

*Gerda Bikales is a writer and public policy analyst who has long been active in the defense of English as the common language of the United States, including a term as executive director of U.S.English.*

# The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo: Truth and Consequences

For the radical Chicano dedicated to keeping dreams of a mythical lost empire of Aztlan alive, the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo is an essential prop. Nearly 150 years after its signing, the treaty that ended the Mexican-American War in 1848 is routinely cited as legal justification for the growing demands that the Spanish language — the cultural foundation from which Aztlan is to rise — must be granted a measure of official recognition in the United States. The treaty, we are told repeatedly, guarantees the people of the annexed territories, and their descendants, the right to maintain the language of Mexico in perpetuity.

One encounters this assertion in indignant "Letters to the Editor" that denounce the imposition of American culture and of English, in defiance of terms of the treaty. One hears the claim repeated in the passionate oratory of Latino activists exhorting their constituents. One sees references to it in Congressional testimony presented by Hispanic leaders who, one suspects, actually do know better.

Politicians, journalists and writers on Mexican-Americans frequently allude to the existence of a provision in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo to keep Spanish entrenched in the territories once controlled by Mexico. Earl Shorris, in a reference work entitled *Latinos: A Biography of a People* (1992), writes of "the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which promised citizenship, freedom to choose their religion and language ... to the Mexicans who lived in territories ceded to the U.S. after the Mexican War...." In the midst of the campaign for passage of Proposition 63, a 1986 citizen initiative to declare English the official language of California, the state's top legal officer, Attorney General John K. Van de Kamp, asserted that the proposal would violate the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. Challenged about the accuracy of his claim by this writer, Van de Kamp's office quickly issued a retraction:

*It turns out that the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo contains no mention of Spanish or English.... While it is certainly possible that Proposition 63 may have constitutional flaws, it would appear that violating the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo is not one of them.*

The public response to the Attorney General's blunder was quite unusual. Most advocates pressing for a bilingual Spanish/English America, and basing their case upon the Spanish-language rights allegedly granted in the treaty, are greeted by embarrassed silence rather than sharp questioning. Few of us are familiar with the details of this important document, and even fewer are willing to admit our ignorance. Most of us have vague memories from high school history classes about a war with Mexico which fulfilled a young America's expansionist aspirations to reach its "manifest destiny" — to be a mighty nation stretching across the continent from sea to shining sea.

We now live in a period of orchestrated and unending collective self-flagellation about our country's many sins, both real and imagined, and we are programmed to be uncomfortable about any war we have won — all the more so about one in which we acquired vast stretches of rich territory. We are expected to be self-conscious and timid rather than disputatious and assertive. So it is that the claims about Spanish language rights being in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo often go unchallenged — the truths remain unexposed — and the unscrupulous are free to take full advantage of our ignorance of the facts to promote their irredentist agenda.

Those who take the trouble to locate and read this treaty entitled "Peace, Friendship, Limits and Settlement" will be surprised to find that such an obscure document makes for lively and interesting reading. It's spirit is not punitive or demeaning, but

friendly and hopeful. It speaks of a sincere desire on the part of both countries "to put an end to the calamities of war which unhappily exists between the two Republics, and to establish upon a solid basis relations of peace and friendship, which shall confer reciprocal benefits upon the citizens of both...."

The treaty offered residents in the ceded territories the right to stay

*where they now reside, or to remove at any time to the Mexican Republic, retaining the property which they possess in the said territories, or disposing thereof and removing the proceeds wherever they please; without being subjected, on this account, to any contribution, tax or charge whatever.*

Within a year of the treaty's ratification, residents would have to choose affirmatively to keep their Mexican citizenship, or to become citizens of the United States. Those making no selection were to be considered United States citizens.

The treaty also addressed the property rights of absentee Mexican owners of ceded lands, which were to be

*inviolably respected. The present owners, the heirs of these, and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said property by contract, shall enjoy with respect to it, guaranties equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United States.*

The treaty gave assurances of the incorporation of the people living in the territories into the Union of the United States, at a time to be judged by the Congress, and of their admission "to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution." And while awaiting their entry into the Union, they "shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction."

The fact of the matter is that the choice offered was between United States citizenship (on an equal footing with all other U.S. citizens) and Mexican citizenship. It was religious freedom — the very hallmark of American democracy — that received special emphasis, no doubt to reassure a Catholic population joining a Protestant majority. Nowhere were languages given as an option, nor granted special protection.

The maintenance of the Spanish language in the American West and Southwest, or anywhere else in the country, is not a treaty obligation incumbent upon the American people. They are free to assert with confidence that English is indeed our public language — by tradition, by the imperatives of national unity, and by right. ■

[A copy of Peace, Friendship, Limits and Settlement (*The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo*) may be ordered from **THE SOCIAL CONTRACT**, 316½ E. Mitchell St., Petoskey, MI 49770 for a cost of \$2.50 including postage and handling.]

## Changing Your Address?

Don't miss a single issue of **THE SOCIAL CONTRACT**. Simply use one of the pull-out subscription cards, write the word "Change" along with your new address and drop it in the mail; no postage needed. It's as easy as that.

*Samuel Francis holds a Ph.D. in history from the University of North Carolina and is a nationally syndicated columnist for the Washington Times. This article appears as the foreword to Importing Revolution by William R. Hawkins which has just been released by the American Immigration Control Foundation, Monterey, Virginia.*

# Funding "Demographic Warfare"

By Samuel Francis

In the 1980s, conventional wisdom began to hold that "Marxism is dead everywhere except on American college campuses." Like much that passes for conventional wisdom, the claim was not exactly true, but by the end of the decade, with the overthrow of communist governments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the American university seemed to stand out as just about the only institution north of Havana and west of Pyongyang where you could easily locate anyone who openly admitted being a Marxist.

On American campuses, Marxism continued to flourish at the same time it was withering away in most other places. The cults of "political correctness," "multiculturalism," "Afrocentrism," feminism, "gay and lesbian studies," and similar ideologies and movements often harbored Marxist premises in one form or another, though they combined and tried to buttress those premises with a body of scholarship so shoddy it would have humiliated the original Bolsheviks themselves, not to speak of those dead white males who were responsible for so much tyranny in the modern world, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

While most of the cults and movements gained notoriety in the 1980s as they threatened professional standards of serious learning and even the careers of students and teachers who fell afoul of their dogmas, there was another, similar cult that seemed to escape attention. All through the 1970s and 1980s, almost from the time when the Immigration Act of 1965 abolished the "national origins" standard for immigration into the United States, a small band of Marxists and left-leaning radicals was working to exploit the new law, and the new masses of immigrants that soon began to arrive in its wake, as political weapons against the United States.

Now at last, William R. Hawkins has exposed and documented their work — who they were, how they

operated, and (most important) who paid for it. His answers ought to give a lot of Americans pause as they start considering what has been going on while their attentions were directed elsewhere.

The constant theme of Mr. Hawkins in this thoroughly researched monograph is the conjunction of two seemingly contradictory and hostile forces — the Marxist socialism of the "immigration lobby," which includes not only the political activists among the immigrants themselves but also their army of lawyers and propagandists, and the financial power accumulated by American capitalism that has been stashed away in large tax-exempt foundations.

Specifically, Mr. Hawkins shows how leftists, Marxists, and anti-Americans in the immigration lobby were supported and encouraged by one of the largest and wealthiest philanthropic institutions in the world, the Ford Foundation. Virtually from the beginnings of the political side of the immigration movement, Ford has devoted immense sums to it to assist its legal, "educational," and policy-influencing activities, and at almost every node and juncture of Ford's philanthropy, the recipients have been partisans of the far left.

Thus, Mr. Hawkins shows that MALDEF, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, was established with grants of \$2.2 million from the Ford Foundation in 1968 and that Ford awarded more than \$5,500,000 to MALDEF from 1983 through 1988. In 1986, Ford trustee Harriet Schaffer Rabb joined the board of MALDEF, thus wedding the two organizations in a marriage that could spawn only more mischievous offspring. If MALDEF were simply a "humanitarian" effort, this level of support might be unremarkable, but the fact is that from its very origins, as Mr. Hawkins also shows, MALDEF's legal work has been under the control of members of the radical-left National Lawyers Guild and like-minded organizations.