

CORRESPONDENCE

To the editor:

Joe Fallon has told me that a mistake I have previously alerted him to in his account of the Stephen Steinlight meeting has been corrected, at least on the Web version of *The Occidental Quarterly*. But I gather that the correction could not be made in the print version.

According to Mr. Fallon's original version, Steinlight said that Patrick Buchanan is an anti-Semite, and I then challenged him "to cite even one quotation to substantiate that charge," which Steinlight could not do. That is incorrect. Steinlight did not, at least initially, call Buchanan an anti-Semite, and the quote has now been changed to "racist," which is closer to what he said.

Here is a fuller account of the exchange from my notes, which I wrote down the day of the meeting:

I asked Steinlight from the floor: 'You've called immigration restrictionists abominable, racist and dangerous, but when Mark Krikorian asked you what specifically you found objectionable about them, you said that it was that they didn't come clean about their own identity politics. Is that all you mean by abominable and racist?' Steinlight gave an evasive answer.

I asked him: 'Can you name anything Buchanan has said on immigration that's racist and dangerous?' He replied that he didn't have any quotes at hand, but that Buchanan was an anti-Semite. This was changing the subject. Joseph Fallon who was at the meeting pointed out to me afterward that if Steinlight really knew Buchanan to have said something so awful, he would have been remembered it and been able to quote him.

I particularly want to clear up this mistake since, as I wrote in an article at *Front Page Magazine* this past April, Buchanan's recent attacks on Israel for defending itself from suicide bombers had persuaded me, to my great sadness, that Buchanan is indeed, as others have insisted for years while I had defended him from the charge, driven by an anti-Jewish animus. As I wrote in *Front Page*, the animus is so great that it drives Buchanan to adopt leftist-style arguments against Israel (such excusing the "oppressed" for horrible crimes while demonizing the "oppressor" for legitimate self-defense) that he would despise in other situations--for example, if it were a matter of black rioters and police. However, though I had not yet come to that definite conclusion about Buchanan as of November 2001 when the Steinlight meeting took place, I still would not have challenged Steinlight on that point, given the many well-

known charges of anti-Semitism that have been made against Buchanan over the past ten years. Anyone who wants to see my reasons for concluding this about Buchanan can look up my article, *An Open Letter to Patrick Buchanan*, (<http://www.FrontPageMagazine.com>) April 15, 2002.

Sincerely,
Lawrence Auster

Greetings from Austin,

I just completed reading Hugh Perry's very insightful critical remarks on Kevin Macdonald's "Culture of Critique" on your website. It is a fine article and your journal serves the nationalist movement well. I deeply appreciate its value.

I find it curious that in the midst of all the evolutionary talk of "inclusive fitness" that no one has yet confronted the blatant fact that any species that allows itself to be marginalized, and ultimately exterminated, through various forms of evolutionary sabotage and race regression, is probably not fit to exist in the first place. I think Darwin himself (and Herbert Spencer definitely) maintained that the process of "race (or species) suicide acts as a real biological brake for any species that have become increasingly maladaptive. In other words, a species will only continue as long as it is genetically endowed with the effective means to do so. Otherwise, it will perish. This is what Darwinians mean by the term "inclusive fitness."

Are whites following this kind of pattern? Are we actively pursuing through sick immigration and outbreeding patterns our own untimely, genetic doom? It is altogether possible that this is the case. But I think another factor really needs to be considered in this seemingly endless "long argument" regarding the impending fate of the white race. This factor involves the role of the federal government--and its imposition of direct force in implementing the majority of the policies that we as race nationalists reject. When considered from an evolutionary standpoint, the federal government's role in the creation of a super racist state encompassing ever growing numbers of rootless third world elements is essentially what should rightly be called a normative (or artificial) arrangement. It is, in other words the objective articulation of a strictly formal operative idea--the sum product of countless governmental edicts and impositions. It is an arrangement that is maintained solely through the use of force and intimidation. The physical sinews of this system we are all more than familiar with: the Office of Civil Rights, the IRS, Hate Crimes legal apparatus, the national courts, hyperactive politicians and so on. As Robert E. Lee once predicted, the United States is now a republic maintained at the end of a bayonet.

At the same time that this system is normative, it is not adaptive. This means that it is not organic to the traditional spirit in which America was founded and continues, at least in some quarters, to be understood. The present system, therefore, exists much as the old communist regime existed prior to its spontaneous implosion in 1989. That system was also a normative one, and appeared to function just fine as long as there were enough Red Guards and tanks to preserve it. Eventually, however, history and the inability of the communist system to adapt to changing circumstances, brought it down.

I suspect that we are facing a similar situation in the United States at this time. I think all of us understand that America's so called "race problem" (now problem of the races) was created solely through the involvement and duplicity of the American government in destroying the republican form of government in which this country was conceived. It was a naked grab for power that worked extremely well for those in power who benefited from it at the time. This power fulcrum however has now mutated into a global maladaptive disease that is not subject to any effective internal controls. In order to maintain some degree of cohesion at home, America must now embroil the rest of the world in its race problems, along with its sinking indebtedness. As millions of aliens continue to swamp the nation, a growing number of states are struggling to cope with insolvency and growing white flight. As I write these words, the US Congress just voted to increase, once again, the already staggering national debt of 5 trillion dollars.

The present racial spoils system currently prevailing in the United States is, like its Soviet predecessor, economically and socially impracticable. Indeed, whites in increasingly numbers are finally waking up to the swindle. In much the same way, millions of average Russians woke up one day to discover that they were not, after all, living in the worker's paradise they had been promised. Similarly, long before the last white person has expired -- or departed for Australia or Argentina -- the federal racialist and entitlement spoils regime will have collapsed. It doesn't take a genius to figure that out.

It is important to remember that a normative system of political power (and the abuse of that power) can only prevail as long as the system itself continues relatively unstrained by external pressures. It is a system that must always remain either at rest or in nearly perfect motile equilibrium. It is definitely not a dynamic system. This is why normative systems of political and military control -- unless earnestly supported by an intensely nationalistic populace, such systems rarely survive truly aggressive revolutionary movements. We can very safely assume (particularly after the events of last fall), that our own government is not immune to this fundamental socio-biological principle.

Warmest regards,
Charles A. Roberts