

Share Report Abuse Next Blog»

CONSERVATIVE SWEDE

"Două FETE ŞI UN SUEDEZ"

Thursday, August 13, 2009

America as the birthplace of Multiculturalism and Political Correctness

I have touched upon this many times. An [ongoing discussion](#) over at Gates of Vienna inspired me to make a more complete and systematic argument. The subject of that discussion is slavery. It was pointed out how in America, unlike in many other places, the slaves were not castrated. To which I answered:

As Dymphna touched upon, the slaves in America were treated very humanely in comparison. A relation of caring and respect could often develop between the black slave and the white owner. But a modern Western European cannot allow himself to know that, he must see this slavery and all of its expressions as evil evil evil. And neither an American today either, at least not under the current Presidency.

By not castrating the slaves America today has got some 40 million descendants of these slaves living among them, as a people within the people, who forever hold a grudge against their former prisoners, no matter how well they are treated or fawned upon. There are fundamental reasons of human psychology why it is so.

In addition this made America the international scapegoat of "evil" slavery. It's very simple: people associate slavery with America, since in America you can see loads of traces of slavery, such as 40 million black people (in essence every time we meet a black American we have the issue of slavery at the back of our head). Nobody thinks much of the slavery by Britain, France, etc. Or by the Arabs. Since there's nothing there to remind us. Btw Rocha, I think the blackness found in Yemen can be because of its climate zone, quite as for black people in southern India (look at your own map).

So this has been the reward for the kindness Americans shown to their slaves.

Certain things should be done properly, or not at all. E.g. going to war. Either one abstains from it or one does it properly in the responsible way. Doing it as a half-measure is the worst thing. Same with slavery, in my view. The half-measure has the worst consequences (as seen above). Treat them kindly by all means, but make sure to castrate them. Or better, have no slaves.

I think this is one more example of how [this sort of goodness](#) leads to not only wrong but potentially [devastating results](#).

But it doesn't stop there. After the Civil War the Americans did not only free their slaves, but actually made them citizens!! (once again the modern men do not grasp the vast [significance](#) of this second step!). And that was the embryo of the first multicultural state. Multiculturalism and race-sensitive political correctness was being born, and in place early 20th century in America. And subsequently these ideals where spread / pushed

Follow this blog by email:

Email address...

[Overview of recent comments and posts](#)

[Alternative ways of browsing this blog](#)

Email: [conswede \(at\) mailbolt.com](mailto:conswede@atmailbolt.com)

Recent Posts

[Nazification Spells and Philosemitic Assurance: The EDL Case and Theory](#)

[Joe Bloggs on the EDL Jewish Division affair](#)

[Some of my #1 rankings at Google](#)

[I'm a vicious antisemite!](#)

[Ferdinand Bardamu on the foolishness of anti-Semitism and anti-anti-Semitism](#)

[Stranglers: Shah Shah a go go](#)

[Ferdinand Bardamu: "White people are their own worst enemy"](#)

[When is discussing useful anyway?](#)

[Wovon man nicht sprechen kann, darüber muß man schweigen](#)

[Open thread. March 2011](#)

Moderation Policy

Any comment that does not *contribute* to the discussion in a meaningful, respectful and intellectually honest way risks ending up on the scrap heap. If you get upset by the topics discussed here (many people have indeed become so during the years) it's a pity if you should waste your time by writing a comment that will never see the daylight. I'm fed up with the mediocracy of open/free debate. I want to see *good* debate.

Important Posts

[America as the birthplace of](#)

upon Europe after WWII. The American race-mixed society became the ideal, and the Western European nations followed suit. And so we are where we are today.

Here are some evidence of the prevalence of PC + MC in America before 1945, while the opposite was in place in Europe:

1. [Agatha Christie publishes a book](#) called *Ten Little Niggers* in 1939 in Britain. It was immediately renamed *And Then There Were None* when released in the US in 1940. Such a über-sensitive politically correct "translation" of the title was not adapted in Great Britain until 1967, and in Sweden only in 2007.

2. [See here](#) a collection of reviews of Louis Armstrong's visit to Sweden in 1933. In all the news papers he was described as something monkey-like let loose from the jungle. All across the line! And this in the reviews by the most serious music critics. Hardly PC, nor MC.

3. The first expression in art of multiculturalism, that I know of, is from the American movie *Birth of a Race* from 1918. In the scene staring at 5:30 Jesus is speaking to all the races of the whole world. [Watch it here!](#) Check out the Chinese sitting there listening to Jesus, that's hilarious! And it's hard to blame the Frankfurt School for this one :-)

 These are clear evidence of both PC and MC in America in the interwar period, while evidence of the opposite attitude in Europe in the same period. What does that suggest about the origin of MC + PC for the impartial observer? It is important to realize this, since most right-wingers see America as the one that could save us from the horrible evils of MC + PC. Which is unfortunately an upside down view. Which more and more right-wingers have woken up to with the ascendance of Obama.

It took the post-WWII anti-Nazification campaign and Adorno's "F-Factor" to wash out traditional European attitudes and install MC + PC in their place. [As I have written elsewhere:](#)

America is seen as right-wing in the current political theater, however historically America together with France has been the main force in pushing our civilization to the left.

After WWII European patriotism was seen as the root of the evil, which had to be held down. The only permitted patriotisms were American and Israeli. Britain and France got away with some, but after the Suez crisis in 1956 they were effectively out of the picture too. Now offensive military actions were only accepted from America and Israel.

In the 50s and the 60s America and Israel were celebrated as model countries of progressivism. European conservatism had been rooted out in the cultural revolution imposed upon America in Western Europe. Adorno's The F-Factor describes European conservatism as a psychological pathology related to fascism. But the Europeans learned fast. First they learned to follow the American example and see America as the model country. The Europeans could pick this up fast since the ideas were rooted in the Christian gospels. But soon they learned that America didn't live up to code of moral goodness that they had imposed on the Europeans. And left-wing anti-Americanism was born. And to be precise, even anti-Americans wasn't born in Europe but also imported from the US.

The problem for America was that in their quest to end all "evil" empires, they had effectively become the big empire themselves. E.g. inheriting the role of maintaining the Pax Britannica. Then they had to do all the sort of things they had taught the Europeans were wrong. The Europeans soon learned to beat the Americans in their own game, becoming the leading in progressivism and "holier than thou". And curiously enough, thus America ended up being seen as right-wing. The original right-wing had been rooted out in a collaboration between America and the European

[Multiculturalism and Political Correctness](#)

[The power configuration of the Wilsonian West](#)

[Christian ethics—to be or not to be?](#)

[Jewish God, anti-Semitism and Oedipus Complex](#)

[Catholicism—aneccdotal conservatism](#)

[Islam—perverted parasitical psychopathy](#)

Historical Top Posts

[1. Join the art project!](#)

[2. Part 2: Sweden Democrats and Hollywood Nazis](#)

[3. Catholicism—birth control and birth rates \(part II\)](#)

[4. Islam—perverted parasitical psychopathy](#)

[5. I'm an island](#)

JOIN THE ART PROJECT!



SUPPORT FREE SPEECH

Recent Comments



Archive

- ▶ 2011 (10)
- ▶ 2010 (3)
- ▼ 2009 (32)
 - ▶ November (1)
 - ▶ October (2)
 - ▶ September (1)
 - ▼ August (3)
 - "Intellectual subtlety"

socialists in the wake of WWII.

The turning point came by the end of the 60s -- the Vietnam war and the Six-Days war. The image of America and Israel shifted, and they were no longer seen as the model countries of progressivism, but as "evil" right-wing countries. We should remember that our progressivist paradigm (which is always going left) is based on Christian ethics. And Christian ethics means the inversion of values. So it's the weak that is considered good, while the strong is considered evil. In WWI and WWII America had defeated all the strong (and therefore evil) European empires. The job was completed in the Suez crisis in 1956 by turning against their former allies. But you can never win with Christian ethics, because now America became the strong one, and therefore the evil one.

So now American and Israeli patriotism becomes highly questioned and opposed. But not based on restoring any other patriotism, but by going even deeper into deranged progressivism. Thus, in effect, American and Israeli patriotism are still the only permitted patriotisms. Surely now the holiest priests of our leftist paradigm now condemn the actions of America and Israel. But in effect it is tolerated. While if any other (white) country acts militarily offensively it's seen as a major global crisis (e.g. Serbia, Russia).

I will conclude with [something I wrote last year](#):

1918 and 1945 have been the recent paradigm shifts at civilizational level. The civil war for America. 1989 for Eastern Europe. 1968 was a minor transformation.

1918 and 1945 are better seen as two steps of the same shift, with 1945 as the concluding step, and therefore a more decisive change. In fact, the American civil war was a pre-step to all this, its resulting "patch" was made universal across the West from 1945.

The embryo of multiculturalism was dreamed up during the enlightenment, but was first institutionalized by the result of the American civil war.

[As Diamed has written](#):

"If we had combined freeing the slaves with deporting them, they could hardly complain since they had never been citizens in the first place. Unfortunately Lincoln was assassinated, the plan was abandoned, and the window of opportunity vanished. Now blacks are equal citizens of the USA and, so long as the USA exists, it is as much black as it is white."

And multiculturalism was born, and out of its rib bone political correctness had to be created.

By Conservative Swede At [22:02](#)

32 comments:

 [Rollory](#) said...

Yup. No argument with any of that.

I've seen claims that Lincoln planned on deporting them all before he was killed. It wouldn't have made up for his smashing the power of the states (absolutely necessary in restraining the federal government) but it would've helped. Also that a senator Theodore Bilbo tried to do the same thing in the 1920s. Today of course suggesting such a thing in public would be unacceptable, so things will drift until the separation impulse turns violent.

[August 14, 2009 2:30 AM](#)

 [Afonso Henriques](#) said...

[America as the birthplace of Multiculturalism and ...](#)

[Geza: "The Austerites value Christianity over Euro...](#)

- ▶ [July \(2\)](#)
- ▶ [June \(5\)](#)
- ▶ [May \(9\)](#)
- ▶ [April \(8\)](#)
- ▶ [January \(1\)](#)

▶ [2008 \(19\)](#)

▶ [2007 \(77\)](#)

Subscribe to feeds:

 [Posts](#) ▼

 [Comments](#) ▼

Blogroll

[1389 Blog](#)

[Big Peace](#)

[Bruce Charlton](#)

[Brussels Journal](#)

[Cavatus's Blog](#)

[Chronicles Magazine](#)

[Cox & Forkum](#)

[Crucible of Terror](#)

[Diana West](#)

[Dissident Frogman](#)

[English Defence League](#)

[Europarl's video channel](#)

[EuropeNews](#)

[Faith Freedom International](#)

[Fjordman Blog](#)

[Fjordman Files](#)

[Foreign Policy Research Institute](#)

[Gallia Watch](#)

[Gates of Vienna](#)

[Gerald Celente](#)

[Guillaume Faye](#)

[Hans-Hermann Hoppe](#)

[HonestThinking](#)

Conservative Swede,

"After the Civil War the Americans did not only free their slaves, but actually made them citizens!! (once again the modern men do not grasp the vast significance of this second step!)."

In my identity card I have two things: Nationality and Citizenship. My view is close to yours. I just believe we can have citizens who are not Nationals. I mean, people living here, enjoying "some" benefits and havins "some" responsibilities. And then we could have the entire people being both Citizens AND Nationals. The Nation would be anchored in the Nationals and the Citizens would just be people the Nationals would accept but who would never be real Nationals (It would be easy to take the Citizenship away from them too). And of course, because I'm really evil, I think that only some few Nationals could constitute a "Nobility" and "direct" the entire Nation.

Conservative Swede, what I really wanted to say was another thing. You say that Multiculturalism was born in America. Have you study Mexico? Do so. It is a very interesting case and I believe it was indeed the first self proclaimed multicultural country. And proud of it.

But you're right when you say that Mexico never had the power to impose its multiculturalism in Europe. The same can't be said of the United States and I tell you that your reason is very strongly based in logics. Yes, America is the root of the problem the French initiated.

I just don't think your three examples are bright ones. Sorry man, I'm being honest.

[August 14, 2009 1:40 PM](#)



[Conservative Swede](#) said...

While not agreeing with the rest of what he says, [Afonso](#) makes a very good point over at GoV:

Baron B had written:

The truth is that Muslims have been slaughtering and enslaving black Africans for more than a millennium.

Afonso answers:

This is redundant. The Africans themselves enslaved each other (just lay an eye on Haiti) like no one did.

That is, the Africans treated each other much worse than the Americans treated them. In fact, as bad as the Muslims. And with have other such historical examples of inter-race atrocities, e.g. the Aztecs.

So ones again, how were the Americans rewarded for this niceness? By permanently having a class of people built into their society who will, as a group, forever feel grudge against the majority for having enslaved their ancestors. And as a consequence of this, becoming known as the epitome of cruel slavery. And this is all an effect of their own creation, by their nicety. As Rollory pointed out, this could have been avoided if Lincoln had been able to execute his plan.

This is yet another example of human decency that does not scale up to the state level.

But for example: Shouldn't we help poor people? Yes, of course. But if we apply this morality at the state level and hand out welfare money to them, we create a permanent class of poor people within our society that will grow. Essentially we pay them to remain poor.

As Baron Bodissey pointed out in his excellent [Darwin at Work](#)

[In Mala Fide](#)

[Jim's Blog](#)

[Kitman TV](#)

[Liberties Alliance](#)

[Liberty and Culture](#)

[MEMRI](#)

[Mr. O'Brian's Thinking Emporium](#)

[New English Review](#)

[Ohmyrus essays \(FFI\)](#)

[Organicist](#)

[Peter Schiff](#)

[Politically Incorrect - English Version](#)

[Polymath](#)

[Ramzpaul](#)

[Ron Paul](#)

[Russia Today](#)

[Snaphanen videos](#)

[Spogbolt](#)

[Srdja Trifkovic](#)

[Steve Sailer](#)

[Stratfor](#)

[Surviving in Argentina](#)

[The Anger of a Quiet Man](#)

[The Conservative Kitchen Table](#)

[The Joy of Curmudgeonry](#)

[The Local - Sweden's news in English](#)

[The Long View](#)

[The Spearhead](#)

[The Telegraph News Bloggers](#)

[The Wandering White](#)

[Up Pompeii](#)

[Watts Up With That?](#)

[Wilson Revolution Unplugged](#)

[Bloggrulle \(in Scandinavian languages\)](#)

[A very useful portal: Motvärnet.nu](#)

[Affes Statistik-blogg](#)

[Axess](#)

article: "*Christian ethical principles don't scale up.*" This holds true for any altruism "*originally intended to be a code followed by the individual believer.*"

We should help poor people as individuals. But if the state is doing the same, not only does it spend other people's money (the taxpayers money), but it causes a problem instead of fixing it. The same with single mothers. We should help and support them as individuals. But if the state is doing it, it will encourage more to become single mothers. The incentive for single mothers must be to find a new man. If they end up finding abusive men, we should help them with that -- as individuals.

We are decent people, so we should treat black people, and of course slaves, with human decency. But once again, this does not scale up to the state level. This is a prime example of good intentions leading to hell. By not deporting their freed black slaves and by making the citizens, the American state seriously corrupted the nation of Americans and created a permanent problem within their society.

As I always say, what's so special about the Israel/Palestine conflict? Such population transfers and redrawing of maps have happened many times in history, e.g. between Turkey and Greece after WWI, and between Germany and Poland after WWII. And we do not hear a peep about it today, in spite of there being just as many arguments about wrong-doings as with the Israel/Palestine issue.

The reason that we hear about the issue all the time is that a permanent class of people has been created, the Palestinians, who forever hold a grudge and are agitated about the issue. Israel could have avoided that, if they had acted more appropriately, instead of with half-measures.

The same applies with America's way of dealing with their former black slaves. Because of misplaced decency, the United States have created a similar class of tens of millions of black Americans, who will forever hold a grudge and be agitated about their crimes of slavery. That's the result of treating slaves with misplaced decency. It would have been better if they had been castrated.

[August 14, 2009 1:56 PM](#)



[Conservative Swede](#) said...

Afonso,

What you say about "citizens" and "nationals" is confusing and incomprehensible.

Regarding Mexico. What you say would be interesting if you could make that case. So make your case!

I just don't think your three examples are bright ones. Sorry man, I'm being honest.

Once again flimsy claims without substance from you. It's a nice irony how your unsubstantiated comment, of how you think my examples are not "bright ones", is an example of the very opposite of a bright comment.

[August 14, 2009 2:10 PM](#)



[Conservative Swede](#) said...

Rocha is of course right, [over in the other thread](#). It was not Ancient Rome but the Holy Roman Empire who enslaved Slavic people. And he makes some other good points too:

The Germans, not the Romans invaded and conquered the Sclavus tribe. The latin word for slave is Servus wich in english is

[Balder Blog](#)

[Beska droppar](#)

[Blågula frågor](#)

[Captus](#)

[Contra](#)

[Cornucopia?](#)

[Dansk Folkeparti](#)

[Dick Harrison](#)

[Document.no](#)

[Every Kinda People](#)

[Flashback Forum](#)

[Flute-tankar](#)

[Fremskrittspartiet](#)

[Fria Tider](#)

[Fröken Sverige](#)

[Gotiska Klubben](#)

[Gudmundson](#)

[Hodja](#)

[Human Rights Service](#)

[ISLAM - Allt du behöver veta](#)

[Jan Milld](#)

[Kent Ekeroth](#)

[Klartexten](#)

[Kurt Lundgren](#)

[Merit Wager](#)

[MetalMatte's videos: Blattar bråk](#)

[Nicolai Sennels](#)

[Peter Santesson](#)

[Politiskt Inkorrekt](#)

[Rakryggad](#)

[Robsten](#)

[SD Webb-TV](#)

[Snaphanen](#)

[Spydpigen](#)

[Sverigedemokraterna](#)

[Tanja Bergkvist](#)

[Ted Ekeroth](#)

[Thoralf Alfsson](#)

[Tommy Hansson](#)

serf and is on the root of servant. It brings ligh to what the serfs really were. and to what catholic mass means as servant of god. In reality white slaves were common in all europe untill the 1500's. We have documents telling about them in England, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Germany, Byzantium, Ireland, Russia, etc. Crowell slaved thousands of irish in 1650's and send them to the caribbean, they and their descendents were free in the early 1800's and migrated en masse to southern USA.

[August 14, 2009 2:25 PM](#)



[Fellow Peacekeeper](#) said...

Another prize example : Franz Boas and his acolytes, key originators of much of the pseudoscience later justifying MC and some facets of PC.

I often ask myself what advantages our 'good society possesses over that of the 'savages' and find, the more I see of their customs, that we have no right to look down upon them. . . We have no right to blame them for their forms and superstitions which may seem ridiculous to us. We 'highly educated people' are much worse, relatively speaking. . . Franz Boas to Marie Krackowizer, December 23, 1883.

Like the Frankfurt school, a German export, just 50 years prior, and like the school found his audience in the US.

[August 14, 2009 3:16 PM](#)

 [Afonso Henriques](#) said...

Conservative Swede,

I just do not think your three examples clearly illustrate a change of vallues or just a change of prespective of the society or of the upper segments of the society. To me, all your three examples seem isolated individual cases. But once again, your reason is based on logic. I agree with your reason, I just did not like your examples because I think they do not explain or illustrate such a change.

We'll not fight about it, will we ?

[August 14, 2009 5:30 PM](#)

 [Afonso Henriques](#) said...

"What you say about "citizens" and "nationals" is confusing and incomprehensible."

Let me try to simplify it. I know I sometimes cannot express myself as well as I want to.

The concept of Nationality would be transmited by "jus sanguinius" (not sure it's how it is spelled), meaning that it would be transmited from parents to children. It would be granted to the entire people of a Nation. That people would have all the benefits and all the responsibilities to the State, the State would exist to serve them.

In a way, this concept of Nationality follows that hardcore Nationalist view of it as a somewhat exclusive club. (It would be derived from the Hitlerian ideal of a "Volk" or the way indigenous Arabs are prefered in the United Arab Emirates).

The benefitors of Citizenship would be, in a way, second class citizens. They would enjoy some benefits and have some responsibilities.

You know that foreign that is likable, actually enriches us somewhat but is not exactly one of ours? That would recieve the Citizenship.

It does not matter if he's a cuisine chief, a football player or just the immigrant who behaves well and actually does the job no one wants to do without bothering a soul (they are very few, but they

[Trykkefrihedsselskabet](#)

[Uriasposten](#)

[Varjager](#)

[Zonka](#)



[CONSERVATIVE SWEDE](#)

Studying our history, to be prepared for our future.

[View my complete profile](#)

do exist).

I hope it is now understandable, Conservative Swede.

Concerning Mexico, like every other former colony substantially populated by European peoples (colonizers), it was the Europeans who fought for the independence. And like most Latin American countries, Mexico found itself with a majority non white population but with a substantial population being part of the European Civilisation. Thus, Mexico had this two heritages: An European and an Indigenous one, and since the independence it triumphed a liberal European mindset.

Now, the interesting thing about Mexico is that it was a country with a large Indian heritage that justified independence from Spain but at the same time, the thinking in Mexico was not too indigenous but European, although of liberal inclination.

Mexico got an (the only) Indigenous president in the 1860s. After some time there was a liberal revolution - the Mexican Revolution - that originated a constitution dated from 1917 in which we can read that Mexico is a pluricultural indivisible Nation based on the indigenous communities.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mexican_Constitution_of_1917#Article_2 - Here's Wikipedia.

I believe you know that in Mexico there are no Europeans, Africans or Indians. All of their are "mestizo" and rightly deserve California and Texas which have been stole from them. At least, that's what they say. This is part of the deranged Mexican multiculturalism that comes from long.

There is also a very widely known Mexican writer who speaks about a mix-race super race that is destined to take over all the Americas.

It's all these early multiculturalism in Mexico that I was talking about.

[August 14, 2009 6:30 PM](#)

 [Roman](#) said...

Altogether, the issue of slavery is very complicated indeed, especially in Eastern Europe.

Actually serfdom(a different name for slavery) in big parts of Poland ended in 1864 only! Even later than in Russia! I refer to so called "Congress Poland" under Russian control.

The tensions resulting from this are still noticeable - the parts of the society that have some aristocratic background still despise peasants, who were kept uneducated for generations. I suspect that "Polish jokes" common in the US have to do with the influx of illiterate Polish peasants to America in 19th century.

This split in the society was the main reason for the loss of independence in 18th century. The ruling "Sarmatians", as the Polish nobility started to call themselves (inventing their ancient ancestry), claimed that they are the only rightful citizens and removed any chances of upward mobility for peasants. This in consequence weakened the town folk and replaced the native bourgeois with large Jewish petty merchant class who were easily controlled and acted on behalf of the nobles. Which resulted in the famous Polish populist anti-semitism and general backwardness. Btw - it isn't my theory, Norman Davies has described it in his books - he is considered by many the best in the field of Polish history. Altogether this subject is rather avoided by native Polish historians, since it undermines the much -cherished myth of greatness of the First Republic (until 1795) which fell prey to "evil" Russia, Prussia and Austria and not to the general corruption of

the Polish ruling class.

Most of the Westerners have heard about Russian serfdom through Nicolai Gogol and his "Dead Souls". The situation was rather similar in most of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth - a sad story.

This post might be perceived a bit off-topic, but I think it (that being so recent) might help us to widen the scope of discussion.

Actually very large part of these serfs were of Germanic origin, having been invited (imported) en masse since Mongol invasions (starting 1241), which completely depopulated large parts of Poland. Scores of villages by the name of "Olendry" (the Hollanders) attest to that. There is a village called Wilamowice (from Willem probably) where Germanic language is still spoken.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wymysorys>

[August 14, 2009 8:39 PM](#)

 [Afonso Henriques](#) said...

Roman, you're a Polish guy that also comment on Brussels Journal, right?

Anyway, I liked your comment and I don't think it is off topic especially once Con Swede invited people here to answer to the Gates of Vienna thread.

I don't know much about Eastern European serfdom or Germanic serfdom and I truly cannot identify much with an advent like the Thirty Years War due to cultural dissimilarities but my impression is that "serfdom" in Western Europe was different from that in Eastern Europe.

But I also only know some things about it over the Atlantic fringe. And now that I think about it, we here on Portugal and Spain under feudalism had some other entrepies going on such as war, war, war, ethnic tensions, war and colonisation.

So that my impression is that here "serfdom" was just the hard life of poor, brute but good people in the fields. I don't think that my grandfather was less of a slave than the serfs of the Visigoths, for instance. My father.... that's an whole different story.

[August 14, 2009 11:37 PM](#)



[Conservative Swede](#) said...

Afonso,

We'll not fight about it, will we?

You seriously need to make a choice.

Either you continue with your cocky and taunting style. But then you shouldn't come whining, in this way, when you are met in the same manner.

Or you conform with a well-behaved manner to start with, and you do not need to lose face.

I think the second choice will cause less trouble for all of us.

[August 15, 2009 2:41 AM](#)

 [Engineer-Poet](#) said...

NB: deporting the former slaves was a non-starter even in the 1860's. Who would have worked the cotton fields of the former plantations? Certainly not people from the industrial cities of the North! Shutting down the economy of the South was as contrary to the goals of Reconstruction as it was to the need of the North for that same cotton.

There would have been an immediate need to import a new worker class to replace the one just deported. Then, as now, the business elite was interested in cheap labor. They turned the freed slaves into sharecroppers held in debt peonage and business went on for the better part of a century. We are still paying the price.

You can see echoes of this cheap-labor paradigm (socializing the costs, privatizing the profits) in the use of illegal immigrant and "refugee" labor in meat-packing plants and agriculture around the USA. The solution is to get rid of cheap labor and mechanize, mechanize, mechanize! Machines wind up in museums, not causing social ills to the seventh generation and beyond.

[August 17, 2009 3:39 AM](#)

 [Conservative Swede](#) said...

So therefore the former slaves were made citizens!?!?!

And today the Americans are equally eager to make their illegal aliens residents and then citizens. That REALLY makes sense, riight! It's like an obsession, a madman obsession.

Didn't deport them, fine. But why on earth make them citizens! THAT's the issue!

The problem here is that modern people (and Americans since their inception) are completely devoid of understanding the meaning of citizenship, and the consequences of its meaning. The most vacuous ones do not even grasp that it has a meaning at all.

It's like if people started seeing marriage as of no special importance anymore. But wait, that is pretty much how it is too in the West today, isn't it?

[August 17, 2009 2:16 PM](#)

 [Engineer-Poet](#) said...

"Didn't deport them, fine. But why on earth make them citizens! THAT's the issue!"

Having obliterated the nationality they would have inherited from their parents, what nation would they belong to? Deporting them would have been kinder than denying them a nation to belong to. This is the logic behind the [Fourteenth Amendment](#).

If we have problems today, perhaps the solution is to encourage the problem people to leave. Commute prison sentences if they surrender their citizenship and leave the country, pay the welfare cases to go where their fees will buy a house and servants, and so forth.

[August 17, 2009 3:48 PM](#)

 [Lucille](#) said...

Hmm. You compare the Islamic world and the American countries; but what about other societies - Ancient Rome? the Byzantine empire? China? Greece? Persia? the Aztecs? What were the normal practices?

I think I need to find some good history books...

My theory (although I'm not sure of it) is that geography had a lot to do with the difference. Simply allowing natural replacement was easier and cheaper than primarily relying on the transatlantic shipments.

Engineer: the answer to your question is simple: they would have been replaced by European laborers.

[August 19, 2009 3:47 PM](#)

[Engineer-Poet](#) said...

I'm skeptical. Even if European laborers would have accepted the jobs at a wage which left the cotton plantations competitive with e.g. Egypt, would they have been able to remain in business during the upset caused by the changeover?

Historical contingency is a powerful thing. Once the South built its fortune on cotton grown by slave labor, no easy or quick changes were possible. This is why we have to get rid of cheap labor industries in the USA; we are just repeating the same folly.

[August 23, 2009 8:10 PM](#)

[e](#) [Lucille](#) said...

"Political correctness" was [not unknown](#) in Europe before the post-war era...

[August 29, 2009 7:55 PM](#)

[Engineer-Poet](#) said...

Dickens' personal conversion story is very different from the orthodoxy of PC.

[August 30, 2009 3:08 PM](#)

[e](#) [John Sobeiski](#) said...

I have lived in Sweden for a few years now, and am up for citizenship.

The amazing thing i have found here is that native Swedes seem to feel some form of embarrassment towards their own nationality. It is almost like they are continually apologising for something that they have never done.

The leftist movement (IMO) is always labelling patriots as racist rightwing extremists. One example that I noticed was that when I first came to this country, there was an abundance of anti-nazi propaganda (graffiti with swastika's and a cross over saying "Nazister försvinn").

Whereas, there was absolutely no sign of Nazi presence at all. There were no skinheads, or propaganda. I am no advocate for Nazi ideology, but in this case it would appear that the leftist/muslim group were trying to indicate there was a problem by creating the illusion of an issue.

This was my first impression of Sweden – oh did I mention this was in a predominantly immigrant neighbourhood?

Why are Swedes so quick to defend an ideology that only causes them pain? Is Sweden headed for complete internal collapse and civil-war?

[September 02, 2009 5:23 PM](#)

[Rocha](#) said...

CS,

It's good to know that you noticed my post, since was the end of the posts and almost everyone had spent theirs i didn't think if i was noticed. Afonso ideas of citezenship are close to mine (i reject the monarchist overtones) what do you think of it?

I have to say that i'm somewhat puzzled about some of your ideas (the über-germanic empire disgusts me) but others times your ideas make me think again, and i like to think. =]

[September 08, 2009 5:59 PM](#)

[Conservative Swede](#) said...

 *the über-germanic empire disgusts me*

I have no idea of what you are referring to.

[September 08, 2009 10:33 PM](#)

 [Rocha](#) said...

CS,

I believe that my early post got lost, but the whole idea is in the Reversal is possible thread.

"Germanic people need to live in a land where Germanic culture and ethnicity is the norm in this very natural and strong way. 100% ethnic purity is not needed, is unnatural and a failed concept."

There you also denies it but that's what i felt there. Anyway that's not the important issue. Who will and who will not survive it's up to fate but i sadly doubt anything west of lake lagoda and the vistula will survive.

[September 09, 2009 2:32 AM](#)

 [Robert Marchenoir](#) said...

Fascinating post.

Suppose Americans were given the magic power to change past history.

Suppose we'd organise a referendum over this question : would you like history to be re-made as if slavery in America had never happened ?

Suppose that Whites and Blacks got to vote separately.

My bet is that Whites would vote yes, and Blacks would vote no.

All things considered, American Blacks came out the better for slavery (see the state of Africa). And unless someone proves that the economic development of the United States would not have happened without slave labour (I'm not aware that any historian has), Whites would have been better off without it.

I certainly hope to be proven wrong, but the presence of a significant and enslaved black population at the start of United States' history might well be the seed of its ultimate destruction through multiculturalism.

Question to CS : do you have positive information that Agatha Christie's "Ten little niggers" was changed into "And then there were none" in the US 1940 version, because of the offending nature of the word "nigger" ? And not for some other local marketing reason, as is often the case nowadays ?

After all, they could have used the word "negro", which, if I remember correctly, was still the politically correct way to speak back in the 1960's -- precisely in order to avoid the word "nigger".

When I first read the book in French, it was called "Les dix petits nègres". Thanks God, it still is :

<http://tinyurl.com/yjqt4h4>

(You don't need to spread the news. Thank you.)

The French "nègre" is a translation for both "nigger" and "negro". There's no equivalent for the distinction. Further down in history, it gave way to "personne de couleur" ("coloured"), then "Noir" ("Black"), and, more recently, in familiar discourse... "Black", which, since its Englishness gives it a trendy and hip quality, is

deemed a tad more politically correct than "Noir", especially in Leftist circles.

Nowadays, you can even be branded a racist if, on a TV talk-show, you mention, during a discussion about the concept of race, that one of your co-panelists is black.

When I began blogging a few years ago, I was stunned to discover that a large number of Frenchmen (and an even larger proportion of the Left) actually believe that races do not exist, to the point of correcting you if you mention the R-word.

My astonishment at such a discovery really proves I'm an old fart.

[October 25, 2009 7:50 PM](#)

 [rebelliousvanilla](#) said...

EP, not making them citizens would have been an incentive for them to leave. Anyway, the whole liberation thing was done wrong, they should have liberated only the slaves that were willing to move to another country. And by the way, economic studies showed that slavery would have become inefficient in a decade or so.

The problem in the US now and cheap labour is that white Americans are made uncompetitive by the minimum wage or spend their days on welfare. It's all a function of the state involvement in the economy.

Anyway, I agree with Afonso, you can give citizenship to others and not see them as nationals. This is what happens in my country - Hungarians and gypsies are citizens, but most Romanians don't see them as nationals and Hungarians are white. lol. This is why you might find comments on youtube videos and news articles in which a gypsy does whatever and people say that "oh, Romanians" and you will have Romanians say that they're not Romanian, they're gypsy. The same logic we had about Italy being pissed off at the gypsies that moved there and saying that Romanians do it - our only problem is that they said Romanians did it, when we consider only ethnic people Romanian.

[March 14, 2010 11:13 PM](#)

 [Benge Runfalk](#) said...

Moments after re-reading this excellent piece I was reminded of the nursery rhyme "Herr Krokodil" by Elsa Beskow (1943). I remember singing it without omissions as a child in the 70s. A couple of years ago it was blacklisted due to actions taken by a obviously swedishtongued woman living in New York called Michelle Cadeau!

<http://www.expressen.se/1.105541>

[January 22, 2011 9:27 PM](#)

 [Conservative Swede](#) said...

Hej Benge,

Yes I used to listen to that song about the crocodile family living in Niggerland. It was completely innocent, no harm intended whatsoever, and perfectly normal still in the '70s and '80s (well not in the US though, they have been hysterical about these things since the '40s, which is exactly what I point out in my article above).

And somehow, as we have perfected our brave new world, these sort of things have become the worst sort of blasphemy. And this idiocy has been exported to us from America.

So thanks for "Herr Krokodil". Wonderful! I had forgotten. In return I give you [Margareta Kjellberg - Hottentottvisa](#)

[January 23, 2011 10:56 PM](#)

[Conservative Swede](#) said...

Somewhat improved google translation of the lyrics:

Deep down in dark Africa
at the river Chikahdoa
there lived a negro boy
named Hoa-Hoa
And he was not dressed as we
no, he did not care about clothes
But this did not matter
for he was a true HOTTENTOT

He lived in a "negro village
for it makes the Hottentots
There lived also the king himself
and the king's wife and daughter
He was a fat and jolly man
and ring in his nose he had
that he thought was very stylish
for he was a true HOTTENTOT

And the village was on the riverbank
with forest on all sides
And lions sneaked in the forest around
and wild elephants
When Hoa went out in the woods
he brought always with his spear
To watch out for big and small
so does a real HOTTENTOT

One evening when everyone was asleep
you could hear something rustling
And Hoa suddenly waking up,
the whisper and rustle
And Hoa who was very wise
realized that something was wrong
And soon as he understood
that this was no HOTTENTOT

There were no lions step
it could Hoa hear
It's probably Babo-tribal people,
what are they doing here?
On highwaymen rob them of course is
and intend to attack us
Then it is perhaps as good
to bring every HOTTENTOT

So he sneaked out and listened
with his hand behind the ear
Then he crept up to the drums
and now you'll hear
The biggest drum, he then
and began to turn it on
The noisy as live ammunition
and out came every HOTTENTOT

When the robbers came storming
then it was okay
For the Hottentots were
with spears and bows ready
When the robbers got this look
they did not want to be with
They turned around and got a hurry
thanks to a small HOTTENTOT

And the King he was very happy
and it was all together

And the chef gave us milk chocolate
and all was joyful
Then there was dancing to Ljusnan days
the king's great pleasures
He both swing dancing and jumping
for it makes a real HOTTENTOT

And the king said: I do Hoa
the prince among the Hottentots
And you should get a coconut ball
and also my daughter
Among all my black men
You should get to be my best friend
And follow me in the dry and wet
for you are a genuine HOTTENTOT!

[January 23, 2011 11:03 PM](#)

[Conservative Swede](#) said...

After all these year I notice the following when listening to the Hottentot song:

The Hottentots dances swing (because that's what Hottentots do).

In the end the King gives Hoa-Hoa a kokosboll (not a negerboll).
[This comment will only be funny for Swedes who know modern PC talk.]

[January 23, 2011 11:12 PM](#)

[rebelliousvanilla](#) said...

Ten little Negroes ate eggs
One was intoxicated and only nine were left

Nine little Negroes went swimming
One drowned there and only eight were left

Eight little Negroes ate baked chestnuts
One burned himself and only seven were left

Seven little Negroes were building houses
One broke a leg and only six were left

Six little Negroes were trying boots on
One slipped and only five were left

Five little Negroes went to the theater
One played poorly and only four were left

Four little Negroes were eating peppers
One was stung pretty badly and only three were left

Three little Negroes went to war
One was shot and only two were left

Two little Negroes fired a cannon
One of them died and only one was left.

This apparently is based on Agatha Christie's book and it's a song for kids here. Obviously, the most racist song is probably our national anthem, since it pretty much says we are Christian and the descendants of the Romans. I'm shocked that nobody said we should change it so far. What's funny is that, along with not knowing what sex is until quite late in life, I had no idea what racism is either until about high-school. Sadly, people younger than me apparently know what both mean.

I do like being among people who see our minorities having higher birth rates as the problem though. I'm not sure if this will still be the case. On another note, here student organizations are concerned about our abysmal birth rate, which is the result of the

government keeping real estate prices high by keeping retirees on aid even if they're home owners, while taxing young renters. Pretty much insane.

Since you mentioned blasphemy, I have a friend who really put together the whole religious symbolism is a joke. Racist being the new heretic, MLK the patron saint and so on. It's really funny to look at it from that perspective.

[January 28, 2011 11:47 PM](#)

 [rebelliousvanilla](#) said...

Now I reread all the posts here. EP, blacks don't see themselves as part of the same nation as whites anyway, so its not like they have a nationality now. And even if you made them citizens, without complete intermarriage to the point where they would have formed the same ethnic group, it wouldn't have solved the problem. I'd also like to point out that America would have stopped being part of any form of European civilization at that point.

So really, as long as you kept the blacks around, the situation wouldn't have been solved. And reality shows that CS is right.

And in Eastern Europe, we got over the slavery thing. We dislike Hungarians because they still agitate for crap, but a lot of people are saddened that the Germans left(who by the way, used Romanians as serfs).

Afonso, your concept makes no sense. Why should citizens, who vote and can have political power, rule in the benefit of non-citizen nationals? The way you do things for rich people is give them residency and protected status. Or you need a totalitarian system who portrays itself to care about nationals and all that like Hitler pretended to care about Germans. What you said only works is if all nationals are citizens and you have a few other people become citizens, which I tried to say earlier, but didn't make myself clear.

[January 31, 2011 2:46 AM](#)


 [Polymath](#) said...

I'm not arguing about what should have been done in 1865. But that doesn't help figure out what America should do now. Obvious first steps are to abolish all anti-white preferences, stop subsidizing dysfunction, get rid of most of the immigrants who are not citizens, and so on.

These are negative measures. More positively, Western Civilization should be re-privileged and its superiority properly presented, while the fundamental and serious things wrong with other cultures should be taught, as well as realistic anthropology based on HBD science.

That still doesn't touch the race issue. There was a great debate on VDare.com between Steve Sailer and Jared Taylor about whether American whites, once they finally recognize that they need to act in their own interests as all the other groups do, should do so in a formally color-blind way (Sailer's "citizenism" proposal) or explicitly adopt "White nationalism" (which is not at all the same thing as white supremacism). See [here](#) and the previous articles in the series linked there. In the end there was quite a bit of common ground, especially regarding what needs to be done first. Once PC/MC has been made ridiculous and untenable and the borders have been defended seriously while non-citizen immigrants have their state benefits and most of their employment prospects taken away, and once anti-white policies and the subsidization of dysfunction are stopped (which can be done in a formally color-blind way), it will become necessary to resolve that debate, but we have much more immediate and politically promising ways to make progress.

[February 17, 2011 3:58 AM](#)

 [rebelliousvanilla](#) said...

Polymath, Sailer's citizenism makes no sense because most of the American citizens are alien fruitcakes and quite a lot of whites prefer them over fellow whites. But remove the latter part - I care about Somalis that are citizens of my country as much as I care about those in Somalia.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Zj6e4v_sMs

If whites pushed for their interests, Americans not being a people would be obvious. And just like me if I was an American, I'd find any government in which outsiders can influence by voting irrelevant and not my own government. Sailer's view would have worked in 1860, not now.

[February 17, 2011 6:08 PM](#)

[Post a Comment](#)

Backlinks

[Create a Link](#)

[Newer Post](#)

[Home](#)

[Older Post](#)

Subscribe to: [Post Comments \(Atom\)](#)