

Re: Re: The Hubble Should SPLASH!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-09/0660.html>

From: Topaz (mars1933_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 09/14/04

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 19:00:41 -0500

On 11 Sep 2004 04:52:59 GMT, gherbert@retro.com (George William Herbert) wrote:

>

>*As a reasonably successful white male American, I would like to
>appologize to the racial and religions minorities that "Topaz"
>has slandered.*

Who's to Blame for the Affirmative Action Fiasco?

By Hugh Murray

Searching for employment in the late 19th century, many Irish immigrants in America encountered the sign, "NINA" (No Irish Need Apply). Today, their descendants face much the same discrimination. Of course, now, it is not limited to the Irish – for in America men are routinely denied jobs, promotions, contracts and scholarships because they are of Irish, Italian, English, German or general European heritage. Worse, not only is this discrimination government sponsored, it is performed in the name of "Equal Opportunity." How did this come about? Why do the media prefer to ignore it? Who fostered this discrimination against white men?

In high school a white boy may be denied entrance into special programs because he is not a preferred minority; or, in some cases, he may be denied because he is not a girl. There are scholarships available, but many cannot be awarded to a white male (for example, Bill Gates of Microsoft was recently lauded by the media for establishing a billion-dollar scholarship program – one in which recipients are restricted to blacks only.) When the teen applies to university, the administration will admit "basically qualified" minorities, but reject better-qualified whites. When applying for jobs, the same discrimination occurs. If the teen finds employment, special, on-the-job training for promotion may be denied him as it is reserved for minorities, even if they are lesser qualified and have been on the job a shorter period of time. Once hired, he may be required to attend "diversity training" sessions, in which he is supposed to confess his alleged guilt of racism and sexism.

How did this systematic discrimination arise?

What did it mean to forbid discrimination? From the early days of the 20th century through 1964, most liberals were clear as to what this meant—show no bias against or preference for a person because of his race, sex, religion etc. This was the dominant view. But in the debate over the civil rights bill in 1964 some opponents declared that if passed, it would lead to, among other things: racial quotas and racial balance in the workplace, preferences for blacks over whites in employment, promotion, bank loans etc.

But, in Congress, the debate went otherwise. No senator who favored the civil rights bill spoke up for quotas, "positive integration," racial balance or preferences for minorities above whites. Quite the contrary.

How then did a law which promised to end discrimination by outlawing discrimination against any individual, a law that promised preferences for no group, which agreed to retain testing to reject unqualified applicants—how was this law subverted into its opposite? Here the role of Alfred Blumrosen is crucial. Blumrosen was among the zealots working for the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission who did not want the agency to function as created.

Alfred Blumrosen was instrumental in this and other shifts. He was a professor at Rutgers University who became the EEOC's liaison chief for federal, state and local agencies, and he admitted that his "creative" reading of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was "contrary to the plain meaning." But why worry? By 1965 when the Bank of America instituted quota hiring under a euphemism, "the standard refrain of the EEO bureaucracies, [was that] affirmative action [AA] had nothing to do with racial quotas. That was illegal." Unfortunately, that deceptive refrain is still heard today.

The goal of Sonia Pressman, another ideologue in the EEOC, was "to document large disparities in employment patterns, [so] that discriminatory intent might legally be inferred." ...the EEOC sought to impose quotas while not calling them such because quotas were clearly illegal. The agency sought to break the law.

Blumrosen and Pressman pushed the EEOC to defy the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by imposing quotas, demanding racial balance in the workplace and giving preferences to blacks over whites. Essential to the Blumrosen–Pressman campaign was the collection of statistics to show "disparate impact," how minorities were underutilized, employed in a smaller proportion in various occupations to their numbers in the general population.

Blumrosen was set upon "selectively enforcing" the civil rights act by using disparate impact theory and proportional representation only when it affected others. (More accurately, Blumrosen was "selectively malenforcing" the civil rights law, imposing quotas for underrepresented blacks, using quotas to curb whites; for women,

against men; but never for gentiles and against Jews.)

Of course, had the EEOC sought to restrict Jews as it has white men, the storm of protest would have cast "disparate impact" theory into the dustbin of history. Thus, the role of Blumrosen and his allies in the media, academia etc., was to create a false target – the "overrepresented," "privileged" and "oppressive" white male. According to the EEOC, the statistics proved just that. However, the statistics proved otherwise. The partial statistics used by Blumrosen were simply the effort to deflect criticism to another group instead of the one most overrepresented, privileged and oppressive – his own.

By not asking the religious question on the EEOC questionnaires, the EEOC created a scapegoat of the white male. Once smeared as "privileged" and "oppressive," the non-privileged, working-class and poor whites began to pay the price for the "moral" system of affirmative action by being legally discriminated against and denied equal opportunity.

The proportional test, the liberals' test of all tests, when applied to the religious clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, shows Jews to be the most privileged and oppressive of people in America. The favorite test of liberals reveals white men to be less privileged than the Jews. Why does not The New York Times, the EEOC, NBC, CBS or ABC report that statistic? The media remain silent on the issue of Jewish privilege while simultaneously exposing every time white men are somewhat overrepresented. Why the silence regarding Jews? A glance at the ownership of the media just might have something to do with this disparity in exposing "privilege." And if any individual in the media dared to expose some Jewish privilege, there would be a thunderous assault upon that individual's "bigotry." However, daily, reporters write of white male privilege, but almost no one denounces this anti-white bigotry.

Once smeared as privileged, the non-privileged middle-class, working-class, and poor whites pay for the "moral" system of AA by being legally discriminated against and denied equal opportunity. But then the history of America since the 1960s is often the record of wealthy liberals using the law to curb and oppress blue-collar whites, because the blue-collar folk are deemed privileged, prejudiced and provincial. Therefore, such blue-collar whites deserve to be passed over in scholarships, jobs and promotions; the blue-collar crowd should be shunted aside, and instead the "pets" of the elite should be elevated: the children of illegal immigrants, of wealthy minorities and the daughters of rich liberals. And this is done in the name of morality, fairness, and justice.

In summary, the great hoax concocted by Blumrosen and his collaborators in the media, academy, and government is "white male privilege." Most white men are not privileged. Those who are, often support AA because it is no loss to them – their children will not

sci.space.policy: Re: Re: The Hubble Should SPLASH!

require a scholarship, an entry-level job, a position as policeman or fireman, or a promotion. It is the poor and middle-class whites who, denied equal opportunity, must pay with thinning wallets and shrunken dreams for the "morality of diversity" imposed by the wealthy, liberal elite.

Even if every CEO in America were a white male, that would be no reason to discriminate against a poor, white teenage boy seeking a scholarship and give it to a lesser qualified girl or minority. "White male privilege" is a social construct created by liberals. They have used their power in government, media, and academia to deny equal opportunity to white men, to undermine and stigmatize America's working class, and to immobilize with guilt the white middle class. America does not suffer from white male privilege and oppression; it staggers beneath Jewish privilege and oppression.

Excerpted from article found at:

[http://www.barnesreview.org/Nov Dec 2001/Who s to Blame for the Affirma/who_s_to_blame_for_the_affirma.html](http://www.barnesreview.org/Nov_Dec_2001/Who_s_to_Blame_for_the_Affirma/who_s_to_blame_for_the_affirma.html)
www.spearhead-uk.com <http://www.natvan.com>
<http://www.altermedia.info> <http://www.RealNews247.com>