


Substantial Disruption



The Future Bleaching of America?

By Mike Tully

Somewhere in heaven, the ghost of Abraham Lincoln threw up in his top hat. “I can’t believe it,” said Abe, wiping off his beard. “My Party nominated and my country elected a white supremacist. My God!”

God, who happened to be nearby, looked over. “What can I say?” God told Abe. “A plague is a plague.”

Is Abe right about Donald Trump being a white supremacist? The possibility cannot be ruled out, given the prominence of Breitbart.com figures in his campaign. The Breitbart website is commonly referred to as an “alt-right” website, and “alt-right” is basically the politically correct term for [white supremacist](#).

But, does it matter? Years ago I conducted a workplace investigation into alleged racial harassment. When I interviewed the accused, he told me, “I swear to God, I’m not a racist.” My reply: I don’t care. Go ahead and be a racist if that’s what you are. Just don’t act like one in the workplace. I take the same approach with the nation’s new employee: Go ahead and be a white supremacist, if that’s what you are -- just don’t govern like one.

How will we know whether Trump will govern as a white supremacist? The answer may come fairly quickly, as he lays out his immigration policy. It won’t be in provisions to deport most undocumented immigrants, or to build a wall along the Mexican border. Neither mass deportations nor the wall will ever happen. That rhetoric will not become reality. The litmus test for whether, and to what extent, Trump is influenced by white supremacist ideology will be his proposal for future immigration.

During his immigration policy speech in Phoenix last August 31st, Trump [made a comment](#) that the mainstream media ignored. In outlining immigration policy, he stated this as one of his goals: “To keep immigration levels measured by population share within historical norms.” He didn’t elaborate and apparently nobody has asked him to specify what “historical norms” he is talking about. According to the Southeast Vermont Community Learning Collaborative’s [“Flow of History,”](#) there have been 41 iterations of immigration policy since 1790. Which does Trump favor?

While Trump hasn’t answered this question, the Breitbart.com site has. On October 3, 2015, Breitbart writer Julia Hahn [decried a 1965 law](#) that “abolished the national origins quota system,

which had favored immigrants from nations with a similar heritage to our own.” “While about nine in ten of the immigrants who came to the United States during the 19th and 20th century hailed from Europe,” she wrote, “the 1965 law inverted that figure.” “In 1965, according to Pew, the country was 84 percent white, 11 percent black, 4 percent Hispanic and less than 1 percent Asian,” wrote Ms. Hahn. In 2015, she noted, “the country is now 62 percent white, 12 percent black, 18 percent Hispanic and 6 percent Asian.”

On December 11, 2015, David Bossie, who served as Trump's Deputy Campaign Manager, [wrote](#): “The next president should enact an immigration moratorium or strict quotas across the board,” he argued, adding, “There is precedent for this in the 1924 immigration law.”

Ms. Hahn echoed Bossie’s approach in a [subsequent article](#) written for Brietbart. “The most potent framing of the immigration issue is to focus on the numbers and scale of total immigration into the country,” she wrote. Citing a pollster’s conclusion that Americans are unsatisfied with immigration policy, she suggested a remedy: “In the 1920s, the last time the foreign-born share of the population reached a record high, then-President Calvin Coolidge hit the pause button for roughly fifty years, producing an era of explosive wage growth and allowing immigrants already in the country to assimilate.” Ms. Hahn predicted that “a majority of U.S. voters would be supportive of similar measures to reduce immigration.” That article appeared exactly a month before Mr. Trump gave his Phoenix immigration speech.

The 1924 Immigration Act admitted two percent of each nationality based on residency in 1890. The result heavily favored immigrants from western and northern Europe. In 1952 the quota for northern and western European immigrants [was fixed at 85%](#) while Asian immigrants and black West Indians were severely limited. The State Department’s “[Office of the Historian](#)” says this about the 1924 Immigration Act: “In all of its parts, the most basic purpose of the 1924 Immigration Act was to preserve the ideal of U.S. homogeneity.”

If Trump’s immigration policy echoes the 1924 approach, Honest Abe could be right about his being a white supremacist. Whether we are in a three-piece suit or [wearing rags and feathers from Salvation Army counters](#), we’ll find out soon enough.