

**TERRORIST ATTACKS** in New York City and Washington, D.C., have focused the attention of many on the dangers of militant Islam. But as usual, our vacuous talking heads and elites are overlooking the two most important aspects of the attack: the revival of the centuries-old violent conflict between Islam and Christianity, and the growing capacity and sophistication of non-state organizations to challenge the nation-state.

Historian John Keegan tells us that "Islam has bloody borders." We must look with a jaundiced eye on those who claim these terrorist acts represent only a tiny splinter group of crazed fanatics—the implication being that all other Muslims are peaceful liberal democrats just like us. Granted, these acts of violence are being conducted by a fanatical minority, but the TV scenes of mobs cheering in places like Islamabad and Gaza demonstrate that there is growing support for *jihad* upon the Christian West, particularly the United States. Our retaliatory acts will only foster more support for terrorists in Islamic countries.

Future historians may well view September 11, 2001, as the opening blow of the latest round in the clash between Islam and Christendom. Israeli historian Martin van Creveld reminds us: "If the growing militancy of one religion continues, it almost will compel others to follow suit. People will be driven to defend their ideals and way of life . . . Thus Muhammad's recent revival may yet bring on that of the Christian Lord, and He will not be the Lord of love but of battles."

The terrorist attacks also demonstrated the growing ability and sophistication of private, non-governmental organizations to challenge the monopoly on violence that the nation-state claims for itself. Our surveillance satellites, nuclear weapons, carrier battle groups, stealth bombers, and other push-button war gadgetry failed to deter the terrorist attacks on New York City and the Pentagon. Those acts demonstrated a coordinated, well-planned effort normally associated with the military operations of advanced nation-states. Our terrorist foes are fighting by their own rules, not those of the Pentagon—and our rules of war may be outdated.

Our response to this threat will not be limited to bombing a few of Osama bin Laden's caves into dust or accelerating

Afghanistan's drive to return to the Stone Age. The military response, the politicians' much-touted "war on terrorism," will resemble a counter-guerrilla war, and our Armed Forces and citizens are ill equipped to conduct such a campaign. To win the war on terrorism, our troops must become as ruthless as their will-o'-the-wisp enemy. Our foes lack any scruples in conducting their jihad, but our troops have ethics, and in the age of CNN warfare, we will fare badly. Such an endeavor will take a long time, and it will not be bloodless. Will the American public endure such a lengthy effort? Given the Vietnam experience, I would be tempted to say no, but since the carnage occurred within the United States, that attitude may change.

While the politicians beat the war drums, they seem to be acting like criminologists, claiming they will "hunt down and bring to justice" those responsible. Hauling bin Laden before some court will not deter future acts of terrorism. What should we do with terrorists? My remarks to students at Washington & Lee University in 1997 are just as applicable today: "Hunt 'em down and kill 'em like rabid dogs." We had better be prepared to do this, rather than treat terrorists as criminals—because that will not halt terrorism.

Failure to counter terrorism successfully will have dire consequences for the American nation-state, because it will have failed to fulfill one of its most elemental functions: protection of its citizens. When a state fails to protect its citizens, it forfeits their loyalty, and this loyalty will be transferred to whatever group or organization *can* protect them. The attacks in New York City and on the Pentagon are symptomatic of the nation-state's faltering ability to retain its monopoly on violence—or, in plain words, to protect its citizens' lives and property. Nobody knows what the ultimate significance of this failure would be, but it is likely to be eventful—and very bloody.

—Morgan Norval

**THE WORLD TRADE CENTER** attack may prove to be one of the grimmest moments in modern American history. Understandably, most Americans are enraged and demand revenge, while de-

spair and fear are evident even in people who, only a very short time ago, managed to maintain a fairly detached view of the political scene. In this atmosphere, very few are prepared to complain about the strict new security precautions that are being imposed at airports and public facilities. Quite apart from the grief they feel for the victims of terrorism, citizens who would normally be sensitive to government encroachments on civil liberties believe that rights have to be yielded in order to secure better protection.

In theory, this idea of a tradeoff is not unreasonable; in practice, the notion is poorly founded. When rights are eroded in the heat of war and terrorism, these changes rarely produce any practical benefit beyond a general sense of communal sacrifice. And once they are gone, these rights and liberties are very, very difficult to regain. To take an obvious example of a futile expansion of official powers: Just what has been gained by the massive extension of identity checks at airports and the requirement that travelers carry official identity cards? Anybody who believes that such controls will prevent terrorism is obviously deluded: As every antiterrorism professional knows, the first requirement for a serious terrorist is the ability to procure immaculate false papers.

In the age of the internet, many of the critical struggles for rights necessarily occur on the electronic frontier; here, too, terrorist outrages provide a convenient excuse to encroach on individual rights. Over the last two years, privacy battles have raged over a proposed FBI system called Carnivore, designed to intercept potentially vast numbers of e-mails in search of suspect communications dealing with (for instance) terrorism, drug trafficking, or child pornography. Court warrants would not, of course, play any role in this process. Carnivore was fiercely opposed by a broad cross-section of activists, including political conservatives and economic liberals, in addition to the traditional civil-liberties constituency.

The whole idea of e-mail snooping has been desperately controversial, and it took a bold bureaucrat to defend it—at least, until the fall of the World Trade Center. Suddenly, massive e-mail snooping became the norm, Carnivore surveillance became widespread, and nothing

more has been heard about the need for warrants. The logic is simple: Would any internet service provider like it to be known that it had delayed or obstructed the FBI in a quest for information that might have prevented more airliners from being hijacked, more buildings from being blown up? The question is absurd: Carnivore is here to stay.

But this is not simply a conflict between effective policing and civil-libertarian idealism, between good cops and naive eggheads. If the FBI or any other agency has any reasonable suspicion that intercepting communications might help suppress terrorism, I wish it success in its endeavors. The problem is that, in most instances, this is just not going to happen, and random trawls can even do more harm than good. Basically, too much information can overwhelm a system, even if the individual pieces of information are priceless.

The principle can be illustrated from any antiterrorist or countersubversion war, from Vietnam to Algeria to Ulster. Time and again, security forces have tried to pull in hundreds or even thousands of suspects, who are either not interrogated thoroughly, or who produce so much information that the system is swamped. Far better to round up a dozen or so activists who can be interrogated in depth, with the information properly analyzed and assimilated. Those wars, of course, are ancient history: They occurred in the dear, dead past, before electronic surveillance became so miraculously "effective," and computers could (in theory) analyze all the data. Even so, somewhere along the line, inefficient human beings have to read and react to what the computers are collecting. And they are going to miss a great deal.

Carnivore, in short, might be the worst of both worlds. Random snooping interferes massively with the privacy of communications, while offering little chance that bad guys will be apprehended. Furthermore, Carnivore is a symptom of America's overreliance on electronic technologies, which have largely displaced traditional human intelligence tactics—the use of spies, moles, and defectors. These methods have worked well in the past, and properly applied, they might even have averted the catastrophe in New York City this past September.

—Philip Jenkins



**AMNESTY** for illegal immigrants is an idea whose time not only has passed but, like Elizabethan collars and virginity, can hardly be imagined—unless what Peter Brimelow calls "immigration enthusiasts" are more fanatical still than the Muslim terrorists who struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11. Even before the strike, a major national poll showed 69 percent of the American public opposed to amnesty; the week previous to the catastrophe, Rush Limbaugh, in a dramatic reversal, devoted two hours of his radio program to attacking illegal and even, by implication, legal immigration. Recent reports, as of this writing, have Presidents George W. Bush and Vicente Fox putting their heads together to discuss how to make the 2,100-mile Mexican-American border less open, not more so.

Almost the first words out of Mayor Rudolph Giuliani's mouth after the two hijacked planes collided with the World Trade Center towers were exhortations to New Yorkers to refrain from committing hate thought against "people of other faiths" and colors; before the week was out, the FBI announced it would prosecute harassment of Muslims and Middle Easterners in the United States as a federal hate crime. Having done its best to assure that minorities in America got a good night's sleep, the establishment dropped the alien issue fast—but not fast enough. Talk-show hosts and their guests had already taken up the question of how hate-ridden alien criminals came to be here in the first place.

The pro-immigration lobby is naturally concerned for Bush's Mexican amnesty proposal and Tom Daschle's universal one, which it fears will come to naught. Indeed, it will be lucky if its losses are restricted to the withdrawal of amnesty plans. What I call the wild card (see "The Third Compartment," *Views*, p. 14) has been turned up at last, and all bets are off on the direction the immigration debate is likely to take from here on out. Overnight, immigration has been transformed from an ideological luxury, a moralistic indulgence, and a capitalist subterfuge into a black-and-white issue of national security—of national survival, in fact. Whatever limited success Washington's retaliatory strikes may achieve, nothing is more assured than that the President's "crusade" abroad will ultimately prove as futile as his grandiose attempt to "rid the world of evil." There is one way, and one way only, to provide

America with a measure of security, and that is to secure its borders tightly (if not to seal them off completely) and prevent more immigrant terrorists from coming in along with all the rest; identify those that are already here; round them up; and deport them. If the events of September 11 have not yet made the truth clear, subsequent and perhaps much worse ones are likely to do so. The issue is no longer xenophobia *versus* xenophilia, diversity *versus* homogeneity, generosity *versus* selfishness, universal nationhood *versus* the nation-state, libertarian economics *versus* mercantilism, *cabrito* *versus* steak and mashed potatoes. It is survival, pure and simple; and unless Americans have totally lost their minds along with their stock portfolios, they will recognize the prospect of what one commentator has described as "interminable warfare" and make the appropriate mental and political adjustments.

When I learned of the strikes against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, my first thought was that the perpetrators must have arrived in the United States on international flights just hours before they commandeered the doomed planes. The truth, of course, was otherwise: Many of them had lived several years in this country, where they "assimilated" into America so far as to enroll in flight school, attain valuable job skills, participate in the consumer economy, and acquire a Florida or California tan. (I've even heard these devoted Muslims developed a taste for vodka tonics, but perhaps that was just a joke in bad taste.) Maybe we will learn that they acquired stock portfolios of their own—of which they divested themselves at the appropriate split-second, of course—and that they cast votes in the 2000 election. Model immigrants, in short, of the kind Jack Kemp has praised as "entrepreneurial" and Julian Simon called the "ultimate resource." Except for one thing: While doing well in America, these people hated its—our—guts.

What kind of country accepts immigrants from countries with which it is, effectively, involved in protracted warfare? The kindest word I can think of is "naïve." Anyone who wants to come to the United States (so the assumption goes) must be good; anyone who wants to come here from an enemy nation or a rival culture must be even better. Immigrants emigrate to America because they love us (having watched us on TV); because they want to contribute to the world-epochal

American project; because they want to be just like us; because they want to *be* us.

As Hemingway would have said, "Isn't it pretty to think so." Since September 11, few Americans can be thinking prettily—except maybe John Miller, *National Review's* resident immigration enthusiast and chief assimilation strategist. And—who knows?—perhaps not even he. American journalists, like Americans generally, have to grow up sometime—don't they?

—Chilton Williamson, Jr.

**VICENTE FOX**, Mexico's president, began his state visit to Washington in September by issuing a public challenge to President George W. Bush to grant amnesty to millions of illegal Mexican aliens in the United States by year's end. He said he wanted a "bilateral migration agreement" that would ensure that "all Mexicans entering the United States did so with the proper documents."

What President Fox really wants is for every Mexican who may ever wish to live in the United States to be free to do so. He also wants millions of his countrymen who are already here to be "legalized." Legalization would happen in waves, and temporary work restrictions would halt low-skilled workers like meatpackers or waiters from moving into higher-skilled jobs.

President Fox's challenge stems from his desire to create a "North American common market" similar to Europe's, which would allow free movement of people. The equalization of wages in a common market, he argues, is how Germany and other prosperous European countries stopped poor people from immigrating illegally from Spain, Portugal, and Greece. He ignores the fact that those countries have functioning polities and low birthrates, highly literate populations, and—by Mexican standards—bureaucratic structures that are paragons of efficiency, honesty, and civic responsibility. In addition, those countries, unlike Mexico, have no irredentist designs on America.

Nevertheless, there is a political consensus in favor of amnesty (or, at least, there was until September 11), and its purported rationale is reflected in the words of White House Spokesman Ari Fleischer: "There are people who are already in this country, contributing to the American economy even though they may not be legal, and they are paying tax-

es."

Fleischer is mistaken: Immigration is not economically necessary; at best, it is a zero-sum proposition financially, and it carries a huge social and cultural price tag. The consensus in Washington is not really about economics but about ideology and the short-term objectives of special-interest groups.

The liberals want a Mexican amnesty because they are ideologically committed to American exceptionalism. To them, any notion of an American polity founded on shared ethnic, cultural, and religious bonds is strictly *verboten*, and every step aimed at diluting that majority is welcome. Their political vehicle, the Democratic Party, sees in these future citizens a key component in the black-Hispanic-Jewish coalition that has been crucial to all of their recent presidential and congressional victories.

GOP leaders have given up on their natural constituency. Contrary to the will of Republican voters, they subscribe to the establishmentarian consensus on race and dare not openly appeal to the concerns of European-Americans. Republican strategists pathetically hope that competing for the Latino vote will save the party from its deserved demise. "If Republicans don't move on this, and don't find some leadership from the White House, Democrats will seize on it," says Sen. Chuck Hagel, a Nebraska Republican. "It would be almost folly to let this slip through our fingers." Hagel and his ilk are wrong; Latino votes are not up for grabs; they belong to the Democrats now and always. For the GOP to become a willing accomplice in Fox's design is folly for the party and the nation alike, but few dare say so out loud.

The unions see an opportunity to recruit new members in the millions of uneducated, poorly paid Mexicans. The churches see a chance to fill their empty pews. Federal and state bureaucrats want to cater to them. Corporate America wouldn't mind even a billion new immigrants, as long as their influx kept American wages down. "North America Doesn't Need Borders," the *Wall Street Journal* proclaims. "Legitimize labor flows and ensure that Mexican workers in the US enjoy the same legal rights and protections as their local counterparts," echoes the *Financial Times*. These special-interest groups care about America's cultural and demographic profile about as much as they care about its industrial base.

Regardless of the wording of the com-

muniqueé at the end of Fox's visit, the onslaught will continue unabated across America's southern border, thanks to the efforts of this country's deracinated elites, corrupt politicians, self-serving unions, and globalized corporations. President Fox's aplomb is due to his awareness that the movers and shakers in Washington are on his side. Doubtless, he can hardly believe his luck. Exporting thousands of angry and poor young men averts the potential for racially based revolutionary violence so familiar to Mexico. Sending them north of the border but allowing them to retain dual citizenship is the best of both worlds for Mexico. It reflects former President Ernesto Zedillo's frankly stated hope to "create an ethnic lobby with political influence similar to that of American Jews."

We will pay the price: Though President Fox's avowed goal is to lift Mexican living standards closer to those of the United States and Canada, he does not admit that the corollary of his project is the lowering of our standards closer to Mexico's. Illegal immigrants are already draining America's resources—setting aside the social cost of their presence. The ultimate price tag of what Fox and his friends in Washington propose is the destruction of the United States as the nation-state of the American people.

The ruling elites will aid and abet him because they know that the ever-growing pool of immigrants, legal or otherwise, will permanently enhance their centralization of political, economic, and cultural power. They are the social engineers of postnationalism *par excellence*, and with every fresh amnesty, they make the possibility of the revival of the Old Republic ever more remote.

Mexican fifth columnists in the United States see what is going on and make no bones about their long-term ambitions. Richard Alatorre of the Los Angeles City Council says of his Anglo neighbors: "They're afraid we're going to take over the government and other institutions. They're right. We will take them over." Prof. Jose Angel Gutierrez of the University of Texas points out that an aging white America is not making babies: "They are dying. The explosion is in our population. I love it!" Mario Obledo, California's secretary of health, education, and welfare under Jerry Brown and a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom from Bill Clinton, says that California will be an Hispanic state—and "anyone who doesn't like it should

leave.”

—Srdja Trifkovic

**SEN. JESSE HELMS'** announcement in August of his retirement at the end of his current term was an opportunity for vituperation on the part of the left-wing media that has so detested the North Carolina conservative throughout his entire 30-year political career. “It is always tempting,” moaned the *New York Times* lead editorial the day after Mr. Helms’ announcement, “when old warriors retire, to lament their passing from the political stage. In the case of Senator Jesse Helms, that is a temptation to be resisted.” There’s never much danger that any spark of gallantry might flash through the darkness at the *Times*.

The editorial was followed a few days later by yet another shot at Helms in the paper’s “Week in Review” section—this time by Rick Perlstein, author of a recent study of Barry Goldwater’s presidential campaign, attended by a selection of what the *Times* considered choice quotations from the senator going back to his quite unreconstructed comments on Negroes in 1956. Nor was the *Washington Post* to be outdone by its grim sister in Manhattan. It took the *Post* a week or so, but eventually, columnist and chief political reporter David Broder unbosomed an op-ed entitled “Jesse Helms, White Racist.”

Of course, this kind of press coverage of Helms is not unusual, and one may guess that the senator, a former journalist himself who has regularly expressed contempt for most of the national media during his career, took it all in stride. Helms’ defenders—including not a few neoconservatives—insisted that Helms was, at least, a political leader who always stood by his principles. Writing in the *Weekly Standard*, Fred Barnes remarked that, “So far as I know, he’s changed his mind on only one issue in three decades, dropping criticism of Israel and becoming a strong supporter”—which, of course, is why the neocons had anything nice to say about him at all. It is true that Helms seldom if ever altered his positions or thinking on any public issue and true as well that his positions and thinking almost never reflected political expedience but rather his own religious, moral, and political principles.

What was striking about Helms, however, was not so much that he voted consistently in support of conservative posi-

tions but that he often chose to lead, or at least carry a torch, on the most difficult and controversial conservative positions—one thinks not only of abortion, arms control, and various nominees of both Republican and Democratic administrations, but also of his strong and simple opposition to the legitimization of homosexuality, to the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday, to the Genocide Treaty, to various United Nations conventions that violated both national sovereignty and constitutional rights, and to the renewal of the Voting Rights Act in 1982, a measure supported by then-rising GOP star Newt Gingrich and his cronies.

Despite his courage and integrity on these and other issues, Senator Helms was not without his flaws. On more than one occasion, he displayed a repellent ingratitude to long-time staff members when political convenience dictated. His switch on Israel, whatever its merits or weaknesses, was almost certainly driven more by his hunger for political survival than the religious and moral tinsel in which he chose to wrap it. And, while Helms emphasized issues of immense moral and religious import, such as abortion and homosexuality, he virtually ignored—especially in his latter years—the far more central threat of mass immigration to the nation and its civilization. The immense energy and attention he and his staff always devoted to even the most obscure issues of foreign affairs might have been better spent on resisting the internal cultural and moral disintegration of American society.

What distinguished Helms from virtually every other conservative political leader in Washington in the latter part of the last century (and what probably accounts for both his virtues and his shortcomings) was simply his utter and total indifference to what the press in Washington or in his own state, the political establishment, his colleagues, or his own party thought about him. It was his calculated indifference to—and even contempt for—such quarters that allowed him to say and do precisely what he wanted to say and do, in the certain knowledge that he was accountable only to God and the voters. At the end of his article on Senator Helms in the *Weekly Standard*, Fred Barnes asks, “Will another Helms emerge in the Senate?” Of course not, until another senator is able and willing to insulate himself politically and psychologically as effectively as Jesse Helms did. If there are few willing to

bear such insulation, there are even fewer able to sustain it. And most who do will receive little comfort from the *Standard* and the kind of conservatism it represents.

“Few senators in the modern era,” the *New York Times* sneered, “have done more to buck the tide of progress and enlightenment than Mr. Helms.” The paper that prints all the news that fits could not have bid farewell to the senator it hates so much with a greater compliment.

—Samuel Francis

**OBITER DICTA:** The third of our three new quarterly columns debuts this month on p. 13. In *Sins of Omission, Chronicles’* newly minted corresponding editor **Roger McGrath** will reveal the *real* American history—the tragedies and triumphs that the politically correct commissars of American culture and the academy don’t want you to know about.

There is still time to register for the 12th Annual Meeting of the John Randolph Club, which will convene in Rockford November 9-10. For more details, please see the ad on the back cover. If you are planning on staying at Cliffbreakers (the hotel where the conference will be held), please note the change in the room rate.

Our first poet this month is **Catharine Savage Brosman** of New Orleans, Louisiana. Her poetry and prose have appeared in the *New England Review*, the *American Scholar*, the *Southwest Review*, the *Southern Review*, and the *Sewanee Review*, among others. Two collections of her verse, *The Swimmer and Other Poems* (R.I. Barth) and *Places in Mind* (LSU Press), were published last year.

Our second poet is **Bradley R. Strahan**, who teaches poetry at Georgetown University. The publisher of *Visions-International*, Mr. Strahan has had over 500 poems published in such journals as *America*, *Christian Century*, *Cross Currents*, the *Seattle Review*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, *First Things*, and the *Hollins Critic*. His latest book, *The Conjuror’s Gallery*, was released last year by Crosscultural Communications.

Our art this month is provided by **Jeff Drew**, who, with his wife and four cats, lives in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Mr. Drew, a graduate of the John Herron School of Art in Indianapolis, is a freelance illustrator and animator. This is his first appearance in *Chronicles*.



# Redeeming the Time

by Thomas Fleming

The Days are Evil

The human universe, we are told by optimists on the editorial pages, is contracting into a gray and insipid doughball, pasted over with brightly colored labels advertising the only ethnic rivalries that persist: the struggles between Nissan and Daimler, Pizza Hut and Taco Bell. Unfortunately, there are people around the world who do not read the *Wall Street Journal*, and some of them are hurling themselves into the bloody conflicts that regularly dominate the headlines. In the Middle East, the election of Ariel Sharon has predictably intensified the struggle between Arabs and their Israeli neighbors, who are mostly immigrants or the children of immigrants. U.S. support for Israel has cast American citizens in the role of enemies of Islam, and Muslim hatred of America reached a fever pitch on September 11, when terrorists attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. In the Balkans, Albanian immigrants in Serbia and Macedonia have been continuing their genocidal war against their Slavic hosts, and last spring, the “international community” was dismayed to learn that a U.N. employee is an accused Rwandan war criminal—really, just the perfect person to help with humanitarian development in the midst of an ethnic civil war.

The comedy continued in May, when a Rwandan accused of planning the genocide of a half-million Tutsis was found working in Tanzania as a defense investigator for the war-crimes tribunal. The very next day, John Ashcroft was in Mexico, promising President Fox that George W. Bush would send Congress a program granting Mexican immigrants guest-worker visas. Unlike previous administrations, however, the Republican White House would not be demanding, in return, any concrete Mexican proposals to reduce illegal (much less legal) immigration.

It is a simple fact, so obvious that it should not need stating, but it does: All ethnic conflict is the result of migration, whether of Albanians into Kosovo, Anglo-Saxons into the Indian lands of North America, the forced migration of Africans to the United States, or the comparatively recent (18th century and earlier) invasion of Tutsis into Hutuland. Ethnic diversity almost always means ethnic conflict, which can be resolved by genocide (the solution devised by the English to answer the Tasmanian question), subjugation (the Norman Conquest of the Anglo-Saxons and of the Irish), or absorption (the fate of most Northern European ethnic groups in the United States), or some gruesome combination. Where are the Celts of yesteryear?

America, as we know, is an exception to every rule. Here, all the various ethnicities have blended into an harmonious multi-ethnic nationality that defines itself neither by blood nor religion. We are, as one Canadian immigrant who has spent his life making trouble for his adopted homeland puts it, “a propositional nation.” Ask Robert E. Lee. Ask W.E.B. Dubois. Ask

Davy Crockett or Jesse Jackson or Abe Foxman. Ask Geronimo.

The reality of American life is that this nation has been dominated by ethnic conflicts throughout its history—some of them carried out openly in the form of Indian wars and race riots, others more covertly, as in the repeated attempts to keep Catholic immigrants in their place. Inevitably, both political parties have used ethnic tensions as a motive force for building coalitions and holding power.

In the 1850’s and 1860’s, the Know-Nothings and their successors, the Republicans, wanted to unify the country against immigrants (most of whom were Catholic) on the basis of ethnicity and religion, just as the Republican strategy today is to bind future generations of Mexicans, on the basis of class and economic interest, and use them as a counterweight to African-Americans, who vote Democratic.

The ethnic focus of the two political parties became very sharp in the years after the War Between the States. The Republicans were the party of the Union—that is, the GOP represented the members of the non-Southern middle classes who were Protestant and Anglo (or also, after a time, assimilated Germans and Scandinavians). After the end of Reconstruction, blacks hardly counted politically, because they had so little money and even less opportunity to vote; they were, nonetheless, clients of the GOP, much as they are clients of the Democrats today.

The Democrats were stigmatized as the party of “Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion”—that is, as a coalition of Southern WASPs and wine-bibbing and whiskey-swilling immigrants from Catholic Ireland, Italy, Poland, and Hungary. The coalition also included comparatively small numbers of Orthodox Greeks and Slavs and some Protestant ethnicities, but the lines were fairly clearly drawn. Midwestern WASPs, whose ancestors had once looked toward the South and to the party of Jefferson, were staunchly Republican, while Southern WASPs, whose families had been Whigs and unionists, became yellow-dog Democrats.

The Democratic Party, outside the South, was the party of excluded minorities and “forgotten men.” Finnish socialists voted Democratic (when there was no Marxist candidate running), and Southern and Eastern European ethnics supported the party of minorities against the WASPs who went to Yale and owned the country. The Democrats’ strategy was clear: to co-opt each arriving immigrant group by providing favors, organizing their neighborhoods, and getting out the vote. The same strategy almost gave them Florida and the White House in the 2000 election. The Republicans, on the other hand, relied on the farmers and the business classes and hoped, gradually, to convert the more assimilable ethnics, as they bought property