

started the night they moved into the housing project: BB gun pellets shot through windows, firecrackers hurled into the house, and a perpetual pounding on the door by thugs camped out on their doorstep. For months they endured robberies, attacks on their children, and nightly assaults on their home, until HUD, in the words of one bureaucrat, finally decided that "it's become real clear to us that their lives are in danger." The Iraqis were moved out, and put up at the Holiday Inn. Asked why he thought he and his fellow Iraqis had been singled out for harassment, Hussan Al-Barakat spoke hesitantly, in his broken English, as if bewildered by the stark contrast of America as he imagined it and the reality of Double Rock: "Maybe I mistaken, but I think they want black family here."

Liberals of all races will one day regret conciliating or even tolerating black racism, for this is a movement with national scope—and growing power. Sonny Carson has made a career out of his crusade to drive all Koreans out of New York City, and the Rodney King uprising in Los Angeles saw Koreans once again bear the brunt. In his infamous Houston speech, Pat Buchanan paid tribute to them for valiantly (and hopelessly) defending their community from rampaging looters during the Los Angeles riots. The media lambasted Buchanan for his "racism," but the real story is that Pat was speaking out *against* racism—black racism. (The irony is that he was holding up these immigrant Koreans as models of Americanism, against the thuggish example of their native-born tormentors.)

Black hatred of whites, and of Asians of all denominations, is the grisly and frightening secret at the heart of American race relations, the Hate That Dares Not Speak Its Name. Black racism has been relegated to the fringe by liberal elites in government and the media, supposedly confined to the likes of Carson, Louis Farrakhan, and the black fringe. But the O. J. Simpson trial forced us to confront it as a mass phenomenon—still without naming it.

The left's riposte to conservatives who condemn affirmative action as racism in action is to deny that blacks (or other "powerless" oppressed minorities) are even *capable* of racism, since they lack economic and political clout. But in the case of Double Rock, blacks *do* have the power: to intimidate and physically assault Asians and others with the wrong skin color. They are so powerful, in fact,

that an armed gang of black racists faced down a federal agency and won without firing a shot—which is more than Randy Weaver or the Branch Davidians can say.

Justin Raimondo writes from San Francisco, California.

Letter From Britain

by Christie Davies

Where Euroregulation Meets Socialism



John Major lost the British election in 1997 not because Tony Blair's "New" Labour Party had stolen the Conservatives' policies but because the Conservatives adopted socialist ones. The last ten years have seen an explosive rise in levels of bureaucratic regulation in Britain, which have particularly hit small business and also professional people, especially those working in the public sector. These groups may be considered a Conservative government's natural supporters, but many of their members will have voted for the Labour or Liberal Democrat parties out of sheer frustration.

It is impossible to find good National Health Service (Britain's system of socialized medicine) dentists any more because they have all gone private to avoid a system that insists on the provision and justification of a detailed treatment plan for each patient. As my own, now private dentist put it: "I came into the profession to look after patients' teeth, not to fill in forms." For exactly the same reasons many able and experienced schoolteachers have taken early retirement to be replaced by semiliterate young dullards who cannot teach but who love staff meetings. Everyone is tied up in the creation of paper trails for a distant centralized inspectorate that does not understand the old proverb, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." When a local doctor (a general practitioner) retires it is difficult to find a replacement, even though the job pays well and is rightly held in high esteem. Who wants to shuffle doc-

TELOS

A Quarterly Journal of Critical Thought

Does it still make sense to talk about Left and Right? What remains of the communist project after the collapse of the Soviet Empire? Has collectivism become official liberal ideology? What is the impact of feminism, anti-racism and multiculturalism on American traditions? What has happened to the American Right after its anti-communist ideology became obsolete? Are paleo-conservatives and neo-conservatives on the same political side? What does it mean to be a conservative today? What remains of American particularism in the age of globalization? Is the crisis of conservatism but another version of the crisis of liberalism?

These questions are debated in the pages of *Telos* by independent scholars unafraid to challenge various ideological establishments. Recent issues have re-examined the meaning of American federalism, the populist legacy, the resurgence of nationalism, separatism, etc. Future issues will deal with the crisis of European Unification, the collapse of American education, the disintegration of "humanism" and the possibility of religious alternatives.

Number 108

Special Issue on:

Racism, Multiculturalism and Globalization

Adam: Anti-Semitism and Racism

Sniegowski: Lester Frank Ward

Pels: Strange Standpoints

Michael: Making a Stand

Karnoooh: On Drugs and Society?

De Benoist: On Globalization

Hunt: The First Peoples and Quebec

Combe: French Historical Research

Pickstock: Capitalism or Secularism?

Wegierski: Canadian Conservatism

Murray: On Affirmative Action

Gottfried: Post-1989 Socialism?

Subscriptions include 4 issues per year and cost \$40 for individuals and \$95 for institutions. Foreign and Canadian orders add 15% for extra postage. Checks must be in US funds. Back issues cost \$14 each (\$30 for institutions). For subscriptions, back issues or information, write:

Telos Press Ltd.
431 E. 12th Street,
New York NY 10009
212-228-6479 fax: 212-228-6379
e-mail: telospress@aol.com

uments on a computer rather than cure people?

Attorneys paid by the government on a case-by-case basis to do "legal aid" work for the poor and who deal with divorce, small civil claims, and criminal defense work, constitute a patchwork of small partnerships spread across the country, but Major's government deliberately sought to concentrate this work in the hands of a few large firms. Lord Mackay of Clashfern, who was the Conservative government's Lord Chancellor (the head of the legal system), redesigned the system in such a way that poor clients will no longer be able to choose who represents them but will be forced to take their cases to lawyers belonging to a monopoly licensed and franchised by the state. Independent practitioners are being forced out of business by their own principled unwillingness to allow semieducated high school graduates, employed by the British legal aid board as inspectors, to go through their confidential files.

Behind all these disasters lies a socialist obsession with providing everyone with more free health, "education," teeth, and pseudosafety. In the past this was done by raising taxes; under the pseudoconservative John Major, the pretense was maintained that more of every-

thing could be provided by employing extra commissars to squeeze the suppliers. Bold and meaningless planning targets worthy of Stalin filled such foolish documents as "Health of the Nation," and absurd slogans, mission statements, and charters proliferated. The new professionally unqualified administrators all spoke about enforcing "policy" and "priorities" and demanded endless quantities of information to enable them to do so. This meaningless information is then used by these bureaucratic clerks to nag and torment the same skilled professionals who have slaved to provide it. Chuck it, Major . . . or rather, the British people chuckled you.

In Britain, well-run and effective small private schools have been forced to close because they could not provide all the nonsense specified in the bureaucratic "National Curriculum" laid down by the central government, even though their pupils were better educated and better behaved than those from the state-run schools. Many other small businesses are in difficulties because they cannot standardize or label their goods according to the choking net of the law or comply with absurd and unnecessary health, fire, and safety regulations. A nonsmoking colleague of mine has recently been told that he is a fire hazard because he has too

many books and papers in his office. How do British second-hand bookshops survive?

Many of these rules were invented by the enthusiastic socialists who run the European Community in Brussels, but why does the British government have to enforce them? In a British world of chronic shortages, why is there always enough money for administrators, snoopers, and regulation enforcers? A nonsocialist, freedom-loving government would have made sure that there were never enough staff and resources to enforce the decrees of Britain's European masters. Why did Britain not simply allow her small traders to go on working just as they chose, by assigning an inadequate number of idle officials to enforce the rules, by slowness to prosecute, and by imposing trivial sentences? After all, that is the way the British government currently deals with juvenile delinquents, burglars, and illegal immigrants. Instead, the owners of small abattoirs, cheese-makers, and horticulturists have been relentlessly persecuted by British officials whose interpretation of the Brussels regulations is more rigid, detailed, and socialist than anywhere else in Europe. In no other country have Euroregulations been expanded and gold-plated in the way they have been in England.

Anyone who has ever complained to Britain's politicians about these insolent folk or about the arbitrary behavior of Britain's innumerable ruling quangos (quasi-autonomous, nongovernmental organizations) set up by Parliament has been told by politicians that they could not possibly interfere. In this way they hope that the British people's resentment and hatred of living in an over-regulated society would be focused on their most immediate tormentors and not on those who were really to blame—the government. It was a tactic that did not work, and that is why John Major's socialist government was ignominiously kicked out of office. The key virtue of British democracy is that the people do have the power to "turn the rascals out." However, matters are now getting even worse. Although he will not admit it, Labourite Tony Blair loves the socialist regulated society even more than John Major did.

Christie Davies is chairman of the sociology department at the University of Reading, England.

ADVERTISING POLICY

Chronicles accepts advertising from reputable book publishers and distributors and from companies selling educational and cultural products compatible with the magazine's purpose and standards. Although we try to verify claims made by advertisers, publication of an ad does not in any way constitute an endorsement.

*

Chronicles
ADVERTISING DEPT.
934 N. MAIN ST.
ROCKFORD, IL 61103
815-964-5813



POLITICS

The Politics of Hispanic Identity

by Joseph E. Fallon

The federal government officially recognizes "Hispanic"—an artificial and arbitrary concept devoid of ethnic, racial, cultural, or linguistic meanings—as a legitimate collective identity for two reasons. Domestically, it is to create a "Hispanic nation" within the United States, to inflate the numerical size of that "nation," and to have all members of that "nation" eligible for affirmative action programs. Internationally, it is to legitimize "Hispanic" power in the 18 Spanish-speaking countries in the Western Hemisphere by recognizing the population of each as a homogenous "ethnic" group, thereby denying the existence of non-Hispanic peoples and enabling the suppression of their languages, cultures, and religions.

Achieving the domestic objectives, which virtually guarantees the realization of the international one, required rewriting the history of the United States. As George Orwell recognized in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: "Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past." According to this historical revisionism, a significant Mexican population lived in what is today Texas and the Southwest of the United States before the arrival of the Americans; Mexican-Americans have always been loyal to the United States; and the status of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in the United States has historically been more comparable to that of African-Americans than that of "whites."

Between 1820 and 1900, the average annual number of Mexican nationals immigrating to the United States was only 350. The demographic impact of such numbers on the Mexican-American community was negligible since as many

Mexican nationals departed as entered. This changed dramatically after 1900, especially during the two decades spanning the "Mexican Revolution" and its aftermath. Between 1910 and 1930, nearly 700,000 Mexicans crossed the border into the United States—approximately three percent of the entire population of Mexico.

Most entered Texas. It was this post-1910 immigration which for the first time established a significant Mexican presence in Texas. In 1821, when American colonists began to arrive, there were only an estimated 3,000 Mexicans in the entire Mexican province of Texas, and most of them lived southwest of present-day Colorado. By 1834, Americans outnumbered Mexicans by ten to one. In 1860, there were only an estimated 12,000 ethnic Mexicans living in all of Texas—less than two percent of a total population numbering over 600,000. By 1900, the estimated number of ethnic Mexicans living in Texas was only 70,000—less than three percent of a total population in excess of three million. In San Antonio, ethnic Germans outnumbered ethnic Mexicans.

The estimated number of ethnic Mexicans living in the other Southwestern states in 1900 was similarly low: Arizona—14,172 out of a total population of 122,931, or less than 12 percent; California—8,096 out of a total population of 1,485,053, or less than one percent; and New Mexico—6,649 out of a total population of 195,310, or less than four percent.

Between 1910 and 1920, the politics of the Mexican Revolution followed the wave of Mexicans into the United States. It consisted of acts of violence by rival Mexican warlords—principally Victoriano Huerta, Venustiano Carranza, and Francisco "Pancho" Villa—and by Mexicans living in the United States—such as Agustín S. Garza, Luis de la Rosa, Aniceto Pizana, and Esteban Fierros, all from Texas. Those perpetrated by the former included armed raids into Texas and New Mexico, as well as threats of a general war against the United States. Those committed by the latter centered on the "Plan de San Diego," which called for a general insurrection by Mexicans living throughout the Southwest of the United

States and the extermination of European-American males residing in that region.

Many historians believe the Plan de San Diego had a foreign, chiefly Mexican, component to its origin. Some consider it to have been part of a conspiracy for returning the deposed Mexican dictator Huerta to power. In any event, the plan was then used by the reigning dictator of Mexico, Carranza, as a tool for extorting official recognition for his government from Washington, which is why many maintain that the Plan de San Diego originated with Carranza from the start. Further disagreement centers on the role, if any, of the Imperial German Government—which was endeavoring to keep the United States out of World War I—in formulating or funding the proposed insurrection.

However, several historians, including those who believe that Huerta and/or Carranza were involved in the conspiracy, judge the plan to have been "an authentic product of the border region." Championing this opinion, the militant Hispanic publication *AZTLAN: Chicano Journal of Social Science & The Arts* printed in its Spring 1970 issue: "Mexicans, citizens of the United States and Mexico, conceived, wrote, and attempted to implement a manifesto of liberation entitled the Plan de San Diego." The article included an English translation of the plan and justified its 15 points, "harsh as they may seem," on the ground that Mexicans in the United States had historically suffered from "the racism, brutality, and fear of the Anglo population."

Point One: "On the 20th day of February 1915, at two o'clock in the morning, we will arise in arms against the Government and country of the United States of North America . . . we will proclaim the independence and segregation of the States bordering upon the Mexican Nation, which are: TEXAS, NEW MEXICO, ARIZONA, COLORADO, AND UPPER CALIFORNIA, OF WHICH States the Republic of MEXICO was robbed in a most perfidious manner by North American imperialism."

Point Two: Our "army shall be known by the name of: 'LIBERATING ARMY FOR RACE AND PEOPLES.'"