

eran left-wing ploys when muckraking the Right. One is quoting from the *Enemy*, and saying breathlessly, in effect, "look at what *he* says!", without bothering to refute it. The trouble is that this tactic will not be persuasive to Frum's conservative readership, most of whom (at least outside New York and the Beltway) will agree with the dread quotes in question. The second tactic is personal insult, which will certainly not persuade any decent or intelligent reader. And third, of course, is a mixture of the first two.

Some examples: a quote from Tom Fleming is dismissed as "demented," and one from me (from my speech to the John Randolph Club published in *RRR*) as "heading off to the booby hatch." So much for *that!* Sam Francis is a "huge man with a bright red face, who puffs cigarettes below anachronistic black hornrims." The bulk of Frum's venom is reserved for *Chronicles* editor Tom Fleming: who is "a strange man: a bearded left-over from the 1960s, an unsuccessful poet, briefly a teacher of classics at a small South Carolina college, who drifted into journalism and found himself at Rockford."

Consider this strange, nay bizarre, passage. First, put this in the context of the fact that only paleos are on the receiving end of Frum's little reportorial vignettes: for example, nowhere does he state that Bill Bennett is "thuggish looking," or that Kemp "is

muscle-bound with a squeaky, high-pitched voice."

Next, for a textual critique, why is Fleming attacked for being mobile; surely, Frum, as a partisan of immigration, and as an immigrant himself, should value geographical mobility in America. Secondly, what exactly are Frum's credentials for judging poetry? Methinks they are about as shaky as his bonafides as a psychiatrist. "Drifted?" "found himself?" What exactly does this mean? The implication is that hobo drifter Fleming jumped off the train or the truck one day, "found himself" in the fair city of Rockford, and decided to settle down. I haven't talked to Tom about this aspect of his bio, but I'm reasonably certain that this is *not* what happened. An important omission of course, is that Tom has a Ph.D. in classics from the prestigious University of North Carolina, and that if Frum should ever magically acquire a small fraction of Fleming's brilliance and erudition, he would consider himself a very lucky man.

Perhaps the oddest phrase from this odious passage on Fleming is Frum's sneering reference to "a bearded left-over from the 1960s." Maybe the rubes in Canada automatically consider anyone with a beard a hippie-Commie, but *Americans*, Mr. Frum, are a bit more sophisticated. One would think that his years in the U.S. would have rubbed off, but maybe

they can take the boy out of Canada but not Canada out of the boy. Or perhaps the New York and Beltway sharks that Frum hangs around with feel the same way. In any case, Frum deserves to be shipped back to his homeland forthwith, preferably to do penance for a decade among the Inuit somewhere on the frozen tundra.

Finally, the old adage about "people in glass houses" applies in this case, and in spades. If the author is going to insult people viciously about their looks, the publisher made a most unwise decision in the picture of Frum that he put on the flap. For Frum looks out at the reader with a particularly ugly smirk on his face. It is the sort of smirk which, apart from the contents of the book, would bring the average reader to reach for his machete. ■

The Campaign To Save Our Sovereignty

by Justin Raimondo

Juanita Chavez, daughter of Cesar Chavez, stood on a street corner in the Mission District of San Francisco, handing out leaflets. The leaflets denounced Proposition 187, California's Save Our State (SOS) initiative that would deny welfare benefits and free public education to illegal immigrants. But there

were no takers. At this point, she tried a new strategy: according to a recent article in the *SF Weekly*, Chavez decided to address her target audience directly: "Indocumentados!" she shouted at two Latina mothers pushing strollers. Chavez then harangued them in Spanish, of course, about the dire consequences if 187 should pass: no more free clinics, no more free schools, no more free lunch.

Bingo! Chavez had a sale. The women not only stopped to listen but also agreed to attend a community meeting on the issue after Chavez assured them that the INS would not be there checking green cards.

Incredibly, the opposition to Prop. 187 is openly organizing around Mexican irredentism too! The *SF Weekly* informs us that "Juanita Chavez recounts meeting an elderly Mexican American in the Mission, who, after explaining the Hispanic-dominated history of colonial California, declared in a fury, "They have no right to do this to us. This was our land."

If the battle over Proposition 187 is defined in terms of Should the U.S. give California back to Mexico? The outcome would be a foregone conclusion. Posed this way, the question answers itself.

Unfortunately for our side, the Chicano nationalists are only one small facet of the anti-187 forces, a coalition spearheaded by mostly Anglo professionals: the teachers union, health care bureau-

crats, and the burgeoning nonprofit services sector, which feeds off government largess and favors. Also opposed to SOS are the doctors, lawyers, and big business. The whole political establishment is lined up against Prop. 187, which does not come as much of a surprise to Ron Prince, co-chairman of the Save Our State committee, who attacks the many special interests that want the flow of illegal immigration to continue. Why? Because there are advocacy groups that profit from litigation, he says. Because they are multinational corporations that profit from cheap labor. Because they are bureaucracies that grow more powerful with ever increasing "caseloads."

The argument made by the professional elites is that Prop. 187 will lead to the loss of billions of dollars in federal aid to education and health care facilities. A look at the substance of their arguments is revealing: for example, they point to the fact that the educational bureaucracy receives \$6600 for what they call LEPS (Limited English Proficiency students) and only \$4100 for EPS (English Proficient students):

thus, if 187 wins, the system will suffer a net loss. By this argument, it would be better for all students in California's public school system to be LEPS, and the more illegal aliens the better! (Of course, what this argument ignores is the fact that federal aid does not cover the real cost of bilingual education, nor does it consider the cultural costs of bilingualism.)

The campaign to save California from a flood of illegal immigration is the crest of a wave of right-wing populism that is sweeping the country. The SOS initiative grew out of the first statewide organiza-

tion devoted to stemming the tide of illegal immigration, the California Coalition for Immigration Reform (CCIR). The Coalition turned in nearly 600,000 signatures, with representation from all 58 counties. According to the California Secretary of State's office, the signatures on the petitions had a validity rate of

84%, the highest ever achieved by an initiative campaign in the state. Local groups sprang up seemingly overnight, and mounted a statewide campaign with no help from existing immigration re-

**Incredibly,
the oppo-
sition to
Prop. 187
is openly
organizing
around
Mexican
irredentism.**

form groups. (Indeed, when I called the establishmentarian FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, they not only wouldn't give me the telephone number or address of the SOS group, they denied having any knowledge, connection with, or sympathy for the group!)

In an interview, Barbara Kiley, mayor of Yorba Linda and co-chairman of the SOS initiative campaign, said the drafters of the initiative sat down to write the most radical proposal they could come up with, so that their victory would send a message to Washington that the immigration crisis is imminent.

Naturally, the smear campaign against Prop. 187 and its supporters has already begun, with Latino nationalists and their Anglo fellow-travelers charging racism. But SOS polls show that 45% of Latinos support 187. "This is a real people's initiative," says Barbara Kiley, supported by people of every race and creed who don't want to see the tide of illegals swell the welfare state. Entirely supported by the grassroots and by small donations, the 187 campaign is ahead in the polls.

While the irredentist argument is not likely to appeal to anyone outside Mexican nationalists, in San Francisco's Mission district it makes perfect sense: after all, it is fairly easy to vote in the Bay Area if you aren't a citizen. All you have to do is register. Asked how her office checks to make

sure that illegal immigrants are not voting, Germaine Wong, San Francisco's registrar of voters, answered: We don't.

Prop. 187 calls for school authorities to cooperate with the INS in identifying the children of illegals in public schools, but San Francisco superintendent Bill Rojas helped fund something called the Student Empowerment Project, which is signing up voters and actively campaigning against Prop. 187. And so it is possible for illegal immigrants not only to vote, but to sign up their fellow *indocumentados* and form a voting bloc of their own.

As a comic sidelight to all this, the Libertarian Party of California has come out against 187, because enforcing it might harm "civil liberties." But this is just a cover for big-government libertarianism, since every effort to reduce and roll back the welfare state is a plus for liberty.

In fact, Prop. 187 doesn't even stop illegal immigration: instead, it makes it more selective, and restores the way things used to be before the welfare state took over. Illegal immigration has been with us a long time, but has only been a problem since the welfare state. Back in the good old days, the motivation of immigrants, both legal and illegal, was the same: to work hard and make a better life for themselves. Now a whole different set of motivations and incentives have sprung up. Prop. 187 weeds out the

parasites and criminals.

When the Mexican consul general in San Francisco announced that his government would do all it could to defeat 187, the SOS committee held a press conference on the steps of the consulate and delivered a resounding rebuke to the meddlers in the Mexican government: stay out of U.S. elections! The campaign to enact 187 is the vanguard of a new American nationalism, a vital new force on the Right. These new populists are destined to replace the Washington-centered Conservative Establishment as the engine of a revived conservative movement in America.

From California to Colorado, throughout the South and even in the North, the movement to take back our country is growing by leaps and bounds. Victory in California will mean similar measures introduced throughout the country, a national campaign to roll back the multicultural socialism favored by the political and business elites. ■

School Reform Rackets

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

Forget lunch boxes. Many children in public schools this year can't carry them or book bags either. And they can't have lockers. This is supposed to solve the problem of guns and knives. Can't deny