

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-

ture, 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. **Ω**

*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

workplace before. In Harlem, seven white customers were burned alive in a store torched by a black racist after Al Sharpton and other racial demagogues had led protests against its presence in the neighborhood because the owner was white. This did elicit some editorial commentary, but without a single acknowledgment by any public figure of any color that the black community might have its own racial problem.”

One wonders which is more chilling—black racial hatred itself or the outright mendacity and deliberate indifference with which the press and the fashionable left cover it up.

Yet there is a major problem with Mr. Horowitz’s account, which is that for all his candor in discussing such matters and for all his rethinking of the leftism in which he was bred, to this day he still just doesn’t get it about race per se. Thus, as he tells us in his introduction, “The tolerance of *Salon*’s editors for the views in this book should not be surprising, since they are the same views once advanced by the civil rights movement [Martin Luther] King led.” Mr. Horowitz still seems to think that “race” is largely a fiction, and nowhere in the book does he mention, much less discuss, *The Bell Curve* or the work of Philippe Rushton, Arthur Jensen, Michael Levin, Richard Lynn, and others on racial differences in mentality and behavior.

Nor, for all his exposure of the lefties whom he knew and worked with in his red days, does he have anything to tell us about the “civil rights movement” itself—although we know very well that it was no less a collection of crooks and frauds than the New Left. Mr. Horowitz is exclusively concerned with what he believes is the “betrayal” of the civil rights movement by black leaders today and their indulgence of black racism or their outright endorsement of it. Hence, his columns center only around black-white antagonisms and ignore the impact of immigration and the emergence of anti-white Hispanic racism.

What Mr. Horowitz does not appear to grasp is that his beloved “civil rights movement” was merely the opening stage of a continuing and ever-intensifying revolution—Lothrop Stoddard’s “Rising Tide of Color,” or what the late sociologist Robert Nisbet called the “racial revolution” in which “color has come close to replacing nationality and economic class as the major setting for revolution—thrust, strategy, tactics, and also phi-

losophy . . .” Like all opening stages of revolutionary movements, that of the racial revolution was fairly moderate, demanding only “equal rights” and “color blindness” in law and policy. King was the leader and hero of this stage of the revolution, and in this respect it was little different from analogous stages of the French, Russian, and other revolutions.

But, again like all revolutions, it quickly moved on. Once legal racial barriers had been dismantled and equality before the law granted, the revolution began to unmask itself as a demand for racial power pure and simple. Equality of result and outcome as well as “tolerance,” “diversity,” and “racial reconciliation” have now come to serve as ratio-



David Horowitz.

nalizing slogans that are useful for discrediting “white supremacy” and “institutional racism” but are conveniently muted or abandoned entirely when non-white racial power and interests are at stake.

The movement from King’s “color blindness” to present-day Afro-racism is no more bizarre than similar transitions in other revolutionary processes; Orwell’s “All animals are equal—but some are more equal than others” is the classic satire of this pattern. Nevertheless, non-revolutionary power structures are constantly befuddled by it, as is the white establishment today. Having granted the legitimacy of the early stage of the revolution and swallowed the sugar-coated rhetorical and ideological premises of egalitarianism and environmentalism, the old regime finds it all but impossible to resist the demands of the later stages of the revolution that exploit those premises for anti-white racial purposes—even if it wanted to resist those demands in the first place.

Of course, it is to Mr. Horowitz’s credit that he has resisted and refused to embrace the more extreme anti-white impli-

cations of the “color blindness” he espouses, and it is because of his resistance that he exposes the racial revolutionaries at all. But because he does not really seem to understand that it is a revolution continuous with the civil rights movement, he misses much of what needs to be said about it and in the end has very little to tell us about how to resist the revolution effectively.

In fact, pretty much all that Mr. Horowitz can do, given his continuing commitment to King’s “color blindness” and his satisfaction with present-day American society, is bemoan and expostulate about the trends that have made “color blindness” a bad joke, and exhort us all to get back to good old Dr. King’s wisdom. Of course, the reason color blindness has become a bad joke and the reason that what King preached was wrong (whether he knew it or not) is that race is real. It is precisely because it is real, rooted in nature and evident in behavior, that normal human beings cannot be “blind” to it and cannot pretend indefinitely that it doesn’t exist or isn’t important.

That is also why just about every other race has now rediscovered it and is in the process of using it to build a mass base mobilized around racial consciousness for the revolt against the civilization that whites have created and ruled. Since Mr. Horowitz’s commitment to “color blindness” and his denial of race mean that he cannot and will not invoke white racial identity and consciousness as a counterweight to non-white racial forces, about all he can offer with which to resist the anti-white racial hatred and quest for non-white racial power he accurately perceives are expostulation, exhortation, and bemoaning. The damage his insistence on color blindness does is that it prevents whites who become aware of the racial revolution from understanding that the construction of their own racial consciousness—not the denial of it—is the only realistic means of resisting a revolution directed against them that will certainly lead to their political and cultural dispossession and may eventually result (if contemporary anti-white racial hatred and viciousness is any indication) in their physical destruction.

Mr. Horowitz has written a compelling and often powerful account of the rising tide of color that, as it becomes a majority in the United States and threatens to engulf other white societies, will paint a dark future for white people ev-

erywhere in the world. It is unfortunate that as well informed about it and as experienced as he is in its inner circles, he

does not more fully understand the force that really drives the racial revolution he at first assisted and later deserted. 

*Samuel Francis, a nationally syndicated columnist, can be reached through his website at [www.samfrancis.net](http://www.samfrancis.net).*

## Our Wandering Ancestors

*Mysterious Mummies of China*, NOVA Videos, WGBH Boston, 1998, 60 mins. \$19.95. *Homicide in Kennewick*, Channel Four International (U.K.), 1998, 60 mins.

### Remarkable discoveries now on video.

reviewed by James P. Lubinkas

Recent discoveries of Caucasian mummies and skeletons have raised the possibility that whites took their civilization well beyond Europe far earlier than previously thought. Two recent videos offer evidence, sometimes in amazing detail, of our globe-trotting ancestors.

*Mysterious Mummies of China* is part of the science and nature NOVA television series, and describes the remarkably well-preserved 3,000-year-old mummies discovered in the Takla Makan desert of Central Asia. The bodies were preserved by the arid climate and not by any human means. Several clearly have red and blond braided hair, white skin and other unmistakably European features. The discoveries first came to the attention of the West when a visiting American anthropologist named Victor Mair saw some of the mummies at a local museum in Chinese Central Asia. Intrigued, he assembled a forensic archeology team to return to China and identify the ancient remains. The video follows the groups efforts to learn who the mummy people were.

The most impressive mummy was found by a Chinese archeologist identified as "Mr. Hua," who discovered its tomb in the Takla Makan. Along with a young female and a baby who appear to have been sacrificed for the burial, Mr. Hua found a tall, white-skinned, blue-eyed (the color of her eyes is clearly visible in the video), blond-haired, woman with braids, who was probably a noble. She died at about age 40 and was buried in skillfully woven, tartan-like cloth. The 3,800-year-old mummy looks so life-like that Mr. Hua, who has found 17 similar corpses in the area says, "When I brought her out of the ground and held her in my arms, I realized that she was the most beautiful woman on earth."

Where did these ancient whites come from and what happened to them? The team thinks they may have been related to the Tokharians, a people that founded several settlements along the ancient "Silk Road." Mummies and skeletons of the Tokharians show striking similari-



ties to the Takla Makan mummies. A mummy of a Tokharian man clearly has red, braided hair and is wearing tartan cloth. Facial reconstruction's from skulls show a resemblance to the Celtic people of Europe. Grave artifacts like saddles and bread ovens are similar to ones used by the people of western China today.

The video shows the team in areas of China formerly closed to the West, discovering eye-opening rock carvings and cave paintings that show the Tokharians as tall, red-haired, and white. Their writing was in a European script. Interestingly, some are shown with Indian caste marks, which suggest the region was a mixing bowl with the Tokharians taking on characteristics of other people. Prof. Mair says the drawings are consistent with early Chinese accounts of

"barbarians" described as red-haired, with blue-green eyes and long noses. He believes the Tokharians were the descendants of the mummy people who, themselves, came from the Urals. Prof. Mair believes they introduced the wheel and certain types of weaving to China; the Chinese may even have built the Great Wall to keep them out. They disappeared after the 10th century and seem to have been absorbed by Asians. Still, the video notes that many people in western China do not consider themselves racially Chinese. They call themselves "weggers" and while Asian in appearance, some appear in the video with light hair, white skin, and blue-green eyes.

There is little doubt that whites had an early presence in Asia and an influence on the development of China, cracking its isolation thousands of years before Marco Polo. The video concludes that "the region on the doorstep of China was continuously populated by whites from 1800 BC."

### Kennewick Man

There is persuasive but inconclusive evidence that whites were the original inhabitants of North America. *Homicide in Kennewick*, released in 1998 by the English television station Channel Four, describes the discovery of a skeleton known as Kennewick Man, named after the little town in Washington state near which he was found. Outdoorsmen discovered the skeleton in July, 1996 (see AR, Jan., April and June, 1997), and it has been a source of controversy between scientists and Indians ever since.

The police asked Jim Chatters, a local anthropologist, to investigate the mostly intact skeleton. He knew it was not recent, but the long, narrow skull, prominent nose, and long limbs indicated it was not an American Indian skeleton either. He also discovered an arrowhead in the pelvis of the type used by Indians over 5,000 years ago. Despite the arrowhead, he thought he had the skeleton of an early white pioneer, which would make it about 200 years old. He