

*[CHRONICLES, February, 2001]*

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Rout of the Republicans*

The first thing to be said about the presidential election of 2000 is that George W. Bush and the Stupid Party lost miserably. This is true despite their actual victory in the great post-election Florida chicken-scratch because, without Ralph Nader on the ballot, Al Gore would have won the election easily. Nader's votes in Florida alone would mostly have gone to Gore and put the Democrat over the top almost as early as the TV networks originally predicted. The same is even more true in a number of other states, including Washington and Oregon. Exit polls estimate that some 47 percent of voters for Nader would have voted for Gore had Nader not been on the ballot. If it's conspiracy theories about the election you want, forget the Mossad manufacturing fake absentee ballots in Israel and the various frauds each party is supposed to have perpetrated in the Sunshine State. The real question is how much did the Republicans pay Mr. Nader to stay in the election.

The meaning of the Gore-Nader vote is that all the pandering, all the Big Tent compassionate conservatism, all the muting of traditional conservative themes and issues, all the hiding the conservatives in the basement at the GOP convention last summer, all the careful waffling in the new language of the party

platform, all the outreach to blacks, Hispanics, women, homosexuals, Martians, and three-toed Lesbian Pacific Islanders in which George W. Bush and his Rainbow Republican allies enveloped themselves didn't help one little bit. In a word, the Soft Right strategy of dulling the sharp edge of radical conservatism is a failure and an embarrassment. Let the facts be submitted to a candid world.

Black voters went for Al Gore by a whopping 90 percent -- the largest proportion since 1984 and before that since at least 1960.

The carefully deployed blacks at the Republican convention, the careful prance and prattle about affirmative action and Colin Powell's insulting convention speech in support of it -- none of it worked. The Democrats, aided by the NAACP, virtually implicated Bush in the "hate crime" murder of James Byrd in 1998 and nakedly relied on the exploitation of racial fear and hatred to mobilize black voters against the Republicans. Gore in the closing days of the campaign told black audiences that Bush's "strict constructionism" meant a return to Jim Crow, the end of affirmative action, and the appointment of segregationist judges and justices. What does the thin mewling of "compassion" have to say against the scream of racial paranoia that the Democrats unleashed?

Nor was Bush much more successful among women. He won only 43 percent of the female vote to Gore's 54 percent. The former number is a slight increase over Bob Dole's 38 percent, but Clinton in 1996 also won 54 percent. Bush failed to cut into the Democratic majority among female voters and gained female votes

only marginally. Bush did gain a few points among white females, but the black female vote went to Gore by a mammoth 94 percent.

Among Hispanics, the grand plan of Republicans to cut into the Democrats' whopping majority in 1996 was also a dismal flop. Dole carried only 21 percent of the Hispanic vote nationally; Bush last year raised that to 31 percent (against Gore's landslide 67 percent), but even that increase is deceptive. As Steve Sailer reported in a United Press International news story, Bush won a mere 18 percent of Hispanics in New York (where 85 percent voted for Hillary Clinton), 23 percent in California, 42 percent in his own state of Texas, and barely 50 percent in Florida. These four states are the main regions where Hispanics live and vote, and in none of them did Bush win anything approaching a clear majority. Even in Florida, the mainly Cuban Hispanic voting bloc went to Bush in large part out of anger over the Clinton administration's support for sending the Gonzales boy back to Cuba earlier in the year. For all the Soft Right rhetorical chicken-doodle about Bush's winning a majority of Hispanics in his own state, his 42 percent showing there was only slightly better than the 39 percent he won in his 1998 re-election campaign. His 23 percent Hispanic vote in California is not a significant improvement over Dole's 21 percent national figure in 1996, and it should be recalled that some 23 percent of California Hispanics also voted for Proposition 187 in 1994. In other words, about a quarter of California's Hispanic population normally votes Republican, and Bush's 23

percent added nothing substantial to that figure. In other words again, all the pandering to Hispanics, all the jabbering in Spanish, all the abandonment of the powerful immigration issue availeth the Stupid Party nought. Hispanics vote for left-wing candidates not because Republican support for Prop 187 and immigration control alienated them but because Hispanic voters tend to be leftish in their political sympathies.

If the presidential election proves anything, it is that race drives American politics. As The Washington Times' Ralph Z. Hallow reported the day after the vote, "race was the most potent factor in Tuesday's elections." With 90 percent of blacks and 67 percent of Hispanics (and 54 percent of Asians) all voting for the Democratic candidate and with 59 percent of white males voting Republican, there can be no further doubt of that. The natural strategy for the Republican Party therefore is to abandon its foolish and fruitless efforts to win "inroads" among racial minorities and to concentrate on increasing its share of the white vote. As Peter Brimelow has argued, white Southerners face far more formidable racial opposition in their part of the country than the white Californians who have just become a minority in their own state. But even with black voters accounting for 40 percent of the electorate in the South and the Democrats winning 92 percent of their vote, white Southern Republicans still manage to carry most Southern states easily. That's because Southern whites vote as a racial bloc themselves far more than whites

outside the South (66 percent of whites in the South voted for Bush last year compared to only 49 percent of whites in other regions). If Republicans could increase their national share of the white vote to a comparable level (65 percent or more), they would not have to worry so much about the opposing black, Hispanic, and Asian racial blocs.

But the Republicans will not beat the drums necessary to win those votes. They have abandoned immigration control and now boast of their support for open borders and making Puerto Rico a state. They have all but abandoned opposition to affirmative action, and their positions on such racially electric issues as hate crime legislation and racial profiling are softening. Last year GOP strategists boasted of having abandoned the "Southern strategy" that pulled white Southerners into Republican ranks in the first place; fortunately for their party, most whites have nowhere else to go and have not yet perceived that the party's leadership no longer thinks they're important enough to court.

One reason white voters have nowhere else to go but the GOP is that the alternative party of the right, which is what the Reform Party promised to become with Pat Buchanan's seizure of it last year, has flopped even more drastically than the Big Tent Republicans. There were three main reasons for Buchanan's miserable showing that do not really reflect on him or his campaign very much -- the fixation of most conservatives on ridding themselves of the Clinton-Gore demons their own propaganda

had created; the lack of appeal last year of the two main issues on which the Buchanan campaign chose to run, trade policy and an America First foreign policy; and the difficulty of winning control of the Reform Party in face of the determined opposition of the nuts and crackpots that littered it when the Buchananites hit its beaches. Nevertheless, the Buchanan campaign proceeded to commit major tactical blunders that convinced most conservatives that its leader could not win or even make significant headway against the Republicans. The promotion of Lenora Fulani to co-chairmanship of the campaign was one such blunder that sent confusing signals to rank-and-file Buchananites and offered endless opportunities for Buchanan enemies like Rush Limbaugh and the Weekly Standard to ridicule his claims to conservative purity.

The preposterous prediction by the campaign's Pat Choate that Buchanan would win 35 percent of the popular vote because of the "coalition" that the Fulani alliance created only opened the whole campaign to further ridicule among politically sophisticated observers. Buchanan also managed to keep himself out of the public eye during most of the primary season and afterward, so that by the time he popped onto the national screen in Long Beach, Calif., for his party's convention, most voters had probably forgotten he was running at all and had long since made up their own minds about which of the two empty suits offered by the major parties they were going to support. Buchanan's gall bladder operation and repeated hospitalizations thereafter, the brawls at

the Long Beach convention with the flying squirrels of the Natural Law Party, and the delay of federal matching funds were further setbacks not entirely due to the candidate or his campaign. But, to top it all off, Buchanan chose as his running mate an obscure black John Birch Society member who soon turned out to have an ethics problem in her background. Ezola Foster brought absolutely nothing to the ticket -- no stature, no votes, no balance, no reputation -- and by picking her Buchanan (a) alienated racially conscious conservatives who had already been alienated by Bush's Rainbow Republican convention and who might otherwise have been attracted to the Buchanan standard and (b) pushed himself back toward the fading movement conservative ghetto from which Mrs. Foster came. The candidate who started off his two previous campaigns in 1992 and 1996 vowing to forge a new political identity of Middle American nationalism and populism thus wound up drifting back to mere conservative ideological torch waving. For most of the rest of the campaign, Buchanan intoned predictable noises about abortion, homosexuals, and the culture war and abandoned the anti-corporate and pro-working class themes that had won him both votes and sympathetic press attention in his first two races.

In fact, it was the Gore campaign that tried to sound the populist bugle with what was at once dubbed by both his supporters and his foes as "class war." As The Washington Post's Thomas Edsall noted in September, "Gore's aggressive pursuit of a

populism that pits the middle class against the elite, corporations and the wealthy has provided a way to counter his major liability among white men: their doubts about his strength and leadership," and he attributed to this tactic the vice-president's rise in polls in "the battleground states of Michigan, Ohio and Missouri that hold the balance of power in the 2000 election. Among all voters in each of these states," Gore "is either fully competitive with, or slightly ahead of" Bush. In the event, of course, Gore carried only one of these states, and in October Edsall later noted that intensive anti-Gore efforts by the National Rifle Association in key swing states were countering the Gore appeal to white males. "The problem for Democrats," he reported, "is that gun control is unpopular among many of the swing voters both campaigns are targeting in the final weeks of the campaign, particularly in battle ground states -- such as Michigan, Missouri, Ohio and Pennsylvania -- with a sizable bloc of hunters and other gun enthusiasts." In the end, Gore wound up with only 36 percent of the white male vote, which is in the range of what Democratic presidential candidates have received since the 1970s. What made the Gore campaign somewhat unique among recent Democratic national campaigns was its effort to combine transparent racial appeals to non-whites with economic populist appeals to white males. Gore won the non-white vote overwhelmingly but lost the white guys. In the end, race trumped economics.



And that should tell us something about the future, both of American politics in general and of the Hard Right in particular. The 2000 election proves that the Soft Right -- the Beltway-based tub thumpers for Economic Man, imperial globalism, Big Government conservatism, multiracialism, open borders, and only the most tepid resistance to the dominant culture -- is a political flop. Even those in the conservative establishment a bit more to the right were eager to ride along with George W. as he abandoned and muted almost every conservative theme and issue. Eventually they may bolt over the direction the Bush administration is likely to take, but if and when they do, why should anyone pay any further attention to them? They helped legitimize and nominate Bush as a "compassionate conservative." More serious voices on the right need to be heard in the future.

And, given the clear racial alignments and polarizations revealed in the recent election, those voices need to say something significant about race. It was the silence of the Buchanan campaign about race and racial politics that helped reduce it to single digit figures in the opinion polls before it ever really started. It was the racial demagoguery of the Gore campaign that helped win it as much of the vote as it did win -- enough to take the election if Nader had not been on the ballot. And it was the confusions about race expressed by the Republicans that led them to neglect their major political base among whites and lead them into the fantasy land of multiracialism. White

voters may now have nowhere else to go, but if an alternative should arise, they might well start flocking to it. There is little indication that the Stupid Party, no matter who leads it, will change its course or understand the real message of the election; and if the Republicans are unable to understand that message and act on it, the political future may yet belong to a non-Republican Hard Right that does.■

[CHRONICLES, May, 2001]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*The Proletarian Weapon*

No sooner had George W. Bush entered the White House and its previous occupants padded off to Harlem with as much public swag as they could pack into the helicopters than the news media suddenly began to discover "layoffs," "downturns," and a looming economic crisis that threatened to strip the flesh from the eight fat years that the great and wise Clinton administration bestowed upon us. Is the conjunction of a new Republican administration with stories of national economic ruin merely a coincidence, or were the media trying to knife the new president in the back even before Mr. Bush had thrown out the beer cans and brassieres that the Clinton clan left behind them? There is no question that the economy did suddenly begin to sour and that full employment began to crumble, but the new administration really could not be blamed for it, no matter how convenient its arrival on the eve of yet another romp around the business cycle.

If there is any concrete cause of the recent economic wobbles, it probably lies in what everyone now fondly terms "globalization," the process by which nation after nation is stripped of its industrial plant, skills, jobs, and even native population and converted into a vast cow pasture where herds of former citizens and barely assimilated aliens now calmly munch

whatever fodder and slop is dumped in front of them. The fodder and slop, of course, do not entirely consist of what passes for meat and potatoes but also include the mental diet stuffed down our maws by the organs of the dominant culture. Globalization may temporarily raise the living standards of those who experience it, but eventually -- and the significance of the stories about layoffs earlier this year suggests that "eventually" is coming closer and closer -- it will reduce the national level of affluence to one more typical of the Third World, in addition to enveloping the historic nation and its political and cultural identity into the global fog.

The prospective metamorphosis of Americans into First World proletarians was brought to mind by the publication in the Wall Street Journal on Feb. 6 of an essay by neo-conservative sage Charles Murray, co-author with the late Richard Herrnstein of The Bell Curve and almost always a source of far more interesting ideas and insights than most of the neo-con mediocrities, has-beens, and never-weres with whom he associates. The subject of Mr. Murray's article was the phenomenon of "proletarianization" itself.

Mr. Murray made use of Arnold J. Toynbee's meaning of the term "proletariat" rather than the better known meaning of Karl Marx, and he quoted Toynbee as arguing that in periods of civilizational decline, the "dominant minority" or ruling class of a civilization will begin actually to emulate the proletariat it rules. The elite itself will "lapse into truancy" and abandon the duties of citizenship, "surrender to a sense of promiscuity," and

begin to exhibit styles of behavior that "are apt to appear first in the ranks of the proletariat and to spread from there to the ranks of the dominant minority, which succumbs to the sickness of 'proletarianization.'" Mr. Murray noted as current signs of proletarian emulation such patterns of behavior as the use of drugs, the popularity of rap music, the vulgarization of language, the legitimization of sexual license including illegitimacy, and similar trends, all of which are notoriously spreading up from the underclass. Mr. Murray cited as the pre-eminent model for such behavior the repellent entertainer Eminem and as the archetypal example of a member of the dominant minority adopting such behavior none other than Bill Clinton himself. "Bill Clinton's presidency," he wrote, "in both its conduct and in reactions to that conduct, was a paradigmatic example of elites that have been infected by 'the sickness of proletarianization'. The survival of our culture requires that we somehow contrive to get well."

As usual, Mr. Murray's ideas provoke other ideas. There is no doubt that he is correct, though far from being the first to notice or write about it, that what is ordinarily regarded as moral and behavioral decline has crept up the social ladder and infected parts of of American society outside and above the underclass. But, as I argued in an earlier article last year, what appears as decline to the adherents of one civilization and its moral code is not necessarily decline to adherents of what is trying to become a new and different civilization and morality.

What pagan Romans regarded as morally normal or neutral (abortion, homosexuality, gladiatorial games in which the contestants were forced to slaughter each other) early Christians regarded as abhorrent. One of the central confusions of our age is that we live in a society that is, so to speak, between civilizations -- on the one hand, the old bourgeois, Western, and generally Christian civilization that rejects and condemns the "proletarian" behavior Mr. Murray and Toynbee describe, and, on the other, a new managerial, non-Western, and supposedly rationalist, secularist, universalist, and egalitarian civilization that often sees little wrong or "sick" in the new codes of behavior. That does not mean that the new civilization is "relativist" or rejects all morality; only that it rejects the old morality and possesses or is trying to formulate a new moral code appropriate to itself. Of course, in the process of civilizational change, some people who are merely vicious may take advantage of the moral confusion for their own gain. That is where characters like Bill Clinton come in, and it is precisely because of the moral and civilizational confusion of our times that he could so successfully try to talk his way out of his troubles by telling us "it depends on what you mean by 'sex'" and "what you mean by 'is.'" A non-confused civilization knows perfectly well what it means by these and other words, but in times of confusion, there are enough who don't know or who disagree with each other about their meanings that knaves like Mr. Clinton can get themselves off by exploiting the muddle.

Nevertheless, although the Toynbee-Murray model of proletarianization may apply to Bill Clinton and no small number of his political and business cronies, it is not clear that the concept is applicable to most members of the new managerial ruling class, the dominant minority, of American (and by extension, Western) civilization. Most members of the corporate elite, the political elite, and (with the exception of social deviates and outright criminals in the entertainment elite like Eminem, Mike Tyson, and others) the cultural elite (academics, scientists, journalists, authors, etc.) are not particularly notable for emulating the proletariat or underclass. They don't rot out their brains with drugs, catch venereal diseases from licentious sex, shoot each other over their basketball shoes, or riot in the streets when one of their favorite television stars gets convicted or one of the celebrities they have decided to hate is acquitted.

That is exactly how the underclass in American society and indeed in most societies behaves, and as corrupt, degenerate, arrogant, and narrow-minded as our ruling class is, most of its members don't behave that way.

The point that Mr. Murray seems to have missed -- and, as insightful as he usually is, I would modestly suggest his missing it comes from being a neo-conservative and therefore on the side of the ruling elite, whatever its flaws -- is that proletarianization is not so much a behavioral pattern of the elite as it is a tactic of the elite by which it contrives to

intensify and extend its domination of non-elite strata of society. That brings us back to globalization, as well as to the culture of degeneracy of which Mr. Eminem is representative.

The managerial elite typically (though not always) exercises power through manipulation rather than force, reflecting in this respect Machiavelli's foxes rather than lions. One of its instruments of manipulation is proletarianization itself, the process by which it destroys alternative centers of power and possible resistance by undermining social institutions and traditional patterns of belief. Economically, proletarianization takes the form of organizing the mass labor force into positions of dependency as workers in mass factories and offices, members of mass unions, and consumers of mass-produced and mass-distributed goods and services. Once entwined in such dependency, few workers are able to mount much political resistance to the policies and directives of the system without being vulnerable to retaliation, and most don't even want to. Globalization is merely a further intensification of economic as well as social proletarianization, reducing the labor force to further dependency on a foreign economic plant over which neither the workers nor any other American has any control.

Socially, proletarianization takes the form of undermining and disciplining social institutions such as families, neighborhoods, locally autonomous communities, schools, religious bodies, and similar groups, and typically the process is carried



out by encouraging the growth in scale and size of such groups to the point that they can no longer be disciplined or administered by traditional, personal, local, and informal procedures but are so large and complicated that they have to be governed by technically skilled experts (managers). The same process takes place on the political level through the organization of politics in mass political parties, local governments that are larger and more powerful than most empires of the past, mass elections that are virtually meaningless, and the invasion of social and private institutions by the centralizing and public organs of the state. Once families, neighborhoods, churches, and schools have been so thoroughly enveloped and intimidated by state power, media scrutiny, and economic dependency that they are unable to mount even any thought of dissent, much less actual resistance, and the population has been converted from a civically active citizenry into a passive proletarian herd, the edifying cultural contributions of Eminent and his colleagues to the heritage of Western civilization are entirely predictable. What Mr. Murray, describing the ethic of proletarianization, calls the "thug code" becomes, not the ethic of the dominant minority but of the mass population it has subdued: "Take what you want, respond violently to anyone who antagonizes you, gloat when you win, despise courtesy as weakness, treat women as receptacles, take pride in cheating, deceiving, or exploiting successfully." Obviously, you don't want to meet someone who abides by this code in a dark

alley, but you need have no fear of him if you run into him on a battlefield, in a political contest, or in a cultural conflict. Thugs and those who live by their code cannot be rulers or even serious contestants for power because they lack the self-discipline required to get, use, and keep power; they are by their nature slaves, and a ruling class able to induce such codes and behavior in its subject populations need worry very little about being overthrown.

Mr. Murray acknowledges that as yet only a "tiny minority" actually lives by the thug code, but he is entirely correct in saying also that there is and can be no counterweight to it from the ruling elite. There can be no counterweight not because, as he argues, the elite has lost confidence in its own codes but because the elite wants the thug code and proletarianization to prevail and does all it can to encourage it and distrusts and hates and tries to destroy anyone who either points this out or tries to resist or tries to uphold alternative traditional codes.

The elite, the ruling class, the dominant minority, is the real enemy, and if you want to stop and reverse proletarianization, you must first rid the society of its ruling class.

With all due respect to Mr. Murray, this is also something that, as a neo-conservative, he perhaps cannot bring himself to recognize. As a neo-conservative, he is committed to the defense of American society as it is currently structured, with only minimal reforms on the formal governmental level. For the most

part, the neo-conservative movement has decidedly rejected and even expressed abhorrence for the paleo-conservative view that American society is decadent, corrupt, and in decline. Given that view, paleo-conservative political strategy has generally been willing to consider far more radical measures than what virtually any neo-cons would support: the rejection of the New Deal, the dismantlement of the federal mega-state, the withdrawal from Cold War international commitments and activism, the repeal of civil rights legislation, the termination of immigration, etc. Paleo-conservatives have espoused either an outright reactionary political strategy, by which the current regime is replaced by another modeled on earlier systems, or a revolutionary (or, if you will, counter-revolutionary) strategy, by which a new but radically conservative system is constructed. Neo-conservatives have no interest in and usually considerable fear and dislike of both paleo alternatives, and Mr. Murray's final sentence in his article -- "the survival of our culture requires that we somehow contrive to get well" -- is as true as it is unhelpful.

Of course we need to get well, but if the dominant minority, which controls the government, the economy, and the culture, is at the root of the disease, we can't get well until we rid ourselves of the dominant minority. Neo-conservatives, unwilling and unable to contemplate such radicalism of the right, are left with only a strategy of exhortation: Please, please don't be so proletarian; please don't be racially conscious; please believe in a color-

blind society; please act like a good ruling class and not like the gang of tyrants and criminals that you are. Admittedly, paleo-conservatives have failed to make much progress toward either reaction or counter-revolution, but at least they see and have constructed a body of social and political analysis that tries to make clear that the incumbent ruling class, and for the most part the neo-conservatives who make it their business to defend that class and its system of rule, are not the solution but the problem itself.■

[CHRONICLES, June, 2001]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*The New Meaning of 'Racism'*

The tedium that descended upon the nation's politics last winter with the advent of Bush II to the presidential throne was relieved briefly in the waning days of the Clinton era by the bitter breezes that wafted around some of the new president's cabinet appointments. After repeatedly muttering throughout his campaign the meaningless slogan, "I'm a uniter, not a divider," Mr. Bush suddenly found himself accused of the horrid and unpardonable offense of dividing when he nominated certain individuals of whom the real rulers of the country did not approve. "Uniting," as the former governor of Texas should have known and probably did know, means doing what the Zeitgeist and those who craft it want; "dividing" means doing what they don't want, and some of the cabinet nominees seemed for a short time to be the kind of undesirables who entertain ideas of their own and harbor sneaky inclinations to act on them. For a few weeks, it was uncertain whether the president would cave in to the demand of his political opponents in Congress and the mass media and dump the objectionable nominees or whether he and the nominees would contrive some means of placating their foes and persuading them they had no intention of bucking their wishes or challenging their power. What was never even contemplated, of course, was that the

president and his prospective ministers would defy their critics and actually dare assert their own authority and leadership.

The most controversial of the cabinet nominees was former Missouri Senator John Ashcroft, whose opposition to a Clinton-appointed black judge as well as several other thought crimes immediately sparked the predictable accusations of "racism," "white supremacy," "insensitivity," and similar charges. A black former congressman, Missouri Democrat William Clay, at once mocked Mr. Bush's professions of "reaching out" to blacks by comparing Mr. Ashcroft's appointment to the Ku Klux Klan's attempts to "reach out" "to blacks with nooses and burning crosses," while a small-time left-wing witch hunter in Missouri breathlessly declared that "an examination of Ashcroft's recent record shows that he has actively cultivated ties to white supremacists and extreme hate groups." The "white supremacists and extreme hate groups" turned out to be merely the Southern Partisan magazine, a Confederate heritage periodical whose editor-in-chief last year ran the South Carolina presidential campaign of Sen. John McCain (it's interesting that Honest John never once opened his trap to defend either his ally or his ally's magazine). This "linkage" was soon turned into political fodder on which the media, the Congressional Black Caucus, and Senate Democrats were able to browse for several weeks.

In the event, Mr. Ashcroft was confirmed as attorney general, but only because he did indeed dance to the tunes called by his and the new president's enemies. The nominee hastened to repudiate any sympathies for the Confederacy, its leadership, or

its political heritage that his interview with the Partisan might have suggested. "Slavery is abhorrent," Mr. Ashcroft gushed to his inquisitors, "Abraham Lincoln is my favorite president... I would have fought with Gen. Grant... I believe that racism is wrong."

Of course at no time in his life had Mr. Ashcroft, who seems to be a rather dim but decent enough chap, ever delivered himself of any thought or opinion that would insinuate he believed "racism" in any conventional or traditional meaning to be right.

However vague the word has always been, its traditional usage generally had something to do with race and the claim by members of one race that another race was in some sense inferior -- intellectually, morally, etc. But by that conventional meaning, Mr. Ashcroft is not only not guilty but his critics never produced any evidence whatsoever to suggest that he was. At the most, they merely inferred his supposed beliefs about race from his stated views about the Confederacy and his various "links" with people and groups who also were never shown to be "racist."

A few weeks after the Ashcroft hearings, yet another controversy about "racism" erupted, this time on American college campuses. Neo-conservative activist David Horowitz promoted a series of ads in college newspapers arguing against the budding movement in support of reparations for slavery. Mr. Horowitz' ads, probably deliberately designed to be innocuous, offered 10 reasons why reparations are "a bad idea for blacks -- and racist"

to boot. Some college newspapers actually dared to publish the ads and, not infrequently, soon found themselves under siege for their own "racism." At the University of Wisconsin's Badger Herald, for example, a mob quickly showed up at the paper's offices demanding the resignation of the editor and sporting signs with the slogan, "Badger Herald Racist."

Similar incidents are well known, of course, both on college campuses and elsewhere, but the point is that what the targets are being accused of has nothing whatsoever to do with what they have said or thought or done about race as a biological or social phenomenon. "Racism" today has nothing to do with race; it has to do with politics. "Racism" is simply a set of beliefs or actions that oppose a certain political agenda, and that agenda is largely initiated by and closely associated with non-whites and pushed by them and those whites who ally with them.

Thus, opposing reparations, as the mob indicated, is itself a "racist" act -- not because the opponents of reparations think all blacks are naturally inferior and therefore should be and should have been slaves, but simply because reparations are now part of the black racial-political agenda, and anyone who opposes that agenda is himself a racist. Opposing affirmative action is also racist -- not because its opponents are said to hate blacks and other non-whites and want to repress and exploit them but for any reason. The same is largely true of supporting Confederate flags and symbols or opposing immigration or arguing for "racial



profiling" by police. I recall back in the 1980s, white South Africans would tell me that "apartheid" had been largely abolished in their country and that even radical critics, black or white, would have to recognize that truth. I always tried to make them see that "abolishing apartheid" had nothing to do with racial equality, that their critics had little interest in that, and that what they were really interested in was black domination. "Apartheid" would cease to exist not when South African blacks were able to eat in desegregated restaurants and vote in parliamentary elections but only when they had taken over the government of the country. That is exactly what happened. "Apartheid" ended the day Nelson Mandela and his Communist Party-dominated African National Congress came to power, and not a moment before.

"Racism," in its simplest new meaning, is merely opposition to non-white power or to any measure that promises such power or support for any measure or institution that thwarts such power. The rationale behind the new meaning of the word is the claim that in American, Western, or white societies, non-whites are -- virtually by definition -- subordinate groups, and the dominant society is therefore (also by definition) "white supremacist." It is not necessarily "white supremacist" because of the formal legal and political structure (as in South Africa under apartheid or the segregated South), any more than it is "racist" because of the particular ideological rationalization of the domination.

"Racism" in this sense is therefore no longer confined to those who adhere to hereditarian views of intelligence and behavior. That is indeed one form of the new racism but by no means the only one. In the ideological Weltanschauung from which the new meaning is derived, scientific theories and empirical studies that depict non-whites as being in some respects inferior to whites are merely one means by which white dominance is rationalized, but religious, moral, social, historical, and other non-scientific rationales are also available and today tend to be favored by the white ruling class over the rationale of biological "racism." The liberal-neo-conservative ideal of a "color-blind society" is also racist, because it is used to reject measures like affirmative action that empower non-whites. By the same reasoning, non-whites themselves can also be "racists" -- Clarence Thomas comes at once to mind -- as the white ruling class conscripts and rewards non-whites willing to offer justifications for their domination. Moreover, opposition to "hate crime" legislation, "sensitivity" education, any "civil rights" measure, law, or policy, immigration, or to anything else the non-white agenda demands is also racist, regardless of the reasons offered. You can argue against affirmative action because it's inherently unjust to everyone or support the Confederate flag because not many white Confederates owned slaves or be against reparations because they're bad for blacks or oppose immigration because it increases population growth or for whatever other reasons you can concoct, but it

doesn't matter. You are still a "racist" and a supporter of "white supremacy" because what you want to do or stop doing thwarts non-white power.

The new meaning of "racism" is not a verbal trick or a political charade. It derives logically from the world-view that regards the dominant society as repressive and exploitative of non-whites for the benefit of whites, and, granted its premises, it makes at least as much sense as the older and more conventional meaning of the word. Indeed, the new meaning becomes increasingly obvious as we see how the term is actually used and deployed against political figures like Mr. Ashcroft, President Bush, or Justice Thomas.

But in fact the new meaning is not as obvious as it should be, for the simple reason that conservatives -- I use the term in its broadest possible meaning, to include Mr. Bush and Mr. Ashcroft and Mr. Horowitz -- still don't get it. They don't get it because their tactics in fighting the racially-tinged measures they oppose seem always to presuppose the old definition of the word and therefore to aim at all costs at not being tarred with the "racist" label. Let's get a black nominee or spokesman; then they can't possibly accuse us of being racists. Let's not use hereditarian arguments but just talk about the "culture"; then they can't possibly accuse us of being racists. Let's not say reparations or affirmative action or immigration or sanctions on South Africa are bad for whites or for white Western societies and

civilization, but say instead they're bad for blacks, for immigrants, for non-whites; then they can't possibly accuse us of being racists.

The problem, of course, is that they always do accuse you of being racists, despite your pathological phobia of being so called and the bizarre lengths to which you are willing to go, distorting and weakening your own case, to avoid and deny the accusation. They accuse you of being racists precisely because, no matter what you say or how you say it, you are, by the new meaning of the term, exactly that. You may oppose the non-white political agenda for precisely the reasons you offer, because it really is, by your values, bad for blacks or immigrants or the environment or simply unjust, but the reasons don't matter, and no one on the other side of the racial power struggle gives a hoot about them. What they do give a hoot about is the triumph of their agenda and the power it will yield, and anyone who is not on board with that agenda, for whatever reasons they offer, is a "racist" and an apologist for "white supremacy."

Failure to recognize the new meaning of "racism" therefore constitutes a serious vulnerability on the part of those who oppose the non-white agenda, because by planning strategy as though the conventional meaning of "racism" still applied, they do nothing to avoid the charge of "racism" in its new meaning and waste an immense amount of their time and energies trying to avoid being identified as "racists" in any sense. Their enemies can

then avoid any serious debate about the issues on their agenda and spend all their time lobbing accusations and making the opponents of the agenda jump through hoops -- which is exactly what Mr. Ashcroft did and what Mr. Bush has been doing ever since he was elected. But the new, political meaning of "racism" is so broad in the tar it tries to smear that it effectively strips the word of the old pejorative associations that serious political figures understandably wish to avoid. By the new meaning, the term has no more pejorative connotation than "conservative" or "liberal"; indeed, it is more or less identical with the former term, and much of the purpose of the new meaning invested in it is precisely to demonize and delegitimize conservatism of any kind. Nevertheless, the word retains negative implications at all only because of its linkages to the old meaning -- which is why it survives at all in the national political lexicon -- not because of the actual content of the new one.

Conservatives who seriously oppose the non-white political agenda (as serious conservatives will and should) can therefore expect to be called "racists," and while it is not useful to court the label, the new meaning it has acquired removes any compelling reason to avoid it, certainly any reason to obsess over it. As the revolutionary and totalitarian character of the non-white racial-political agenda becomes more and more obvious, those who push that agenda will discover that the "racists" who oppose them are more and more numerous, until what they call "racism," so far

from being "extremist" and a "fringe" movement, has in fact evolved into the political and cultural mainstream, to the point that virtually all conservatives of whatever orientation will be proud to say, We are all "racists" now.■

[CHRONICLES, December, 2001]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Enemies Within and Above*

Within a few hours of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon last September, it had become commonplace for even high-ranking government officials and elected leaders to say publicly that Americans would just have to get used to fewer constitutional liberties and personal freedoms than they have traditionally enjoyed. Of course, that was hardly news, though it may have been the first time such leaders actually admitted that freedoms are dwindling. Americans have been losing their liberties for several generations now, and for the most part seem entirely content to do so. By the end of the week after the terrorist attacks, some callers to radio talk-shows were saying, quite literally, that they were willing to give up "all our constitutional rights" if only the government could make them safe from the terrorists.

The government seemed ready to oblige. Plans to expand wiretapping and surveillance powers were perhaps understandable, and bans on carrying scissors and razor blades on domestic air flights were not infringements of constitutional rights in any case, but some proposals went well beyond reasonable security measures. A week after the attacks, the Washington Times carried a front-page but none-too-accurate story headlined, "Wartime

presidential powers supersede liberties," which argued that the president's declaration of a national emergency gave him authority to "impose censorship and martial law." It also misquoted the U.S. Constitution and garbled American history on the suspension of habeas corpus. "In 'cases of rebellion or invasion [when] the public safety may require it,' the Constitution permits a president to suspend the right of habeas corpus -- as Lincoln did during the Civil War," the story reported.

In fact, the Constitution in Article I, section 9, does permit the suspension of habeas corpus, but says nothing about permitting the president to suspend it. The suspension power occurs in the article that deals with legislative power, and the whole point about Lincoln's suspension of habeas corpus is that Chief Justice Roger Taney held in a famous ruling (ex parte Merryman) that only the Congress, and not the president, had the power of suspension. Taney cited precedents from both previous American presidents and jurists as well as Blackstone and the example of British monarchs. Nevertheless, Congress, under Radical Republican control, upheld Lincoln, who proceeded to lock up pretty much anyone he wanted as long as he wanted, but as late as 1946 the Court overruled a presidential suspension of habeas corpus in Hawaii that lacked statutory authority.

But regardless of what emergency powers the president really has, the seeming eagerness with which Americans of all ranks and degrees were willing to surrender their freedoms was alarming enough for some civil libertarians to start squeaking in protest. The zeal to smother freedom also contrasted strongly with the



silence about the massive immigration into the United States that probably made the terrorist attacks possible at all. In the week after the attacks, the FBI nabbed some 75 foreign nationals, mainly on immigration violations, who were suspected of having something to do with the massacres. The terrorist hijackers themselves -- the "cowards" as various public leaders kept calling them (this from a nation that routinely drops bombs from 30,000 feet and pushes buttons on guided missiles hundreds of miles away) -- were all foreigners who had entered the country more or less legally and had managed to function quite normally within the Arabic-Muslim subculture that has emerged in the United States as a result of immigration. Yet at no time did public leaders, who did not hesitate to inform us that the Constitution was essentially expendable, suggest that immigration should be restricted or that some immigrants and aliens already here should be kicked out.

Indeed, not only did the ruling class never even mention immigration and its consequences as possible threats to national security but also it persistently insinuated that for all the dangers of foreign terrorism, the threats of "racism" and intolerance were even more dangerous. The morning after the attacks, America Online posted a greeting that instructed its viewers to guard themselves against "intolerance" and celebrate diversity, and the graphic showed a young black man smilingly reading from a large book to several young white persons, male and

female (only whites harbor "racism," you know, and only blacks are able to cure them of it). Whatever the dangers of global terrorism, the real enemy remained "racism" and the white people who practice it. In the next few days news stories about "hate crimes" against Arab-Americans, Muslims, and even Sikhs competed with stories about the attacks themselves and their consequences.

Both the president and the attorney general went out of their way to denounce such crimes and warn against any displays of intolerance against Arabs and Muslims, and President Bush even traipsed out to a local mosque, where he unbosomed various banalities about tolerance and stupidly remarked, of a religion that boasts of its warriors and its devotion to jihad, "Islam is peace."

Of course attacks on Arabs and Muslims were as irrational and ugly as they were illegal, but, like much of the over-reaction with intensified security measures, the over-indulgence in rhetoric about tolerance perhaps pointed to purposes other than controlling mass hysteria against aliens. What Americans were essentially being told by their leaders and the ruling class in general was that the American public identity was no longer defined by the Constitution or the liberties it protects but by immigration itself and the kind of country that refuses to restrict it. We can get along without the Constitution if we have to, but we can't halt or restrict immigration without ceasing to be the country we are and want to be, the kind of country, the

ruling class likes to pretend, that we always have been. As Angela Kelley, deputy director of the National Immigration Forum, remarked, in a statement that confirmed her genius for regurgitating cliches, "We're a nation of immigrants. You couldn't try to solve the problem by attacking all immigrants without really attacking America at its core, and then you're giving the terrorists what they want." Immigration and our willingness to accept it -- not the Constitution and certainly not the historic identity of the nation -- is now the "core" of America.

From the perspective of the world-view and material interests of the ruling class, of course, that message makes sense. The Constitution, after all, is an 18th century document reflecting the beliefs and interests of a long-defunct agrarian and mercantile ruling class and society, while mass immigration and the kind of society it shapes reflect the modern, post-industrial, globalist regime that breaks down all such distinctions and barriers -- between nations, cultures, races, and religions themselves. The New World elite can easily get along without the Constitution and those pestilent rights it sets up, but it has to have immigration -- not only for cheap labor but also as a cultural battering ram to knock down the barriers that separate group identities and limit its power and reach. But the problem (one problem, at least; there are in fact several other problems as well) is that the immigrants in general -- and the terrorists of last September in particular -- themselves insist on keeping

those barriers intact.

What soon emerged about the hijackers of the planes that smashed into the trade center and the Pentagon made confetti out of the foolish vacuities about a "credal nation" and a "proposition country" that pro-immigration ideologues have been chattering about for decades. The 19 hijackers came to this country, lived in it for some years, went to school here, mastered Western technical skills like flying jetliners, spoke English, had families, got drunk in bars, ogled girls in the swimming pools, joined athletic clubs, and behaved in superficial ways exactly like the Americans they pretended to be. In fact, they hated every man, woman, and child they laid eyes on; they hated them in some cases for years; and they were willing and eager to die to satisfy their hate. There was never any question of assimilation.

Whatever "creeds" or "propositions" they assented to, it wasn't one that defined this country or one that this country would even recognize. They were and remained enemies of the West.

The attack they perpetrated represented the first time non-Western enemies have been able to inflict significant damage within the West itself. For more than a century the Western peoples have been in retreat from the global imperium they created between the discovery of the New World and the First World War, and in the 1960s and '70s, terrorists within the Western states, acting as surrogates for anti-Western forces under the slogans of "anti-imperialism," managed to set off a few pipe bombs and

occasionally knock off a politician. But not until this September have non-Western agents of the non-Western forces been able to inflict major and potentially lethal damage within the main citadels of the West itself. Whatever the contributions of the pro-Zionist and often murderous foreign policy of the United States against various Middle Eastern states in the last decade, the world-historical clash of races and civilizations underlies the most recent attack, which is why allowing immigration on the scale we have permitted it is the suicidal folly it is.

Indeed, the hijackers represent precisely what Thomas Jefferson was talking about with respect to the dangers of immigration in his Notes on the State of Virginia. "They [immigrants, mainly European in Jefferson's mind] will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave," he warned, "or if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as usual, from one extreme to the other.

It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty." Not the least of the problems of mass immigration is that the "principles of the governments they leave" will travel with the immigrants, along with the ancient feuds and hatreds those principles imply. The results are bad enough when one alien population fragment imports its beliefs and hatreds; when several do -- from the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, not to mention Europe itself -- the result will be chaos.

It is perfectly true, as the president and various other wise

persons kept telling us after the attacks, that not all Muslims and not all Arabs are terrorists or haters of America or the West.

But -- once again -- the point is not about "most" of anything. The point is that some are terrorists and haters, and "some" -- as few as 19 -- can virtually bring the most powerful nation-state on Earth to its knees. If these men were cowards, it's just as well the heroes haven't been deployed yet. The point also is that the presence within a Western nation of an alien subculture creates an alternative social structure in which terrorists can operate virtually undetected, as well as the same cultural soil from which the fanaticism, hatred, and terrorism sprouted in the first place.

It's perfectly true that most Muslims and most Arabs aren't terrorists, but throughout Muslim history, from Marco Polo's Old Man of the Mountains to the present day, the use of the assassin's arts as regular modes of war has been commonplace among them.

To grasp the relationship between the terrorist attacks last September on the one hand and mass immigration on the other, and to understand as well the absolute refusal of the American and Atlantic ruling class to confront the relationship and accept some restrictions on immigration is a good deal more frightening than anything that happened in or after the attacks themselves. What the relationship means is that the terrorist enemy is already within the gates, and those who have appointed themselves guardians of the gates don't have a clue about it -- not only not a clue about what to do about it but also not a clue that anything

is at all wrong. Bombing "training camps" in Afghanistan, assassinating supposed terrorist "operatives," declaring war against somebody or something or everybody and everything, curtailing civil liberties, spending more millions on defense, and "unleashing" the CIA and the Special Forces will accomplish absolutely nothing if an internal subculture capable of breeding more terrorism within the belly of the beast is not eradicated.

What is even more alarming is that the ruling class not only has no clue to the danger it has allowed and even encouraged to blossom under its own nose but that it is incapable of perceiving the danger. Because its own structural interests bind it to an open borders immigration policy, to the erosion of national sovereignty and independence and eventually of the nation-state itself, and to the managed destruction of all distinctive national and cultural identities, it is unable to see that the dynamic of its own interests leads logically to nursing the vipers that will destroy the ruling class itself as well as the society it is supposed to rule. If what remains of the real West -- not the hegemonic system of reward and force that the Trade Center and the Pentagon symbolize, but the Western peoples who still adhere to their real civilization -- wishes to survive, it has to recognize it cannot do so under the leadership of the New World elite. The West can survive only if that elite is removed from its hegemony and a new ruling class rooted in and loyal to our real civilization replaces it.■