

# On the Liberal/Leftist Mantra: "Our Common Humanity"

There is an overabundance of the use of the words "we," "us," and "our" in the following polemic. Whites in America have been discouraged from describing themselves with these terms in discussions about race, because we have been discouraged from having a collective identity. In defiance of that convention, I have used the terms often in this essay.

I will begin by stating that America's Europeans – Europeans everywhere – are experiencing massive displacement by swelling non-White populations, a shift that threatens to make our political and cultural landscapes unrecognizable in the near future. As this happens, public discourse has been reinvented to accommodate the visible changes in our societies. Let us start by examining just a few examples:

- Demands for redistributions of wealth are now increasingly presented as being reasonable and inevitable; the imported poor must be fed and subsidized.
- The historical narratives of Western nations are increasingly rewritten to include non-Whites, even if the rewrites are historically inaccurate.
- The rare acts of violence committed by Whites against non-Whites are extensively examined for any hints that they are "hate crimes," while vastly more numerous incidences of violence by non-Whites against Whites are generally dismissed being merely criminal in intent.
- Institutional discrimination against non-Whites is intensely denounced as being unthinkable, while the legalized discrimination routinely directed at Whites in job hires, promotions, and college placements is either ignored or applauded as necessary.

Ironically, all of these things, and similar convolutions of logic and justice, now occur while great to-do is made about a

need for “colorblindness,” or the need for “equality under the law,” or “understanding.” As our societies are enthusiastically deconstructed and reinvented, one of the most perpetual refrains that we now hear is the insistence that Whites search within themselves for tolerance by tapping into their sense of the common humanity that they share with all other human beings, and especially human beings of color.

As appealing as this sounds, if we are to examine humankind’s “common humanity,” it may be important that we include in our examination a thorough appraisal of the vast destruction that we humans have repeatedly inflicted on our own species, other species, and the natural environment. We should perhaps intellectually embrace the reality that placing multiple and very different groups in previously homogeneous areas – like the U.S., Canada, Germany, or Australia – greatly increases the potential for intergroup conflict, overpopulation, political upheaval, resource depletion, environmental devastation, and a host of other problems. And let us least of all forego an examination of the potential for this kind of demographic change to rapidly submerge the original populations of those countries. Are the odds of perpetual conflict and collateral devastation not exceedingly high? If they are, is it not exceedingly foolhardy to take these risks?

Fundamentally, it’s because the people who are engineering this transformation and a great many of their followers hate White people far more than they worry about the downsides of multiculturalism. Most of us, whatever our political persuasion, do not look into another man’s face without seeing therein a fellow human being. But seeing a shared humanity in another person’s face requires reciprocity. We are not receiving reciprocity when other individuals and groups condemn us for wanting the historical and cultural and racial continuity of our own lineages and societies to endure into the future. We are not guilty of any sin merely by virtue of having a racial or cultural or religious identity that we

desire to perpetuate – just as no other group is guilty for having these things and wanting to perpetuate them. We also are not receiving reciprocity when we are forced to demand the same rights of association or freedom from discrimination that other groups around us consider to be their entitlement. And it again follows that we are guilty of no moral misdeed when we make appeals that the same standards of morality and civic engagement apply to our group – especially when we can see very clearly that they do not.

As a rule, it is better that enlightened individuals hate no man, and hate no group of men. Be that as it may, we are not guilty of “hate” by virtue of wanting to keep our own house. There is no guilt in wanting our children and grandchildren to remain a majority in the United States in order that they may remain in control of their own political destiny. We are not immediately guilty of racism or any other “ism” for preferring the company of our own ethnic group, our own religion, our own race, and our own social class. We are also not guilty of malevolence because we perceive the desirability of holding membership in a dominant religious or racial group – these perks are a reality in every country with a dominant ethnic or religious majority, and they cease to be desirable only in groups hell-bent on self-immolation. Has anyone on the left complained about Korean supremacism in Korea or African supremacism in African countries? Of course not. It’s a concept that they apply only to White countries.

And horror of all modern horrors, we may want our children to marry into their own race and class and religion! Yet, nothing even in this is innately sinister, and if any of these things are sins, then most humans in most nations of the world are guilty of them. We know better; these things also are a part of our common humanity, not sins to be overcome, but to acknowledge and accommodate as if in many ways our welfare and survival may depend on them. Because in today’s realities, they often do.

The founding documents of America were formulated to be examples to the world, but they were primarily compacts intended for the benefit of the descendants of the founders. Only beguiled or fevered minds dare to argue otherwise. We want the America that we inherited to remain our legacy, and also the legacy of our children and grandchildren. The world may follow our example if it desires, but there is no moral imperative that it be allowed to invade us *en masse*, displace us, and usurp that birthright. These sentiments, by any sane logic, are not sinister. They are pragmatic. They are entirely legitimate by any moral logic known to man.

Let us thus move further beyond the pale, at the risk of inspiring greater fury, and state new truths that are self-evident: that no two individuals, groups, or institutions are equal, nor were they ever construed as being equal by America's founders or founding documents. Let us speak plainly: The moral posturing in our founding documents about equality and rights was solely for the benefit of our British overlords. The documents speak of their contents, meaning, the egalitarian and democratic principles of government contained therein, as being "for our progeny," and the only brown faces present at the authorship of those documents were the ones scrubbing chamber pots. The documents speak of slaves, who formed the vast majority of Blacks, as property and Native Americans as "savages." And in 1790 passed the Naturalization Act that made it quite clear that the founders intended American to remain a White country. The notion that the founding documents represented the formation of a "propositional nation," meaning, a nation based solely on democratic ideals, and thus a nation conducive to the creation of an American dumping ground "nation of nations" – is thus an absurdity.

The welcoming of massive influxes of dissimilar peoples is only a moral imperative in the West, and the sins of which we have spoken are only sins for the melanin-deficient. It is by

codifying these sins into violations of never intended moral laws that we have made ourselves pariahs in our own lands. Can our adversaries acknowledge the bloody history of multicultural, multiracial societies, and then deny us the human right to be afraid as we watch the gleeful and irrevocable erasing of the American nation-state? Any student of history knows there is plenty to fear. So, too, do our enemies, who are promoting America's deconstruction.

If we must emote with great shows of guilt over the loss of the Native Americans' world, are we not allowed to mourn the loss of our own? If Native Americans were morally justified in resisting their displacement, are we not morally justified in resisting our own? If it is permissible to say that Iowa is too White and needs more diversity, is such a statement substantively any less racist than saying that Mississippi is too Black, and needs an increased percentage of White people? If all groups in America are afforded the privilege of having a group identity, do Whites not have that same right, especially as we shrink into minority status in the country our ancestors overwhelmingly founded and built? If it is permissible for non-Whites to advocate solely for the welfare and interests of their own groups, are we guilty of mere hate or intolerance or intellectualized racism when we advocate for our own?

Is it a sin to wish, when passing a baby carriage, to see the future of our own people in it? Is it a sin, when passing a school, to want to see the progeny of one's own people playing in the school yard? When we are in the marketplace, is it a sin to want to be surrounded by our own people's faces and the sound of our native tongue? Is it a sin, to spurn the notion that our most desirable future involves becoming strangers in our own land?

We already know the answers to these questions.

If a special understanding and empathy are required for the

future, then what must also be understood is our resentment toward our own government, inasmuch as in what our leaders have planned and failed to plan for us, nothing is guaranteed for our own group except extinction. Let our adversaries comprehend our contempt for our own people, who, like bumbling zoo pandas, no longer possess even the primal instinct to procreate sufficiently to replace their numbers that die. Let there be empathy for our disdain for these human pandas, who have allowed themselves to be manipulated into believing that their dispossession is inevitable and natural and good. Pandas who allow themselves to be uniformed and stationed to defend borders in other countries, rather than rallying to obstruct armed and unarmed invasions across their own. Pandas so monstrously beguiled as to believe that their ancestors spent centuries building infrastructure and institutions – all while doing the great bulk of the dying in this country's wars and famines and epidemics – so that it could all be deeded in its entirety to people whose ancestors played marginal parts or no part in creating those things.

Let us ask that our adversaries see our common humanity in our discomfort, when we see our kinsmen bowing and supplicating in raucous debates about "cultural appropriation," because some melanin-impaired dolt decides to wear beaded dreads or a sari, and while the complainants screech their arguments in our language, while wearing Western attire, while using technologies and mediums our ancestors created, and while enjoying the benefits of the wealth and institutions and freedoms that many of their own ancestors, to reiterate, played little or no part in creating. Let them understand our rage, when they whine about "White privilege," while enjoying the racial preferences that are now routinely showered on Third Worlders newly disembarked from boats. Let them refrain from sneering about cultural appropriation while basking in all of these perks, as they applaud overpriced performances of *Hamilton* – American history deformed into universalist hip-hop blackface. Further, let them understand our resentment when

the same complainants and their collaborators survey the feast that they are consuming and then jettison the parts of our culture and history that they have decided are irrelevant – such as recent college curriculum purges of Shakespeare, Plato, Descartes, and Immanuel Kant, for being too Eurocentric.

Can we correctly assume that all of the demands for empathy, humaneness, and cultural sensitivity will remain one-sided?

You can bank on it.

Finally, let us request a comprehension of our all too human despair when we denounce the sum total of all of these hypocrisies and assaults – all of them paraded as virtues, and all of them better described as treasons. In that vein, let them understand our rage when we start expressing what are, for “us,” two simple truths: that the intent of both our opposition involves taking a completely viable and advanced nation-state and destroying it, and that – in both our silence and our inaction – we have made ourselves accessories to murder.

© 2019 Sid Secular – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Sidney Secular: [Success\\_Express@yahoo.com](mailto:Success_Express@yahoo.com)