

Challenging the Myths

Here are samples from a Canadian website that apply to many other countries

by Wayne Lutton

The Canadafirst Immigration Reform Committee maintains an excellently-crafted website at www.canadafirst.net. One of the segments deals with twenty common “myths” about immigration. As one examines these myths and the group’s response to them, he realizes that the name of the country is interchangeable with many others — the same myths are voiced in the U.S., Australia, New Zealand, Britain, and many European countries.

Here we print three of the “myths” along with Canadafirst’s reply. Just substitute the name “America” for “Canada” to have a cogent response to a few common myths about immigration.

Myth No. 1: Canada is a Nation of Immigrants

Feeling guilty yet? Well, you should be, at least that’s the idea that drives these cliches. Of course, it’s true. Whether we arrived by way of the Bering Land Bridge or in steerage, we all came from somewhere else. According to that logic aboriginals are immigrants, too. As the oldest, best-established group on the continent they presumably owe an enormous debt of gratitude, moral support, time and money to all subsequent arrivals. But somehow it doesn’t work that way. It is Canadians of European descent who are expected to subsidize — in perpetuity — those who came before us, as well as those who continue to roll in. In other words, we must assist those we displaced, while supporting efforts to displace us.

Aboriginal rights revolve around the idea that a standing population was first overwhelmed, then subsumed and forced to toe the line by new people(s) and new culture(s). We’ve heard the charges of genocide and cultural extermination. (Both concepts have

been rather successfully marketed to Canadians of European descent under the guise of “multiculturalism.”)

Noticing any similarities is rather forcefully discouraged. Aboriginals may balk at the mere suggestion, but their ancestors, crossing the Bering Land Bridge, had more in common with immigrant European arrivals than PC politics will admit. Aboriginal and European antecedents did not find their way here through the intervention of an immigration lawyer or consulting service. And both arrived into a wilderness. They most assuredly did not find welfare, education, old age and medical programs. Even the most hopelessly brain dead liberal knows there is a *world* of difference between today’s immigrant and those, both red and white, who created something out of that wilderness. The liberal just doesn’t want you to talk about it.

And while we’re on the subject, not all of us came to North America as immigrants. Indeed, our two major founding European peoples — the French and the English — came [as citizens] to part of their homeland. The French came to “New France”; the English to a British colony.

Myth No. 2: Diversity Makes Us Stronger

What is your definition of strength? A nation of people forbidden to discuss the very things which impact on their every action? What is your definition of diversity? True diversity is anathema to multicultural principles. The dictionary definition of diversity stresses differences, but as we’re told — officially — there are no differences at all. And that’s what makes this sham “diversity” such a living hell.

Now that we are living in close proximity, you might think the learning curve would begin to climb steeply. Unfortunately, the Canadian government forbids debate and dialogue, characterizing it as “hate.” So, Canadians

Wayne Lutton is editor of *The Social Contract*.

are effectively and quite efficiently crippled. We are not permitted to talk about issues of diversity or immigration without being accused of racism. What this kind of “diversity” does create is a phenomenon known as “white flight.” As old communities accommodate new populations, the neighborhood experiences a transformation. Soon it bears no resemblance to the former (now marginalized) community. Different cultural values and customs prevail. It may be interesting to visit, but would you really want to live there?

The elderly feel it first. They grow increasingly uncomfortable in their long-time homes. When people feel conditions have passed the limit of toleration, they simply give up, sell, and move elsewhere — usually well away. Those who do flee are characterized as wet-blankets, or dinosaurs. What our press disapprovingly calls “white flight” is called ethnic cleansing elsewhere. People would never leave their homes and communities if they felt they had any real choice. We really have to begin to appreciate the distinction. As for diversity “making us stronger,” we’re going to have to force ourselves to examine and confront feel-good cliches whenever some idiot clears his throat to recite a few. We’ve been eager and willing accomplices in our own demise.

Placing blind faith in a collection of hyper-ambitious lawyers masquerading as “committed and caring” statesmen has brought us to a point where even *they* dare not criticize immigration, refugee and multicultural policies:

There is something wrong with a government that says a person or party which disagrees with something like immigration policy is racist — or when a party, group or individual disagrees with the gay rights legislation that they are homophobic. There is something wrong with the message the government is sending across this land.

— M.P. Randy White, May 28, 1996

Myth No. 4 But We Need Immigrants

The neo-con argument is that our population is shrinking and aging (and no doubt shrinking as it ages), and that immigrants cheerfully will shell out for our pensions when the time comes. A recent study in the

U.S. suggests that immigrant populations will hear of no such thing. As of September, 1997, Canada’s Liberal government is launching a major public relations campaign to soften us up for an overall ten percent reduction in Canada’s old age benefit, as well as nearly doubling (by 73 percent) the amount of CPP [pension tax] extracted at source.

The concept of state-care for the elderly is unheard

“As for diversity ‘making us stronger,’ we’re going to have to force ourselves to examine and confront feel-good cliches whenever some idiot clears his throat to recite a few.”

of in the Third World. Indeed, since June, 1996, wealthy Singapore has had a Tribunal for the Maintenance of Parents. The body merely requires children to care for aged parents. “Officials were surprised at the numbers of neglected parents,” according to the *New York Times*.

Thanks to multiculturalism, recent arrivals are not only encouraged to do things the “old” way, but force-fed a steady drip of anti-white rhetoric once they settle in. Canada is currently experiencing an exodus of wealthy Chinese returning to a less-taxed Hong Kong where, among the half of the population that is actually required to pay taxes, the maximum taxation rate is just 15 percent. Liberal types insist that immigrants are paying more than their fair share of taxes — *Great!* — assuming that a completely revised infrastructure to accommodate the needs of recent arrivals didn’t cost anything.

Rather than simply replacing the standing population and consistently compromising Canadian expectations to accommodate recent arrivals, responsible government would implement programs to upgrade our own skills and stop importing them from countries which need those skills desperately. Moral government would encourage the growth of Canadian families with incentives, tax breaks, discounted mortgages and assistance with schooling and the other associated costs of raising Canadian children. Our manageable little problems have ballooned into massive bloated imponderables which we are not allowed to discuss. -//-