


pay for them. These are heady times for the *reconquista* crowd, and will continue to be until the majority comes out of its trance. 

ernment endorses. In the introduction to *We the American Hispanics*—part of the Census Bureau’s “We the American[s]” series of demographic profiles of blacks, Hispanics, Asians, Pacific Islanders, American Indians, and even the Foreign Born, but not whites—the Census Bureau writes: “Our ancestors were among the early explorers and settlers of the New World. In 1609, 11 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, our Mestizo (Indian and Spanish) ancestors settled in what is now Santa Fe, New Mexico.”

Of course, the first permanent English settlement in the New World was not Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1620, but Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607. The fact that this predates the Santa Fe colony no doubt accounts for why it goes unmentioned. Nor was Santa Fe settled by “mestizos” but by Captain-General Don Juan de Onate who was, along with his party of priests and settler-soldiers, a white Spaniard. Nor, for that matter, did Santa Fe amount to much. As T.R. Fehrenbach explains in his definitive history of Mexico *Fire and Blood*:

“It had a thin, isolated population scattered along the river [Rio Grande]. When Anglo-Saxon explorers and traders found it early in the nineteenth cen-

tury, New Mexico was still living in the seventeenth century . . .”

The Spanish settlement of St. Augustine, Florida, in 1565 does predate the English at Jamestown by nearly half a century and is often cited by Hispanics as proof they were here first. Why doesn’t the Census Bureau mention it? Probably because St. Augustine is an embarrassment that reflects Spanish intolerance of New World rivals, espe-



Now you don’t even have to leave El Paso.

cially if they weren’t Catholic. Admiral Pedro Menendez de Aviles arrived in 1565 for the express purpose of exterminating the French Huguenots who had founded Fort Caroline in northeastern Florida. After killing all of them, including children and pregnant women, the Spanish renamed the colony “San Mateo,” a name it still bears. Needless to say, Admiral de Aviles was no mestizo either.

Hispanics like to claim not only that they were here first, but that they were present in large numbers in the Southwest when the United States annexed it in 1848. In fact, in 1821, the Spanish-speaking population in the Mexican province of Texas numbered only 3,000—and this was a vast territory of 389,000 square miles that included most of present-day New Mexico and part of Colorado in addition to Texas. By 1834, ten years after the Mexican Government first invited Americans to settle in Texas, Americans outnumbered ethnic Mexicans ten to one. In 1860, ethnic Mexicans were less than two percent of the total population of Texas—an estimated 12,000 out of a total population of 600,000. By 1900, the number of ethnic Mexicans had risen to 70,000 but was still less than three percent of a Texas population exceeding three million. In fact, in San Antonio, home of the Alamo and cradle of Texas Independence, there were more German immigrants than ethnic Mexicans.

It was the dismantling of immigration restrictions in 1965 that brought in large numbers of people who now claim to have been here all along. **Q**

Mr. Fallon lives in Rye, New York.

The Colorblind Leading the Colorblind

David Horowitz, *Hating Whitey and Other Progressive Causes*, Spence Publishing Company, 1999, 300 pp., \$24.95.

Former lefty gets it half-right.

reviewed by Samuel Francis

David Horowitz first made a name for himself as the radical—indeed, communist—co-editor, with Peter Collier, of *Ramparts*, the New Left’s leading magazine in the 1960s, and later as a born-again conservative. He is the founder and editor of *Heterodoxy*, a monthly magazine devoted to exposing and dissecting “Political Correctness,” and chronicler of his own misadventures as a red-diaper baby in his autobiographical *Radical Son*. In the latter part of his career as a neo-conservative, Mr. Horowitz has become well known also as one who does not spare the literary rod in chastising “black racism” and the transparent double standard

by which liberals, white or black, typically evaluate racial injustice when committed by blacks rather than whites. This is the theme of the essays that make up his most recent book, *Hating Whitey*.

Hating Whitey is composed of rather brief columns from *Salon*, the on-line magazine for which Mr. Horowitz regularly writes, and one of the few non-conservative magazines of any kind that will allow him to write for it at all. As a kind of literary treasure trove of reflections on such subjects as black racism and double standards, the fraudulence of the Establishment Left, and the sheer viciousness of black criminals, especially when hidden under radical garb as “Black Panthers,” Mr. Horowitz’s collection can’t be beat. He offers chilling accounts of Huey Newton and the Panthers, for whom in his leftish days Mr. Horowitz served as an adviser, and of the black murderer Geronimo Pratt, also a Panther until New-

ton and his pals kicked him out and who was released from prison in 1999 due to the efforts of his lawyer, Johnnie Cochran. But neither the brutality of black racial hatred these essays recount nor the silence of the establishment press about it is isolated. As Mr. Horowitz explains:

“In the wake of the Million Man March, blacks burned a white man alive in a Chicago neighborhood, with no accompanying press comment. In Illinois, three blacks murdered a pregnant white welfare mother and her two white children, while ‘rescuing’ her black fetus by cutting it out of her womb. No one called the attack racial even though a second black child of the woman was spared. A black city worker in Fort Lauderdale gunned down five white co-workers, again without the press intimating a racial element might be involved, even though several survivors testified the killer had used anti-white epithets in the