

Yankee Steve's Column

for the week of July 16, 200

Multiculturalism: America's Greatest Problem

Part Two of Two

We Are the Enemy

Multiculturalism has any number of adherents: your professor in college, your spiritual leader, and even the guy who bags your groceries. Among all of them there is a false show of humility. They all pretend that America is a live-and-let-live society, but is that what we want or want? Is it reasonable to think that everyone should be allowed to do "his own thing?"

Multiculturalists tell us that want nothing more than that America should be allowed to fulfill its destiny - it must continue to be a haven for all who are in need of a refuge. That sounds nice but those who talk that way will also tell you that if America welcomes the broken peoples of the world they should not have to undergo any changes, and that these new Americans should be allowed to remain what they are. We must never give visitors the impression that Americans expect them to change.

In other words multiculturalists want us to follow the example set for us by the Canadians who allow Pakistanis coming into their country to stay just like they were before they arrived.

We are asked to believe that if any one comes to America they do not have to conform or be assimilated. In other words America is just a place to hang your hat. You can live here and in doing so you do not have to change. What Hector St. John de Crevecoeur [1735-1813] said would not meet with the approval of multiculturalists. Listen to the great patriot.

The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles; he must therefore entertain new ideas, and form new opinions . . . Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labors and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world . . . An (immigrant) when he first arrives . . . no sooner breathes our air than he forms new schemes, and embarks in designs he never would have thought of in his own country . . . He begins to feel the effects of a sort of resurrection; hitherto he had not lived, but simply vegetated; he now feels himself a man . . . Judge what an alteration there must arise in the mind and thoughts of this man; . . . his heart involuntarily swells and glows; this first swell inspires him with those new thoughts which constitute an American.

Judge Robert Bork [1927-] said that if we are not careful America will have to compete within its own borders for the right to preserve its own heritage. He wrote, "**The United States now**

faces the question of how far a culture can stretch to accommodate more and more ethnic groups and religions and still remain recognizable as a culture rather than as a conglomeration of cultures.”

Bork takes note of the fact that multiculturalists would never and could never have founded a nation like our own which though today tottering on the brink of ruin has remained a democracy.

Had we been at the Founding a people as diverse and culturally disunited as we are today, there would have been no Founding. A Constitution and Bill of Rights would not have been proposed, and, if proposed, would have provoked political warfare that would have torn the country too deeply for any hope of unity. It was only the momentum of the original cultural unity that carried us forward with a single dominant culture for so long. [Bork]

John Davenport, who like most Puritans was first-rate scholar, said that by the year 1662 he had amassed evidence which could demonstrate that America had provided a safe haven for the Protestant cause; and that this was necessary because Protestantism had experienced a number of significant setbacks in Europe. He stated without any hesitation that had it not been for America the Protestant cause may have never recovered. At the same time we have to remember that America went far beyond that. For over two centuries the United States has become a safe haven for any and all who have had to experience political oppression and economic hardship.

Who then would not be proud to be an American multiculturalist? They cannot hide their contempt for America, especially for Christian white Americans. First of all multiculturalists are determined to make us feel guilty for being Americans, and secondly, they are determined to prove that America should no longer stand aloof from other nations, so that we should strive for a federalism on an international scale, and all because we are supposed to think of ourselves as citizens of the world and only secondarily as citizens of America. Our desire to hold on to our national sovereignty is they tell us nothing more than hubris. Our national sovereignty should be replaced by a one-world government.

This brings to mind the *Journal of Edmond Goncourt* which he compiled in 1871 after Paris had been taken over by Communists. Their banner was a red flag. The official name for their movement was The Commune, or more properly The Paris Commune. Those who supported it were called Communards or Internationals, or those who wanted to build a world-wide commune. The Prussians had soundly defeated the French whose surrender shocked the nation. Goncourt wondered why the French in the Paris Commune would not surrender, and why they showed such strong resistance. What he wrote is close to home. It touches directly on multiculturalism which has also shown a disregard for our national sovereignty.

Xenophobia or Common Sense

Multiculturalists are quick to label those who differ with them. They call us xenophobes or worse yet nativists. We are always being told that we must “celebrate diversity,” and that unless we agree to celebrate the things that make us different from one another, and not the things that make us alike, we should wear a dunce hat.

In other words America must no longer be thought of as a melting pot, but a fruit bowl, one in which each and every person remains what they were when they came here. Consequently, those who emigrate do not need to change in any significant way. But if we always thought that every culture were equal in value, wouldn't America still be ruled over by a king and parliament?

Many of us think that it is not too much to ask of people that they embrace American culture. In place of diversity they should celebrate their new found Americanism. We have the right to ask visitors to this country that they leave behind at the border some of the ideas and customs which at one time were held in high esteem, for example Muslims, polygamy; or Hindus, the caste system, neither of which is acceptable to those who live in a western style democracy. Our democracy is based on one idea more than any other, namely that God made man so that he could enjoy freedom. Freedom is our natural habitat.

America does have a culture, and it is the best that can be found anywhere. Those who come to America ought to be shown from the outset that there is something unique about our way of life. No one should suggest that America is the kingdom of God, or a New Canaan, but there is something about the American culture that makes us stand out from the rest of the world, if only that we have experimented with democracy more than any other nation, or that we have preserved it longer than any nation in history.

On Being Correct

Multiculturalism has given birth to two children, **Affirmative Action** [AA] and **Political Correctness** [PC]. Both were born out of wedlock.

AA

An orchestra does not solely choose a violinist on the basis of skill any longer because it must have so many women, etc. It has a quota to meet. AA is wrong because in some instances an interfering government is allowed to exercise a control over schools, industries, and the like. We are moving in the direction of Socialism/Communism which calls for a planned society where the government is authorized to plan for the rest of us because the government knows best. **Yes, there should be planning, but it should be carried out by competent people in the private sector because the government should know that it exists in order to preserve the private sector.**

An example of AA is the election of President Barack Obama who lacked the qualifications needed to be the president. He won because America wanted to elect someone from a minority. That was its mood. This explains why he faced stiff competition from a woman, and not just any woman, but Hillary Clinton who has a disreputable character. Obama never ran a lemonade stand. He is unqualified to run a nation facing economic disaster.

Another example of AA is Obama's choice for the Supreme Court Sonia Sotomayor. Federal Judge Sotomayor of the U.S. Court of Appeals has not been chosen on the basis of merit, but because she is a woman and a Latino.

The Obama administration wants us to think that Sotomayor followed a straight line from her 1954 birth in the Bronx projects to Princeton University when she graduated in 1976. Americans like rags to riches stories, or the possibility that old money will have to make room for new money. On the contrary Sotomayor moved very early in life to a middle class neighborhood where she attended private schools.

We have been asked to believe that Obama's choice for the high court has no agenda. That is not possible because she is a confirmed Socialist. All Socialists have an agenda; they are utopians. In her yearbook at Princeton she went so far as to quote Norman Thomas. Why not quote Karl Marx or Chairman Mao? **We remember Thomas as the one man, who more than any other, competed with Eugene Debs for the title leading Socialist of the 20th century.** Does the quote sound like she has an agenda? **"I am not a champion of lost causes, but of causes not yet won."**

Sotomayor is a staunch defender of AA.

Case in point: a group of New Haven, CT firemen who passed the examination for promotion. No sooner had they gotten back their grades then they were told that they were ineligible because none of the candidates were black. They challenged but obtained no help from Sotomayor.

Sitting on the bench of the second court of appeals Sotomayor upheld the monstrous lower court decision. When questioned about this she will claim legal precedent for her actions. In other words her hands were tied. Does anyone believe that? We all know that precedent can be overruled. If that were not the case, we would have to do away with the appeals court system altogether.

Note: The Supreme Court has just overturned Sotomayor's ruling in favor of the white firemen. President Obama has tried to take the sting out of their decision but it is one more proof that the court has to acknowledge that Affirmative Action is inherently unjust and nothing more than reverse racism.

Those who have done the research tell us that cases presided over by Sotomayor demonstrate that she is an activist. She seems to believe that a Latina can make better legal decisions in some instances than some gray-haired, male Wasp. In other words she wants us to think that legal decisions cannot be arrived at objectively, and that the law is not the law. She says she can on legal matters better than some man because a Latina has the needed empathy and feelings. This is akin to the women's movement which acts as if certain courses in the college curriculum remain unintelligible to men. Somehow this takes us back to First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, a radical Socialist, who declared, "As a rule women not only know what men know, but much than men will never know." [March 6, 1937] Does that mean that a Latina woman can be a better judge than a man, especially if he is an old Wasp?

All Socialists have an agenda. They are busy bees. This is why they get involved in government to begin with; they believe that government provides the solution to our problems, whereas conservatives believe that the government is the problem. If conservatives get involved in politics they do so in order to weaken the stranglehold a Socialist-controlled government can have on the people.

Obama's pick for the court is a radical. World Net Daily reported, "**As President Obama's Supreme Court nominee comes under heavy fire for allegedly being a 'racist,' Judge Sonia Sotomayor is listed as a member of the National Council of La Raza, a group that's promoted driver's licenses for illegal aliens, amnesty programs, and no immigration law enforcement by local and state police.**"

PC

Political correctness has been enthroned. It is used in order to silence those who would pass judgment on peoples, movements, and ideas that ought to be exposed.

PC has allowed the homosexual community a greater voice than it deserves. Talk show hosts, television journalists, and politicians are not allowed to expose the myths surrounding the gay movement. Homosexuals tell us that they are being unduly persecuted and in the same way blacks were persecuted in the Jim Crow South. The African-American community has taken exception to that kind of logic. In a recent plebiscite dealing with Gay marriage in California blacks made their voice heard. As a matter of fact they carried the day for the pro-family movement. African-Americans know that there is a great deal of difference between racial-based hatred and the way Americans have traditionally turned away in disgust from homosexuality.

In the public school system anyone who criticizes Charles Darwin is ridiculed, or worse, their grades are by lowered. Darwinism has always had critics in the scientific community; but they have not been allowed a voice in the public schools. As for Creationists they have not only been marginalized, they have been ostracized. The old blasphemy laws have been replaced with unwritten laws protecting the sacred name of Darwin.

By far and away the worst example of political correctness I have ever witnessed was in the 2008 film by Ben Stein entitled *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, in which Stein exposes the way the scientific community has refused to evaluate certain ideas. In the documentary, a woman showed him a place where Jews and retarded people had their brains excised. The grounds for doing this was Darwinism; they had not evolved correctly. Stein expected her to agree with him and call this “evil.” The self-righteous prig refused. She as much as said that it was not within her domain to call evil, evil, even that kind of extreme evil.

The politically correct person seems to have been influenced by the Orient. Pat Means in *The Mystical Maze* quotes from Hermann Hesse’s novel *Siddhartha* where the enlightened Guru says, “**The world Govinda is not imperfect or slowly evolving along a path to perfection. No, it is perfect at every moment . . . Therefore, it seems to me that every thing that exists is good - death as well as life, sin as well as holiness, wisdom as well as folly.**” [*emphasis added*]

Apparently multiculturalists have been influenced by nihilism, or the idea that no one has a hold on truth. No one can say that there are absolute truths or that they know what they are. This can help to explain why they think that no one culture is superior to any other. That does not mean that they do not know that a particular culture can be all the rage, but that is not the same as their acknowledging that a particular culture **is** superior to all the others, which is what we do when we say that the American form of government should be an exemplar to the world.

Now if no one person can say that he has a corner on the truth then the emphasis will fall on tolerance. After all if your culture is no better than mine then I will have to tolerate your opinions since mine are no better than yours, or yours are no better than mine. PC is “tolerance” abbreviated.

Multiculturalists forget that the founders of America were not tolerant. It was their way or the highway. But among multiculturalists tolerance has become a virtue. It reminds me of a statement by Aristotle. “Tolerance and apathy are the last virtues of a dying society.”

Many of these multiculturalists proudly display a bumper sticker that has on the one side a Muslim half moon and star, made to look like a **C**, and on the other end (with a lot of other religious symbols in the middle) we find a **T** that is supposed to represent the Christian symbol of a cross. Consider yourself warned: you had better learn to **COEXIST**. If this were not so pretentious and self righteous it would be funny. The dogmatism is impossible to miss. All it needs is an “or else” after the T. Nothing is said about the fact that it is the followers of Islam who are fomenting trouble around the world. and not Christians.

I ask you, does Islam want to coexist? If that were the case they would have to edit the *Koran*. An unabridged Koran calls on the faithful to make war against all who do not honor Mohammed as the last in a long line of prophets, superior to even Jesus. The holy book of Islam divides the

world into two halves in the same way that Lenin once did. That old fox drew up a division between “THEM” and “US.” This is why he began the Comintern, with US, or members of the Comintern, were supposed to make war on THEM. Show me a Muslim that does not make war on the rest of us, and I will show you someone who is not really following the Koran. Why do I have to tolerate Islam? Is it not true that Islam is a political ideology; one that uses religion to accomplish its ends? Do I have to tolerate all political systems? If so, I will have to tolerate Communism. Flat out, I refuse!

Since when do we in America not allow ourselves the right to take sides on political issues? If Islam is after all a political ideology, or even if it is really and truly a religion, do I have to tolerate a religion that degrades women, foments war, preaches and practices the virtues of polygamy, and denounces Christians and Jews? I demand the right to censure any political ideology that uses religion in the way that Islam does, i.e. to promote hatred and injustice around the world, all with the aim of conquering the world for Allah.

COEXIST? Can we coexist alongside Hindus who wish to keep 40 million untouchables far below the poverty line because maintain that they sinned in a prior life? Now I ask you, what do multiculturalists have to say about living along side Hindus who defend an idea like that? Do I not have the right to demand that Hindus change ASAP in order to fit into America?

President Theodore Roosevelt was a little on the liberal side but he would have kicked multiculturalism in the slats. He would have stood behind the idea that America is exceptional and that those who come here should be willing to abandon anything that gets in the way of their becoming an American. Roosevelt would have known that America has a culture of its own, and that we should expect that those who come to our country to learn about that culture so that they can embrace it. He told us that we have every right to demand of immigrants that they learn our ways.

In the first place, we should insist that if the immigrant who comes here in good faith becomes an American and *assimilates* himself to us, he shall be treated on an exact equality with everyone else, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed, or birthplace, or origin. But this is predicated upon the person's becoming in every facet an American and nothing but an American . . . There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American, but something else also, isn't an American at all. We have room for but one flag, the American flag . . . *We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language . . . and we have room for but one sole loyalty and that is a loyalty to the American people.*" [emphasis added]

In addition to Teddy Roosevelt, Alexis de Tocqueville reinforced this dictate. Tocqueville discovered after traveling extensively in our country that the Americans did have a culture of their own, and that it was superior to anything he had seen in Europe. There was something exceptional he thought about the American experience. Our culture was based on the kind of

government we had devised, a government that was of the people, but not just any people, **a people that had embraced Christianity**; a people who truly believed that Christianity could be relied on to support the kind of government the founding fathers had left behind for us.

Make no mistake about it, in America there has always been a connection between democratic rights and Christianity. Democracy would not have taken flight in a secular or Islamic culture. The followers of Islam have to learn how to coexist alongside democratically-minded Christians.

Who or what is behind multiculturalism?

Keying in on Socialism

If something smells in America you can be certain that the Socialists are not far away. Socialists want us to think of ourselves as citizens of the world and not as citizens of America. We are even asked to place the interests of the world above our own, and that unless we are willing to do this then we have rejected the idea that humankind is made up of a common brotherhood, which would mean that we are cold-hearted isolationists. It has even been suggested that anyone who comes to America illegally should be given amnesty.

That is not how an old enemy of Socialism, labor leader Samuel Gompers, would have thought about this; I wish he were here now to speak to the likes of Nancy Pelosi or Ted Kennedy. In a letter to Congress [March 19, 1924] he wrote:.

America must not be overwhelmed. Every effort to enact immigration legislation must expect to meet a number of hostile forces and, in particular, two hostile forces of considerable strength. One of these is composed of corporation employers who desire to employ physical strength (broad backs) at the lowest possible wage and who prefer a rapidly revolving labor supply at low wages to a regular supply of American wage earners at fair wages. The other is composed of racial groups in the United States who oppose all restrictive legislation because they want the doors left open for an influx of their countrymen regardless of the menace to the people of their adopted country.

The American Congress along with Cardinal R. M. Mahony of California, and a number of laymen and clerics attached to the Roman Catholic Church, would do well to listen to this sage advice from Gompers. Many of them act as if an illegal crossing into our country has not broken the law, or if a law has been broken, then a law of that kind must be unjust. On the contrary, America has every right to expel illegal aliens who always work for less than American workers, who by coming to America have lowered our standard of living.

Unassimilated immigrants who have no real appreciation for just what it is that makes America what it is will come here to make a buck, which because they are willing to work for less than most of us will mean that many people will make a lot less bucks. This is what Socialism does.

The lower class and the middle class are combined which in the end will mean that a new lower class will have been created.

Unfortunately becoming an American does not mean what it once did. **The Trans-nationalists and political globalists are winning.** We are asked to believe that if we are citizens of the world then being an American is not that important. George W. Bush, who often did thoughtless things, even cheapened the idea of becoming a citizen further. Georgie Anne Geyer writes in *Americans No More*,

When President George W. Bush signed still another immigration bill, the Immigration Act of 1990, he called it “the most comprehensive reform of our immigration laws in sixty years.” Advocates praised its “streamlining” of the process of citizenship. And perhaps it was that. Nevertheless after this bill, the historical and beautiful courthouse ceremonies - in which new citizens were sworn to fealty to their new nation in a solemn court room scene reciting the oath of Allegiance before a judge of that nation - became “optional.” At every turn, the entire process of citizenship was being made more remote, the old one-on-one relationship of citizen to state, diminished: there was talk of getting citizenship by mail; there were plans for taking the citizen English test by phone; by 1995, voting by mail was “in” . . . As immigration lawyer Mark Mancini put it wryly at the time, “You might as well as be at the Department of Motor Vehicles.”

Conclusion

Those who come to America must want what America has and has given to the world. They must want freedom. Not the freedom to act as if America is just a place to make a living, but the freedom to preserve in tact the idea that self-rule accords with reason. Those who come here are encouraged to bring with them old world recipes, time-honored customs, a language they will want to hang on to, and whatever else allowed them under the U.S. Constitution. What they cannot bring with them is the idea that the American, the Yankee, has no culture. Nothing could be further from the truth. As long as the Constitution remains in force America will have a culture of its own, one that we have always been willing to recommend to the rest of the world. Our culture is summed up in one word, “freedom.” No culture could ever best that maxim.
Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros

oldlineconservative.com