

Funding Hate

Foundations and the radical 'Hispanic' lobby

by Joseph Fallon

In today's Orwellian America, where all groups are equal, but some groups are more equal than others, four radical "Hispanic" organizations — League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA), and National Council of La Raza (La Raza) — champion discrimination against non-Hispanics in general and European-Americans in particular.

In most cases funded by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and in all cases abetted by the U.S. government, LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza are "politically correct" hate mongers. These four organizations, which form the core of the radical "Hispanic" lobby, have succeeded in having the U.S. government advance their agenda in ten key areas:

Official identification — legal recognition of "Hispanic" as a separate ethnic category.

Affirmative Action — legal expansion of affirmative action programs to cover the newly recognized "Hispanic" population.

Legal immigration — adoption of immigration laws limiting ethnic European immigration while promoting massive Third World immigration in general and massive "Hispanic" immigration in particular.

Illegal immigration — refusal of Immigration and Naturalization Service to arrest and deport all illegal aliens; granting children born in the United States to illegal aliens U.S. citizenship; providing all other children of illegal aliens free public education; providing illegal aliens free social and welfare services; and granting illegal aliens amnesties enabling them to apply for naturalization, and after obtaining U.S. citizenship, vote,

run for elected office, and sponsor additional immigrants.

Voting — allowing illegal aliens and non-citizens to vote in local, state, and federal elections; Department of Justice obstructing attempts by U.S. citizens to challenge election fraud at the polling booths, and Congressional leaders quashing legislation that would impose stiff penalties for election fraud.

English language — adoption of government services in languages other than English for voting ballots, welfare, social security, and IRS forms, and drivers' licenses; elimination of the English language proficiency requirement for U.S. citizenship for certain aliens 50 years old or older; conducting part of the U.S. naturalization ceremony in Spanish; penalizing private companies that require employees to speak English on the job; refusal to enforce laws that established English as the official language of State government; refusal of Congress to pass legislation or a Constitutional amendment recognizing English as the official language of the government of the United States; tacit federal support to those States that declare themselves officially bilingual or multilingual, and tacit federal and State of Texas support to the Texas city of El Cenizo for declaring, itself, officially Spanish only. This tacit support by the federal and State governments extends to the decision by the authorities of El Cenizo to fly the Mexican flag over City Hall.

Bilingual education — educating students in languages other than English, principally Spanish; denying parents any say in whether their child should be in such classes; threatening legal action against local school boards that teach children in English; denying bilingual education to non-Spanish-speaking Indian immigrants from "Hispanic" countries (i.e., refusing to educate them in their Indian languages and English) and instead teaching them in Spanish; manipulating "bilingual" education to officially promote Spanish as co-equal to English.

Multiculturalism — promotion of other cultures, especially "Hispanic," while demonizing, demeaning and eliminating the European-American heritage and identity

Joseph Fallon, a frequent contributor to The Social Contract, is a published author and researcher on the topics of immigration and American demography.

of the United States wherever possible from school curriculum to the names of buildings and streets to the recognition of monuments and holidays. For example, in 1994, San Jose, California spent \$500,000 of taxpayers' money to erect a statue to the Aztec god, Quetzalcoatl, in a public park replacing the previous monument of the Liberty Bell.

Land claims — introduction of H.R. 505, "Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty Land Claims Act of 1999" that would enable descendants of Mexican citizens who had been living in what is now the State of New Mexico at the time the land was acquired by the U.S. in 1848 to submit community land grant claims challenging the existing ownership of private and public properties.

Freedom of speech — refusal of federal, State, and local authorities to arrest and prosecute those "Hispanics" who called for the assassination of California Governor Pete Wilson or made death threats to the sponsors of California Proposition 187 that denied free welfare services to illegal aliens; refusal of federal, State, and local authorities to protect billboards in Los Angeles calling for immigration reform or to arrest and prosecute those "Hispanics" who threatened violence if the billboard was not taken down; the removal by local authorities of billboards in New York City that called for immigration reform in blatant violation of the First Amendment; enactment of "hate crimes" laws which demonize European-Americans then interpreting such laws to cover "hate speech" so as to legally and financially penalize any expression of "politically incorrect" beliefs on immigration, bilingualism, multiculturalism, affirmative action, etc.

Where does the term 'Hispanic' come from?

LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza all claim to be "Hispanic" organizations. In fact, the word "Hispanic" is devoid of meaning and legitimacy. It does not denote a racial, ethnic, linguistic, or cultural group. It is an artificial term created to maximize political power for extremist elements within the Spanish-speaking minority. Historically, political opportunism has always dictated the racial identity of "Hispanics."

From 1820 to 1930, Mexican immigrants (whose presence was negligible since they never exceeded, on average, more than 350 annually between 1820 and 1900) and Mexican-Americans were officially classified

as "white." In 1930, however, they were officially reclassified as "non-white." This reclassification was due to two events — the unprecedented level of mass Mexican immigration after 1910 and the attempted genocide against European-Americans by an armed alliance of Mexicans, Mexican immigrants, and Mexican-Americans in 1915.

Between 1910 and 1930, approximately 700,000 Mexicans (three percent of the population of Mexico) crossed into the United States, principally Texas, fleeing the chaos of the Mexican Revolution. This dramatic growth in the size of the Mexican population persuaded some a "Reconquista" of the U.S. South-west from California to Texas could be achieved.

An insurrection was planned for two o'clock in the morning on February 20, 1915. The goal was to seize power in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado and California and then declare these five States a single independent republic, which could in the future unite with Mexico. The written manifesto of this insurgency, the "Plan de San Diego, Texas," declared that this was to be "a war without quarter" against whites. At that specified day and time, Mexicans throughout the U.S. Southwest were to rise up and murder every white male over sixteen years of age and expel the surviving women, children, and elderly from the newly liberated land. To insure the planned genocide was successful, the leadership of the Mexican insurgency sought an alliance with blacks, American Indians, and Asians proposing that most of the United States be partitioned among themselves. European-Americans were to be confined essentially to the Northeast and Midwest. This overture was rejected by blacks and American Indians. But some Japanese accepted the proposed alliance and joined the self-styled "Liberating Army for Race and Peoples" apparently functioning as ordnance experts.

The insurrection, when it occurred, was limited to Texas. Using bases in northern Mexico, Mexicans and Mexican-Americans waged a guerilla war lasting 16 months — from February 1915 to June 1916 — against the European-American population of Texas.

Among the ringleaders were Luis de la Rosa (Mexican-American and a former deputy sheriff of Cameron County), Aniceto Pizana (Mexican-American from a respected ranching family near Brownsville), Esteban Fierros (Mexican-American from a prominent family in Laredo and a Colonel in the Mexican Army),

Agustin Garza (Mexican immigrant), Basilio Ramos, Jr. (Mexican immigrant), Porfirio Santos, Manuel Flores, A.G. Almaraz, L. Perrigo, A.A. Sanez, and E. Cisneros (all Mexican nationals) and Mexican Generals Pablo Gonzales and Juan Antonio Acosta.

While the insurrection was eventually defeated by the Texas Rangers and the U.S. Army, this was not before the guerrillas had murdered 33 European-Americans, wounded 24 others, “ethnically cleansed” thousands of European-American families from south Texas, and destroyed thousands of dollars worth of public and private property.

To prevent this from happening again, the federal and Texas governments decided it was necessary to know how many Mexicans were living in the United States in general and Texas in particular. To learn this,

***“Between 1910 and 1930,
approximately 700,000 Mexicans (three
percent of the population of Mexico)
crossed into the United States,
principally Texas, fleeing the chaos of
the Mexican Revolution.”***

“Mexicans” were counted separately from “whites” for the first time in the 1930 Census. They were listed along with non-white groups — “Negro,” “Indian,” “Chinese,” “Japanese,” and “Filipino.” Since Mexicans were now no longer counted as “white,” they were considered “non-white.” Such a legal classification had the potential of subjecting them to the same conditions as blacks in segregationist Texas.

Therefore, during the 1930s, “Hispanics,” led by LULAC, opposed identifying Mexicans as “non-white,” but did not oppose segregation. They only opposed “illegal” segregation — i.e., applying the “Jim Crow” laws for blacks to Mexicans. Within a few years, LULAC succeeded in having Mexicans once again officially recognized as “white” and eligible for all the benefits accruing to whites under segregation.

Getting on the ‘affirmative action’ bandwagon

Forty years later, in the 1970s, after affirmative action programs were instituted for blacks, “Hispanics,” led by LULAC and La Raza, changed their position on their racial identity and successfully lobbied the federal government to officially recognize them as a “non-white” group for purposes of eligibility for affirmative action programs.

In both instances, the losers in the game of official racial identification pursued by “Hispanics” were African-Americans.

What eventually became the “Hispanic” category was created on June 16, 1976 by Public Law 94-311, “Economic and Social Statistics for Americans of Spanish Origin.” This law, which was endorsed by several “Hispanic” organizations including LULAC and La Raza, contained two significant elements: (1) the subject: “Americans of Spanish origin or descent” and (2) the legal status: “American citizens.” Both qualifiers were soon dropped in an effort to maximize political influence by maximizing numeric size.

After asserting that “a large number of Americans of Spanish origin or descent suffer from racial, social, economic, and political discrimination and are denied the basic opportunities they desire as American citizens,” Public Law 94-311 mandated federal agencies to “collect, and publish regularly, statistics which indicate the social, health, and economic condition of Americans of Spanish origin or descent.” The law further required the Census Bureau to provide both Spanish-language census questionnaires and Spanish-speaking enumerators and to “implement an affirmative action program...for the employment of personnel of Spanish origin or descent.”

According to the legislation, the phrase “Americans of Spanish origin or descent” applied to anyone who can “trace their origin or descent from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Central and South America, and other Spanish-speaking countries.”

That the purpose of this legislation was to create an artificial “ethnic” group — similar to the practice of the former Soviet Union, especially under Stalin, of creating “nations” by fiat — can be seen in the flawed methodology of this law and its inconsistent application. It was flawed because the law equated “State” (a political entity) with “ethnicity” (a biological/cultural entity). Then this flawed methodology was only applied to Spanish-speaking dominated countries, such as

Mexico. But if all the inhabitants of Mexico are ethnic “Mexicans,” then logically all the inhabitants of Belgium are ethnic “Belgians,” not Dutch, Walloons, and Germans. Likewise, all the inhabitants of Switzerland must be ethnic “Swiss,” not French, Germans, and Italians. All the inhabitants of former Czechoslovakia must have been ethnic “Czechoslovakians,” not Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians. All the inhabitants of the former Soviet Union must have been ethnic “Soviets,” not Russians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, etc. All the inhabitants of pre-1990 Yugoslavia must have been ethnic “Yugoslavs,” not Albanians, Croats, Gypsies, Hungarians, Macedonians, Serbs, and Slovenians. And, most importantly, all the inhabitants of the United States must be ethnic “Americans.” Since this would completely undermine the purpose of the law — to officially create an artificial “ethnic” group within the United States and then reward that “ethnic” group with access to affirmation action programs — it explains why the law’s methodology was not applied consistently.

But there was another instance of flawed reasoning and inconsistent application in the law’s methodology, which again revealed the intellectual dishonesty of its sponsors. The flaw was the assumption that a common language of government among different countries meant a common supra “national” identity. While language can be universal, a nation cannot. A nation, by definition, is always distinct, unique, one-of-a-kind. The idea of an international or supra “nationality” is an oxymoron. Yet, by this law Congress was declaring Spain, Puerto Rico, and the 18 Spanish-speaking dominated countries in the Western Hemisphere — most of the latter having antagonist, sometimes violent rivalries over borders and/or regional dominance — shared a common supra “national” identity. According to this logic, India and Nigeria must have a common supra “national” identity since they share English as a common language of government. Similarly, Belgium and Haiti must have a common supra “national” identity because they both share French as a common language of government. But Congress again refused to apply its own methodology consistently. To do so would have exposed the absurdity of the law.

The next year, May 12, 1977, the Office of Management and Budget adopted the shorter title of “Hispanic” and revised and finalized the official definition in Directive No. 15, “Race and Ethnic Standards for

Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting.”

Since then “Hispanic” is defined as: “A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.” The new definition sought to further inflate the numerical size of the “Hispanic” community. First, all reference to “American citizens” was dropped. This omission enables illegal aliens to be counted. Second, by changing the phrase from “Spanish origin or descent” to “Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race” it is now possible to count as “Hispanics,” among others, individuals from Morocco, Western Sahara, and Equatorial Guinea in Africa, the Philippines, Guam, the Northern Marianas, the Marshall Islands and the

“...after affirmative action programs were instituted for blacks, ‘Hispanics,’ successfully lobbied the federal government to officially recognize them as a ‘non-white’ group for purposes of eligibility for affirmative action programs.”

Federated States of Micronesia in the Pacific, and Jamaica, Trinidad, and the Dutch West Indies in the Caribbean.

Under this new definition, a sign of “Spanish culture or origin” is the possession of a “Spanish” surname. This enables the U.S. government to inflate the numeric size of the “Hispanic” population even more by counting “Urban Indians,” i.e., American Indians living off tribal reservations, as “Hispanics” or “Mexicans.” Since “Hispanic” is officially an “ethnic” group, “Urban Indians” are counted twice — once racially as American Indian which they are and a second time “ethnically” as “Hispanic” which they are not. In reality, many surnames considered as “Spanish” by the U.S. government are not Spanish at all — but Basque.

The Basques live on both sides of the Pyrenees. The majority resides in Spain. Basque culture, language, and origin, however, are unrelated to those of Spain. Although

a small nation, the Basques played a leading role in Spain's exploration and colonization of the Western Hemisphere. Basque surnames are common in Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Central and South America. Typical Basque surnames now regarded by the U.S. government as "Hispanic" include: Aquirre, Arteaga, Echeverria, Garate, Iturbide, Uribe, Vizcaino, and Zavala. This is the equivalent of classifying Irish as English, Dutch as German, Poles as Russian, Koreans as Japanese, or Tibetans as Chinese.

The category 'Hispanic' as a political tool

The "Hispanic" category serves two political functions.

Domestically, it is to create a "Hispanic nation" within the United States, inflate the numerical size of that "nation," assert that that "nation" has historically been a victim of white oppression, and insure such "nationals" become beneficiaries of all affirmative action programs.

Internationally, it is to legitimize and maintain "Hispanic" power and privilege in the 18 countries of the Western Hemisphere dominated by Spanish-speakers. It does so by realizing the stated goal of such Spanish-speaking extremists as former Guatemalan military dictator and mass murderer, General Oscar Mejia Victores: "We must get rid of the words 'indigenous' and 'Indian.'" By adopting the term "Hispanic," the U.S. government is fulfilling the General's wish by denying the existence of all non-Hispanic populations — principally, Indians, but also Europeans and Asians. For example, non-Spanish-speaking Indians — the majority population of Guatemala and Bolivia, Italians — the plurality of the population of Argentina, and Chinese — a minority population in Mexico, do not exist in the eyes of the U.S. government. Just as in the former Soviet Union ethnic groups that fell out of favor with the Communist Party officially ceased to exist and became an "unpeople."

Instead, each of the 18 countries is viewed as a homogenous "Hispanic" subgroup — "Argentine," "Bolivian," "Cuban," "Guatemalan," "Mexican," etc. This is the clear intent of Directive No. 15. And it is how the

Census Bureau identifies people from those countries. The attempt is to convince the public that each of these 18 Spanish-speaker-dominated countries is a "nation" just as the Germans, Irish, and Tibetans are nations. By use of this fiction, Spanish-speakers are able to continue their historic persecution of the languages, religions, and cultures of the non-Hispanic peoples with the blessing of the U.S. government. Since the U.S. government officially denies that non-Hispanic peoples exist in those countries, the U.S. government can officially deny such people are being persecuted. For how can you persecute someone who does not "exist"?

That the term "Hispanic" is an example of political opportunism can be seen by two

facts. First, neither the U.S. government, nor LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, or La Raza apply the methodology used to establish the "Hispanic" category consistently. If anyone of "Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race" is "Hispanic," then anyone of "British culture or origin, regardless of race" (i.e., Egypt, India, Jamaica, Malaysia, etc.) should be recognized as "Britannic," and anyone of "French culture or origin, regardless of race" (i.e., Algeria, Congo, Haiti, Vietnam, etc.) should be recognized as "Gallic." But this is not done.

If this methodology was applied consistently, then, just as Argentina is recognized as a "Hispanic" country because of its "Spanish culture," thereby, denying the official existence of its non-Spanish majority population (Italians, Germans, British, etc.), then the United States would have to be recognized as a "Britannic" country because of its "British culture," from law to literature, and its "Hispanic" minority population would have to be denied official existence. Such consistency would effectively put an end to LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza.

Second, the U.S. government and LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza all promote racial/ethnic identities. There are no Americans, only African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Native-Americans, Pacific Island-Americans, and non-Hispanic white-Americans (a derogatory euphemism for European-Americans officially

“... in [OMB’s] Directive No. 15, ... ‘Hispanic’ is defined as: ‘A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.’”

employed by the U.S. government which also employs the terms “hillbilly” and “Swamp Yankee” as official synonyms). This methodology, however, is not applied to Mexico and the other Spanish-speaking dominated countries of the Western Hemisphere. If it was, there would be no “Mexicans” only African-Mexicans, Asian-Mexicans, European-Mexicans, Indian-Mexicans, Mestizo-Mexicans, and Mulatto-Mexicans. Each category could be further broken down — i.e., Chinese-Mexicans, Basques-Mexicans, Mayan-Mexicans, etc. The same would happen to the other 17 “Hispanic”

“By use of this fiction, Spanish-speakers are able to continue their historic persecution of the languages, religions, and cultures of the non-Hispanic peoples with the blessing of the U.S. government.”

countries. This would pose a greater threat to LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza than recognition of the United States as a “Britannic” country.

Official recognition of the ethnic, racial, cultural, and linguistic diversity of “Latin” America would jeopardize the continued political and economic domination of Spanish-speakers over a number of countries, either in part or in whole — i.e., Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. It would make the term “Hispanic” untenable in the United States either as an official “ethnic” category or as a rhetorical designation for an “oppressed minority.” The result would be a dramatic fall in the number of people officially classified as “Hispanic,” while those still identified as “Hispanic” would be recognized as members of a historically racist and oppressive community. LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza would lose power, influence, and the ability to present themselves as credible “civil rights” organizations.

The support given by the U.S. government to “Hispanic” hegemony, however, goes beyond official classification. It extends to direct action. When

“Hispanic” control over any of the 18 Spanish-speaking dominated countries in the Western Hemisphere is threatened the U.S. government intervenes to preserve it.

In the 1970s and 1980s, when “Hispanic” control over Guatemala was endangered by an armed Indian insurgency the U.S. government, claiming that the insurgency was a Communist plot, successfully intervened with military aid to prop up the “Hispanic” regime.

During the 1980s the Miskito, Sumo, and Rama Indians fought the Marxist Sandinista government of Nicaragua to regain their freedom. Their land, historically known as the “Mosquito Coast,” comprises between one-quarter and one-third of the territory of Nicaragua and was only annexed by Nicaragua, with the blessings of the U.S. government, in 1894. In the 1980s, the U.S. government worked with the anti-Sandinista Nicaraguan “Contras” to defeat them. The Spanish-speaking “Contras,” the Spanish-speaking Sandinistas, and the U.S. government shared the same fundamental position — “Hispanic” hegemony must be preserved and Indian independence must be suppressed.

This year, by threatening to impose economic sanctions if they were successful, the U.S. government was able to defeat revolts by Indians and others which were about to topple the “Hispanic” regimes of Ecuador and Bolivia.

On-going American actions in Guatemala and Bolivia refute the assertion that the U.S. government supports “democracy” or “human rights.” Whose “democracy”? Whose “human rights”?

Searching for a shared history

After “identity,” the next shared core belief of LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza is “history.” What is presented as history, however, is a series of half-truths and total falsehoods to advance the “Hispanic” claim that “we were here first.” A claim officially promoted by the U.S. government whose rewriting of history proves Orwell’s dictum in 1984 — “Who controls the present controls the past; and who controls the past controls the future.”

In the introduction to “We the American Hispanics” — part of the Census Bureau’s “We the American” series which provides a separate demographic profile for Blacks, “Hispanics,” Asians, Pacific Islanders, American Indians, even the Foreign Born but not for European-

Americans — the Census Bureau proclaims: “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.”

This statement is remarkable not only for the breadth of its falsehood but also for its injection of a subtle anti-Southern prejudice into its overall anti-European-American message. The first permanent English settlement in the New World was not Plymouth, Massachusetts in 1620, but Jamestown, Virginia in 1607. The settlement of Jamestown predates that of Santa Fe by more than two years.

Nor was Santa Fe settled by “Mestizos.” It was founded in the winter of 1609-1610 by the governor and Captain-General Don Juan de Onate who was, along with his large party of priests and settler-soldiers, white. The true history of the Spanish settlement of this region is told in T.R. Fehrenbach’s monumental work, *Fire and Blood: A Bold and Definitive Modern Chronicle of Mexico* (New York: Collier Books, 1973). This book received critical acclaim from, among others, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Albuquerque Journal*, and the *Christian Science Monitor*. Fehrenbach writes:

He [Don Juan de Onate] reduced the sedentary Zuni and other Amerindians of the Puebloan culture and soon subordinated them to Spanish landowners and mission priests, but the Puebloans resisted the loss of their old religion and sacred rites more than many Indians. The Spanish were unable to provide the reduced

indios full protection from ancient enemies like the fierce Apaches. The Puebloans revolted in 1680, driving all the Europeans south after a general massacre.

The Spanish returned ten years afterward, suppressing resistance in fire and blood, powerfully aided by smallpox. However, the missionaries now pragmatically permitted the northern indios to keep many of their ancient practices alongside the Mass. The result was that these indigenes, who had felt only pale emanations of the Meso-American culture, were never fully Christianized or Hispanicized.

The New Mexican outpost failed to grow. It had a thin, isolated population scattered along the river [Rio Grande]. When Anglo-Saxon explorers and traders found it early in the nineteenth century, New Mexico was still living in the seventeenth century, following life styles as primitive as the lances and shields still carried by its horsemen. (p.274)

However, the Spanish settlement of St. Augustine in Florida, founded in 1565, does predate the English at Jamestown and by approximately half a century. It is, in fact, often cited by “Hispanics” as proof that they were here “first.” Why then did the Census Bureau not cite St. Augustine? The apparent reason is that the history of St. Augustine is an acute embarrassment to the authors of “We the American Hispanics.” No amount of historical revisionism by them could hide the truth about St. Augustine and St. Augustine reveals the truth about Spanish colonization.

By the Treaties of Tordesillas in 1494 and Saragossa in 1529, Spain and Portugal partitioned the world between themselves. By comparison, the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 was miserly; it only partitioned Eastern Europe between the Nazis and the Communists. The treaties recognized Spain as ruler of the entire Western Hemisphere minus Brazil, which went to Portugal, as did most of the Eastern Hemisphere. In that portion of the globe claimed as its property, Spain did not tolerate the presence of any European rivals, especially if those Europeans were Jews or Protestants.

Following instructions from King Philip II of Spain, Admiral Pedro Menendez de Aviles founded St. Augustine in 1565 for the express purpose of destroying the French Huguenot (French Protestant) colony of Fort Caroline which had been established along the St. John River in northeastern Florida in 1564. After capturing Fort Caroline, the Spanish, on September 8, massacred all the Huguenots — men, women, including pregnant women, and children — and then renamed the colony “San Mateo,” a name it still bears to this day.

The Spanish Empire invaded California in 1769 and established the Mission of San Diego. Within a month, Indians attacked the mission and, thereafter, effectively confined Spanish control to the coast of California. Three dates stand out in the Indians’ armed struggle against Spanish/Mexican invasion, colonization, and oppression. On November 4, 1775, Indians destroyed the Mission of

San Diego. This is considered to be one of the earliest and most successful uprisings. In September 1795, Indians rebelled against the Spanish in the region of San Francisco. In Spanish-occupied California, resistance was greatest among the Indians of this region. And in February 1824, when the Mexicans “ruled” California, Indians revolted at Missions La Purisima and Santa Barbara in what some historians consider to be “the most spectacular Indian rebellion in California during this era...” All three dates should be made official State holidays.

Revising history

“History” as told by supporters of LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA, and La Raza almost invariably includes not only the claim that “Hispanics” were here “first,” but that “Hispanics” were established in large numbers throughout the Southwest at the time the United States annexed that territory in 1848.

In fact, the Spanish Empire was unable to establish effective control over most of the land that today forms the seven States of the U.S. Southwest — Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah. The Indian nations — Apache, Comanche, Hopi, Navajo, Paiute, Shoshone, Ute, etc. — not only militarily defeated the Spanish attempt to invade and colonize this land, but the Apaches and Comanches counter-attacked and raided deep into what is now Mexico. The Comanches raided as far south as Guatemala. Spain retreated and established a series of military forts eastward from Sonora, south of California, to San Antonio in south Texas as a buffer between them and the Indians, especially the Comanches. North of this “boundary,” with the principal exceptions of the coastal strip of California, and Santa Fe, Spain exercised no effective authority in the territory which later became the U.S. Southwest. On obtaining independence, Mexico inherited Spain’s claim to this land but, like Spain, Mexico had no means to impose its rule. The land belonged to the Indians and the Indians were free, sovereign and independent nations.

Since the Indians controlled this land and were independent of Mexico, the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was a swindle whereby Mexico received \$15 million for “selling” the United States territory it did not legally own. Thirty-eight years later, the U.S. Supreme Court was forced to recognize this fact in *United States v. Kagama*, 118 U.S. 375 (1886). The previous year,

Congress had enacted the Indian Appropriation Act of March 3, 1885, 23 Stat. 385. This legislation specified seven crimes — murder, manslaughter, rape, assault with intent to kill, arson, burglary, and larceny — over which the federal government had absolute jurisdiction on Indian land. The basis for this claim of federal jurisdiction was the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. The constitutionality of this law was challenged on the ground that the U.S. government had never legally acquired sovereignty over the territories of the so-called “Mexican Cession” because Washington had never negotiated any treaties with the Indian nations who were the de facto owners of the lands of the Southwest.

Under the Constitution, the U.S. government was required to negotiate treaties with Indian nations. Article 1, Section 8 conferred on Congress the power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.” Article II, Section 2 empowered the president “with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties...” That Indian nations were sovereign polities and that the U.S. government had to deal with them through treaties was affirmed by Chief Justice John Marshall and the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831).

In fact, between 1787 and 1871, the U.S. government negotiated more than 650 treaties with Indian nations in various territories it had acquired — but not in the so-called “Mexican Cession.” In 1871, Congress passed legislation declaring “No Indian nation or tribe...shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty” (25 U.S.C.A. & 71). While this law was blatantly unconstitutional, its wording did acknowledge that prior to 1871 Indian nations had been officially recognized as sovereign polities and their relationship with the U.S. government had been officially based on negotiated treaties. In other words, if Washington had wanted to acquire legal sovereignty over the so-called “Mexican Cession” in 1848, it would have been required to negotiate treaties with the Indian nations of the Southwest.

However, in 1886 the U.S. Supreme Court panicked. If it ruled that the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was invalid, the Court would be admitting: (a) that the United States had been swindled, (b) that it had to negotiate a multitude of separate treaties instead of

relying on the convenience of one, (c) that until such treaties were negotiated the federal government did not exercise any legal authority on Indian lands, and (d) that all previous convictions of Indians under federal law were null and void.

To avoid such consequences, the U.S. Supreme Court falsely claimed it could not question the legality of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. The Court further asserted that treaties were not necessary for governing the relations between the U.S. government and Indian nations in the Southwest. The reason given by the Court for refusing to render a decision on the constitutionality of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was so outrageous — it was repudiating the wording of the U.S. Constitution, previous decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court, and the existence of more than 650 treaties — that its “decision” actually proved that the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was legally invalid, a fraud, and a swindle.

How insignificant the Spanish-speaking presence was even in the part of this territory Mexico did control can be seen in Texas. In 1824, the Spanish-speaking population in the Mexican province of Texas — a vast territory of 389,000 square miles that included most of present-day New Mexico as well as parts of Colorado and held one of the largest concentration of Spanish-speakers in the Southwest — numbered only 3,000. Compare that to the number of English-speakers in Rhode Island, the smallest State in the Union, with an area of only 1,525 square miles. Extrapolating from the 1820 U.S. Census, if the number of English-speakers is restricted to just the native-born “free white” population then they numbered approximately 83,000.

In other words, although Providence was founded in 1636 twenty-seven years after Santa Fe, and Rhode Island possessed less than one half of one percent of the land area of Texas, the number of English-speakers in that State was at least 28 times greater than the number of Spanish-speakers in Texas.

In 1824, the Government of Mexico invited Americans to settle in Texas, a land neither Spain nor Mexico had been able to effectively colonize or develop. The Mexican government extended this invitation because it saw in the American colonists a source of revenue through taxation and a source of protection, acting as a buffer or cannon fodder, against the Indians. By 1834, Americans outnumbered “ethnic Mexicans” ten

to one. In 1860, “ethnic Mexicans” were less than two percent of the 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 this was still less than three percent of a Texas population that exceeded three million. In San Antonio, home of the

***“On obtaining independence,
Mexico inherited Spain’s claim to this
land but, like Spain, Mexico had no
means to impose its rule. The land
belonged to the Indians and the
Indians were free, sovereign and
independent nations.”***

Alamo and cradle of Texas Independence, German immigrants alone outnumbered “ethnic Mexicans.”

The question of slavery

“Hispanic” historical revisionism also includes the claim that with the Guerrero Decree of September 15, 1829 Mexico had abolished slavery several decades before the United States. This is another example of intellectual dishonesty. All Mexico abolished in 1829 was the name, not the institution.

In fact, the Spanish were first to institute race slavery in the Western Hemisphere. The Indians were enslaved almost immediately but when they proved unsatisfactory, the Spanish introduced African slaves in 1502. The last two Spanish colonies “officially” to abolish African slavery were Puerto Rico in 1873 and Cuba in 1886.

The history of African slavery in the United States, on the other hand, begins in the colonial era with the arrival of African slaves in Virginia in 1619 and officially ends with the passage of the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in December 1865 following the Civil War.

African slavery in “Hispanic” America, therefore, predates the establishment of that institution in British North America by 117 years, and continued to legally exist for another twenty-one years after it was extinguished in the United States.

Despite “Hispanic” assertions to the contrary,

slavery and the slave trade officially existed in Mexico from the 1840s until at least 1890. Among the first victims were the Mayan Indians of the Yucatan who revolted against Mexico in 1847 in what is known as “The Caste War.” The Mayans defeated the Mexicans. From 1847 to 1901, Mexico did not exercise any jurisdiction in central and eastern Yucatan. This vast area became an independent Mayan country called “Chan Santa Cruz.” But by instituting a policy of “ethnic cleansing” — consisting of the mass murder of Mayan Indians, the mass rape of Mayan women, and the destruction of their villages and crops — the Mexicans were able to regain control of the western coastal area of the Yucatan. “The Caste War” lasted from 1847 to 1850. The dead, mostly Mayans, numbered between 147,000 and 275,000 out of a total population in the Yucatan of 575,362. In other words, thirty to thirty-five percent of the population in the Yucatan was exterminated.

The policy of killing captured Mayans was replaced on March 5, 1849 with a policy of selling them to Cuba as slaves. Eventually, Mexico would sell hundreds of Mayans into slavery. While slavery was once again “officially” abolished in 1861, this time by Mexican President Benito Juarez, all that changed was the identity of the slaves. The slave trade shifted from the Yucatan in the southeast to Sonora in the northwest. Instead of Mayan Indians, the slaves were now Yaqui Indians. Instead of hundreds being shipped to Cuba, thousands were shipped, ironically, to the Yucatan. “Men were kept in barracks and marched to work by armed and mounted guards, encouraged by majordomos with whips, marched back, and locked in at night.” By 1890, one-third of the population of the Yucatan, more than 100,000 people, were “indebted servants” — a Mexican euphemism for slaves — and their families, principally Mayan and Yaqui Indians.

In a military campaign lasting from 1898 to 1901 and involving four Mexican army battalions, units from the Yucatecan National Guards, and the Mexican Navy, Mexico finally succeeded in invading and conquering “Chan Santa Cruz.” The defeated eastern Mayans were now subjected to the Mexican debt peonage system — slavery under a different name.

While the debt peonage system was supposedly abolished in the aftermath of the Mexican “Revolution” of 1910-1920, nothing really changed. Witness the

scandal involving the business activities of the newly elected President of Mexico, Vicente Fox. He has been employing underage children on his ranch in violation of Mexico’s child labor law. Fox epitomizes Mexico — there is the “law,” then there is the reality.

Elsewhere in “Hispanic” America, Indian slavery existed in Peru as late as 1915; and, as documented by the International Workgroup for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and the Anti-Slavery Society and reported to the United Nations, it still existed in Bolivia in 1975, and in Guatemala and Paraguay in 1978.

Enter the Ford Foundation

While they promote similar views on “Hispanic identity” and “Hispanic history,” the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA), and the National Council of La Raza (La Raza) have separate corporate identities and histories. What is unique about both MALDEF and La Raza is that they are the creations of the Ford Foundation, which remains one of their principal sources of funding.

The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the nation’s oldest and largest “Hispanic” organization, was established on February 17, 1929 in Corpus Christi, Texas by the merger of three rival, and often feuding, Mexican-Texan organizations — The Order Sons of America, The Knights of America, and League of Latin American Citizens.

From 1929 through the 1950s, LULAC was a middle-class, patriotic organization of U.S. citizens of Mexican descent whose activities centered primarily on education. Its agenda was traditional “Americanism” — Mexican-Americans must assimilate to the “Anglo” culture of the United States and acquire proficiency in the English language. It stressed “Mexican-Americans” were “Americans,” not “Mexicans.” An integral part of its activities was the promotion of U.S. citizenship and loyalty to the United States. LULAC rejected the idea the U.S. Southwest should be returned to Mexico and opposed establishment of Spanish-language enclaves in the United States. Because illegal aliens from Mexico were violating U.S. laws and posing an economic burden on Mexican-Americans by lowering wages, LULAC endorsed immigration control and supported President Eisenhower’s “Operation Wetback” which deported a

million illegal aliens back to Mexico.

By the 1950s, LULAC had expanded its activities to include litigation. In 1954, LULAC succeeded in having the U.S. Supreme Court hear *Hernandez v. Texas*, the first “Hispanic” civil rights case. LULAC asked the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn the murder conviction of a Mexican-American in Jackson County, Texas on grounds that the composition of the jury was unconstitutional. Although Mexicans comprised 14 percent of the population of Jackson County, none had served on a jury for the previous 25 years. LULAC argued that by not having any Mexicans on his jury, the convicted murderer’s constitutional rights guaranteed by the 14th Amendment had been violated. The Court agreed with Chief Justice Earl Warren affirming “that persons of Mexican descent were a distinct class” — not “white” but not “black” either.

This legal victory spelled the beginning of the end for the original LULAC. Although the formal trappings remain — the official colors of LULAC are still red, white, and blue; the official logo is still a shield emblazoned with the stars and stripes and bearing the name “LULAC”; “Washington’s prayer” remains the official prayer of LULAC; “America” is still the official hymn; and the Pledge of Allegiance continues to be recited at the start of meetings — the LULAC which so vigorously championed traditional “Americanism” is gone. Today, LULAC is a “Hispanic” supremacist group advocating actions that are diametrically opposed to those championed by its founders.

The original LULAC declared “Mexican-Americans” to be “white,” a part of the same race as European-Americans, and successfully lobbied both the federal and Texas governments to officially classify them as such. Nearly a quarter of a century later, LULAC’s position changed. Beginning with *Hernandez v. Texas* in 1954 and finalized in OMB Directive No. 15 in 1977, LULAC succeeded in having the federal government recognize “Mexicans,” and all “Hispanics,” as separate from European-Americans and essentially “non-white” so as to be eligible for affirmative action programs.

While the original LULAC emphasized “Mexican-Americans” were “Americans” sharing the same national interests as other “Americans,” today LULAC’s goals center on “group entitlements” as can be seen in *The 1998 LULAC Legislative Platform* available on its website (www.lulac.org).

Among its objectives: expansion of American empowerment and enterprise zones along the U.S.-Mexican border; incentives for “Hispanic” small businesses; retention of affirmative action hiring policies “to ensure diversity in all workplaces”; preventing California Proposition 209 from being enforced; increasing the number of “Hispanic Serving Institutions” and according them “as many of the same benefits provided to Historically Black Colleges and Universities”; increasing the number of “Hispanics” at all levels of the federal government and in the civil service, especially at “key positions in the State Department, the Foreign Service and the United Nations”; confirmation of 60 “Hispanic” judges; appointing a “Hispanic” as the next Supreme Court justice; employing sampling for the 2000 census; having the Census Bureau include the population on the island of Puerto Rico in the total “Hispanic” population for the United States; increasing the number of “Hispanic oriented programming in TV and print” as well as having the major media companies increase the number of “Hispanics” employed in “creative positions.”

U.S. citizenship is no longer important. Membership in LULAC is not restricted to U.S. citizens. “Residents of the United States” are now eligible to become members (Article III of the Constitution of the League of United Latin American Citizens). Interestingly, it does not specify that they be legal residents. U.S. Citizenship is also apparently not a qualification for National, State, and District Officers, whether elected or appointed. (Article VIII, Section 4).

LULAC’s apparent attempt to denigrate the meaning and value of U.S. citizenship extends to the franchise. In *The 1998 LULAC Legislative Platform*, the organization appears to condone, if not actually promote, the violation of this country’s election laws. According to the section entitled “Voter Registration and Citizenship”: “LULAC actively encourages eligible Hispanics to fully participate in the democratic process and register to vote. *We also encourage those who are eligible to become citizens*” (italics added). Since the law states one must be a U.S. citizen in order to be eligible to vote, the wording of this LULAC platform encourages voter fraud.

In 1954, LULAC supported immigration control and mass deportation of illegal aliens. Today, LULAC opposes both measures. Convicted criminal José Velez, the head of LULAC from 1990 to 1994, typifies this

reorientation. Using his “special status with the INS as director of LULAC,” Velez submitted false documentation for 6,000 illegal aliens seeking amnesty that netted him millions of dollars. Velez had previously declared that the U.S. Border Patrol is “the enemy of my people and always will be.”

- ULAC sought amendments to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996 to increase the cap on suspensions of deportations from 4,000 to “at least 75,000 per year.”
- LULAC lobbied for full restoration of benefits cut by the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 to legal immigrants.
- LULAC was one of the primary opponents of California Proposition 187 — the proposition to deny illegal aliens free social and welfare services.
- LULAC “reject[s] attempts to dramatically cut legal immigration” insisting that current levels of nearly one million a year “serve[s] the U.S. national interest.”
- LULAC opposes any deployment of the military to defend U.S. borders — not even to interdict drug smugglers — because “military personnel are not trained for border patrolling and might easily violate the civil rights of those they intervene with.”

Prior to the 1960s, LULAC recognized English as the official language of the United States. Today, LULAC vigorously opposes any official recognition of English as the language of this country.

For example, in 1996, when U.S. House of Representatives passed the “English Language Empowerment Act” declaring English the official language of the United States in the “Bilingual Voting Rights Act,” LULAC responded with an “Action Alert” to members and supporters. Full of disinformation, smears, and the threat of violence, this “Action Alert” claimed:

English Only is incredibly divisive because it

sends the message that the culture of language minorities is inferior and illegal. With a dramatic increase in hate crimes and right wing terrorist attacks in the United States, the last thing we need is a frivolous bill to fuel the fires of racism. ...English Only is unnecessary because over 97 percent of Americans already speak English and those who don't are eagerly trying to learn. English language classes have three year waiting lists in Los Angeles and New York and current immigrants are learning English at a faster rate than their predecessors.

LULAC offered no evidence to support any of these claims. If what LULAC claimed was true, however, then why was LULAC — a) opposed to legally recognizing this fact by legally recognizing English as the official language of the United States and b) demanding that the U.S. government provide bilingual voting ballots, bilingual

welfare forms, bilingual motor vehicle examinations, bilingual education, bilingual translators, etc.

The “Action Alert” then contradicted its claim that virtually all Americans already speak English by declaring: “If Congress was serious about increasing English fluency in the United States it would pass English Plus legislation that would promote English speaking and encourage Americans to become bilingual.”

By bilingual, LULAC means fluency in Spanish, not Arabic, Chinese, German, Greek, Italian, Polish, or any one of several more languages.

But if bilingualism is as beneficial and enriching as LULAC implies, then where is the reciprocity? If English-speaking Americans should be legally encouraged to learn to speak Spanish here, then, logically, Spanish-speaking “Latin” Americans should be legally encouraged to learn to speak English there. Where are the comparable bills in each of the 18 Spanish-speaking dominated countries of the Western Hemisphere to encourage Spanish-speaking Mexicans, Colombians, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Guatemalans, Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, etc., to learn to speak English

“[In 1954, the Supreme] Court agreed with Chief Justice Earl Warren affirming ‘that persons of Mexican descent were a distinct class’ — not ‘white’ but not ‘black’ either. This legal victory spelled the beginning of the end for the original LULAC.”

in their respective countries? Why isn't LULAC demanding that? Because LULAC is pursuing power not principle, is engaged in rhetoric not logic, and is motivated by hatred not tolerance.

This official attack on the English language continued later that year during the "Latino March on Washington." Belen Robles, National President of LULAC, told the audience "We must say no to politicians who vote for English only, the unwelfare bill and anti-affirmative action. Vote those in Congress who violate our rights out! Viva La Raza!"

Funding for LULAC's activities are derived from corporations such as AT&T, and, unlike the other "Hispanic" groups, membership dues. For the period 1994-1997, funding from "contributions, gifts, grants" totaled \$380,929. "Membership dues and assessments" for that period amounted to \$503,524. For those four years, total "compensation of officers, directors, etc." was zero. But "other salaries and wages" amounted to \$336,988.

The post-*Hernandez v. Texas* metamorphosis of LULAC from a patriotic, middle class organization of U.S. citizens of Mexican descent into today's "Hispanic" supremacist organization was due in large part to LULAC's need to compete with the more radical Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) and National Council of La Raza (La Raza) for influence and money.

MALDEF — The Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund

Perhaps the most important book to examine the origin, activities, and source of funds of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) is *Importing Revolution: Open Borders And The Radical Agenda* by William R. Hawkins. (The American Immigration and Control Foundation, Monterey, Virginia and United States Industrial Council Educational Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1994). The following paragraphs while based principally on the findings of Hawkins also include data from the MALDEF website at www.maldef.org.

Ironically for LULAC, the founder of the rival Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) was Peter Tijerina, State Civil Rights Chairman for the LULAC chapter in San Antonio. Tijerina felt LULAC had failed to use its victory in *Hernandez v. Texas* to pursue legal activism. He

wanted LULAC to imitate the actions of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense Fund (NAACP-LDF). In 1966, Tijerina sent a LULAC member to the Chicago convention of the NAACP-LDF. As a result of the contacts established at the convention, the next year, Jack Greenberg, president of the NAACP-LDF, arranged for Tijerina to meet Bill Pincus, head of the Ford Foundation. Pincus agreed to advance Tijerina "seed money" to create a five-state "Mexican-American" organization modeled after the NAACP-LDF. This new organization would pursue civil rights litigation on behalf of "Mexicans" as the NAACP-LDF was doing on behalf of blacks. Tijerina became MALDEF's first executive director, and, in 1970, Mario Obledo, former Texas Attorney General, became General Counsel. After MALDEF was established by "seed money," the Ford Foundation then awarded the organization a five-year grant in excess of \$2 million.

MALDEF was a creation of the Ford Foundation in more ways than just funding. The Ford Foundation soon took control of virtually all important matters from where the headquarters should be located, to the appointment of its executive director, and the type of legal cases it should pursue.

Initially, MALDEF addressed a variety of issues ranging from education to school desegregation, voting rights to job discrimination, composition of draft boards to legal advice for anti-Vietnam war protesters. The Ford Foundation found this tactic unsatisfactory. The cases MALDEF was litigating were not radical enough. The Ford Foundation wanted precedent-setting cases to go before the U.S. Supreme Court whose rulings would effect the entire country. MALDEF was duly restructured to achieve those goals.

Since then MALDEF has redirected much of its effort to bilingual and bicultural education — i.e., promotion of the Spanish language and "Hispanic" propaganda — and immigration — i.e., promotion of massive "Hispanic" immigration in opposition to the wishes of the majority of U.S. citizens. Among some of its actions:

- MALDEF supported the plaintiffs in "Lau v. Nichols." The ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court requiring non-English speaking students to be taught in English or "other adequate instructional procedures" was successfully misinterpreted by MALDEF to mean education in languages other

than English.

- MALDEF sought to amend the “Bilingual Education Act” so general instruction could be conducted in languages other than English and bicultural programs could be included in the education.
- MALDEF filed charges alleging textbooks in California were biased against minorities.
- MALDEF litigated for free public education for the children of illegal aliens that successfully culminated in the 1982 U.S. Supreme Court decision in “Plyer v. Doe.”
- MALDEF opposed California Proposition 187 that denied illegal aliens free social and welfare services and filed a class action lawsuit “challenging its every provision.”
- Some individuals associated with MALDEF have demanded that U.S. citizenship be eliminated as a requirement to vote.
- MALDEF sought and received legal status to naturalize immigrants.
- MALDEF successfully lobbied for passage of the “motor-voter” bill of 1993 that allows voter registration at welfare offices or when applying for a drivers’ license; mandates mail-in voter registration and discourages States from verifying the applicant’s eligibility or citizenship.
- MALDEF filed suit in 1997 to abolish the state requirement that students pass the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TASS), a three-part standardized test, for a high school diploma claiming among other things that the “test contributes to the high drop out rates among Mexican Americans and African Americans.”
- MALDEF is defending “affirmative action” enrollment at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.
- MALDEF opposes immigration reform.
- MALDEF opposes securing the Mexican border even to stop the flow of illegal drugs into the U.S. When the Federal government launched “Joint Task Force Six” to combat drug smuggling along the border, MALDEF filed suit to halt the project arguing in court that “it would cause irreparable damage to the human and physical environment in

the area.” What of the irreparable damage being done to the human and environment due to illegal aliens and drug smugglers? On that question, MALDEF is silent.

What is MALDEF’s goal? According to Mario Obledo, former head of MALDEF, “California is going to be a Hispanic state. Anyone who does not like it should leave.” In 1998, Obledo was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Clinton.

MALDEF obtains the funding to support its activities primarily from corporations in particular AT&T and IBM, and philanthropic foundations. For the period 1991-1995, the total amount of “gifts, grants and contributions” to MALDEF was over \$17 million. Between 1996 and 1998, MALDEF received over nine million dollars from just three foundations: the vast majority, over six million dollars from the Ford Foundation, \$1,200,000 from Carnegie Corporation, and another \$1,525,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation.

For the two-year period, 1995-1996, MALDEF paid a total of \$720,992 in “compensation of officers, directors, etc..” But paid \$4,021,363 in “other salaries and wages.”

La Raza — The Race

The National Council of La Raza was established in 1968 with support from the Ford Foundation and was originally called the Southwest Council of La Raza. According to a 1984 Ford Foundation report “Hispanic Challenges and Opportunities,” its funding of La Raza “provides Mexican American communities and organizations with technical assistance and ... has also become an effective voice for Mexican Americans and other Hispanics.” La Raza operates a Policy Analysis Center, which it claims is “the pre-eminent Hispanic ‘think tank’” and uses its “findings” to lobby for, among other policies, affirmative action, bilingual education, mass immigration, and more “hate crimes” laws.

For example, La Raza demands an expansion of “hate crimes” laws claiming “Traditional hate crimes against Hispanics have increased in number during the 1990s.” What La Raza does not say is that such an increase is due to the flawed methodology employed by the U.S. government for reporting “hate crimes.” When “Hispanics” are victims of “hate crimes” they are classified as “Hispanics,” but when they are perpetrators they are classified as “white.” Any bias incident between

organization receives two-thirds of its funding from corporations and foundations, and the rest from the government.” For the period 1992-1996, the total amount of “gifts, grants and contributions” to La Raza was more than \$38 million, not including revenues from “government fees and contracts.” Over three years, 1996-1998, La Raza received over five million dollars from just three foundations: the majority, nearly four million dollars, from the Ford Foundation, \$850,000 from the Carnegie Corporation, and another \$850,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation.

“1996-1998, La Raza received over five million dollars from just three foundations: the majority ... from the Ford Foundation...”

For the period 1993-1996, La Raza paid \$983,522 in “compensation of officers, directors, etc..” But paid \$9,842,560 in “other salaries and wages.”

MEChA

Founded in 1969, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA) is the youngest of the four “Hispanic” organizations. It is also the most unabashedly racist and its pronouncements the most incendiary. *Reconquista: The Takeover of America*, prepared and published by the California Coalition for Immigration Reform in 1997, documents the truth about MEChA by quoting what the founders and supporters of this organization have said.

a “Hispanic” perpetrator and a “Hispanic” victim, therefore, will be reported as a white on “Hispanic” “hate crime.” The number of “hate crimes” against “Hispanics” is naturally increased by such definitions.

La Raza condemns the “step-up [in] immigration law enforcement significantly along the U.S./Mexico border and in the interior of the country” claiming such activities violate the civil rights of “Hispanics.”

La Raza has called upon the Congress to rescind the immigration and welfare reform acts of 1996 calling them “a disgrace to American values.” In addition, it has demanded another amnesty for illegal aliens from Central America coupled with this threat: “Our elected officials should not be surprised if their failure to act on reforms of these terribly unjust laws is met with a firm response at the ballot box.” And U.S. citizens should not be surprised that those going to the ballot box for La Raza include illegal aliens and non-citizens.

On its website, www.nclr.org, La Raza claims to be “the largest constituency-based national Hispanic organization, serving all Hispanic nationality groups in all regions of the country...[with] over 200 formal affiliates who together serve 37 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia...and a broader network of more than 20,000 groups and individuals nationwide — reaching more than two million Hispanics annually.”

Where does La Raza get the funding to support its many activities? According to its website, “the

The first chapter of MEChA, called “El Plan de AZTLAN,” was established at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1969. Other chapters eventually were formed at other colleges and even at high schools. “According to Miguel Carillo, a Chula Vista High School teacher, there are MEChA chapters at over 90 percent of the high schools in San Diego and Los Angeles.”

Money facilitated this rapid growth. Where did the money come from? As unbelievable as it sounds, according to Jacqueline Carrasco of UCLA, “Most chapters get their budget from the (tax-funded) schools and sometimes from the associated students. Funds range from \$100 to \$8000 for larger schools such as Cal State Northrop.”

Among the demands MEChA has made are: rescinding California Proposition 187 (ending welfare benefits to illegal aliens); rescinding all “English Only laws; abolishing the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Border Patrol; and open borders.

The goal of MEChA, however, is an independent “Aztlan,” the collective name this organization gives to the seven States of the U.S. Southwest — Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and

Utah. According Miguel Perez of MEChA, at Cal State Northridge: "When asked his preference of government, he replied, 'Communism would be closest. Non-Chicanos would have to be expelled...opposition groups would be quashed because you have to keep the power.'"

As one of MEChA's mission statements declares: "This is revolution at its basic level, moving the people ["Hispanics"] to confrontational politics..." At the November 1996 MEChA statewide conference, one thousand supporters assembled to condemn California Proposition 187 and Proposition 209 (ending bilingual education). According to *Reconquista*, California State University Professor, and MEChA advisor, Rodolfo Acuña — who previously stated "the (demise) of the Soviet Union was a tragedy for us" and "Chicanos have to get a lot more militant about defending our rights" — proclaimed "anyone who's supporting 209 is a racist and anybody who supports 187 is a racist... you are living in Nazi U.S. We can't let them take us to those intellectual ovens." Not surprisingly four months after those and other incendiary statements were uttered, a MEChA representative during a rally in front of Los Angeles City Hall publicly declared; "When the people in this building don't listen to the demands of our community, it's time to burn it down!"

This was not an empty threat. In 1993, in order to advance their demand for full department status for Chicano Studies at UCLA, MEChA spearheaded a riot that destroyed half a million dollars worth of campus property.

MEChA spreads its message of hate through campus newspapers such as *El Popo*, *Aztlán News*, *Chispas*, *Gente de Aztlán* (UCLA), *Voz Fronteriza* (UC at San Diego), *La Voz Mestiza* (UC at Irvine), and *La Voz Berkeley*. MEChA's hatred extends to any "Hispanic"-American who is loyal to the United States.

For example, the front page of the May 1995 issue of *Voz Fronteriza* carried a picture of Luis A. Santiago and the story of how this INS agent was killed in the line of duty defending the U.S.-Mexican border. The headlines read: "Luis A. Santiago: Death Of A Migra Pig."

In April 1997, MEChA held its national conference at Michigan State University and decided, in an apparent attempt to be more indigenous, to change the spelling of its name replacing the "ch" with "x." "MEChA" became "MEXA" and "Chicano" became "Xicano."

Unlike MALDEF, and La Raza, MEChA apparently does not receive funding from the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation or the Rockefeller Foundation. Unlike LULAC, MALDEF, and La Raza, MEChA does not have a national headquarters. Instead, it has regional centers. [*Editor's note: You may contact this journal for a complete list of e-mail addresses and phone numbers.*]

Conclusion

So with the encouragement of the U.S. government and with the financial support of major U.S. corporations and foundations, LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA/MEXA, and La Raza, pillars of the radical "Hispanic" lobby, successfully and aggressively promote hatred of the history, identity, culture, language, and laws of the United States.

For LULAC, MALDEF, MEChA/MEXA, AND La Raza, "Hispanics" are the new "Herrenvolk," European-Americans their "Undermench" and the United States their rightful "Lebensraum." As Art Torres, Chairman of the California Democratic Party declared at the January 1995 Latino Summit Response to Prop 187 at UC-Riverside: "Remember Prop 187 is the last gasp of White America in California!"