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Note to readers:

In the text that follows, when an asterisk appears next to a footnote number it means the reference will include content, not just a citation.
On March 13, 1961, black boxer Floyd Patterson knocked out Swedish challenger Ingemar Johansson to retain the world heavyweight title. I was nine years old and knew nothing about boxing, but my eye was caught by a newspaper picture of the victorious Patterson standing over Johansson, out cold on the canvas. I read the article and asked my father if this meant no one on earth could beat Patterson. He said that was right; Patterson was the best boxer in the world. I remember thinking to myself that this just wasn’t right. Surely, there must be one of our guys—a white guy—who could beat him. Floyd Patterson was an American like me, while Ingemar Johansson was a foreigner, a Swede, but I still wanted the white man to win.

Readers will no doubt dismiss these thoughts of a nine-year-old child as “racism”—as prejudice I learned from my surroundings—but they should not be so hasty. My parents were missionaries, and I was born and reared in Japan. At age nine I had no experience of black people. My parents had always said that all races were equal and that all people were children of God. I also had no special objection to Patterson because he was black. I think I would have been just as perplexed if Johansson had been knocked out by an Arab or a Chinese.

As I grew up I adopted my parents’ liberal views of race, and forgot all about Patterson and Johansson. In fact, as a young liberal I would have been ashamed to recall that I had rooted for the white man rather than the American. It was only when I was in my 40s and began to question conventional assumptions about race that I even remembered what I had thought about that 1961 title fight.

As we will see in Chapter 4, children of all races have untutored racial preferences that may be part of their nature. It serves little purpose to call these preferences “racism,” as if they were a moral failing. They appear to be an expression of natural racial identity, which arises far earlier than most people realize and can persist despite efforts to suppress it. Clever experiments in adults show that they retain these preferences, even when they are convinced they do not. Racial identity can be condemned, fought, ignored, or cultivated, but it is unrealistic for a society to pretend it does not exist.

The American civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s was based on the assumption that consciousness of race is a prejudice that is learned from a prejudiced society. The movement’s goal was to eliminate racial prejudice and even consciousness of race, and build a society in which race would not matter. That effort failed; generation after generation, race continues to matter.

And yet, official American assumptions about race—that it is a trivial distinction it is our destiny to transcend—have not changed. The result is a stubborn gap between what Americans say and claim to think about race, and how they act. This stark contrast is described in the first chapter of this book. Though they seldom talk about it, at some level most Americans know how little their behavior resembles what are supposed to be their ideals. The result is frustration, confusion, and not a little hypocrisy. I believe decades of frustration were behind the wishful thinking that surrounded the election of the first black American president in 2008.

Shortly before Barack Obama took office, I was invited to join a radio debate on the significance of the election. The other guest, a professor at Yale, used language that was then nearly universal. He called the election “transformational,” saying it would dramatically change the lives of both blacks and whites.
I said it was a mistake to expect “transformation,” or perhaps even much change at all. I asked whether the fact that we had a black president would reduce rates of black crime, illegitimacy, and school failure, and whether whites would now welcome black and Hispanic neighbors. I noted that in 1990, Virginia—the heart of the old Confederacy—elected a black man, Douglas Wilder, as governor, and that his election was greeted with similarly extravagant expectations. At the end of four years, the circumstances of blacks and the state of race relations were unchanged.

The host of the program so resented my suggestion that “transformation” should be expected to show concrete results that he accused me of trying to deceive his listeners. Clearly, he had been swept up in the heady excitement of the moment, an excitement caught by Paul Krugman, who wrote in the *New York Times* that if Mr. Obama’s election “didn’t leave you teary-eyed and proud of your country, there’s something wrong with you.”

Why would an election cause a radio host to take offense at the idea that “transformation” should bring measurable gains? Why would it bring a Nobel laureate in economics to tears? It is because so many people saw the election as expiation for America’s sins and the final achievement of the goals of the civil rights movement. The election of a black president meant victory had finally come.

There had already been a half century of effort. School integration, civil rights laws, affirmative action, the Great Society, Black History Month, the King holiday, black appointments to cabinet and Supreme Court—all reflected a deep desire to do away with distinctions of race. Every institution and authority figure in the country condemns racism and urges that it be fought on all fronts. The United States has poured more moral energy into improving race relations than into anything else in its history.

And yet, in November 2008, race was still the American dilemma. The fact that it was still a dilemma despite so much effort fostered something like a yearning for miracles. That yearning gained force with every step Mr. Obama took towards the White House and reached a climax at his inauguration. Two years later, there is so little euphoria left that it is difficult for most Americans to remember how giddy with hope they were on January 20, 2009 when Mr. Obama took the oath of office. The CNN news channel hinted at miracles when it offered viewers an inaugural T-shirt that read, “Obama raises hand, lifts a nation.” Actress Susan Sarandon was hoping for miracles when she said of the new president, “He is a community organizer like Jesus was. And now, we’re a community and he can organize us.” The whole world was hoping for miracles. The London *Times* headlined its inauguration story “The New World.” England’s *Sun* newspaper titled its story “One Giant Step for Mankind.”

There was such a frenzy over the new president that former Clinton press secretary Dee Dee Myers was no doubt right to call him “the most famous living person in the history of the world.” Mr. Obama had been president for less than a month when he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, and had been president for only eight months when the Nobel Committee declared him the winner.

All this explains the hostility to my question about the tangible consequences for race relations of an Obama victory—whether there was going to be real change or just happy talk. People hoping for miracles do not want to be asked practical questions.

There have been no miracles. The Gallup organization recorded a huge spike in optimism about American race relations at the time of the inauguration, but one year later it found that “optimism about race relations is now almost identical to where it was 46 years ago, when Gallup first asked the question.”
This book tries to explain why there have been no miracles. It does so by examining the enduring phenomenon of racial consciousness. For many Americans—probably most Americans—race remains an unspoken consideration in decisions about where to live, what schools to attend, what clubs to join, whom to marry, and what parts of town to avoid at night. The closer we look at how Americans live, the more clearly we see how much race continues to matter. At the same time, the moral imperative of the civil rights movement—that race should mean nothing—remains so strong that many whites deny, even to themselves, that race plays any role in these decisions.

We insist that “diversity” is a great strength, but for most Americans this is mere lip service. They rarely seek diversity in their personal lives, living instead in homogeneous islands that look nothing like the racial and cultural mix this country has become. Anti-discrimination laws ensure integration at work, at school, and in public, but in private the races generally separate. A dinner party, poker game, wedding reception, church service, or backyard barbecue is rarely a multi-racial mosaic. When they are beyond the reach of the law, Americans revert to the patterns of segregation the law forbids. Why is this? Chapters 2 and 3 of this book, together with the scientific findings reported in Chapter 4, should leave no doubt that diversity is not a source of strength but a source of conflict.

Americans therefore live a contradiction that makes it difficult to talk honestly about race. There is probably no other subject about which there is a greater divergence between what is said publicly and thought privately, or between official pronouncements and personal behavior.

At least that is true for whites. Chapters 5 and 6 explore the open rejection by Blacks and Hispanics of the civil-rights ideal of transcending race. For many minorities, race or ethnicity is central to their identity. The Congressional Black Caucus exists to shape legislation from a limited perspective: What’s in it for blacks? The Hispanic caucus has an equally narrow perspective.

Non-white racial/ethnic solidarity is an entrenched part of the political landscape, and the pressure tactics to which it gives rise have been very successful. As we will see in Chapter 7, Asians are now adopting the same tactics. Non-white leaders are so accustomed to promoting explicitly racial interests, that they would be dumbfounded at the suggestion that they should broaden their horizons and work for all Americans. And yet that is the goal all Americans must have if the country is to move beyond race.

Chapter 8 describes the radical transformation of white racial attitudes that has occurred in the last half century. Up until the 1950s, most white Americans felt the same kind of racial identity that is common among non-whites. These sentiments have almost completely disappeared—certainly from public sight. No politician would dare examine legislation by asking what was in it for whites. No city in America has a white firefighters’ union or a white caucus on the city council. Across the political spectrum, Americans assert that any form of white racial consciousness or solidarity is despicable. Whites, therefore, have tried to keep their end of the civil rights bargain. They have dismantled and condemned their own racial identity in the expectation that others will do the same.

Why, though, is it so hard to build a society in which race does not matter? To the extent that Americans even ask themselves this question, they would say that it is because Americans—whites, especially—have not tried hard enough. And yet, how much harder can a people try? Today, after 50 years of trying, most whites cannot muster much more than exhausted resignation in the face of reports on school resegregation and yawning gaps in test scores or poverty rates.

This book departs from convention in that it does not ask that we just keep trying harder. Instead, it suggests that we would do well to rethink our assumptions. If, generation after generation, Americans
tend to segregate themselves, is it possible that the expectations for integration were not reasonable? If
diversity is a source of tension are there risks in basing policies on the assumption that it is a
strength? If non-white groups continue to advance race-based interests, is it wise for whites to
continue to act as if they have none?

The ideal of moving beyond race still appeals to the vast majority of whites. They dream of an
America in which there is no such thing as racial conflict, in which all Americans work together for
common goals. They love to quote Martin Luther King’s “I Have a Dream” speech about judging
people by the content of their character. And yet, two generations after that speech was delivered,
how many blacks judge whites by the content of their character? And when whites take a wrong turn
off the freeway, do they lock their car doors because they can read the character of the people on the
sidewalk?

Perhaps it is time to question goals that run counter to near-universal behavior. There may be
lessons for us in the failure of Soviet-style Communism. It is our era’s foremost example of a system
that made mesmerizing promises of an earthly paradise but betrayed those promises. Millions of
people were inspired by an ideology that would do away with capitalist exploitation. Marxists
believed that the working class would seize the means of production, the state would wither away,
selfishness would disappear, and man would live “from each according to his ability to each
according to his needs.” In the name of this ideology millions gave their lives and took the lives of
millions of others.

Communism failed. It failed for many reasons, not least because it was a misreading of human
nature. Selfishness cannot be abolished. People do not work just as hard on collective farms as they
do on their own land. The almost universal rejection of Communism today marks the acceptance of
people as they are, not as Communism wished them to be.

Is it possible that our racial ideals assume that people should become something they cannot? If
most people prefer the company of people like themselves, what do we achieve by insisting that they
deny that preference? If diversity is a weakness rather than a strength, why work to increase
diversity? I believe that mistaken assumptions about race are leading us in dangerous directions.

Merely to raise these questions, however, is to dissent from the deeply held convictions of many
thoughtful Americans—and they are more than mere convictions. For many Americans, perhaps even
most Americans, they are the foundations of morality; even to question the assumptions of the civil-
rights vision is illegitimate.

Of course, we can never speak honestly about race if the majority brooks no dissent. There cannot
be dialogue if doubters are thought to be not merely mistaken but immoral. In fact, it is a sign that the
defenders of orthodoxy are unsure of their ground when they close their ears to disagreement. Real
solutions to real problems require honest discussion, and honest discussion comes at a cost. As
Thomas Paine said, “He who dares not offend cannot be honest.”

When it comes to race, few dare to offend. In February 2009, Mr. Obama’s black Attorney General,
Eric Holder, caused a stir when he noted that workplaces are integrated but that in their private lives
Americans live in “race-protected cocoons,” as if we were still living in “the country that existed
almost 50 years ago.” He said Americans were “a nation of cowards” because they do not talk about
race, and urged us to “be honest with each other.”

Did he mean it? Is he willing to consider that if in some important ways our country has not
changed in 50 years it may mean it was unrealistic to expect it to change? It is likely that he wanted
whites to have the courage to break out of their “race-protected cocoons,” embrace people of other races, and apologize for racism. As we will see in Chapter 8, whites are more than ready to apologize. When they speak as whites it is almost always to apologize, but apologies for slavery and Jim Crow—things for which no living white person is responsible—take neither honesty nor bravery.

Mr. Holder was right to say Americans are cowards about race, but he was wrong about why. White Americans are cowards, but not because they are unwilling to admit guilt and atone for the past. They are cowards because they fear that any departure from carefully scripted opinions about race—to suggest, for example, that the very fact of multi-racialism gives rise to serious problems no matter what whites do—will be met with charges of racism. And they are right. Charges of racism are not a form of debate; they are meant to silence debate. Accusations of racism are often transparent attempts to choke off honest discussion.

This book is an attempt to understand race relations as they are, not as we might wish them to be. We cannot understand the world we live in if we refuse to rethink assumptions that may be wrong. Nor can we make progress if we are knocked off course for fear that others may call us names.

Reexamining our assumptions about race could have far-reaching consequences, which are explored in the final chapter. Disturbing as such a reexamination may be, it will help us understand the choices our nation faces today and the choices we made in the past. We can continue down a path that is likely to ensure tension and social dislocation or we can reorient policies in more realistic directions.

This book is about racial identity, something most people who are not white take for granted. They come to it early, feel it strongly, and make no apologies for it. Most whites do not have a racial identity, but they would do well to understand what race means for others. They should also ponder the consequences of being the only group for whom such an identity is forbidden and who are permitted no aspirations as a group. These questions—certainly the most controversial in this book—are taken up in the final chapter.

Oakton, Virginia, Dec. 31, 2010
Chapter 1: The Failure of Integration

Meredith Brace of San Diego, California, believed in integration. She lived in a white area, but the neighborhood school, Harding Elementary, was 90 percent Hispanic. She thought whites should go to Harding rather than escape to a white school. Even before her son was old enough to enroll, she joined the Harding PTA, raised money for Harding, and went door-to-door to promote it to white neighbors. After her son began to attend, she became president of the PTA, and set up after-school art and theater classes to bring whites and Hispanics together. They were disbanded because so few people took part.

She kept her son at Harding for three years before finally giving up. “[W]e have nothing in common with Hispanics,” she said. “Every time my husband and I would go over for an event, my husband would feel like it was his first time. We haven’t made any friends.” Her son made no friends either. “He hasn’t been invited to a birthday party,” she explained. “There is absolutely no after-school interaction. For his birthday, he invited four of his classmates. Only one came.”

Mrs. Brace joined her neighbors and transferred her son to Hope Elementary School, which was still 73 percent white. As one white parent explained, “[I]f half of [the neighborhood] is going in that direction, maybe we can carpool.”

It is lunch time at the Westerly Hills Elementary School in Charlotte, North Carolina. Black and white children sit next to each other in what seems to be complete disregard for race. The school appears to have passed what educators call the “lunchroom litmus test,” of whether children make friends across racial lines. But the test is rigged. The children have assigned seats; that is the only way to get blacks and whites to eat together.

Columbia, Maryland, was founded in 1967 as a planned community of upscale homes, where blacks and whites would live together in harmony. It considered itself a model for the country, and in the 1970s, prospective home buyers were proudly told that Columbia’s first baby was born to a mixed-race couple. The town attracted people with an unusual commitment to integration and racial equality, but by the 1990s, blacks and whites had drifted apart. Residents noted that self-segregation was most pronounced among children and teenagers.

David Nicholson, a black writer in the Takoma area of Washington, D.C., tried for a year to get blacks and whites to work together to form a crime-watch network. Race was always a barrier, and he gave up. Mr. Nicholson, who describes himself as a staunch integrationist, concluded:

“If we in Takoma who have worked together so hard to form a community can’t transcend the barriers of racial mistrust and, yes, animosity—I don’t think those words are too strong for the kinds of things I’m writing about—I don’t see much hope for the rest of the city.”

Integration is clearly not progressing the way Americans in the 1960s expected. Two full generations of Americans have been reared with the ideals of racial equality, and yet racial separation is almost as pervasive today as it was 40 or more years ago.

Integration was the cornerstone of America’s great campaign for racial equality, and was sought with equal enthusiasm by blacks and white liberals. For those who were crafting a new racial future, integration was to be the decisive first step towards the transcendence of race.

Today, almost no one uses the word “integration.” Partly, that is because the civil rights struggle completely destroyed Jim Crow and removed all legal barriers to integration. Every law Martin Luther King asked for was passed long ago, and governments at all levels devote enormous efforts to
Another reason why few people talk about integration is that there is not much of it to talk about. Despite the abolition of legal segregation, voluntary, widespread racial mixing is not common. In law and in theory, the United States is a land where race not only does not matter, but one in which it is unlawful for it to matter. There has been no official declaration of defeat, but reality is different. Some Americans live in broadly diverse settings, but many more do not. Americans still say integration is important, but very few do anything to bring it about.

Integration has been of enormous symbolic importance because abolishing legal segregation was to be only the first step. Integration was to be the key to unblocking the racial log-jam, to making the races equal in every respect. But if integration has not worked—has failed to unblock the log-jam—what will?

**THEORY OF INTEGRATION**

The theoretical basis for integration was set out in *An American Dilemma*, written in 1944 by the Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal. With the possible exception of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, no other book has had a greater influence on American thinking about race. *An American Dilemma* went through 25 printings—an astonishing record for a dense, thousand-page work of sociology—before it went into a second, “twentieth anniversary” edition in 1962. It set contours for the debate about race that have lasted virtually unchanged until our own day.

Here is one of the book’s key passages:

White prejudice and discrimination keep the Negro low in standards of living, health, education, manners and morals. This, in its turn, gives support to white prejudice. White prejudice and Negro standards thus mutually ‘cause’ each other.\(^5\)

This was the fundamental problem. Whites kept blacks in an inferior position. Whites then pointed to this apparent inferiority as justification for their own prejudices, which gave rise to the very acts of oppression that degraded blacks.

Myrdal believed that if white attitudes could be reformed, oppression would ease, the status of blacks would rise, white attitudes would improve further, and blacks would find yet more opportunities for success. Myrdal was convinced that if the vicious cycle could be turned into a virtuous cycle it would be “America’s incomparably great opportunity for the future.”\(^6\)

Myrdal’s supporters thought change would come quickly. His assistant, Arnold Rose, added a postscript to the 1962 edition, in which he triumphantly described the progress that had been made since the book’s appearance in 1944. He predicted that all legal discrimination would be abolished within ten years (it actually took only three) and that in 30 years—by 1992—residual private friction between blacks and whites would be “on the minor order of Catholic-Protestant prejudice.”\(^7\)

Rose’s optimism was typical. In 1954, when the Supreme Court outlawed school segregation in its seminal decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, Thurgood Marshall, who argued the case for the black plaintiffs, believed it would take perhaps five years before full school integration was achieved nationwide.\(^8\) Kenneth Clark, the black educator whose work on the psychological effects of segregation on black children helped persuade the Supreme Court to order school desegregation, later recalled, “I confidently expected the segregation problem would be solved by 1960.”\(^9\) In 1968, Robert Kennedy said he believed that “the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together.”\(^10\) Even in that era of optimism, however, there
were warnings that integration would have to be handled carefully. Whites should be exposed to blacks under supervised conditions that made it clear how irrational racial prejudice really was.

Discussions about how blacks and whites were to be brought together came to be known as “contact theory,” and its most prominent spokesman was Gordon Allport. In his 1953 book, *The Nature of Prejudice*, he wrote that prejudice “may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports . . . .”

Schools were the best setting for contact. White children, whose prejudices had not yet hardened, would mix with black children under conditions of equality and strict institutional supervision.

Many believed that integration for children was so important that the opposition of parents should be ignored. James S. Liebman of Columbia law school wrote that in order to protect children from the “tyranny” of their parents they should be required to attend “schools that are not entirely controlled by parents,” where they could be exposed to “a broader range of . . . value options than their parents could hope to provide.” Integrated education was the best way to reform “the malignant hearts and minds of racist white citizens.”

Jennifer Hochschild of Princeton agreed that the stakes were so great they justified limiting the will of the public. Because a majority of Americans did not understand the benefits of integration, democracy should be set aside and Americans “must permit elites to make their choices for them.” She believed parents should be banned from sending children to private schools.

The assumptions of the 1950s were that white adults might not integrate willingly, but their children who went to school with blacks would grow up with enlightened views, and the racial problem would be solved.

Initially, desegregation meant only that blacks could no longer be kept out of white schools, and *Brown* applied only to legally segregated schools in the South. Most school districts duly dismantled legal segregation but made no effort at integration. A few ambitious black parents transferred their children to white schools but whites did not transfer to black schools.

In some places whites resisted the arrival of even a handful of black students, and did so far more stubbornly than in such famous battlegrounds as Little Rock Central High School or the University of Mississippi. In what was known as “massive resistance,” Prince Edward County, Virginia, simply shut down its public schools from 1959 until 1964 rather than admit a single black student.

The era of passive desegregation ended in 1968, when the Supreme Court ruled in *Green v. New Kent County* that Southern schools had to do more than open their doors to a few blacks. They were to be deliberately integrated, with obligatory, race-based student assignment, and the 1971 *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg* decision sanctioned busing as the preferred means. It was not until the 1973 decision of *Keyes v. Denver*, however, that the court ordered race-based assignment of students in school districts that had never practiced legal segregation, and where segregated school attendance merely reflected housing patterns. *Brown* had forbidden consideration of race in school assignment; subsequent court decisions required it. Gordon Allport’s “contact theory” was to be implemented nationwide.

Mandatory school integration was exactly what the sociologists wanted but there was a snag: Whites refused to cooperate. They did not usually object to a few well-behaved black transfer students, but when children from the “bad” part of town started arriving by the busload or when white children were bused across town to black schools, whites abandoned the public schools.

In some cases the change was dramatic. In just seven years, nine high schools in Baltimore went
from all-white to all-black. In Montgomery, Alabama, Sidney Lanier High School, which used to educate the state’s elite, had almost no white students left ten years after the first black enrolled in 1964. This pattern repeated itself all over the country. From 1968 to 1988, the Boston school district went from nearly 70 percent white to 25 percent white. Over the same period, the drop in Milwaukee was from nearly 80 percent to under 40 percent, and in San Diego from nearly 80 percent to just over 40 percent. In only eight years, from 1968 to 1976, a staggering 78 percent of the white students left the Atlanta public schools, while white enrollment in Detroit and San Francisco dropped by 61 percent. By 1992, only 15 percent of the students in the Houston public schools were white.

These dry statistics reflect tremendous disruption in countless communities, as whites pulled up stakes and moved to the suburbs or as wives went to work to pay for private school. One of the ironies of busing is that in many cases, it drove blacks and whites further apart. When whites fled to the suburbs, it put even more physical distance between the races. In 1991, the Supreme Court began to relieve the pressure on public schools to assign students by race, and subsequent decisions left only a few permissible grounds for racial balancing. However, by then, busing had transformed America’s big-city school districts into almost exclusively black and Hispanic preserves. By school year 2006-2007, the white percentage was down to single digits in some of the country’s major urban districts: Atlanta—9.0 percent; Los Angeles—8.8 percent; Dade County (Miami)—8.5 percent; Houston—8.3 percent; Baltimore—7.7 percent; Chicago—7.3 percent; Washington, DC—5.7 percent; Dallas—5.0 percent; San Antonio—3.0 percent; Detroit—2.4 percent.

Forced integration thus prompted a colossal change in the American cityscape. The race riots of the 1960s helped push whites out of cities, but school busing, which went on year after year, probably pushed out even more. More than a half century after *Brown*, most whites still refuse to attend schools that are majority non-white. During the 2006-2007 school year, only 13 percent of white students attended such schools.

It would be wrong to think that busing was a complete failure, however. Not all whites were willing to move or could pay for private school, and some welcomed integration. But national studies show that school integration peaked in the late 1980s. Integration had the greatest impact on the South, where the number of blacks attending majority-white schools went from zero in 1954 to a remarkable 43 percent in 1988. By 2001, the figure had dropped to 30 percent, or the level of 1969. Nevertheless, even as it resegregates, the South continues to have the most racially integrated schools in the country.

The Harvard Civil Rights Project reported that in 1968, 77 percent of blacks were attending schools that were 50 to 100 percent minority, but integration programs lowered that figure to 63 percent in 1980. By 2005—25 years later—the figure had climbed back up to 75 percent, almost back to the 1968 level. Hispanics were even more cut off from whites in 2005, with 78 percent attending majority-non-white schools. In an extensive analysis of 185 school districts with enrollments of more than 25,000, the Harvard Civil Rights Project also found that black students increased their exposure to whites in only four districts during the 14-year period ending in 2001.

A Scripps Howard study of US Department of Education records found that the percentage of non-white children enrolled in schools that were 90 percent non-white rose in 36 of the 50 states between
Another Harvard research project concluded bluntly that by 2004, American schools were just as segregated as they were in 1969, the year after Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated. The 2009 report from the Civil Rights Project (which moved from Harvard to UCLA in 2007) repeated the same theme: “The U.S. continues to move backward,” and black and Hispanic students are more separated from whites than at any time since the civil rights movement.

The charter school movement gives parents greater choice by allowing considerable leeway in standards and curricula. For blacks, this often means self-segregation and the promotion of racial consciousness. In 2010, the Civil Rights Project found that 70 percent of all black charter students attend schools in which fewer than 10 percent of the students are white, and that 43 percent of black charter students attend schools with essentially no whites at all. This was two to three times the rate of racial isolation for blacks in non-charter schools: 36 percent in high-minority enrollment schools, and 15 percent in virtually all-minority schools.

By 2007 there were 3,500 charter schools, but many were struggling because their innovations had failed. Not the black charters, said Michael Piscal, whose Inner City Foundation operates schools in Los Angeles. “The momentum we’re building is tremendous,” he said, noting that there were thousands of names on the waiting lists of black schools. One example in Chicago was Urban Prep Charter Academy for Young Men, which opened its doors in 2006 to a student body that was 100 percent black.

The trend towards segregation has been sharper in some places than in others. In Boston in 1967, the average black student attended a school that was 32 percent white; in 2003 he attended a school that was 11 percent white, and 61 percent of black students attended schools that were at least 90 percent non-white. That same year in New York State, 60 percent of black students attended schools that were at least 90 percent black.

Some school districts have come almost full circle. In 1953 in Atlanta, just before the Brown decision, the student population was majority white but blacks and whites were kept apart by law. Fifty years later, in 2006-2007, there were so few white students left—only 9 percent—that there was hardly any more integration than during legal segregation.

In Michigan, close to 75 percent of black students attend schools that are at least 80 percent black. “You would think after 50 years we would see some progress,” said David Plank, co-director of the Education Policy Center at Michigan State University. “In Michigan, there hasn’t been any progress.”

At one time, “magnet schools” were supposed to solve the problem of white flight by making some urban public schools so attractive they would lure back whites who had fled to the suburbs. This approach has failed.

Kansas City, Missouri, is the most prominent case of a heroic magnet effort. A federal judge took over the school district in 1985, and made the city pay nearly $2 billion for the most grandiose schools in America. Over the next 12 years, Kansas City got 15 new schools with such things as television and animation studios, a model United Nations with simultaneous interpreting equipment, a robotics lab, a planetarium, a mock court room with jury deliberation rooms, an Olympic-sized swimming pool with an underwater viewing room, and field trips to Mexico and Senegal. A former Soviet Olympic fencing coach was hired for a high school team. There was a $900,000 television campaign to tell whites about the new improvements, and if white students were not on a bus route,
the city sent taxis for them. It didn’t work. By 1997, when Kansas City finally gave up, it had the most extravagant schools in the country, but the percentage of whites was lower than ever and blacks’ test scores had not budged. Since then, despite the gold-plated schools, the district has lost so many students—down from 35,000 in 2000 to under 18,000 in 2010—that it was near bankruptcy and considering closing nearly half its schools just to stay afloat.

Los Angeles had 162 magnet schools in 2006, but of that number 87 were virtually all black or Hispanic. Almost all of the ones that were considered integrated—where whites were at least 30 percent—were well outside of central Los Angeles, in areas where whites lived anyway. John Garham, who was the district specialist for the magnet effort, conceded that “we are not ever going to be able to get the white population to come into certain areas.”

Once a Los Angeles school takes on a certain character, whites will not attend even if it is next door. In 2000, Crescent Heights Elementary School was beefed up with special programs in the hope of attracting whites who lived nearby, but in 2006, there were only three white students out of 350. “White parents would come and see all these African American children and say, ‘I don’t want my child to be the only white child in the school’, ” explained Sharon Curry, who helped develop the enriched programs.

San Francisco’s school district rapidly began to resegregate in 2001 after a lawsuit overturned race-based student assignments. In 2001-2002, there were 30 schools in which one race made up 60 percent or more of at least one grade. Just three years later there were 50 such schools.

An unwillingness to associate with blacks has long been considered a sign of lower-class closed-mindedness, but a 2006 study by Michael Emerson and David Sikkink of Rice University found that the more education white parents had, the more likely they were to rule out schools for their children simply because of the number of blacks. Only after they had eliminated heavily-black schools did they then compare the remaining schools’ test scores and graduation rates. “Our study arrived at a very sad and profound conclusion,” said Dr. Emerson. “More formal education is not the answer to racial segregation in this country.”

Whites are no happier about schools with large numbers of Hispanics. In most big cities, whites have not even noticed the arrival of Hispanics because they abandoned the public schools in the 1970s and 1980s. It is a different matter when Hispanics appear in rural areas with few blacks. “White flight” has come to places that had never experienced it.

Meatpacking plants in Nebraska towns such as Schuyler, Lexington, South Sioux City, and Madison have drawn many Hispanic workers whose children attend public schools. In Schuyler, for example, the Hispanic influx pushed total enrollment up 19 percent from 1993 to 2003—while white enrollment dropped by half.

White flight usually means moving to better schools, but not always. Monta Vista High School and Lynbrook High School in Cupertino, California, are known for their stellar academic records, but whites have almost disappeared there, too. Why? The schools are almost 100 percent Asian. Whites tend to think Asian children are grinds with no social life, but many simply feel out of place. As superintendent Steve Rowley explained, “Kids who are white feel themselves a distinct minority against a majority culture.” Whites in San Francisco also began avoiding schools that became heavily Chinese.
Not all schools are starkly segregated. In 2004, Evanston Township High School, in the Chicago suburb of Evanston, was a rare example of what Brown was supposed to bring about: It was 48 percent white, 39 percent black, and 9 percent Hispanic. But like many other schools, Evanston Township High had discovered that getting students of different races in the door was not the same as getting them to mix. Students gravitated to different sports teams and clubs, ate lunch at segregated tables, and even left school by different doors. Interracial dating was rare, and there were two non-school-sponsored dances—the Cotillion and the Ebony Ball—that only highlighted the racial divide. As sophomore Paul Schroeder summed up the Evanston experience, “We all go to the same school, but that is pretty much it.”

Many schools are therefore integrated only on paper. Kim Davis, a white senior at Palmetto High School in southern Florida, explained how students socialize: “The whites hang out with the whites; the blacks hang out with the blacks.”

During the 1990s, Montclair, New Jersey, with a population that was just over 30 percent black, was a New York City suburb favored by people who wanted racial diversity. Many of their children did not. “Diversity for me means that I sit next to a black in homeroom,” said a white girl at Montclair High School, which was 52 percent black. “It’s really an aberration when I have any meaningful contact with a black kid.” A black girl echoed her sentiments: “Interracial dating? No way.”

Shaker Heights, Ohio, has made a tremendous effort to encourage racial mixing in its high school. Everything from yearbook photos to class assignments to spots on the ice hockey team has been an elaborate racial balancing act. Students would still not socialize across racial lines. As one white student explained, “If you sit with blacks, your friends would say, ‘Why are you hanging out with those other people?’”

At Toombs County High School in Lyons, Georgia, separation was formalized in a tradition of segregated proms that began in the 1970s. In 2004, the school added a third prom—for Hispanics. Turner County High School in Ashburn, Georgia, also has segregated proms. “The white people have theirs, and the black people have theirs,” explained one graduate. “It’s nothing racial at all.”

Montgomery County High School in Georgia has held separate “black-folks proms” and “white-folks proms” ever since the county schools were integrated in 1971. Taylor County High School in Butler, Georgia, broke with a 31-year tradition in 2002 and tried an integrated prom. In 2003, the 55-percent black 45-percent white school switched back to separate proms. Petersburg High School in Petersburg, Virginia, was integrated in the early 1970s, but class reunions, which the alumni organize themselves, are segregated, reflecting the reality of what it was like to be a student.

The school district in the town of Nettleton, Florida, had a different kind of segregation, to ensure that blacks and whites were equally represented in student elective offices: only blacks could be candidates in one year, and only whites the next year. This system worked well for 30 years until, in 2010, the mother of a half-white, half-American Indian child complained. The school district got national attention and changed its rules.

No combination of races appears to integrate comfortably. In 2007, Bolsa Grande High School in Garden Grove, California was 52 percent Vietnamese and 37 percent Hispanic. Far from mixing, there was underlying hostility. Seventeen-year-old Ivan Hernandez explained that conflicts could be avoided when groups stay apart. “I really don’t know many Vietnamese because I don’t hang out with them,” he said.
“That seems to be a pattern that’s happened all over the country,” said Will Antell, a former desegregation official for the state of Minnesota. When races separate “they’re coming back to join their cohorts. . . . It’s on being with young people like themselves.”

Many schools encourage mixing, but students usually pay no attention. A black student, LaShana Lee, wrote about how her Atlanta school celebrated Mix It Up Day, a national project that encourages students to cross racial lines:

Mix It Up Day was just another failed attempt to get all students to “step outside the box.” No one was really willing to sit with different people. Everyone took it as some sort of joke, and the majority of students understood we wouldn’t actually participate.

Cleavages often harden over time. A long-term study of schools in Riverside, California, concluded that “after five years of desegregation and after most of the fourth- to sixth-graders had been desegregated from the beginning of their schooling, minority children were less likely to be chosen as friends by whites than at the beginning of desegregation.”

Some studies have found that teaching first-graders in mixed-race groups encourages them to play together in similar groups. By the third grade, however, it makes no difference; the children separate at playtime no matter how they are taught.

Increased integration can actually inhibit mixing. If a school has only a few minority students they have no choice but to mix with the majority. “When you get larger minority populations, they reach a size where you can have a viable single-race community,” explained James Moody of Ohio State University. He noted that one way to prevent teenagers from choosing friends of the same race is to segregate schools as much as possible by grade. That way, people who like to skateboard, for example, have to make friends within their own grade rather than do what comes more naturally and find same-race friends in different grades.

Some schools deliberately separate the races for some purposes. When administrators explain to parent groups that white and Asian students are doing better academically than blacks and Hispanics, the information may go down better in segregated parents’ groups. Mary Perry of EdSource, an education nonprofit group, explains that this can be best “when people’s perspectives are so far apart.” Some schools take the same approach with students. Laguna Creek High School in Elk Grove, California, for example, holds racially separate “heritage assemblies” to encourage students to do better on standardized tests. At Ames Elementary School in St. Paul, Minnesota, Principal Delores Henderson separates her students into groups of blacks, whites, Hispanics, and Hmong, so each can hear a pep talk from someone of their own race before taking important standardized tests.

Because there is pent-up demand for it, some teachers quietly offer segregated schooling. Whites fled the Dallas public schools when a judge ordered integration in 1971, and Preston Hollow Elementary School became an overwhelmingly black and Hispanic enclave in the middle of a wealthy, white neighborhood. Over a period of several years, however, white students drifted back to Preston Hollow, thanks to an unwritten policy of grouping whites in all-white classes in a separate wing. The PTA printed school brochures full of photographs of white children, and when white parents toured the school, teachers did not take them through the black and Hispanic wings. Affluent whites started sending their children to Preston Hollow, became active in the PTA, and raised money for new library books and playground equipment.

As a practical matter, this could be considered a success, but it was illegal, and a Hispanic parent sued. When an inspector came by, Principal Teresa Parker mixed up the classes to give the impression of integration. The truth came out, however, and a judge ordered Miss Parker to stop
segregating the children and to pay $20,200 to the plaintiff.64

Once students get to college they are almost entirely free from integrationist pressures. In fact, the intense way in which universities promote “diversity” sharpens dividing lines. Many campuses have special orientations for minorities that begin a week or two early. This gives blacks and Hispanics a chance to bond with people of their own race before whites arrive. Ethnic theme dormitories are widespread, as are student clubs for different racial and ethnic groups.65

Some schools take the opposite approach and try to foster inter-racial friendship by assigning freshmen of different races to share dormitory rooms. However, Russell H. Fazio of Ohio State University found that on his campus, mixed-race roommate pairs broke up before the end of the first quarter twice as often as same-race pairs. He found that even more would have separated if university housing policies did not make it nearly impossible to change housing assignments. In a similar study at Indiana University-Bloomington, Dr. Fazio found that mixed-race roommates were three times more likely to break up than same-race pairs, and that both non-whites and whites opposed being forced together.66

On many campuses, fraternities are the equivalent of segregated high-school proms. The 15 “traditionally white” sororities at the University of Alabama got their first black sister in 2003. Three years later, she was still the only black face. The 30 “traditionally white” fraternities had likewise admitted only one or two blacks. The black fraternities remained 100 percent black.67

A graduate of Northwestern University near Chicago summed up what may be a common experience. When asked by Newsweek about racial hostilities on campus, she replied, “I don’t remember any overt racial hostilities. You need a certain amount of contact to have hostilities.”68

After four years of separation on campus, at some schools minorities can graduate in separate ceremonies. At the University of California at Los Angeles, it has become difficult to schedule all the ethnic graduations. There is one for blacks, one for Chicanas/Chicanos (Mexicans), and one for the entire Hispanic raza (race). UCLA used to make do with an Asian-Pacific Islander ceremony, but now it has separate graduations for Filipinos and Vietnamese, and there was talk of one for Cambodians.69

Outside of California, there may not be enough Filipinos or Vietnamese for separate ceremonies, but special graduations for blacks are common. In 2002, when Michigan State University rolled out a black graduation to keep pace with the University of Michigan, Eastern Michigan, Wayne State, and Oakland University, a few whites criticized it as “separatist.” Supporters argued that black graduation rates were so low that anyone who got through deserved special recognition.70

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

The larger purpose of school integration was to solve the American dilemma, but integration had three specific goals of its own: Lift black academic achievement, raise black self-esteem, and give black and white children better impressions of each other. There have now been hundreds of studies of the effects of school integration, and none of these goals has been achieved.

James S. Coleman is probably the best-known authority on the effects of integration on black achievement. During the 1960s and early 1970s, he was so enthusiastic about integration’s potential benefits to blacks that he became known as “The Scholar Who Inspired Busing.”71 By the mid-1970s, however, after integrated education had produced more than a decade’s worth of research, Coleman
was forced to concede that his expectations had been wrong and that integration did not improve black academic performance. Nancy St. John was another pro-integration scholar who reluctantly changed her views. In a 1975 review of 120 studies she found that the most that could be said for black academic achievement was that test scores did not decline after large-scale integration.

The scholarship of the subsequent 35 years has produced the same results. As an exhaustive 2002 survey reported, “there is not a single example in the published literature of a comprehensive racial balance plan that has improved black achievement or that has reduced the black-white achievement gap significantly.” A 2003 book devoted entirely to the racial gap in school achievement concluded:

Whether African-American students attended schools that were 10 percent black or 70 percent black, the racial gap remained roughly the same . . . . If every school precisely mirrored the demographic profile of the nation’s entire student population, the level of black and Hispanic achievement would not change.

The black-white (as well as the Hispanic-white) achievement gap narrowed somewhat during the 1980s, but began to grow again during the 1990s. The most likely explanation for the modest gains appears to have been the greater resources that were devoted to inner-city schools and to the education of all minorities. Integration itself seems to have had little effect.

Black self-esteem, another goal of integration, has not improved either. Blacks generally have higher levels of self-esteem than whites, and integration appears to lower them. Black children generally do not perform as well in school as white children. They discover this in a mixed setting, whereas in an all-black school, the children with the best grades are, of course, black.

Findings on relations between the races are not promising. As Rebecca Bigler of the University of Texas points out, “Going to integrated schools gives you just as many chances to learn stereotypes as to unlearn them.” A summary of the results of many studies shows that after integration, whites are as likely to have a worse view of blacks as an improved view. These, moreover, are the findings among whites who have remained in integrated schools and who are probably more likely than those who left to have a favorable view of blacks.

The proportions of the racial mix seem to make a difference. Race relations are best when whites are a small minority, since whites do not try to assert themselves, and must conform to black-majority standards. Black-white relations are reportedly worst when schools are 20 to 40 percent black.

**SEGREGATION IN HOUSING**

The advocates of school integration thought it would succeed because they believed children do not see race. They were wrong. Children separated themselves by race even in places such as Shaker Heights and Montclair, where parents wanted them to mix. Many children, however, had no choice but to separate because their parents moved to the suburbs or put them in private schools. It was both parents and children, therefore, who defeated integration.

Now that the Supreme Court has virtually ruled out race-based student assignment, the country is reverting to what was common in the North before the *Brown* decision: neighborhood schools that reflect segregated housing patterns. This has left integrationists hoping forlornly for a virtuous cycle reminiscent of the one Gunnar Myrdal was hoping for a half century earlier. As Brian Stults of the University of Florida at Gainesville explained: “It’s sort of a chicken-and-egg problem: We need...
integration in schools to lessen prejudice, which will then reduce residential segregation, but in order to have school integration, we need residential integration.”

Theoretically, integration could have been promoted on two fronts, with forcible integration of both schools and housing. The same contact-theory arguments could have been made to justify requiring families to choose housing in ways that increased integration. No one seriously considered this, partly because there would have been furious resistance, and partly because integrationists believed residential integration would naturally follow school integration. Governments made it illegal to discriminate in housing rental or sales, but no laws could prevent voluntary clustering by race.

How segregated are housing patterns? There is no agreement on the best measure of housing segregation, and depending on the method used, it can appear to wax or wane. One large-scale study carried out by the State University of New York at Albany used a “segregation index,” which runs from zero to 100. Zero would mean completely random housing patterns, or complete integration, while 100 would be complete separation. Any number over 60 is considered “highly segregated.” According to this analysis of 2000 census data, the national segregation index dropped during the 1990s from 69.4 to 65.1. However, the segregation index for children rose from 65.5 to 68.3. As the researchers noted, single people are more willing to live in mixed neighborhoods, but people with children seek homogeneity.

A different census data study, carried out by the Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, reached the opposite conclusion about the decade of the 1990s: that housing segregation increased. “We’re not more integrated—that’s the bottom line,” explained John Logan of the center. He argued that in cities such as New York and Chicago, black-white housing patterns have not changed since the 1920s. “You might have thought the black civil-rights movement or the rise of the black middle class or changing racial attitudes surely by now would have made a difference,” he said, but they have not.

One trend he found during the 1990s was that minority groups were slightly more likely to live closer to each other—Hispanics and blacks, or Asians and Hispanics—but that by 2000, whites were no more likely than in 1990 to have non-white neighbors. In reporting on this study, the Christian Science Monitor concluded that “children of the early 21st century will likely grow up isolated from people of other ethnic groups—much as the children of the early 20th century did.”

A study that looked at 240 metropolitan areas during the 20-year period from 1980 to 2000 found that black/white segregation, already high, increased in just 15 areas. Hispanic/white segregation, however, increased in 124 and declined in 86, and Asian/white segregation increased in 69 metropolitan areas and declined in 47. The study’s author, Brian Stults of the University of Florida at Gainesville, found that although blacks made considerable economic gains in comparison to whites during the 1990s, “it was particularly surprising that we saw no [neighborhood integration] effect from the growing convergence of black and white incomes.”

Federal law prohibits realtors from answering questions from home-buyers about a neighborhood’s racial makeup, income levels, crime rates, or school quality. Also, the federal government often offers subsidies for low-income housing only on condition that units be built in majority-white areas so as to promote integration. Without these measures, segregation indices would be even higher.

One town famous for bucking the tendency to separate is Shaker Heights, Ohio, which continues its unparalleled, decades-long commitment to residential integration and meaningful contact. Since the 1960s, it has fought white flight with task forces, oversight committees, community associations, and
Social events, all designed to monitor and maintain integration. The town of 30,000 has even been known to check on block parties to make sure they are suitably integrated. In 1985, corporations and philanthropists established the Fund for the Future of Shaker Heights, which offers subsidized loans and down payments for home purchases that will help the races mix. Judy Rawson, who was mayor of Shaker Heights in 2002, said her job was a constant racial balancing act. “It’s something you have to be sensitive to, and this community talks constantly about race,” she explained. As two authors who have researched the problems of integration explain, “Other like-minded communities find this total commitment to integration hard to replicate, try as they might.”

With its well-established reputation, Shaker Heights has attracted people who very much want integration to work, but success is never guaranteed. The black population is rising—from 24 percent in 1980 to 34 percent in 2000—and in 2008 the high school was 55 percent black and 39 percent white. The part of town bordering on Cleveland has become heavily black, and demographers forecast trouble. “The biggest threat to an integrated community is resegregation,” said Chip Bromley, a fair housing advocate in Cleveland Heights. “There’s a sense of fatigue of it all and a sense that whites will give up on it . . . that they’ll escape.”

In early 2008, Shaker Heights residents were shocked when six blacks attacked a white lawyer out for a walk and nearly beat him to death. As fear rippled through the community, a columnist for the Cleveland Plain Dealer gave whites blunt advice: “So move. But do it like we all have—like the whole three-county area has—don’t call it racism. Call it reality.”

The vast majority of whites think about integration only when they are forced to. Emily Hauser described what it was like to walk into a black neighborhood just a few blocks from her upper-middle-class Chicago suburb of Oak Park:

“As I stepped over the curb, I became excruciatingly aware of my skin color, and my heart pounded with social anxiety. In going around a single block, I got stares. Mine was the only white face around, and for five minutes, five blocks from my home, I was a stranger in a strange land . . .

We’re not integrated. We’re strangers.”

There are probably no white journalists in America who would say they chose their houses because they were in white neighborhoods, but that, in effect, is what they do. Peter Brown of the Orlando Sentinel looked up the zip codes of 3,400 journalists, and found that they cluster in upscale neighborhoods, far from inner cities. More than one-third of Washington Post reporters live in just four fancy D.C. suburbs. Television personality Chris Matthews routinely promotes integration, and Ted Koppel hectored whites who live apart from blacks. Where do they live? Mr. Matthews in 95-percent white Chevy Case, and Mr. Koppel in Potomac, also in Maryland, which had a black population of 3.9 percent.

Perhaps these men thought they lived inside their television sets. Sociologist Charles Gallagher of La Salle University has noted that television advertising is a “carefully manufactured racial utopia . . . that is far afield of reality,” where everyone has black and Hispanic neighbors with whom they discuss which brand of toothpaste is best. Jerome D. Williams, a professor of advertising and African American studies at the University of Texas at Austin also laughs at advertisers’ depictions of American life, adding that “if you look at the United States in terms of where we live and who our friends are and where we go to church, we live in different worlds.”

How do worlds separate? New subdivisions often start out with a kind of de facto integration. They do not have established reputations, and people buy houses based on price and location.
York Times columnist David Brooks explains, however, that as neighborhoods mature, they develop personalities—this is where the Hispanics live, that is where the Asians live—and that racial personalities harden over time.\textsuperscript{97}

There is pressure to deny this. ABC Television had to drop a reality program that let a white family outside of Austin, Texas, decide which of seven competing families would get to move into a free, four-bedroom, 2½ bath house next door. Through interviews and contact of various kinds, the white family had eliminated all the “diverse” options—blacks, Asians, Hispanics, and a homosexual couple—and was going to choose the white family as their new neighbors. When word leaked out about this realistic ending, “fair housing” activists badgered ABC into canceling the program.\textsuperscript{98}

\textbf{REGIONAL SEGREGATION}

The impulse to separate has not changed from the white-flight days of the 1960s, but whites now have to flee farther. William Frey, a demographer at the Brookings Institution, is perhaps the leading expert on the increasingly regional nature of residential segregation. “In the past, people could move to a community five minutes away,” he explained. “Now, those communities aren’t very different from the places they are trying to get away from. So they have to move a much longer distance, even to another state.”\textsuperscript{99}

If California is the future of the United States, Los Angeles may offer a lesson. In 1960, it was 72 percent white, but in just ten years that figure dropped to 59 percent, and by 2000 the city was only 33 percent white. During the 1980s, while every other racial group was gaining in numbers, Los Angeles County lost 330,000 whites, and a startling 570,000 during the 1990s.\textsuperscript{100} Where did they go?

Beginning in the 1980s, California saw a major shift of whites from southern, immigrant-heavy regions to the white north.\textsuperscript{101} Many moved to Nevada County, which Mel Mouser, the police chief of the town of Grass Valley, called “the largest concentration of Caucasians in the state of California.” In the 15 years ending in 1995, the county’s population grew by no less than 65 percent and remained 93 percent white. The newcomers were looking for the kind of homogeneity they grew up with but had lost to immigrants. As Chief Mouser explained, the newcomers “bring with them the common strain of thought: Don’t let it be like where I came from.”\textsuperscript{102}

Although Americans have learned to give non-racial reasons like “crime” or “bad schools” for leaving cities, many ex-Los Angelenos were candid about what drove them away. As one 1990s transplant explained, “People come here for a timeout, to go some place where racial problems don’t exist. . . . And when they find it here, they’re pathetically grateful. They want to protect it.” Another explained: “I’d look at my daughter’s classroom and see two blondes. . . . It seemed like there was more of everything else but whites.”\textsuperscript{103}

Whites who did not head north increasingly locked themselves into private, walled-off communities. During the early 1990s, an estimated one third of all new real estate developments in southern California were gated, self-policing enclaves.\textsuperscript{104} As Elias Lopez, a state demographer explained, “California overall is getting more diverse but people with similar backgrounds are clustering in certain areas.”\textsuperscript{105}

Many Californians left the state. “This used to be a white, middle-class, bedroom community,” Cloyd Moody said of his native San Gabriel in Southern California, which has become majority Asian and heavily Hispanic. In 1996, he moved 1,000 miles to a town outside Seattle. “I’m livid that
I had to leave the place where I was born and raised,” he added. California used to be a magnet for Americans from other states, but no more. Even as foreigners poured in during the 1990s, the state lost more native-born Americans than it gained. Seventy percent of the people who left the state were white. This trend continued into the new century. Between 2000 and 2008, the state lost more than half a million white people, even as immigrants boosted the total state population by nearly three million.

Many whites are moving to the country. From the 1940s to the 1980s, rural America lost population: 1.4 million in the 1980s alone. Now it is gaining. Between 1990 and 1995, there was net migration of more than 1.6 million people to rural areas and small towns. Most came from cities and suburbs, and almost all were white. John Kasarda of the University of North Carolina says, “It is a move to remove as far as possible from the inner-city poor areas. It’s both avoidance and flight.”

Herbert Johnson sells real estate in the small Alabama town of Bayou La Batre. “People don’t put up a billboard and announce that they are coming because of immigrants,” he says, “but you can tell what’s on their mind.”

From 1990 to 1996, 3.3 million new immigrants streamed into just 10 metropolitan areas. During the same period, 3.6 million people, most of them native-born whites, moved out of them to other states. Demographer William Frey called this the “push factor.”

Journalist Jonathan Tilove notes that of the 157 counties that grew by 40 percent or more in the 1990s, more than two-thirds were at least 80 percent white, and more than a third were at least 90 percent white. For refugees from the immigrant-attracting cities, he said these places “could be called white meccas.” A 2009 book about whites searching for the comfort of white-majority living calls such places “whitopias.”

Robert Bullard, a sociologist at the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, explains the exodus: “[Whites] are moving farther and farther out, and the counties that are now the growth machines are the ones that people know: ‘That’s not where people of color are.’ ”

It would be wrong, however, to assume that everyone displaced by immigration is white. Aldra Henry-Allison, who is black, spent her whole life in South Central Los Angeles. In 1998 she moved to the suburbs, complaining that the neighborhood had completely changed. “The only people left are elderly blacks my parents’ age and young Hispanic immigrants,” she explained. “I feel out of sync here.”

Rebecca Watkins is of American Indian heritage, but moved out of a small town near Yakima, Washington, when she had a violent encounter with Mexican immigrants. “We lost our country once because of immigrants,” she said. “And now I feel like we’re losing our country again.”

Mohawk Indians in Montreal’s Kahnawake Reserve plan to keep their community Indian. In 1981 they banned all non-Indians, even those married to Mohawks. Couples in mixed marriages could split up or move out. In 2010, tribal authorities gave eviction notices to the approximately 25 non-Indians who had crept back onto the reserve.

Since the 19th century, the Cherokee have considered the descendants of their black slaves to be full members of the tribe, and in 2006, the Cherokee supreme court reaffirmed black membership. In 2007, however, the tribe as a whole overruled its court and voted to expel all 2,800 black members.
WHAT CAUSES SEGREGATION?

It is conventional to assume that segregation is caused by the refusal of whites to live with non-whites, and by malign forces that confine minorities in enclaves. Indeed, a 1993 book on housing segregation is entitled *American Apartheid.* However, how realistic is it to think that all blacks want white neighbors, or that Asians want to live with Hispanics?

When asked point-blank, ordinary Americans do not show much reverence for integration. A survey of Californians conducted by Berkeley’s Institute of Governmental Studies found that majorities of whites, Hispanics, blacks, and Asians agreed with the statement that “people are happier when segregated.”

When the NAACP and Hamilton College commissioned a poll of “Generation X” opinions on race in 1999, they found that about half of 18- to 29-year-olds (52 percent of whites, 40 percent of blacks) agreed with the statement that “it’s OK if the races are basically separate from one another as long as everyone has equal opportunity.”

Scholars are beginning to understand that segregation does not reflect the preferences of whites alone. A study by the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council reported in 2004 that “choice plays an important role in persistent boundaries of segregation,” adding that people commonly seek “cultural affinity” when they look for homes. William Tisdale, president of the council, warned that researchers should realize that many people—not just whites—prefer segregation.

As the nation diversifies, the homogeneous communities that people seem to prefer become increasingly fine grained. When immigrants become landlords, many rent only to people from their own country. Apartment buildings can become entirely Korean, Salvadoran, or Guatemalan, for example. Immigrant landlords are often unaware of non-discrimination laws, and do not hesitate to tell others they are not welcome. A lawyer for Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles noted that some managers rent only to people from a particular state of Mexico, adding, “Our fair housing laws haven’t even anticipated that.”

Many blacks have a similar preference for community. They fought for integration when segregation kept them out of washrooms, lunch counters, hotels, and neighborhoods. Now that they can eat, sleep, live, or be entertained wherever they can afford it, many have lost interest in racial mixing.

Middle-class blacks have enough money to choose from many different majority-white neighborhoods but many would rather live among blacks. In the Atlanta area, blacks cluster in suburbs southwest of the city in DeKalb County. “It’s not a separatist thing,” says sociologist Robert Bullard of Clark Atlanta University. “It’s a choice to be whole.” Eddie Long, bishop of New Birth Missionary Church in southeast DeKalb County, said his congregation thinks of the black suburbs as the “promised land,” explaining that many members “wanted their children to grow up in a nurturing black community.”

A black journalist wrote about a backyard gathering in an affluent, black Atlanta suburb. The party suddenly went silent when a realtor’s car, bearing a white couple, cruised slowly down the street. “I hope they don’t find anything they like,” said one of the guests; “otherwise, there goes the neighborhood.”

An analysis of Northern New Jersey by the Newark *Star-Ledger* found a similar trend. Of the
13,000 black families in the area making more than $114,000 per year—which put them in the top fifth on the state’s income brackets—two thirds chose to live in mostly black neighborhoods. “This is surprising to people,” said sociologist John Logan of Brown University, “and it’s hard to accept that race is still a very important barrier.”

Race is not a barrier; it is a choice.

Azurest is a seaside community of 119 families near Sag Harbor, New York. It was established in 1947 as a vacation retreat for blacks who were not welcome in white resorts. It is now the preferred summering spot for wealthy blacks who could afford to go anywhere but prefer to vacation among other blacks. Those who have owned property in Azurest include Earl G. Graves, publisher of *Black Enterprise* magazine and Alma Brown, widow of Ron Brown, who was commerce secretary in the Clinton administration. “This is a historically black community,” said Lynn Hendy, president of the property owners association. “I’d like it to stay that way.”

When a New York City property boom in the 1990s priced many whites out of fashionable parts of Manhattan, some started moving into Harlem. “I have a problem with that,” said Karlena Byers, a black teacher. Activists passed out flyers that said, “Once this community leaves Black, it ain’t ever going back.”

In southern California it is Hispanics whom blacks want to keep out. They do not like ranchera music or neighbors who keep chickens, or who park their cars on the front lawn. They resent soccer players taking over public parks. As one president of a black homeowners association in South Central Los Angeles described the influx, “It’s a different culture, a different breed of people. They don’t have the same values. You can’t get together with them. It’s like mixing oil and water.”

Most black neighborhoods grew out of segregation or developed haphazardly, but some have been designed to be black from the start. A brand new, up-scale St. Petersburg, Florida, subdivision called Ahali (the Swahili word for family) filled up immediately with the black elite: the head of the NAACP chapter, school principals, doctors, and lawyers. As each new house was sold, residents gathered for an impromptu celebration of their growing “family.”

One argument blacks give for living in black areas is that it means their political representatives will be black. As Michael Bennett of DePaul University explained, “You’re not going to have the same kind of political clout to elect reps or run for office in [largely white] Barrington as you would in the south suburbs [of Chicago], where you can elect a Jesse Jackson, Jr.”

Jeff Johnson, a personality on Black Entertainment Television, is tired of integrationist pretense: “This whole notion of a post-racial society is ridiculous, we need to stop saying it, we need to stop even talking about it. Let’s be honest about the fact that many of us from all races are racist. . . . We’ve lied about progress.”

Many blacks simply prefer to be around other blacks. As one reader wrote to the *Philadelphia Inquirer*:

> There is nothing wrong with segregation. Most African Americans with good sense want the same social relations that most whites want. We don’t want them living in our neighborhoods. We don’t want our children going to school with theirs. We don’t want our daughters and sons marrying their sons and daughters. No thanks . . . .
>
> We don’t need tea and cookies and fireside chats with white people. We don’t have to pretend we like one another to have good relations.

Separatism has come full circle, and blacks are often its most vocal spokesmen. In the past, many blacks were convinced that in order to get a fair share of the money spent on public education—or even a proper education at all—their children had to go to school with whites. Now, with many states
ensuring adequate funding for all schools, and with many blacks in controlling positions on school boards, this is no longer a great concern. By the 1990s, many blacks were increasingly conscious of the costs and disruptions of busing. If black children could get good educations without integration, increasing numbers of blacks saw no need for it.

In 1997, Amos Quick, a member of a citizens committee appointed to redraw school districts in the Greensboro, North Carolina, area, expressed an increasingly typical view: “Separate but truly equal would not be so bad.” In 1995, Edward Newsome, a black member of the Kansas City, Missouri, school board went further: “I think desegregation is dead and should have died a long time ago.” Likewise in 1995, a black law professor, Alex Johnson of the University of Virginia, went so far as to say “Brown [the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation ruling] was a mistake.” He argued that school integration “destroyed the black cultural community.” Harry Edwards, a black sociology professor at the University of California at Berkeley, says that integration “has not been approached or achieved because nobody wants it. Blacks have always wanted to associate with themselves.”

Doris Wilkinson was the first black to enter the University of Kentucky after the 1954 Brown decision, but lost faith in integration, which she calls an “absolute, abysmal failure.” Now a sociologist at the University of Kentucky, she said she looked forward to neighborhood schools that reflect residential segregation. “I hope we get those schools with all deliberate speed,” she said, quoting the Brown ruling.

Leslie Innis, on the faculty at Florida A&M, was one of the first blacks to integrate New Orleans’ Catholic schools, but now thinks the struggle was misguided. She believes that so long as it is voluntary there is nothing wrong with segregation. She says students tell her “they prefer to be around people they feel more comfortable with.”

Even the NAACP, which was the plaintiff in hundreds of school integration cases, no longer has its heart in the struggle. Although the policy of the national organization continues to favor mandatory integration, there have been revolts in local chapters—Bergen and Hackensack, New Jersey; Yonkers, New York—where black parents lost patience with busing and argued that high quality neighborhood schools were more important than mixing with whites. The national organization ousted several chapter heads who openly questioned integration.

At its 1997 national convention, the NAACP debated the goal of school integration for the first time. Although the group decided not to change its official position, to have even raised the question was a turning point. In its own makeup, the NAACP has forsaken its integrated past. Many local chapters are now 100 percent black. By 1995, the number of whites on the 64-member board had dwindled to three. In 2010, there were 83 board members, of which only two were white. As we will see in Chapter 5, many blacks think the NAACP is hopelessly outmoded, and have taken positive steps to provide segregated education for their children.

Other groups are following suit. In 2009, there were 1,050 Seneca Indian children attending public schools in the western tip of New York State. Teachers tried very hard to work Seneca culture, history, and even language lessons into the curriculum, but the Seneca were not satisfied. In August 2008, the tribal council approved a plan to establish Seneca Academies on the Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations. One tribal leader explained that parents did not trust public schools that “have tried to turn Indian children into white people.”

CHURCHES
During the civil rights era, churches made a passionate, moral case for integration. Have they practiced what they preached? Churches are not governed by the same civil rights laws as schools and employers. This explains why they are some of the most segregated institutions in America. According to one study, nearly 95 percent of churches have congregations that are at least 80 percent one race or ethnic group. In a school or neighborhood, this would be considered hyper-segregation.

Churches have tried to fight this tendency, mostly without success. In 1965, New Covenant Presbyterian Church was the first church in Miami established specifically to encourage integration. It prompted glowing news stories about its integrated congregation, choir, and administration. By 2006, it had only one white member.

Fred Caldwell, bishop of Greenwood Acres Full Gospel Baptist Church in Shreveport, Louisiana, got so tired of seeing only black faces in his congregation of 5,000 that he started paying whites to show up for services: $5.00 a hour on Sundays and $10.00 on Thursday evenings. “God wants a rainbow in his church,” he explained.

God seldom gets a rainbow. In 2004, there were nearly 4,000 Asian congregations in the United States (3,000 Korean, 700 Chinese, 200 Japanese). Most were heavily segregated—often because they conducted services in an Asian language—but even the English-speaking ones were segregated. Victor Kim, pastor of the mostly-Korean congregation at Remnant Presbyterian Church in New York City, did everything he could to change that. He barred Korean food at church functions, and refused to make announcements for Asian events. Six years after he started this campaign, his church still had only a handful of blacks or whites. “I just never really fit in,” explained Kyle Allen, who attended for a while and dropped out.

At NewSong Community Church in Irvine, California, half-Korean Senior Pastor David Gibbons also worked very hard to integrate his congregation. He preached what he called a “theology of discomfort,” meaning that people should mix with people unlike themselves. He hired black and Hispanic assistants but his 1,500-member congregation remained 80 percent Asian.

Stacy Heisey-Terrell, a white woman, says racial reconciliation is a big part of her Christianity. She and her mixed-race husband drove half an hour every Sunday to attend Evergreen Baptist Church in Rosemead, California, another Korean congregation that was trying hard to integrate. It didn’t work. “I can’t take this anymore,” she said, of being the only white woman. “There’s no one like me.” She was mortified when she organized a church picnic, and the Koreans would not touch her bean salad.

Victory World Church in Norcross, Georgia, is one of the three to five percent of churches that are integrated. In 2004, its congregation of 4,500 was 60 percent black, 30 percent white and 10 percent Hispanic and Asian—but that was a difficult achievement. “To get to those 4,500, we have gone through thousands and thousands of people over the last 14½ years,” said co-pastor Dennis Rouse. He said that many whites don’t like a black majority, and many blacks “prefer to be over there with ‘the brothers’ in an all-black church.”

At one time, Shallowford Presbyterian Church in DeKalb County, Georgia, had four congregations holding services in four languages: English, Korean, Spanish, and an Asian Indian language. Mostly, the different groups kept to themselves, but sometimes they clashed. “I think if we can’t welcome multiculturalism in this church where we share a common Christian faith, then we can’t do it in any other context,” said Shallowford’s pastor, Gray Norsworthy.
Two congregations share the United Methodist Church in Sunset Park, Brooklyn: one Chinese the other Hispanic. They get along so badly that the pastors are barely on speaking terms. Denomination officials brought in an outside mediator—neither Hispanic nor Asian—but tensions persisted.\textsuperscript{149}

At Holy Trinity Catholic Church in Saint Louis, parishioners sort themselves into different services by race and language. As Mexican-born Angelica Garcia explained, “When I come to Mass at noon, the Anglos leave, and [Latinos] go in and we don’t even say ‘hi’ to each other.”\textsuperscript{150}

Many Christians simply accept separation. In Beaumont, Texas, two United Methodist congregations—one white, one black—merged because both had declining memberships. Most of the members stayed despite the merger because the newly-united church held separate services, one for whites and one for blacks.\textsuperscript{151} Anyone who ran a business or school this way would face a federal lawsuit.

Some blacks want separation so they can be in control. “It’s an issue of power, to be very honest,” said Rev. T. Vaughn Walker, professor of black church studies at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. He added that if black churches were lost to integration, “the African-American community is concerned that its last, viable, free voice would be lost.” Rev. John Crittenden, Jr. of Forest Missionary Baptist Church, also of Louisville, explained that he was comfortable with segregated churches because “it’s not a mandatory thing, it’s a choice thing.”\textsuperscript{152}

Many Asians feel the same way. David Ahn is a Korean who grew up in America and attended a white church in San Francisco before ending up in a Korean congregation. “In general, Korean people and white people just act very differently,” he said. “I don’t necessarily see them as good or bad, just very different.” David Kang, another Korean, asked, “Where else can I go to feel Korean, or feel Asian?”\textsuperscript{153}

Whether they know it or not, many churches are following the advice of Donald McGavaran, a missionary to India, who thought carefully about conversion. “Men like to become Christians without crossing racial, linguistic, or class barriers,” he wrote in the 1950s. He urged ministers to build congregations as “homogenous units,” and churches that follow his advice have the largest congregations. Whenever the famed evangelist Billy Graham issued an altar call he tried to make sure that everyone who came forward was met by someone of the same age, sex, and race.\textsuperscript{154}

Young Life is a religious group in San Clemente, California, that tries to keep teenagers out of trouble by teaching them about Jesus. It established two segregated groups to keep whites and Hispanics from fighting each other.\textsuperscript{155}

Funeral homes are often even more segregated than churches. Segregation is so taken for granted that black and white undertakers have separate professional organizations. Over the years, mobility has made the profession even more segregated. In a small town that could support only one funeral home, all races had to use the same establishment. Now people can drive to a neighboring town and patronize someone of their own race.\textsuperscript{156}

Blacks are particularly loyal to funeral homes, and the rumor that a black home has been bought by white interests can wreck the business. When there were such rumors about the Angelus Funeral Home in Los Angeles, it bought ads in newspapers and church publications, offering one million dollars to anyone who could prove the rumors true.\textsuperscript{157}

There is separation in retirement homes. Charlene Well, assistant administrator at Glen Elston Nursing and Rehabilitation Center in Chicago, explained that she grouped Hispanic and Polish
Residents separately because “you have to create an environment they’re used to living in.” Americans prefer to consult doctors of their own race. A Johns Hopkins study reported that “patient ratings of care and of doctors’ efforts to get the patient to participate in decisions were higher when both the doctor and patient were African American or both were white.” Charles M. Cutler, chief medical officer of the American Association of Health Plans, agrees that race matters: “People want doctors who can relate well to them.”

Americans even care about who sells them cars. A 2004 poll found that the following percentages of the following groups would rather deal with a salesman of their own race or ethnicity: blacks: 46 percent, Hispanics: 38 percent, Middle-Easterners: 65 percent, Northern Europeans: 62 percent, East Europeans: 42 percent.

President Clinton worked as hard as any American president to make racially diverse appointments that, as he put it, “look like America,” and by his last year in office, of the 29 people in the White House who had the title “assistant to the president,” eight were women and seven were minorities. This diversity was reflected at lower levels of staffing as well—and led to voluntary segregation. Officials explained that “African American staff members tend to associate with one another, both in and out of the White House, as do whites, creating cliques and a feeling of division.”

Homosexuals are commonly thought to be free spirits, unburdened by conventional prejudices. Nevertheless, in 2005, a city commission in San Francisco found that Badlands, a popular homosexual nightclub, discriminated against black patrons by requiring several forms of ID and enforcing a stricter dress code. White customers reportedly preferred it that way.

Pop Warner Football is a league for 7- to 14-year olds. In 1993, the first black inner-city team joined the then all-suburban Bay State Conference. By 2005, there was only one suburban team left in the nine-team conference, and it appeared to be on its way out, too. Black coaches said the mass defections to a reconstituted white league were “racism.”

Beauty pageants—except for those that accept whites—are segregated. By 2005, there was a Miss Vietnam USA, a Miss Ethiopia North America, a Miss India USA, a Miss Asian America, a Miss Latina US, and a Miss Haiti in New York City. “It’s just as important as Miss America, if not more” said Reshoo Pande, Miss India USA 2004, adding, “This is not our homeland.” From 2001 to 2004 about 1,000 women competed for Miss Vietnam USA. The first prize was $10,000 and a Mercedes Benz worth more than $35,000. There has been a Miss Black America pageant since 1968.

Verizon Communications offers segregated telephone directories. In 2004, it debuted a listing for minority- and women-owned businesses for the Richmond, Virginia market, and promised similar directories for Baltimore, Washington, and other cities.

Entertainment is often segregated. Comedy clubs routinely book performers of different races for different days of the week, so as to appeal to different audiences. Many offer “Latino Night,” “the Asian Invasion,” and events such as “Mo Betta Mundays” or “Chocolate Sundaes” for blacks. Will Durst, a San Francisco comic, explained that comedy is “tribal,” and “now all the tribes get to elect their own jester.” As one Hispanic comedian cracked at a Hispanic night in a Los Angeles club called Laugh Factory, “Any white people here? What? You guys make a wrong turn? We got White Wednesdays. Come back then.”

On screen there is, of course, Black Entertainment Television and on the Internet there is a host of black-specialty sites such as BlackPlanet.com and TheRoot.com. The giant service provider America
Online has almost a parallel universe of black-oriented news and information as part of its “black focus,” and has equally rich offerings for Hispanics at “AOL Latino.”

Even Internet search engines are segregating. In 2008, Johnny Taylor of North Carolina established RushmoreDrive, which was meant to be Google for blacks. As Mr. Taylor explained, when whites search for “Whitney,” they are looking for the Whitney Museum of Art, whereas blacks want to find the singer Whitney Houston. In 2010 he got competition from GatewayBlack.com, another search engine specially tuned to lead users to “black content.”

Social networking websites draw huge numbers of users, and their personal networks tend to be homogeneous. Even the sites themselves have established racial personalities. Whites congregate at Facebook while Hispanics prefer MySpace. Asians socialize at Xanga and Friendster, and are reported to be almost completely absent from MySpace.

Ezter Hargittai, who studies communications at Northwestern University, first noticed the trend towards separation in 2007. “People said, oh, this is going to disappear,” she recalled two years later, but the separation had only become more pronounced. Danah Boyd, a social-media analyst at Microsoft Research, called it “a modern incarnation of white flight.” She said Internet socializing “mirrors and magnifies” social divisions, adding that “it should scare the hell out of us.”

One expression of separatist sentiment is resistance to intermarriage. Although media depictions of interracial marriage are positive, only about 8 percent of American marriages cross racial lines. In 2008, the white intermarriage rate was the lowest of all racial groups at 5.6 percent, although that was more than double the figure of 2.6 percent in 1980.

During the last two decades, interracial marriage rates declined for Asians and Hispanics. Researchers at Cornell University found that this was because increased Asian and Hispanic immigration meant there were larger pools of same-race potential partners. During the 1990s, 22 percent of second-generation Hispanic women married outside their ethnicity, but from 2000 to 2008, as more married Hispanic immigrants, that number fell to 16 percent. Asian-American women did the same thing. Only 4 percent married Asian immigrants in 1980 but 21 percent did so in 2008. Scholars call this a “retreat from intermarriage.” The Internet helps. It is now easy to find “speed dating,” wine tastings, and other singles events for every race and even many ethnic groups. If the proportion of whites in the population were increasing rather than declining, the intermarriage rate for whites would probably also decline.

The tendency to separation is so common that some people innocently—but illegally—try to accommodate it. Until 1997, the Alabama Department of Transportation made up all-black and all-white road-work crews because that was what the men wanted. A federal judge ordered the practice stopped.

When politicians operate telephone banks to get supporters to go to the polls, black callers get a better response from black voters and whites do better with whites. The Parker Group, an Alabama political consulting company, set up segregated calling banks at the request of both black and white politicians, but again, a federal judge ended what had been an effective practice.

In Cincinnati, the city council was dismayed to learn that the city’s firehouses were drifting into segregation. Firefighters preferred to work close to home and with compatible colleagues. Over the opposition of both black and white firefighters, the city council forced the firehouses to integrate.

As we will see in Chapter 2, prisoners would prefer segregation, but the laws do not permit it.
In social settings, there is probably about as much racial mixing as in churches. Dinner parties, barbecues, camping trips, or bowling parties are rarely integrated. At work, the law requires integration, but when the choice is theirs to make, many Americans prefer segregation.

Contact theory was wrong—integration does not result in yet more integration—but we never abandoned it. The result is one of the greatest contradictions in American life. Our laws and ideals assume that race is such a trivial matter we can easily ignore it, and yet our daily lives violate those ideals. Despite pro-integration campaigns by schools, the media, churches, and government, every new generation baffles the social engineers by behaving like earlier generations.

In a speech in Peoria in October 1854, Lincoln spoke of the tendency of whites to separate from blacks, but he could have been speaking of any group: “A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded, cannot be safely disregarded.” Let us now turn to what happens when Americans are told to disregard this feeling and are made to practice a diversity many do not want.
Diversity has joined apple pie, motherhood, and the flag as a symbol of America. Politicians praise diversity in their stump speeches, and corporate CEOs boast of diverse workforces. The idea that diversity is one of our country’s great strengths—perhaps even its greatest strength—now goes largely unchallenged.

When people praise diversity they may have many things in mind—differences in language, religion, sexual orientation, culture—but diversity’s most important ingredient is race. A university could have a student body composed of people from ten different European countries, but it could not claim to be “diverse” if all its students were white.

It does not take much study to discover that America’s racial diversity is not a source of strength. As we saw in the previous chapter, many Americans prefer not to cross racial lines. The following two chapters suggest why.

**PRAISE FOR DIVERSITY**

Practically every American public figure from the president on down praises diversity. To mark the Mexican celebration of *Cinco de Mayo*, President Obama said, “Today reminds us that America’s diversity is America’s strength.”¹ When he gave the commencement address at West Point in 2010, he told the cadets, “You include the vast diversity of race and ethnicity that is *fundamental* to our nation’s strength.”² (emphasis added) When the US Supreme Court upheld racial preferences in college admissions, President George W. Bush approved, saying, “Diversity is one of America’s greatest strengths.”³

President Bill Clinton once invited black columnists to the White House and told them, “We want to become a multiracial, multiethnic society . . . to prove that we literally can live without . . . having a dominant European culture.”⁴ When Mrs. Clinton spoke at her former high school in the Chicago suburb of Park Ridge she said she was glad to see many non-white faces in the audience. “We didn’t have the wonderful diversity of people that you have here today,” she said. “I’m sad we didn’t have it, because it would have been a great value, as I’m sure you will discover.”⁵

Then-governor of California Gray Davis noted in 2003 with unintended humor that “my vision is to make the most diverse state on earth, and we have people from every planet on the earth in this state.”⁶ In 2007, Governor Martin O’Malley of Maryland said diversity is “our greatest strength as a people.”⁷ In 2003, Governor Gary Locke of Washington, who is Chinese-American, went farther: “Diversity is our greatest strength. . . . In our diversity lies our humanity.”⁸ When Mayor Michael Bloomberg of New York said, “Our city’s diversity is our greatest strength,”⁹ he was only repeating his predecessor, Rudolph Giuliani, who noted in his farewell address that “we’re a city in which our diversity is our greatest strength.”¹⁰

The CIA seeks diversity. “At the Central Intelligence Agency, workforce diversity is a mission imperative,” the agency noted in *Black Enterprise* magazine.¹¹ In 2007, General George Casey, who was in overall command of American troops in Iraq, announced, “I firmly believe the strength of our Army comes from our diversity.”¹²*

The private sector agrees. In 2008, no fewer than 352 companies competed to be included among the “Top 50 Companies for Diversity” selected by the magazine *Diversity Inc*. JP Morgan Chase’s
CEO Jamie Dimon sent a message explaining that “our collective diversity is our strength.” Chairman Ivan Seidenberg of Verizon Communications said, “What I want the company to be is relevant. If you’re not diverse you’re not relevant.” In its final press release the day before it went bankrupt in 2008, the banking conglomerate Washington Mutual boasted about coming in sixth in Hispanic Business’s annual Diversity Elite list.

Many companies claim that diversity offers tangible business advantages (we will examine those claims in Chapter 4), but some executives pursue diversity as an end in itself. In 2005, Wal-Mart’s General Counsel Tom Mars told the company’s top law firms that they would be graded not just on price and performance, but also on the diversity of their lawyers. It was possible to outrank other firms on price and performance but lose Wal-Mart business because of insufficient diversity.

Like many large companies, Wal-Mart requires reports from its suppliers on the number of non-white employees and executives. It does not require reports on such things as budgeting methods, materials handling, or computerization. It insists on diversity without regard to commercial advantage. The New York Times pays its executives up to 10 percent of their base pay in bonuses if they hire enough women and non-whites.

Actual advantage may be sacrificed for diversity. North Miami used to require that police officers know how to swim because they may have to rescue someone in the water. In 2004, the department dropped that requirement because it desperately wanted Haitian officers, and most Haitian applicants could not swim. “Our swimming requirement may give the false perception that we are not serious in our efforts to hire Haitian police applicants,” explained police chief Gwendolyn Boyd-Savage.

Suzanne Bump, Secretary of Labor and Workforce Development for the state of Massachusetts, explained in 2007 why she wanted diversity: “I could fill my office with white lawyers. We’re choked with applications from them. But they’re not going to get the job done. A diversity of skills, perspective and cultural background is necessary for success in creating more and better jobs in this state.” Miss Bump, who is white, did not explain what skills and perspectives whites lack that prevent them from doing the job.

Universities promote diversity. On April 24, 1997, 62 research universities led by Harvard bought a full-page advertisement in the New York Times that justified racial preferences in university admissions by explaining that diversity is a “value that is central to the very concept of education in our institutions.” Lee Bollinger, who has been president of the University of Michigan and of Columbia, once claimed that diversity “is as essential as the study of the Middle Ages, of international politics and of Shakespeare.”

Many companies and universities have a “chief diversity officer” who reports directly to the president. In 2006, Michael J. Tate was vice president for equity and diversity of Washington State University. He had an annual budget of three million dollars, a full-time staff of 55, and took part in the highest levels of university decision-making. There were similarly powerful “chief diversity officers” at Harvard, Berkeley, the University of Virginia, Brown, and the University of Michigan. In 2006, the University of Wisconsin at La Crosse decided that diversity was so important that its beneficiaries—students—should pay for it. It increased in-state tuition by 24 percent, from $5,555 to $6,875, to cover the costs of recruitment to increase diversity.

American law schools are accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA), which uses its power to promote diversity. In 2000, the ABA discovered that 93.5 percent of first-year students at
George Mason University law school in northern Virginia were white. The ABA recognized that GMU had made a “very active effort to recruit minorities,” but said it had not done enough. With its accreditation at stake, GMU law school lowered standards for non-white applicants and admitted more: 10.98 percent in 2001 and 16.16 percent in 2002. That was still not enough. In 2003, the ABA summoned GMU’s president and law school dean and threatened them to their faces with disaccreditation unless they admitted more non-whites. GMU lowered standards even further, and managed to raise its non-white admissions to 17.3 percent in 2003, and 19 percent in 2004. This was still not good enough. “Of the 99 minority students in 2003,” the ABA complained, “only 23 were African American; of 111 minority students in 2004, the number of African Americans held at 23.”

True diversity required more blacks, but what of the blacks GMU did admit? From 2003 to 2005, fully 45 percent had grade-point averages below 2.15, which was defined as “academic failure.” For non-black students, the figure was 4 percent. GMU officials pointed out that the ABA’s own Standard 501(b) says that “a law school shall not admit applicants who do not appear capable of satisfactorily completing its educational program and being admitted to the bar.” Law school dean Dan Polsby explained that this requirement was the greatest obstacle to increased diversity.

American institutions pursue diversity with such enthusiasm that it would be easy to misunderstand their goals. There is a kind of diversity that is essential for any group undertaking, and one might think this is what Americans are celebrating. A contractor, for example, cannot build houses if he hires only electricians. He needs a diverse workforce of carpenters, roofers, masons, etc. If the advantage of hiring people with different skills had only just been discovered, it would make sense to promote it, but that is not the kind of diversity Barack Obama or Lee Bollinger are extolling. They would insist that a “diverse” construction team have the right mix of blacks, whites, Asians, handicapped people, Hispanics, and American Indians. It is not clear how this would result in better houses.

IMPACT OF DIVERSITY

The previous chapter described the extent to which people avoid diversity. What happens when they cannot? Los Angeles is often called the most diverse city in the United States—perhaps in the world. Whites have been a minority in Los Angeles County since 1990, and its inhabitants represent more than 140 nationalities and speak 130 different languages. The city should be a showcase for diversity’s strengths. The schools, in particular, should be ideal opportunities to practice “contact theory.” Southern California also has an important advantage in that the most salient racial mixes are not the historically freighted one of black and white. Blacks and Hispanics, for example, came into contact with no past grievances—no real past at all. There is nothing like the specters of slavery, Jim Crow, lynching, or segregation to poison their relations. If anything, two groups that share common experiences as minorities should find contact especially rewarding.

They do not. For decades, students in Los Angeles have stubbornly defied the expectations of those who praise diversity. For decades, calming racial tension—usually between blacks and Hispanics—has been one of the top goals of the school district. In 1999, the district was putting more effort into conflict resolution than any other organization in the city. It did not appear to be succeeding.

Racial violence in schools can erupt at any time. For a great many students, conflict and tension are the most vivid consequences of diversity. It would be scandalous if only a few students in America
were trying to get an education in the shadow of the threat of racial violence. In fact, tension and violence touch hundreds of schools, perhaps thousands.

There does not appear to be any central organization that monitors racial violence in schools, nor is it something that gets attention outside the neighborhoods in which it occurs. That means it is hard to grasp the true dimensions of the problem or even to know if it is getting better or worse. In any case, a recitation of statistics would not convey the harrowing circumstances under which some Americans are trying to get an education. Some of the following examples may seem repetitive, but only descriptions of specific incidents can suggest the extent of the problem or provide a sense of what diversity can mean for a school.

On November 20, 2004, a black-Hispanic brawl involving an estimated 1,000 students broke out at Jordan High School in South Los Angeles. Gang members from adjoining neighborhoods joined the fighting, and it took 60 policemen in riot gear to break up the fray. The school was locked down, as were two other schools in the area, for fear the violence might spread.26

Three days later, there was a fight between 100 blacks and Hispanics at Manual Arts High School, also in Los Angeles. Dozens of officers, some in helicopters, restored order. A week later, in what police said was a related incident, black students broke the jaw of a Hispanic student in front of Crenshaw High School.27

The next year, there was a series of racial eruptions at Jefferson High School in Los Angeles. On April 14, more than 100 blacks and Hispanics fought each other in the cafeteria after Hispanics told blacks to “go back to Africa.” Police broke up the brawl; administrators locked down the school and let students out early.28

The next day, the violence at Jefferson jumped to two other schools in the area, Norte Vista High School in Riverside, and Santa Monica High School. Norte Vista was locked down and police made five arrests. Santa Monica High School was also locked down, and students were dismissed methodically, building by building, to be sure they did not mix and start fighting again. “It was more racial tension than it was gang-related,” explained district superintendent John Deasy, no doubt in an attempt to be reassuring.29

Back at Jefferson, no fewer than 16 school and city police officers were patrolling the campus to keep tensions under control, but three days later there was another cafeteria brawl involving 100 blacks and Hispanics. One student suffered a broken hip and several others were arrested. Administrators announced they would get a metal detector for the main entrance and shut off all other entrances. They also closed the cafeteria so students could not congregate. Students got bag lunches rather than hot meals, with nothing in them that could be used as a missile—just hamburgers and burritos.30

The next day, 29 police officers were assigned to the school, and 12 more patrolled the neighborhood. Even so, attendance was down by almost half because so many students were afraid. Those who did come to school were dismissed through a phalanx of teachers, administrators, and police in riot helmets. “We just have a lot of issues with race,” conceded Principal Norm Morrow.31

As tensions continued, the president of the school’s Black Student Union said many blacks were thinking of transferring because they were afraid of being “jumped.” The Nation of Islam offered to escort outnumbered black students to school to protect them from Hispanics. Fifteen-year-old Stephanie Alonzo said she thought the solution was to keep blacks and Hispanics apart whenever they
were not in class.

Hispanic students started wearing brown T-shirts as a sign of racial solidarity. Blacks started wearing black T-shirts. During the two months that followed, there were at least two more large-scale melees despite the stepped-up police presence. There were many small skirmishes and a number of organized attacks in which a group from one race cornered and beat a student of another race. Twenty-five students were arrested, three had to be hospitalized, and dozens were suspended or transferred. An anonymous Hispanic student wrote about the fighting at Jefferson in the independent publication *LA Youth*. “I felt good defending my race,” he wrote. “I was hitting anybody I could get my hands on . . . .”

Ron Rubine, a counselor at Carver Middle School in South Los Angeles, which had its own black-Hispanic conflicts, suggested that if the chips were down the staff, too, would square off along racial lines. It was all very well for outsiders to call the students at Jefferson “savages,” he said, but asked, “Is it really that different with adults? If there was a fight among the staff, we’d align ourselves with the people we hang around with. . . . We have our public face, but look at what we do in private.”

Jefferson High School got a new Hispanic principal from East Los Angeles and regular visits from human relations experts, ex-convicts, former gang members, and Justice Department officials, but racial tensions continued.

There was more violence in 2005. That spring, a rumor went around the district that Hispanic gang members were going to celebrate the Mexican *Cinco de Mayo* holiday by killing blacks. Administrators added extra police patrols, and principals sent home letters saying the rumors were groundless. Some schools mounted mass telephone campaigns to tell parents it was safe to come to school. Despite these efforts, 51,000 middle and high school students—18 percent of total enrollment—stayed home. At Crenshaw High School in South Los Angeles, about 1,700 of 2,800 failed to appear. “I’m devastated that a rumor can cause such fear,” said Randy Cornfield, assistant principal at Hamilton High School.

Channa Cook, a black teacher at the highly regarded Los Angeles Center for Enriched Studies, explained that even there, black students routinely skipped school on *Cinco de Mayo*. “My first year here, I didn’t believe it,” she said, “but the students told me, ‘No, Miss Cook, if you come to school you’re going to get shot.’ When I arrived at class, all the black kids had stayed home.”

The next year saw more violence. On March 21, 2006, fighting broke out between black and Hispanic students at Fremont High School in Los Angeles. Police locked down the school and dismissed students in small groups to keep them from mixing. The school hired extra security officers.

In neighboring San Bernardino County on October 13, police arrested five students, and 80 more were suspended after a black/Hispanic brawl at Pacific High School. The fight involved 80 to 100 students and was the third time in three weeks that dozens of students had fought each other. Eight campus security men were present, but could not stop the fighting. Police used pepper balls to separate blacks and Hispanics. The riot was a replay of the previous year’s racial violence that greeted the start of the school year.

On the same day in the same county, an estimated 500 blacks and Hispanics pitched into each other with bottles, rocks, and fists at Fontana High School. It took more than 100 officers, including the Fontana SWAT team, more than an hour and a half to restore order. Helicopters circled overhead as officers fired beanbag rounds, sting balls, and hundreds of rubber pellets. “It all started with blacks
versus Mexicans, as always,” explained sophomore Abigail Orozco. Sixteen-year-old Samantha Dorgey said there were fights about once a week, but this one just got out of hand. Police locked down Fontana as well as nearby Citrus Elementary and Truman Middle School.

Journalists noted that during the previous four years in San Bernardino County, police had had to quell racial violence at A.B. Miller High School, Redlands High School, Bloomington High School, Wilmer Amina Carter High School, and Silverado High School. The Fontana school district later installed an anonymous tip line, hired an intervention specialist, and started making students wear identification badges.

Early the next year, 2007, police fired pepper balls to break up a black-Hispanic riot at San Bernardino High School during a pep rally. “This racial stuff has got to stop,” said Tami Manning, whose daughter was suspended for fighting a Hispanic girl. One black father said that the high school had become so dangerous for blacks that he would send his 10th-grade son to a different school. “This is why I took him out of Pacific [High School]” he added.

Meanwhile, in Los Angeles, police arrested a 16-year-old black student for stabbing to death a 17-year-old Hispanic student at Washington Preparatory High School. Other students said it was the culmination of persistent racial tension.

In 2008 it was Locke High School’s turn when as many as 600 blacks and Hispanics fought each other in a campus-wide brawl. There were only two officers on duty when the fighting started, but campus security brought in 60 more guards and the Los Angeles police sent a dozen patrol cars and 50 men to help lock down the school. One black student explained that the races do not mix at Locke — “Everybody usually just sticks to themselves” — and that violence on such a scale was unusual.

Locke High School has a history of racial violence. In February 1996, 50 police officers broke up a lunchtime riot involving hundreds of blacks and Hispanics. Boys and girls beat each other, and one boy jumped out of a second-story window to escape pursuers. Police in riot gear had to keep students from resuming battle in the streets. Tensions were particularly high because Hispanics resented the February celebrations of black history month.

In April 2009, at least 10 students at Silverado High School were arrested after two large groups of students—one black and the other Hispanic—faced off during the lunch period and began fighting.

Can it be a surprise that a 2008 survey of 6,008 South Los Angeles high school students found that only one quarter said they felt safe in school and that many showed signs of clinical depression? Anna Exiga of Jordan High School who helped organize the survey explained that “there’s racial tension and gang violence, and also many feel that their schools are not schools—their schools look more like prisons.”

Schools may have to be run like prisons simply to avoid liability. In 2005, the parents of four black students received a $300,000 settlement when they sued Valencia High School in northern Los Angeles County for not having done enough to protect their children from racial attack. Racial conflict undoubtedly contributes to the Los Angeles school district’s official graduation rate of only 67 percent.

The Los Angeles area may be the worst for black-Hispanic violence in schools, but the rest of the state is not immune. The Elk Grove Unified School District near Sacramento has long had a task force to try to stop violence. Marjorie Beazer, a black mother with three children in the district, said that
race was so close to the surface “it’s like breathing, almost.”

In 2010, blacks in Union City, California, filed a class-action suit in federal court, claiming that the school district had failed to curtail “severe and pervasive racial harassment” by Hispanic students. The suit alleged that Union City police had told black students and their families that if they didn’t like how they were treated they should move to a different town.

Black-Hispanic school violence is concentrated in California because of its large number of Hispanics, but other states also suffer. In Paterson, New Jersey, administrators at John F. Kennedy High School tried to curb black/Hispanic violence with “conflict resolution” and “peer counseling” programs. In 2001, after police broke up a fight between blacks and Hispanics near the school, blacks went swarming through the streets and beat to death a 42-year-old homeless Hispanic man. In 2007, at Lakewood High School in Lakewood, New Jersey, a fight that began between rival black and Hispanic gangs spread to 150 students. Seventy-five police officers in riot gear from five towns helped reestablish order.

In Chicago in 2005, police made seven arrests after they broke up a brawl between black and Hispanic students at Washington High School. The teachers’ union reported that many teachers felt unsafe and were pressing the district to increase security. Likewise in Chicago, in 2006, blacks and Hispanics fought at Roberto Clemente High School, where Hispanics outnumber blacks. “They don’t want us here,” explained Stephen Flagg, a black student. “We don’t want to be here,” he added. “Everybody is different, and that’s why everybody is fighting.”

In late 2008, Hempstead High School on Long Island was wracked by two days of severe black-Hispanic fighting. The school suspended dozens of students, canceled the homecoming pep rally, and finally stopped the violence by blanketing the school with uniformed police and undercover officers. “They be groupin’ up, and I just had to defend my people and that’s what I do,” explained one of the combatants.

No state with substantial numbers of blacks and Hispanics is safe from violence. Five detectives and ten police officers set up a command post at Memorial High School in Madison, Wisconsin, after fighting broke out between blacks and Hispanics in October 2008. Officers followed school buses home to make sure the fighting would not continue after dismissal. A Hispanic girl who was beaten unconscious in one melee said the trouble started when a group of blacks called Hispanics “wetbacks.”

In March 2001, 400 black and Hispanic students rioted at Andress High School in El Paso, Texas. One hundred officers responded, and there were 11 arrests as a police helicopter hovered overhead. Terrel Tate, a 16-year-old white student, explained that “they [blacks and Hispanics] hate each other because of their skin.”

In 2004 in Phoenix, Arizona, three black girls from Maxine O. Bush Elementary School were convicted of assault for attacking a Hispanic girl. The parents of the Hispanic, who were convinced the attack was racially motivated, threatened to sue the school district, and asked the local chapter of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) for help. LULAC demanded that the principal be fired for failing to protect Hispanics.

The consequences of racial tension can be poignant. In 1997, classes from two Chicago middle schools happened to book cruises on the same ship on the same day to celebrate eighth-grade graduation. The principal of Logandale Middle School, which is largely Hispanic, refused to let the
students from Brown Elementary School, which is black, board the ship. The black children were left on the dock in tears as the Spirit of Chicago set sail. The Hispanic principal, Luis Molina, explained that the risk of violence was too great, even if the two schools were on different decks.\textsuperscript{58}

The tension can spread to adults. The 2010 kindergarten graduation ceremony at Puesta del Sol Elementary School in Victorville, California, was disrupted by a fight between black and Hispanic women that turned into a racial brawl. Police locked down the school and made two arrests.\textsuperscript{59}

Blacks do not see the arrival of Hispanics as an opportunity to celebrate diversity. By 1999, there were 26 schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District in which Hispanics were a majority of the students but blacks were a majority of the staff. Hispanic parents demanded more Hispanic staff but blacks would not step down. As Celes King III, president of the Congress for Racial Equality, who once led a demonstration against a white principal at Manual Arts High School, noted, with no apparent sense of irony: “The situation has gone full circle. The Hispanics are using the same thoughts and practices we used 30 years ago. . . . We need to organize and maintain our positions in education because we worked so hard for them.”\textsuperscript{60}

In 2007, one advisory council to the Los Angeles Unified School District that had black and Hispanic members fought for months over whether to hold its meetings in Spanish or English. Hispanics stormed out of one meeting when the blacks voted to censure the Hispanic chairman. The district brought in dispute-resolution experts and mental health counselors.\textsuperscript{61}

Some Hispanics take proportional representation for granted. In 1999, Burton Elementary School in Panorama, California, was 90 percent Hispanic, and parents sharply criticized its white principal, Norman Bernstein, when he tried to phase out bilingual education in accordance with the provisions of a 1998 ballot initiative. He said two Hispanic men waylaid him on his way to work. “We don’t want you here, white principal,” they said and then beat him unconscious. The Los Angeles school board president condemned the beating but noted that Hispanics often ask for Hispanic principals at their schools adding, “I don’t think this is an unreasonable request.”\textsuperscript{62}

Although the primary ethnic fault line in America’s schools today seems to be black-Hispanic, any mix can cause conflict. In Hamtramck, Michigan, the tension is between blacks and Arabs. After a racially motivated brawl at Hamtramck High School in 2004, the superintendent of schools promised a constant police presence,\textsuperscript{63} but that was not enough. The next year, the school spent $22,000 on surveillance cameras to try to stop fights that were breaking out several times a week. The cameras were in addition to metal detectors and photo IDs students had worn for years. “Blacks and Arabs don’t get along,” said Terrell Beasley, who was hospitalized after an attack by Arabs. “It’s been like that since the beginning.”\textsuperscript{64}

In rural Gentry, Arkansas, between November 2005 and January 2006, police arrested 14 students for what they called “racially motivated” fights between Hmong and Hispanics. The town called in professional help to try to ease the tension. “We really want to make people aware of what’s going on over there before someone gets killed,” said Tessie Ajala, who led an intervention program.\textsuperscript{65}

In 2000, at Valley Center High School in San Diego County, California, 30 police officers put down a fight between dozens of Hispanic and American Indian students. Juan Granados, who is the founder of an organization that tries to train young people in peace-making, said that Hispanic and Indian students had been feuding for 40 years.\textsuperscript{66}

At Sanford Middle School in Minneapolis, there is friction between Native American students and
some 200 Somali immigrant children. In May 2003, parents of Indians held a rally outside the school to protest bullying and violence by Somalis. School officials promised a program of cultural awareness and sensitivity.67

At Purnell Swett High School in Lumberton, North Carolina, blacks and Lumbee Indians do not get along. Thirty Indians and nine blacks were suspended after an October 2002 fight, prompting 100 Indian students and their parents to demonstrate against what they thought was unfair treatment. Someone circulated an anonymous letter filled with expletives about blacks that said, “I am a soldier in the Lumbee’s army. I will never surrender to the enemy.”68

There is trouble between Armenian and Hispanic students in Los Angeles County. In 2000, when 17-year-old Raul Aguirre came to the aid of a fellow Hispanic who was fighting two Armenians, they stabbed Mr. Aguirre and crushed his head with a tire iron. Police booked three Armenian teenagers—including one girl—in connection with the killing.69 Hispanics took revenge a few days later. After a community meeting held to promote ethnic harmony, three Hispanics shot at a group of Armenians, sending an 18-year-old to the hospital with a bullet in his knee.70

In March 2005, there was a riot involving 200 to 400 Armenian and Hispanic students at Grant High School in Los Angeles. Helicopters circled as police officers put down violence that sent four students, two teachers, and a police officer to the hospital. There was so much chaos that police ordered a child development center across the street locked down to keep its 72 children safe. According to a Hispanic student, the riot began when “the Armenians hit a 14-year-old girl in the face because she was Hispanic.”71

Grant High School has had an Armenian-Hispanic problem for years. In October 1999, 20 or so Hispanics crossed the invisible line that divided the Armenian and Hispanic areas, and soon 400 students were rioting. Two teachers and 14 students were injured, and it took more than 30 Los Angeles police officers—some brandishing shotguns—to bring peace. The school’s dean, Daniel Gruenberg, explained that there had been similar ethnic battles at least once a year for more than a decade. The school tried conflict resolution programs, cultural awareness classes, group mediation, peer counseling, and teacher training, but nothing seemed to work.72

As we saw in the previous chapter, so many whites have left urban public schools that those who remain are a small minority. They have a reputation for not fighting back and almost never take part in the massive riots that wrack some schools. Perhaps this helps explain why the problem attracts so little national attention.

The exceptions usually involve white ethnics. At Herbert H. Lehman High School in the Bronx, 200 white students—all Albanians and many of them refugees—refused to be intimidated. They were vastly outnumbered by blacks and Hispanics, but stood up to mass attacks that had to be stopped by police. “They all hate us,” said 17-year-old Diana Gjoljaj of blacks and Hispanics. “That’s why we hang together.” Evan Small, a black junior, said blacks stick together, too: “If you see guys fighting you are going to jump in and protect your people.”73

Occasionally non-immigrant whites are involved in group violence. At Canyon High School in Riverside County, California, 18 students were suspended and eight faced expulsion after two days of fighting between whites and Hispanics. The violence reportedly began when a Hispanic girl started singing in Spanish and a white boy told her to shut up.74

In 2010, police in Torrington, Connecticut, were put on alert when they learned that as many as 50
Dominican gang members, armed with machetes, were planning to converge on the town and “kill any white guys they see walking on the street.” The attacks never materialized but were believed to be a response to racial violence at Torrington High School.75

Like whites, Asian students have a reputation for not fighting back, and black and Hispanic students often bully them. Aimee Baldillo of the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium said that this was “something we see everywhere in different pockets of the U.S. where there’s a large influx of [Asian] people.”76

In 2010, Asian students at majority-black South Philadelphia High School filed a complaint with the US Department of Justice, alleging “deliberate indifference” to no fewer than 26 separate racial attacks by blacks during the preceding school year. In the worst attack, 13 Asian students were treated at hospitals after black students beat them in the halls and chased them into the streets.77

Ethnic celebrations that are supposed to promote multiculturalism and bring students together often drive them apart. In the 1980s, Inglewood High School was overwhelmingly black, but by the late 1990s it was 60 percent Hispanic. 1998 was the last year it celebrated Cinco de Mayo; it took dozens of police to stop the race riot that broke out during the observances. The high school also stopped celebrating Black History Month because it provoked so much resentment among Hispanics.78 Many schools have dropped specifically black or Hispanic observances for the same reason.

School officials held an assembly at Skyview High School in Nampa, Idaho, in 1999 that was supposed to promote racial understanding and tolerance but had the opposite effect. A dozen police officers had to be called in when whites and Hispanics began screaming at each other and then started fighting. The school canceled the rest of the tolerance program.79

In 2010, Assistant Principal Miguel Rodriguez of Live Oak High School in Morgan Hill, California, sent home five white students who were wearing American-flag clothing on Cinco de Mayo. They said they often wore patriotic clothing, and intended no provocation. When their parents and others protested, about 200 Mexican-American students walked out of class in support of the Hispanic assistant principal, and demanded that the white students be suspended. They said wearing red, white, and blue on Cinco de Mayo was an insult to Hispanics.80

Some schools have banned the American flag. After Mexican students at Santa Ynez Valley Union High School in Santa Barbara County, California, brought Mexican flags to school, whites replied with American flags. They said they were simply being patriotic, but Principal Norm Clevenger said the American flags suggested “intolerance” and confiscated them.81

Likewise, at Skyline High School in Denver, Colorado, American flags were banned from campus when Principal Tom Stumpf decided they had been waved “brazenly” at Hispanic students. He banned all other flags, too.82

The entire Oceanside Unified School District in San Diego County banned flags and flag-motif clothing. The district decided they were too provocative after Hispanics participated in large-scale marches demanding amnesty for illegal immigrants. Officials said flags were being used to taunt other students and stir up trouble.83

Thirteen-year-old Cody Alicea liked to fly a one-foot American flag from his bicycle to show support for veterans in his family. Officials at Denair Middle School in Denair, California, made him take it off, explaining that the flag could cause “racial tension” with Hispanic students.84

It is difficult to think of diversity as a strength when Old Glory is treated as gang colors.
Administrators are often reluctant to admit there is racial tension in their schools, but Mara Sapone-Shevin, a professor of inclusive education at Syracuse University, says they are being dishonest. “The truth is that every school has a racism problem, and the only differentiation is between schools that are doing something about it and schools that aren’t.”

Schools have tried just about anything to try to calm racial tensions: professional mediation, multicultural training, diversity celebrations, anger-management classes, and a host of other interventions. In 2004, the Murrieta Valley Unified School District, in Riverside County, California, even considered a rule that would have forbidden any student to “form or openly participate in groups that tend to exclude, or create the impression of the exclusion of, other students.” The school board narrowly rejected the proposal when it was pointed out that the ban would have prohibited membership in the Hispanic group, La Raza, and could have been read to forbid playing rap music around white students. Absurd measures like this show how desperate schools are to solve the race problem.

A 2003 survey found that 5.4 percent of high-school students had stayed home at least once during the previous month because they were physically afraid. This was an increase over 4.4 percent ten years earlier. Racial violence was undoubtedly an important factor.

The circumstances under which some of our least advantaged citizens must try to get an education are nothing short of scandalous. Is it a wonder their test scores are low, that many drop out, that they fail to see the value of an education? How many times must school race riots be put down by SWAT teams before school authorities realize that this may be a problem that will not be cured with sensitivity training? The purpose of schools is to educate, not to force on children integration of a kind their parents do not even practice.

REWIRITING THE CURRICULUM

A different effect of increased school diversity is the pressure it puts on textbooks. Beginning in the 1960s, schoolbooks were rewritten to reflect the views and contributions of blacks, women, and—increasingly—Hispanics. Now there are new challenges.

In Fairfax County, Virginia, Sandhya Kumar led a successful campaign to force the school district to revise its fifth-, ninth-, and tenth-grade materials to show proper respect for Asian Indians and Hinduism. Miss Kumar said she wanted the school curriculum to instill in her three children a love of India.

Muslims are changing American textbooks. The founder of the Council on Islamic Education claimed the group had achieved a “bloodless revolution... inside American junior high and high school classrooms.” For example, it succeeded in having “jihad,” usually considered to mean holy war, redefined as “to do one’s best to resist temptation and overcome evil.” As other immigrant groups grow in numbers they may press for similar changes.

Names of schools must now reflect diversity. The New Orleans school district, for example, which is overwhelmingly black, decided in 1992 that no school should bear the name of a slave-holder or Confederate officer. Schools named for Robert E. Lee and General P.G.T. Beauregard were duly renamed for blacks. Even George Washington Elementary fell afoul of the slave-owner rule and was renamed for the black surgeon Charles Drew. As long-time black activist Carl Galmon explained, “To African-Americans, George Washington has about as much meaning as David Duke.”
The search for a name can become a racial tug-of-war. In Berkeley, California, when Columbus Elementary had to be rebuilt after earthquake damage in 1999, it was rechristened Rosa Parks Elementary, but only after a fierce fight with a strong Hispanic contingent that wanted to honor Cesar Chavez. At the end of 2008, there was a bitter struggle between blacks and Hispanics over whether to name a new high school in honor of Cesar Chavez or of a black police officer killed in a shootout.91

Also in Berkeley, in 2005, teachers at Thomas Jefferson Elementary decided they could no longer bear to work at a school named for a slaveholder, but there was a racial battle over whether to name the school after Cesar Chavez or Sojourner Truth. In a compromise that is likely to become more common in diverse areas, the school settled on the neutral name of Sequoia.92 In Palm Springs, Florida, even after two years of wrangling at what used to be Jefferson Davis Middle School, blacks and Hispanics could not agree on a hero so they replaced the Confederate president with the bland name of Palm Springs Middle School.93

Cesar Chavez was Mexican, so he is not a model for all Hispanics. In 2007, Los Angeles opened Monsenor Oscar Romero Charter Middle School, named after an assassinated Salvadoran archbishop, to help neighborhood Salvadoran children maintain their heritage.94 If the demographics change, that name will no doubt have to be changed, too.

**PRISONS**

Racial diversity causes violence in prisons. Prison race riots appear to be at least as common as school race riots—though more deadly—and no more likely to attract national attention. Again, Southern California leads the way.

Hispanics outnumber blacks in the prisons, and racial tension has boiled beneath the surface for decades. It was already old news in 1995 when the *Orange County Register* ran the headline, “Black Jail Inmates Say They Live in Fear of Being ‘Ambushed’.” Blacks in the Orange County Men’s Central Jail said they were afraid to leave their cells for fear of being attacked by more numerous Hispanics.95

Until 2000, when they started using effective, non-lethal crowd-control equipment, guards routinely used firearms to put down riots. On February 23 that year, when 200 blacks and Hispanics at Pelican Bay State Prison started slashing each other with homemade knives, guards shot 15 inmates, killing one and critically wounding another. Prisoners still managed to stab at least 32 fellow inmates.96

That may have been the last California prison riot put down with rifle fire. A long series of incidents at the Pitchess Detention Center in Los Angeles County later that year proved the effectiveness of more modern riot-control equipment. The problem at Pitchess—as in many other California prisons—was that the more numerous Hispanics had a policy of attacking blacks whenever they gained a sufficient numerical advantage. Critics said the authorities knew this but sometimes let the numbers in a dormitory tip as far as four or eight to one against blacks.

Whatever the cause of the outbreak, in April 2000, hundreds of blacks and Hispanics fought each other for three straight days. Approximately 80 men—most of them black97—were injured and a black prisoner was beaten into a coma. Hispanics stuffed him under a mattress during a search for casualties, and would have finished him off if guards had not found him just in time.98

Whenever the guards thought they had stopped the fighting it would break out again, and as a last resort, guards formally segregated the prisoners. Noting that there had been *more than 150 major*
race-related disturbances since 1991, Sheriff’s Chief Taylor Moorehead explained that “it would be foolish to do anything but segregate.”

The families of black prisoners were pleased. “I know that people say segregation is not fair, whatever, whatever, but segregation is safer for our boys,” explained Ethel Fuqua. “Can you imagine how it feels to go and visit your son and see 43 stitches ’cross his face?” asked Janice Cooper. Christopher Darden, who helped prosecute O.J. Simpson for murder, said black prisoners had to be protected at all costs, and that “if it takes segregation, then that’s exactly what the sheriff should do.”

The inmates enjoyed the respite. “It’s good to have us like this,” said a Hispanic prisoner. “We want to stay with who we know.” Blacks agreed. “I shouldn’t have to come to jail as a parolee and have to fight for my life,” said Leonard Bryant. The prisoners knew, however, that segregation was illegal and would be temporary. Asked what it would be like when the dormitories were re-integrated, a tattooed Hispanic gang member replied, “The raza [the (Hispanic) race] is always ready to fight.” A black did not want to share quarters again with Hispanics: “It’s going to be very difficult for me to go to sleep with someone above me, next to me, under me who would kill me at the drop of a dime,” he said.

After several weeks of peace, the authorities reintegrated the prison, though they did develop computer programs to track the racial balance throughout the complex to make sure Hispanics never achieved a crushing majority over blacks. Still, it did not take long for violence to resume. On July 8, 2000, blacks launched simultaneous attacks in three different dormitories to retaliate for the beating they took during the April riots that led to segregation. The next day, Hispanics in three other dormitories attacked black prisoners. Twenty-two men were hurt and two were hospitalized. Other Hispanics wrecked their own dormitory when they learned they were going to be moved from all-Hispanic housing to share quarters with blacks. Sheriff’s Chief Moorehead said segregation would permanently eliminate racial tension but that the law required integration.

A month after the April riots, black inmates filed a class action suit against the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, claiming that it was a violation of civil rights to let the violence continue. “These riots have happened year after year,” said Leon Jenkins, the lawyer who brought the suit, “and if you don’t take corrective action it shows a deliberate indifference to the rights of these inmates.”

In 2003, an estimated 150 blacks and Hispanics battled for 90 minutes at the Eagle Mountain Prison about 60 miles east of Palm Springs. Two prisoners were killed, four had to be helicoptered to hospitals, and another 50 were treated by prison medical staff. “I walked onto the yard when it was over, and it looked like Beirut,” said Lt. Warren Montgomery, adding that prisoners attacked each other with “anything they could get their hands on.” Eagle Mountain is a low-risk prison for non-violent offenders.

In 2005, San Quentin State Prison had its worst prison riot in 20 years, when Hispanics attacked whites, and 400 inmates joined in the fighting. Thirty-nine needed medical treatment and three were hospitalized. The fighting took place in part of the prison that had already been locked down for a week because of racial violence. Likewise in 2005, five inmates at the state prison at Chino, California, had to be hospitalized after some 200 black and Hispanic prisoners battled each other.

Also in 2005, a white prisoner paid with his life for violating racial etiquette. At the Los Angeles County Men’s Central Jail, mealtimes reflected the racial balance of power: Hispanics ate first, then
blacks, with whites last. A white got in line with 30 Hispanics, who beat him to death. “Race is the predominant issue in everything going on in these jail modules,” explained Michael Gennaco, head of the county Office of Independent Review. 107

On February 4, 2006, 2,000 inmates went on a four-hour rampage at the North County Correctional Facility in Castaic, California. It took 200 deputies to stop what Los Angeles County Sheriff Lee Baca called “massive chaos.” One black was beaten to death and 20 inmates went to the hospital. Sheriff Baca locked down the 21,000-man system and segregated prisoners even though it was against the rules. “Human life is more important than appearance,” he explained. The sheriff released a letter from a Hispanic inmate that said: “If blacks come into the dorms we will fight. . . . Please separate us race by race for everyone’s safety.”

According to official records, the riot was the seventh major incident in the county jail system in just two months. In the previous year, there had been 33 major inmate disturbances, including 19 at the North County jail, a state-of-the art facility that went into service in 1990. 108

The February 4, 2006 riot triggered racial violence that went on for nearly a month and spread throughout the Los Angeles County jail system. Six straight days of black-Hispanic riots in the Pitchess Detention Center left one black inmate dead and dozens injured. “Black inmates are begging us for help,” said an Islamic minister who visited the prison. “They want to stay segregated and be protected.” 109

On February 13, 2006, another black prisoner was killed, this time at the Los Angeles County Men’s Central Jail. Sheriff Baca locked down the entire county system and segregated as many dormitories as he thought he could without provoking a civil rights challenge. Meanwhile, the black-Hispanic violence spread to three youth detention centers. 110 That fall, five inmates had to be hospitalized with stab wounds when whites battled Hispanics in a riot at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility about 25 miles southeast of San Diego. 111

For ten years, Asians were kept in segregated dormitories in Los Angeles County jails. The Mexican mafia had a “green light” on them, meaning that Hispanics were to attack them on sight. They were only about 3.5 percent of the prison population, so it was relatively easy to house them separately. In early 2004, when the “green light” went off, prison authorities decided to return Asians to the general population. “It’s like feeding us to the sharks,” said Raymond Lim, serving time for attempted murder. Some Asians barricaded their cell doors with beds and set fire to mattresses to protest the decision. 112

Nearly two dozen family members of Asian prisoners met with Sheriff Lee Baca to urge him to keep the “Asian-only module” at the downtown Los Angeles jail. Rosie Tse, whose husband was in jail awaiting trial, said she was disappointed Sheriff Baca thought ending segregation was more important than safety. 113

It didn’t take long for the “green light” to go back on for Asians, reportedly in retaliation for Asian attacks on a Hispanic gang in Garden Grove in neighboring Orange County. Inmates at two Orange County jails were put on several weeks of strict lockdown to keep Asians and Hispanics apart. Privileges were to be restored gradually if there was no violence. 114 Strict racial segregation of Asians was not restored.

When California firefighting crews are overwhelmed, they get help from prisoners, but they are not always much use. In December 2007, white and Hispanic prisoners who were supposed to be fighting
the Poomacha fire in San Diego County fought each other instead. The fire burned 50,000 acres and 217 homes and other buildings.\textsuperscript{115}

In February 2009, Camp Scudder, a Los Angeles County juvenile probation camp for girls, was locked down after two girls and eight staff members were injured in a fight. Kerri Webb, a probation department spokeswoman, said that racial tensions at the camp “are very common, unfortunately.” A manager noted that racial antagonism was increasing and warned staff to “remain vigilant and on the alert for racial tension.”\textsuperscript{116} In September 2009, authorities used pepper spray to control an hour-long brawl at the Camp Kilpatrick juvenile facility in California after name-calling touched off violence between blacks and Hispanics.\textsuperscript{117}

Other states have prison riots. At the Dominguez prison near San Antonio, Texas, Hispanics ambushed blacks during a lockdown. A 19-year-old Hispanic explained that “all I could think of was hurting (the blacks) best I could.” The prisoners wanted segregation but as guard captain Don Dalton explained, “They’re going to have to learn to live together.”\textsuperscript{118}

In April 2000, 300 prisoners rioted at the Smith Unit in Lamesa, Texas, when a Hispanic inmate told a black to stop fondling himself in front of a female guard. One prisoner was killed and a kitchen went up in flames before 300 guards managed to stop the violence.\textsuperscript{119} In Oregon’s Snake River Correctional Institution two guards went to the hospital in 2000 after a black sat down in an area reserved for Hispanics and triggered a riot.\textsuperscript{120} In October 1999, more than 280 inmates were involved in a two-hour race riot at Fort Grant State Prison in Arizona. Eighty inmates were treated for injuries and the guards put the prison on indefinite lockdown.\textsuperscript{121} At High Desert State Prison in Nevada, blacks crushed the skull of a Hispanic prisoner with a rock during a race riot in 2004. Prisoner advocate Mercedes Maharis blamed guards who “let the wrong people out in the yard together.”\textsuperscript{122}

In 2007 in the Prince George’s County Detention Center in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, tensions were so high that guards resorted to segregation. A supervisor noted that the prison was abiding by “jailhouse law:” housing inmates only with people of the same race. Guards also made sure blacks and Hispanics were let onto the recreation field at different times.\textsuperscript{123}

In March 2009, James Ingram, a 28-year-old inmate at Lafourche Parish Detention Center in Louisiana, spoke for other blacks when he explained that he wanted whites out of his cellblock, either “on their own or through the hospital.” He and nine other black prisoners attacked several whites in the cellblock and beat them unconscious.\textsuperscript{124}

In June 2009, Sheriff Joe Arpaio ordered all jails in Maricopa County, Arizona, placed on indefinite lockdown after he learned that inmates were planning large-scale racial assaults. The approximately 10,000 prisoners were allowed to leave their cells only for court appearances.\textsuperscript{125}

In August 2009, race riots and fires completely destroyed six buildings, and forced the transfer of 700 of the 1,200 inmates from the Northpoint Training Center near Danville, Kentucky. The prison had already been locked down for three days after a dozen Hispanic prisoners attacked a white and a black prisoner.\textsuperscript{126}

Inmates would overwhelmingly welcome segregation. As Lexy Good, a white prisoner in San Quentin State Prison explained, “I’d rather hang out with white people, and blacks would rather hang out with people of their own race.” He said it was the same outside of prison: “Look at suburbia. . . . People in society self-segregate.”\textsuperscript{127}
Another white man, using the pen name John Doe, wrote that jail time in Texas had turned him against blacks:

> Because of my prison experiences, I cannot stand being in the presence of blacks. I can’t even listen to my old, favorite Motown music anymore. The barbarous and/or retarded blacks in prison have ruined it for me. The black prison guards who comprise half the staff and who flaunt the dominance of African-American culture in prison and give favored treatment to their “brothers” have ruined it for me.

He went on:

> In the aftermath of the Byrd murder [the 1998 dragging death in Jasper, Texas] I read one commentator’s opinion in which he expressed disappointment that ex-cons could come out of prison with unresolved racial problems “despite the racial integration of the prisons.” Despite? Buddy, do I have news for you! How about because of racial integration? (emphasis in the original)

A man who served four years in a California prison wrote an article for the *Los Angeles Times* called “Why Prisons Can’t Integrate.” “California prisons separate blacks, whites, Latinos and ‘others’ because the truth is that mixing races and ethnic groups in cells would be extremely dangerous for inmates,” he wrote. He added that segregation “is looked on by no one—of any race—as oppressive or as a way of promoting racism.” He offered “Rule No. 1” for survival: “The various races and ethnic groups stick together.” There were no other rules. He added that racial taboos are so complex that only a person of the same race can be an effective guide.

In 2001, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit bowed to reality when it ruled that prison guards may sometimes have a duty to segregate prisoners. A black plaintiff claimed guards had let blacks and Mexicans mix in an exercise yard even though they knew this could lead to attacks. Judge Harry Pregerson agreed, saying prison officials must take reasonable measures to prevent violence, and that segregation is reasonable when tensions are high. This ruling became law in California, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, and Oregon—but not for long.

In 2005, the US Supreme Court ruled that segregating prisoners was unconstitutional. Until that time, the entire California system put new arrivals in double cells with someone of their own race while they were initially evaluated. Really dangerous men were then sent to single cells, and others were put into the general population. The ruling meant that even this initial, temporary segregation had to be stopped.

By mid-2009, integration had been officially attempted in only two of the state’s 33 prisons, beginning with non-violent inmates considered most likely to accept it. At Sierra Conservation Center, southeast of Sacramento, integration began in the fall of 2008. For three days, hundreds of prisoners protested by refusing to work, eat, or leave their cells. Rules violations increased five-fold. Prisoners refused to share cells even though they could be punished with withdrawal of television, commissary, and exercise privileges, and have up to 90 days added to their sentences.

> To me, this is like using us like lab rats, to see if it works,” said black inmate Glenn Brooks. “It ain’t ever going to work. All it’s going to do is get somebody hurt, get somebody killed.”

Mr. Brooks was right. In August 2009 at the California Institution for Men in Chino, about 40 miles east of Los Angeles, overcrowding and attempted integration led to an 11-hour black-Hispanic riot in which 250 men were injured and 55 had to be hospitalized. Inmates also burned down six of eight 200-man dormitories. Prison spokesman Mark Hargrove explained that mixed-race housing had increased tensions and that prisoners were resegregated after the riot. Nine other prisons in Southern California were locked down as a precaution.

Prison segregation would be a blessing to both inmates and guards. It would save lives, relieve tension, and probably, as prisoner John Doe suggests, improve race relations on the outside by
sparing convicts racial violence that permanently embitters them. However, because the United States is committed to integration, we ignore those who have the strongest case against it.

Some would say that racial violence in prisons says nothing about diversity as a national goal because the prejudices of the dregs of society have no relevance for the rest of us. We should not be so hasty to condemn people who face challenges we can hardly imagine. Prisoners must suffer the company of strangers in acutely invasive ways. It is nothing short of cruelty to then force them into racial integration that is vastly more intense than anything most of us would choose voluntarily. Federal judges should search their souls before putting men’s lives at risk in the name of principles they, themselves, probably do not practice in their own lives.

Let us now turn to some of the consequences of racial diversity in the lives of ordinary Americans.
Diversity now touches Americans in virtually every part of the country, but its effect is greatest where there have been high levels of immigration. In parts of southern California, diversity has brought school- and prison-type violence into the streets. Black/Hispanic hostility is chronic, but even what amounts to ethnic cleansing does not get national attention.

By 2004, an unincorporated area just north of Watts between Florence and Firestone Avenues had become the scene of what the *Los Angeles Times* called a “deadly racial gang war.” From just January 2004 through June of 2005, a black gang, the Eastside Crips, battled a Hispanic gang called Florencia 13, producing combined casualties of 44 killed and 200 wounded in an area of just 3½ square miles. Police were shocked to find that only about half the victims were gang members. “Violence took a certain turn and became racial war,” explained Los Angeles Sheriff Lee Baca. “People were killed only because they were black or they were brown.” The department put together a 57-man task force to saturate the area.¹

By the next year, federal officials had enough evidence to prosecute four Hispanics for trying to cleanse blacks from the Highland Park area (about 15 miles away from Florence/Firestone) in a series of attacks carried out between 1995 and 2001. During the trial, one witness testified that an order had come from the Mexican Mafia prison gang to “kill any blacks ... on sight.” Others stated that cliques within the Hispanic gang known as “the Avenues” vied with each other to see who could drive the most blacks out of Highland Park. In 2006, four Hispanics were convicted, and three were sentenced to life in prison for, as acting US Attorney George S. Cardona put it, “the despicable act of trying to rid their neighborhood of African Americans.”²

Later that year, violence returned to the nearby town of Harbor Gateway. An informal boundary line had been established at 206th Street: Hispanics to the north; blacks to the south. There had been inflammatory graffiti and racially motivated killings on both sides of the line, but the death of 14-year-old Cheryl Green seemed especially odious. The middle-school student was on the black side of the line talking to friends when a Hispanic walked up and started shooting.³ Sheriff Baca warned that the almost random nature of the killings made them hard to prevent. Florencia 13 leaders continued to give orders to kill black rivals but that if a particular black could not be found, then it was, “Well, shoot any black you see.”⁴

“They just see a young man of the opposite race and they shoot,” said Olivia Rosales, a former hate-crimes specialist who prosecuted many Florencia 13 murders from 2005 to 2007. Of the 20 cases she handled, said Miss Rosales, “most of the victims have not been members of the rival gang.”

Timothy Slack, who is black, grew up in the contested Florence/Firestone area when it was mostly black. He said he no longer let his children go to the store or walk through alleys. One former black gang member still lived in Florence/Firestone because he owned property there but warned, “It’s going to come a time when everybody’s going to have to leave.”⁵

In 2007, blacks publicly protested what they claimed was insufficient police protection. In November, a noisy group showed up at City Hall to rail against Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and members of the city council. A black woman complained that “you have one race of people exterminating another race of people.”⁶

From the summer of 2006 to the summer of 2007, Hispanics shot blacks on 12 different occasions in the Canoga Park area, and Lieutenant Tom Smart of the Los Angeles Police warned blacks that they...
were being targeted strictly because of race. Ironically, two years earlier, Canoga Park had received the prestigious All-America City designation, largely because of its unusually diverse population.\(^7\)

In early 2008, race killing moved to the town of Monrovia in Los Angeles County, when two blacks entered the territory of a rival Hispanic gang and killed one teenage Hispanic girl and wounded another. Police said there had been many shootouts in what they called a “racially charged gang war” in Monrovia and neighboring cities.\(^8\)

In June 2008, Sheriff Lee Baca went public in the *Los Angeles Times* with an article called “In L.A., Race Kills.” He wrote:

> We have a serious interracial violence problem in this county involving blacks and Latinos. Some people deny it. They say that race is not a factor in L.A.’s gang crisis . . . . But they’re wrong. The truth is that, in many cases, race is at the heart of the problem. Latino gang members shoot blacks not because they’re members of a rival gang but because of their skin color. Likewise, black gang members shoot Latinos because they are brown . . . .

> I would even take this a step further and suggest that some of L.A.’s so-called gangs are really no more than loose-knit bands of blacks or Latinos roaming the streets looking for people of the other color to shoot.\(^9\)

The killings continued into 2009. In January, three Hispanic gang members were charged with racially motivated murder for shooting a black in Canoga Park as he was taking out the garbage. Detective David Peteque explained that the men killed him “for no reason at all other than the color of his skin.”\(^10\)

In May 2009, federal officials charged no fewer than 147 members of the Varrio Hawaiian Gardens gang, which took pride in its anti-black violence and called itself a “hate gang.” The indictment noted that “VHG [Varrio Hawaiian Gardens] gang members have expressed a desire to rid the city of Hawaiian Gardens of all African-Americans and have engaged in a systematic effort to achieve that result by perpetrating crimes against African-Americans.” US Attorney Thomas P. O’Brien called the arrests “the largest gang takedown in United States history.”\(^11\) This shocking example of racial conflict received virtually no national attention.

It is hard to imagine the terror of people who are targets. Thirty-one-year-old Channise Davy thought she had found her dream home in Duarte, California, on a largely Hispanic block where she and her four children were the only blacks. On May 8, 2009, shortly after she moved in, she came home to find that vandals had broken in and spray-painted virtually every available surface—floors, walls, furniture, even television screens—with the word “nigger.” After a single trip back to pick up clothes, she never set foot in the house again.\(^12\)

Southern California no doubt has the worst black-Hispanic tension because of its demographic mix, but other areas also suffer. In 2006, Philip Herrera was watching a movie in a theater in the San Francisco Bay-area town of Richmond with his mother and girlfriend. Blacks were shouting, and Mr. Herrera stood up to ask them to stop. Several then dragged him from his seat and beat him badly enough to give him a concussion. Dozens of other blacks kicked him as he crawled up the aisle to the exit. Outside the theater, blacks attacked at least two other Hispanics while black theater employees looked on and laughed.\(^13\)

In Las Vegas, in November 2001, Damon Campbell was sentenced to life in prison for killing Carlos Villanueva. Mr. Campbell shot Mr. Villanueva after saying he did not want any more Hispanics in his black neighborhood.\(^14\) In 2008, Police Chief William Matthews of Coatesville, Pennsylvania, warned that the city’s blacks were targeting Hispanics for rape, robbery, and assault,
and warned that “black-on-brown crime” could provoke the formation of violent Hispanic gangs for self-defense.¹⁵

In 2006, the Pew Hispanic Center found that the closer blacks lived to Hispanics and the more contact they had with them, the more they favored cutting immigration. Likewise, in a study of racial attitudes in Durham, North Carolina, 59 percent of Latino immigrants said that few or no blacks were hardworking, and 57 percent said that few or no blacks could be trusted. Only 9 percent of whites said that blacks were not hardworking and only 10 percent said they could not be trusted.¹⁶ According to another study, Hispanic passengers tipped white taxi drivers 150 percent more than they tipped black drivers.¹⁷

The city of Lynwood in Los Angeles County used to be black-dominated, but by 2007 it was more than 80 percent Hispanic. Blacks still had considerable power, however, because 40 percent of residents were foreign-born and many could not vote. On the city council, disputes broke down along racial lines. “It’s all about race,” said City Councilwoman Leticia Vasquez.¹⁸

Blacks and Hispanics were at such loggerheads on the board of the Roosevelt School District in Phoenix, Arizona, that the only solution seemed to be to appoint a white man to fill a vacancy. William Weiss said he hoped to bring “calm.”¹⁹

A black man wrote about his decision to take his son out of a Washington, DC, primary school where half the students and most of the staff were Hispanic. He said black students came home crying because Hispanics teased them about their skin color and hair. “Diversity can be messier than most of us want to acknowledge,” he wrote. His conclusion? “[T]o all the friends—most but not all of them white—whom I’ve chastised over the years for abandoning the District once their children reached school age: I’m sorry. You were right. I was wrong.”²⁰

The South, where racial conflict traditionally pitted blacks against whites, has found a new fault line. When Hispanics in Georgia sought designation as “minority suppliers” so they could get preferential contracts, it was black legislators who stopped them. As Bob Holmes of the state’s Legislative Black Caucus explained, “There is growing competition between blacks and Hispanics, and in the South, it is going to get worse.”²¹

The booming economy of the Raleigh-Durham area of North Carolina drew many Hispanics in the 1990s, but soon there was tension with blacks. Ana Cabello-Bumpass, who handled apartment rentals, said that when Hispanics looked for housing, “the first thing they ask me is if there are a lot of blacks around, because they do not want to live in a place where there are a lot of African-Americans.” Blacks also wanted to avoid Hispanics.

Once Hispanics arrived in large numbers in an apartment complex, blacks moved out. “We have nothing in common,” said a black who was leaving. Hispanic immigrant Aura Ventura said that when she and her family moved into an apartment in a black area, neighbors threw eggs at the building. Jim Johnson, who used to live and teach in Los Angeles, was a professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, specializing in minority conflicts. He said the situation was like South Central Los Angeles in the 1980s.²²

Mixing of any kind can bring conflict. In South Boston in 2004, a feud between white and Southeast Asian teenagers was supposed to be settled with a one-on-one fistfight between single combatants from each group. The result was a brawl, leaving 16-year-old Bang Mai fatally stabbed.²³

In 2002 in Brooklyn, young Dominicans ventured into a Bangladeshi neighborhood hoping to steal
a bicycle, but a group of Bangladeshis ran them out. The Dominicans returned with reinforcements and began attacking anyone who looked Bangladeshi. Mizinor Rahman saw the attacks and dialed 911 from his cell phone. The Dominicans then beat the Bangladeshi immigrant to death.  

Hispanics and Vietnamese have been living side by side in Orange County, California, for 20 years but the result has been constant, low-level violence. As a 25-year-old Hispanic who grew up with Vietnamese in Orange County explained, “Lots of Vietnamese and Latino immigrants just resent being next to each other.”

In Columbus, Ohio, there is violence between American blacks and Somali Bantus. A 1998 brawl in one apartment complex prompted the managers to give tenants cultural sensitivity classes. That didn’t work. In 2004, there was another fight between Somalis and blacks at the complex that involved 60 people smashing each other with bats and ransacking apartments. Five Bantus went to the hospital. This time, the solution was segregation; all 15 Somali families moved out.

That same year, a fight at Mifflin High School in Columbus between American blacks and Somalis left a 16-year-old Somali boy unconscious. Three Somali girls left the school, saying they could not get along with American blacks. “It will only get more complicated as the community becomes more ethnically diverse,” said Hassan Omar, president of the Somali Community Association of Ohio.

Early in 2009, residents of Paris, Texas, gathered to discuss sources of racial tension. They hoped that the inauguration of Barack Obama, just ten days previously, would inspire them to reach agreement. Despite the presence of mediation specialists from the US Department of Justice, the tense, four-hour session ended with blacks and whites screaming at each other.

Blacks have had well-publicized friction with Asians, especially with Korean grocers who set up small markets in black neighborhoods. In the 1980s, blacks picketed, burned out, or even murdered Korean grocers in New York City, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Chicago. There were many campaigns to urge blacks not to buy from “people who don’t look like us.”

In New York City, there was so much black-Korean hostility that from 1981 to 1995, blacks launched 15 separate boycotts of Korean-owned groceries. Six lasted for at least a month, and one went on for 17 months. Sociologist Pyong Gap Min notes that black-Korean conflict has finally subsided, however. Why? Because new zoning laws led to the establishment of big-box stores that crowd out small grocers, gentrification brought many non-blacks to Harlem and Brooklyn, and the second generation of Korean immigrants went on to white-collar careers—not because blacks and Koreans learned to live with each other.

After the 1992 verdicts in the first trial of the Los Angeles police officers who beat Rodney King, black rioters singled out Korean-owned stores for arson. After the riots, the Los Angeles Black-Korean Alliance, created in 1986 to reduce tensions, fell apart in mutual recrimination and accusations. Outreach efforts had accomplished so little that no one had the will to keep going. Many Korean businesses that were burned down never rebuilt and others continued to leave. “The black-Korean controversy has dissipated because the fuel has been removed,” explained Ronald Wakabayashi, executive director of the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations.

Black-Asian tension came to a head in San Francisco in early 2010, after young blacks beat several Asians to death and brutalized others. In March, hundreds of Asians marched on city hall waving signs that said “Asians Are Not Punching Bags.” Activist Carol Mo reported that a 2008 survey of 300 strong-arm robberies in the city found that 85 percent involved black perpetrators and Asian
victims. “It is San Francisco’s dirty little secret,” she said, noting that the police were reluctant to talk about the numbers.32

Likewise in 2010, in Manhattan, police arrested a group of black teenagers who specialized in beating up Asian women in their fifties to seventies. The boys acted as lookouts; it was the girls who attacked.33*

THE WORKPLACE

American corporations work very hard to promote diversity, but what are the results? As we will see in the next chapter, not much in terms of actual advantage, but a great deal in terms of racial conflict. In fiscal year 2007, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) received 30,510 formal complaints of racial discrimination, 9,369 cases of national origins discrimination, and 2,880 cases of religious discrimination, for a total of 42,759 cases of job discrimination—170 every workday—that arose because of diversity.34 All three categories were up at least 12 percent over the previous year, and it is safe to assume that for every case filed, many cases of perceived discrimination were not formally pursued.

In addition to EEOC filings, states, counties, municipalities, corporations, and universities have their own grievance procedures. Employees can also file directly in federal court; in 2001, blacks alone filed 21,000 racial discrimination cases.35 All branches of the armed services have grievance procedures. The US Civil Rights Commission, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division, and the state and local equivalents of these offices all exist because of conflicts that arise from diversity.

Immigrants are bringing a new kind of discrimination: “colorism,” or complaints about skin-tone differences among people of the same race. Blacks of different skin tones have long discriminated against each other, but in 2004, Vice-Chair Naomi Earp of the EEOC reported that the greatest increase in disputes had been among immigrants from India, Pakistan, and South America, who are extremely color-conscious. She warned that as the country became more diverse the problem of “colorism” would get worse.36

If it were possible to count every case filed in every possible venue, it could well come to hundreds of thousands of diversity-related grievances every year. There are probably tens of thousands of Americans whose job it is to enforce, adjust, promote, and regulate racial diversity. In addition to the emotional trauma for the parties, the costs of diversity management and the grievance mechanisms it requires probably run into the billions.37* This is entirely aside from the billions spent to settle discrimination suits.

Because there are so many suits with potentially high damages, specialized insurers have arisen to offer protection. “Sooner or later, virtually every medium- to large-sized company is likely to find itself the defendant in a discrimination or sexual harassment lawsuit,” said Robert P. Hartwig, vice president of the Insurance Information Institute. He estimated that in any given five-year period, 60 percent of large companies are named in such cases. Why? “The 21st century’s racially and ethnically diverse workforce is a potential powder keg.” In 1990, there were just a handful of companies that sold discrimination insurance. By 2000, there were more than 60.38

Such lawsuits have traditionally been black grievances against white employers, but accusations can now go in any direction. As the Wall Street Journal noted in 2006, “A new wave of race-
Discrimination cases is appearing in the workplace: African-Americans who feel that they are being passed over for Hispanics.” As Anna Park, an EEOC regional attorney explained, “There used to be a reluctance to bring cases against other minorities. . . . This is a new trend.”

Discrimination runs the other way, too. In October 2005, New Orleans Mayor Ray Nagin voiced a common complaint among blacks when he asked: “How do I ensure that New Orleans is not overrun by Mexican workers?” This attitude can be costly. In 2007, a federal jury awarded $254,000 in damages to Thomas Diaz of the Inkster, Michigan, police department because the city had “promulgated and continued a policy of discriminating in employment against non-African-Americans.” In 2008, a Los Angeles jury found that black supervisors in the sheriff’s department had discriminated against a 19-year Hispanic veteran, Angel Jaimes, and awarded him $432,000.

The pursuit of racial diversity can mean discrimination against whites. In 2008, the city of San Francisco agreed to pay $1.6 million to 12 white police officers who had sued in federal court, claiming they had been passed over for promotion because the city wanted black supervisors.

In 2009, after more than 20 years of legal wrangling, 75 white Chicago firefighters shared a $6 million discrimination award. They had scored higher than blacks on a 1986 lieutenants’ exam but the city cooked the scores and promoted blacks. The city fought the case all the way to the US Supreme Court.

In June 2009, the US Supreme Court ruled on the high-profile case of Ricci v. DeStefano, finding that the city of New Haven had discriminated against white firemen when it threw out the results of a promotion test only because blacks and Hispanics had scored poorly. The city had tried very hard to eliminate any source of racial bias from the test, but still decided that promoting only white men would anger diversity advocates and invite lawsuits.

A combination of factors—pressure on employers to achieve a diverse workforce, together with an increasing numbers of non-white managers who favor their own group—led to a remarkable 45 percent climb in race-based discrimination filings by whites from 1998 to 2008. A typical result: In 2010, Officer Paul Waymire of the Los Angeles Police Department sued his Hispanic supervisor for discrimination and was awarded $125,000 in damages.

Problems with diversity may be found where they are least expected. In Canada, it is the job of the Canadian Human Rights Commission to fight prejudice, discrimination, and insensitivity, but its highly diverse employees suffered greatly from these scourges themselves. An internal report on the commission’s 230 employees found many complaints about spiteful managers, sexual discrimination, and a “poisoned work environment.” Forty percent of the staff had quit in the previous 12 months, and 37 percent of those who were still there hoped to leave soon.

Denver’s Human Services Department handles child abuse, welfare, child support, etc. In 2001, many of its 1,300 employees and eight of ten department heads were non-white, as were many of its clients. The city hired the Gallup organization to see how diversity was working, and was shocked. Fifty-seven percent of respondents said employees suffered discrimination because of race, sex, age, etc. Sixty-nine percent said they did not trust management. Gallup assured the city that people in the helping professions are particularly sensitive to discrimination and vocal about it. Social worker Shanna Ritts, a union representative, said that even different groups of Hispanics did not get along. “We have a large group of minority people working, but they clash,” she explained.

Diversity can endanger the public. On August 26, 1997, white and black air traffic controllers in
the tower at La Guardia Airport got into a fistfight when the white used the word “boy” in the hearing of the black controller and the black was insulted. The tower was out of contact with planes for about a minute, a hazardous condition that is strictly forbidden by federal regulations.49

The armed forces are often said to be a model of good race relations, but this is not always so. Although the study is now more than a decade old, in 1997, the military carried out a huge, congressionally mandated race-relations survey that covered more than 40,000 soldiers. Many reported that relations were “not at all” good or good only to a “small/moderate extent:” 51 percent of blacks, 37 percent of Hispanics, 35 percent of Asians, 36 percent of American Indians, and 25 percent of whites.

A striking two-thirds of the soldiers said they had suffered anything from “insensitive language” to racial threats or violence: 63 percent of whites, 76 percent of blacks, 79 percent of Hispanics, 70 percent of Asians, and 76 percent of American Indians. When asked if opportunities for their race have gotten better or worse over the last five years, only 16 percent of whites thought things had improved. This compared with 39 percent of blacks, 47 percent of Hispanics, 50 percent of Asians and 41 percent of Indians. The Pentagon was so embarrassed by the findings it delayed their release for two years.50

Serving officers dare not criticize diversity for fear it will kill their careers. Only after he retired did Army Green Beret Major Andy Messing say that Special Forces units should be homogeneous because this promotes cohesion. He said differences of race or religion add to the tensions of a grinding training regimen and perilous combat missions.51

A recent book-length study of cohesion in Civil War units found that soldiers were less likely to desert if they were fighting alongside men who resembled them in ethnicity, religion, and occupation, and who came from the same part of the country. Authors Dora Costa and Matthew Kahn concluded that men were most likely to risk their lives for men who were most like themselves. They also found that Union veterans’ health was worse in old age if they had seen a lot of combat but were surprised to discover that this effect disappeared for soldiers who had fought in very homogeneous units. Fighting alongside close comrades immunized them against battle trauma.52

The more intimate the setting, the greater the challenges of diversity. Adopted children, for example, often report they never felt they fit in. In a British study of adults who were adopted as children, 46 percent of whites adopted by whites said they felt a sense of not belonging. For non-whites adopted by whites, the figure rose to close to 75 percent. Researchers reported that their constant refrain was, “Love is not enough.”53

There can be worse: The authors of a 2005 study on domestic violence in the United States reached the sobering conclusion that “the incidence of spousal homicide is 7.7 times higher in interracial marriages compared to intraracial marriages.”54

One study for the period 1979 to 1981 found that white men who married black women were 21.4 times more likely to be killed by their spouses than white men who married white women. A white woman increased her risk of being killed 12.4 times by marrying a black man. Marrying a white did not appreciably change a black person’s risk of being killed by his or her spouse.55

**LANGUAGE**

One result of today’s immigration-driven diversity is that millions of Americans cannot talk to each
other. Los Angeles, which is often said to point the way to America’s future, is home to people who speak some 130 languages. As the *Los Angeles Times* points out, this profusion of languages does not unite:

The Filipino never hears the Persian radio program . . . . The Persian speaker never enters the Lithuanian church. The Lithuanian and the Hindi speakers take different freeway ramps into cultures divided by tracts and commercial strips and, most of all, how they speak.56

As immigrants cluster together, language islands arise: Russian in West Hollywood, Farsi in Beverly Hills, Mission Viejo, and Laguna Niguel; Chinese in the San Gabriel Valley, Khmer in Long Beach, Armenian in Glendale. Some islands are tiny. Cecilia Miguel, originally from Guatemala, spoke only her native Indian language, Q’anjob’al, and lived a sharply isolated life. Authorities took her children from her and put them into foster care because she could not explain how one got a black eye.

Other Angelenos become part of islands as immigrants move in. The city of Monterey Park became famous in the 1980s because of a sudden influx of Chinese-speakres who infuriated whites by putting up signs only in Chinese. Months of tension and debate led to an ordinance that required English in addition to Chinese. Whites kept moving out and dropped to about 12 percent of Monterey Park’s 60,000 people, making it the first mainland American city to have an Asian majority. A large number of Chinese now live from year to year without speaking English.

Bridging the gap between Angelenos who do not have a common language is a constant challenge. Although naturalized citizens are supposed to be able to speak English, Los Angeles County prints ballots in English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Japanese, Tagalog, and Korean. The California Department of Motor Vehicles translates documents into 30 languages, including Arabic, Greek, Hindi, Polish, and Tongan.

Witnesses in trials need interpreters for more than 100 languages, at a huge cost to the state. In fiscal 1998-99 there were 193,909 man-days of interpreter work in California trial courts and 91,600 days in Los Angeles Superior and Municipal courts. Hospitals often depend on a system of over-the-telephone interpreting that no one finds satisfactory. People have ended up stranded in mental hospitals because no one could understand what they were saying. Inner-city blacks must sometimes have their speech interpreted for doctors from India or China—or even Iowa.

There are more than 100 languages spoken by students in the Los Angeles public schools, and by 2000 the district was spending $3 million a year on translations into just a few of them: Armenian, Korean, Chinese, Spanish, Russian, and Vietnamese. The translation unit always had a backlog and dared not advertise itself within the district for fear of being swamped.57*

Similar problems are moving East. For the 2001-2002 school year, Clark County, Nevada, (which includes the city of Las Vegas) was spending so much money teaching English to Spanish-speaking students that other programs had to be “cut down to the bone,” according to superintendent Carlos Garcia. The county had reduced high-school transportation, eliminated all middle school sports, and was seeking $77 million more from the state for the year’s English Language Learners instruction. Hispanic students were still dropping out at an alarming rate.58

Although it is frequently assumed that children quickly pick up English, a study by the state of California found exceptions. “We’re suggesting that there are kids who can go all the way through kindergarten to 12th grade and still be considered English language learners,” said Rob Manwaring, who worked on the report.59
A survey of five suburban counties surrounding Washington, DC, found that as many as 75 percent of the grade school students who were taking English as a second language were born in the United States. “Even more worrisome,” added Michael Fix of the Washington-based Migration Policy Institute, “is that over half of the English-as-a-second-language learners in high school were native born.”

Language conflicts are now everywhere. In Albertville, Alabama, a town of 20,000, there were so many businesses with signs in Spanish that in 2009 Mayor Lindsey Lyons tried to require that signs be in English as well so that police and firefighters could read them. Aylene Sepulveda led opposition to the proposal, arguing that if Mexican businesses had to have bilingual signs, so should everyone else.

Spanish-speakers do not always understand each other. In 2010, Carlos Garcia, a New York City public school teacher, sued the school district after it fired him and fined him $15,000 for using the word *cono* in class. In most Spanish-speaking countries it is an obscene word for vagina, but Mr. Garcia claimed that it is a harmless expression in his homeland, the Dominican Republic.

In 2000, the Supreme Court of New Mexico ruled that people must not be excluded from jury duty just because they do not speak English. Since then, courts have been required to provide simultaneous interpreters, at anywhere from $30 an hour for common languages like Spanish to $180 an hour plus expenses for exotic languages. Interpreters accompany the non-English-speakers into the jury room, but must declare that they served only as interpreters and did not take part in deliberations, which are supposed to be inviolate. So far, New Mexico is the only state to rule that an inability to understand English is not a bar to jury service.

Language complicates police work. Los Angeles police once picked up an elderly Korean who was lost and could not explain where he lived. They dropped him off far from home in the middle of the night. He was robbed and beaten and soon died.

In Pennsylvania, when officers pulled Miqueas Acosta over for driving with an expired safety sticker, they read him his rights in Spanish, but then spoke to him in English before searching his car. They found a kilo of cocaine worth $100,000, but Bucks County prosecutors could not use it as evidence because a Superior Court judge ruled police should have waited for an interpreter before proceeding with the search.

Charges also had to be dropped against Mahamu Kanneh, accused of repeatedly raping a seven-year-old girl, because the courts took too long to find an interpreter for Mr. Kanneh’s tribal language, Vai, which is spoken only in Liberia and Sierra Leone. A Maryland judge found that Mr. Kanneh’s right to a speedy trial had been violated. Mr. Kanneh had arrived in the United States as a refugee and attended high school and community college, but claimed he still needed an interpreter.

In Arizona, a judge threatened to drop charges against human smugglers because the prosecution could not find Mayan interpreters. Authorities in Arkansas were nearly unable to prosecute accused murderers from the Marshall Islands for lack of an interpreter, and prosecutors in Louisville, Kentucky, struggled to find a Bantu interpreter for a Somali charged with killing his children. Really exotic languages require two interpreters. Hardly anyone speaks both English and Mixtec, Triqui, or Zapotec, for examples—these are Mexican indigenous languages—so testimony usually goes from Triqui to Spanish and then Spanish to English.

An extended family of Oaxacan Indians managed to run a $2 million-a-month East Los Angeles
heroin smuggling ring for two decades, in part because they communicated in an impenetrable code: Mixteco Bajo, which is spoken only in southern Mexico. “The language, that stalled us,” said Larry Zimmerman, the L.A. County Sheriff’s Department’s lead detective on the case. In 2010, the US Drug Enforcement Administration was advertising for speakers of “Ebonics,” or black dialect, to listen to bugged conversations between American drug dealers. Agents who spoke Standard English could not understand what the dealers were saying.

Mutual incomprehension can be deadly. In 2005, a busload of nursing home residents was being evacuated from the Texas coast in the face of Hurricane Rita. The bus caught fire and 23 people died. Sgt. Kevin Feinglas of Dallas explained that the Mexican bus driver, Juan Robles Gutierrez, did not speak enough English to carry out safety duties: “He was unable to communicate with passengers regarding emergency exits prior to the trip, and he could not give them adequate warning that there were problems when the bus caught fire,” he wrote, in preparation for charges of negligent homicide.

One of the least desirable consequences of diversity is racial bloc voting. When candidates of different races run against each other, an election can become a racial headcount rather than a choice of policies.

Tom Fiedler, a long-time editor of the Miami Herald, pointed out that tribal politics is near universal. He cited a Herald poll that found more than half of ethnic Cubans, and nearly three-fifths of blacks said race or ethnicity was either very or somewhat important when they chose candidates. Only a third of the whites said race was important, but Mr. Fiedler thought many of the rest were lying.

Mr. Obama’s victory in 2008 was hailed as proof that the relevance of race is receding, but it was hardly that. Ninety-five percent of blacks voted for him and only 4 percent for his white opponent, Senator John McCain. Whites, on the other hand, voted 55 percent for Mr. McCain and only 43 percent for Mr. Obama. For Mr. McCain to have received as many white votes as he did despite unprecedented economic insecurity and record opposition to the Republican incumbent, George W. Bush, suggests that some whites, too, were voting as a racial bloc.

Blacks and Hispanics are present in the United States in numbers large enough to elect candidates of their own race, and virtually every other ethnic group is trying to increase influence by voting as a bloc. The theory is that in close elections, even a small minority can change the outcome if its members vote together.

Filipinos have established the National Federation of Filipino American Associations to lobby government and influence elections. According to Jon Amores, a Democrat in the West Virginia House of Delegates, Filipinos have the potential to be among “the most economically and politically powerful” ethnic groups in the country.

In 2007, Vietnamese candidates for the powerful board of supervisors scored major upsets in Orange County, California, by appealing to fellow Vietnamese. “All candidates should know by now they can’t win an election around here without the support of the Vietnamese community,” said Lan Nguyen, a trustee of the Garden Grove school district.

The Islamic Society of North America holds seminars to help the 1.8 million registered voters who
are Muslim put pressure on politicians. In 2004, it organized a conference of 30,000 people that drew three presidential candidates. “For the first time, Muslims may be able to vote as a bloc,” said Sayyid Syeed, the society’s secretary general. Neveen Salem of the American Muslim Council in Washington emphasized that “we can be the swing vote.”

Immigrants from India have been working for years to tilt American foreign policy toward India and away from Pakistan. The Washington Post marveled at “the rise of Indian Americans as a powerful and effective domestic lobby—one that aspires to the level of influence that American Jews have exerted on behalf of Israel.”

Asian Americans, who are a 5 percent minority of the US population, have an assertive and sophisticated pressure group known as the 80-20 Initiative. It has tried to organize the Asian vote to the point that it can promise a candidate 80 percent of it if he promises to push Asian interests (see Chapter 7).

The influence of Asians is growing. As Prof. Jane Junn of the University of Southern California explains, “It’s a risk for the Democrats if they don’t mobilize them. It’s a risk for Republicans [also] because if they don’t get Asians on their side, they’re gone in California.” Asians will demand policies that suit their racial/ethnic interests.

Most white Americans believe elections should be a choice of policies rather than expressions of racial identity. If Americans vote for a candidate because of his racial agenda, representative government is crippled. Democratic systems operate well only when politicians recognize that even if their opponents’ approaches may be different, all parties are trying to work for the good of the country as a whole. When politics fracture along racial lines, it becomes easy to assume that elected officials work for narrow, ethnic interests, and political contests become very bitter.

The ultimate logic of politics in a racially fractured electorate is a system of quotas in which seats in elective bodies are set aside in proportion to the racial composition of the population. This is the formula hopelessly divided countries such as Lebanon and immediate post-white-rule Zimbabwe and South Africa hit upon. It could be the solution for other divided countries such as Iraq, Sudan, Fiji, Malaysia, or Sri Lanka, where politics is a perpetual squabble over ethnic interests.

There is already implied support for proportional racial representation in the federal approach to voter districts. The US Department of Justice has long required that congressional districts be gerrymandered to create black and Hispanic majorities that are expected to vote along racial lines and send one of their own to Congress. The department also routinely sues cities that choose their governing bodies in at-large elections. If, for example, a city is 30 percent black but has no blacks on the city council because all candidates must appeal to the entire city, voting must be switched to a ward system, with wards drawn so that blacks—by voting for people like themselves—have approximately 30 percent of the council seats. In 2006, the Justice Department used precisely this argument to threaten Euclid, Ohio, with litigation if it did not replace its at-large elections with a system of eight separate wards. In 2010, Hispanics made the same argument when they sued the city of Compton: They claimed that an at-large voting system shut them out and kept the city council all black.

Another way to get proportional representation is through cumulative voting. Let us assume that 10 candidates are running for five at-large seats on a city council. Non-whites may be 10 percent of the voting population but may never get a city councilman who looks like them because even if they vote as a bloc, the top five winners are likely to be white. Cumulative voting gives five votes—the number
of seats—to each voter. Non-whites routinely give all five of their votes to the candidate of their race, while whites spread their votes among several white candidates.

In 2010, under a federal court order, the village of Port Chester, New York, instituted such a system. Hispanics voted as predicted and got their first Hispanic city trustee. Cumulative voting, which violates the American tradition of one-man-one-vote, has been used to elect minorities in Alabama, Illinois, South Dakota, and Texas.\(^{82}\)

Although political representation by racial quota is the effect of government policy, it is not yet respectable to call for it explicitly. When President Bill Clinton tried to appoint Lani Guinier as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights her appointment failed, in part because of Miss Guinier’s advocacy of representation by race. In her view, if blacks were 13 percent of the US population, 13 percent of seats in Congress should be set aside for them.\(^{83}\)

It does not cause much comment, however, when the Democratic Party applies this thinking to its selection of delegates to presidential conventions. Each state party files an affirmative-action plan with the national party, and many states set quotas. For the 2008 Democratic Convention, California mandated an over-representation of non-white delegates. Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics were only 4.6, 5.2, and 21.1 percent, respectively, of the Democratic electorate, but had to be 16, 9, and 26 percent of the delegates. Other states had similar quotas.\(^{84}\)

Procedures of this kind do lead to diversity of delegates but suggest that race is more important than policy.

Perhaps it is. In Cincinnati, where blacks are 40 to 45 percent of the population, Mayor Charlie Luken complained that the interests of blacks and whites seemed so permanently in conflict that “race gets injected into every discussion as a result.”\(^{85}\)

In other words, any issue can become racial. In 2004, the Georgia legislature passed a bill to stop fraud by requiring voters to show a state-issued ID at the polls. People without drivers’ licenses could apply for an ID for a nominal fee. Black legislators felt so strongly that this was an attempt to limit the black vote that they did not merely vote against the law; practically the entire black delegation stormed out of the Capitol when the measure passed over their objections.\(^{86}\)

In 2009, when Congress voted a stimulus bill to get the economy out of recession, some governors considered refusing some federal funds because there were too many strings attached. Jim Clyburn, a black South Carolina congressman and House Majority Whip, complained that rejecting any funding would be a “slap in the face of African-Americans.”\(^{87}\)

Race divides Cook County, Illinois, which contains Chicago. In 2007, when the black president of the county board, Todd Stroger, could not get his budget passed, his floor leader William Beavers—also black—complained that it was “because he’s black.” He said there was only one real question: “Who’s gonna control the county—white or black—that’s all this is.”\(^{88}\)

Juries can be swayed by race. In San Diego County Court, Judge John Einhorn was probably right to ask prospective jurors to examine their consciences in the case of three black men charged with the particularly brutal rape of two white women. Judge Einhorn invited all those who could not ignore race to remove themselves.\(^{89}\) Race is such a volatile issue that in the 2010 hate-crime trial of a white teenager who stabbed a Hispanic immigrant to death in upstate New York, Judge Robert W. Doyle spent the better part of two weeks going through literally hundreds of candidates before finding 12 jurors and four alternatives who thought they would not be swayed by race.\(^{90}\)

Such precautions are necessary. In 2010, Sam Riddle of Detroit escaped a murder conviction
because the sole black on the jury refused to consider the evidence. “If you tried to say anything, she
would lash out at you,” said juror Margaret Elyakin. “If you can’t find this man guilty, you can’t find
anyone guilty. Unfortunately, it came down to race.”

This chapter referred earlier to Thomas Diaz, the Inkster police lieutenant who won damages
because blacks in the police department discriminated against him. After the verdict, the city
appealed to the US District Court in Detroit, asking that the judgment be thrown out because Inkster
was 75 to 80 percent black but the jury was all white. The city argued that whites could not fairly
judge the decisions of blacks.

The legal profession recognizes that diversity makes justice more difficult. By 2004, California,
Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and West Virginia all required practicing lawyers to take courses on
diversity and the elimination of bias in the legal system.

Race can complicate anything. As the Oscar candidates began to come into focus for movies made
during 2010, Hollywood got a bad scare: It appeared that for the first time in 10 years there were not
likely to be any black nominees in any of the major categories.

In an effort to relieve congestion on Interstate 395 that runs through Virginia just south of
Washington, DC, transportation authorities proposed a system of tolls to let single drivers use the car-
pool lanes. Arlington County, Virginia, filed suit, claiming such a system would discriminate against
minorities because they were less able than whites to pay the toll. When the Atlanta subway
authority named one of its lines the Yellow Line, Asians protested because it ran through a large
Asian community. At an undisclosed cost to the taxpayer, the authority changed the name to the Gold
Line.

Every year, the Chicago area splits about one billion dollars in tax money between city and
suburban transit services. Most of the money goes to the city, but according to a suit filed in 2010 it is
not enough. Civil-rights lawyers argued that urban service, disproportionately used by blacks and
Hispanics, was being starved of funds because of “chronic racism.”

**AVOIDING OFFENSE**

Diversity leads to what appears to be an infinite variety of ways to give offense, intentionally or
not. Racial etiquette therefore becomes so complex it is impossible to know what is taboo and what
is permitted. For example, Joseph Smith of East Lyme, Connecticut, wanted to scare away geese that
were eating his corn crop. He made scarecrows out of discarded environmental suits farmers use for
spraying crops. The suits were white and had hoods, and blacks complained that they looked like Ku
Klux Klan robes. Mr. Smith had to take down his scarecrows.

In 2004, the Tennessee Department of Health ran a radio ad that was supposed to promote good
diet by encouraging listeners to “try baking your chicken, eating a fresh tossed salad on the side, and
scrumptious watermelon for dessert.” Listeners complained that watermelon and chicken evoked
racial stereotypes, so the department pulled the ad.

In 2010, the public school system of Denver, Colorado, celebrated the legacy of Martin Luther
King with a meal of “southern-style” fried chicken and collard greens. Lecia Brooks of the Civil
Rights Memorial Center in Montgomery, Alabama, complained that “if that is the message young
people are receiving, then why have a holiday?” School authorities apologized.

In Chandler, Arizona, when police described a rape suspect over the radio as “Hispanic,” Mayra
Nieves, vice president of programming for KMYL Radio near Phoenix, called it “racial profiling,” and said the police should have described the suspect as “dark-skinned.”

For years, the Veterans Administration hospital in Indianapolis had a display of war memorabilia, including the front page from the August 14, 1945 Indianapolis Times with a large headline, “Japs Surrender.” In 2009, the hospital took down the newspaper when an employee complained that the word “Jap” was offensive.

In 2002, volunteers for the Fort McHenry Military Museum in San Pedro, California, decided to raise money through a December 7 showing of the film Tora Tora Tora about the bombing of Pearl Harbor. There were to be ushers in World War II uniforms, vintage cars, and Pearl Harbor survivors at a gala evening at the 1930s-era Warner Grand Theater in San Pedro. The Department of Cultural Affairs of Los Angeles canceled the program, explaining that an event on Pearl Harbor Day would insult Japanese-Americans.

In many theaters it has become impossible to show D.W. Griffith’s innovative classic, Birth of a Nation, because of its portrayal of blacks. Charles Lustman, owner of the Silent Movie Theatre in Los Angeles, planned to launch a series with the 1915 epic, and to put it in context with commentary by a film scholar. He received so many threats he canceled the showing.

When one computer controls the operations of another the two machines are called “master” and “slave.” A black employee in the Los Angeles Probation Department took offense at this language, so the director of affirmative action for the county ordered all outside vendors to start calling them “primary” and “secondary” computers.

At Hillsborough High School in Hillsborough, Florida, the editor of the school newspaper wrote an article about the racial gap in standardized test scores at the school. Principal William Orr ordered the article removed from the paper, explaining that he could not permit an article that could hurt students’ self esteem, even if it were factually correct.

After the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, DC, the Society of Professional Journalists issued guidelines on how not to offend Muslims. Writers were to avoid terms such as “Islamic terrorist” or “Muslim extremist,” and to make an extra effort to include positive depictions of Arabs and Muslims. They were to follow the American Muslim Council’s rules in spelling such words as “Quran” (not Koran) and “Makkah” (not Mecca).

Diversity etiquette can change. In 1953, scientists at the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) began giving female names to Atlantic hurricanes. Women’s groups said this was insulting, so in 1979 the WMO added men’s names. Since women were insulted by hurricanes with girls’ names, blacks might have been glad no hurricanes had African-American names like Jamal or Latonya, but no. Black Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX) complained that the names were “lily white” and that “all racial groups should be represented.”

A single race-related mistake can end a career. Dan Issel used to make $2.5 million a year as the coach of the Denver Nuggets basketball team, but in 2001 he got into a shouting match with a fan and shouted, “Go drink another beer you Mexican piece of (expletive).” It was “Mexican,” not the expletive, that got him in trouble. Mr. Issel made a tearful public apology, but the team suspended him for four games and fined him $112,000. This did not satisfy Hispanics, so the Nuggets fired him.

David Lenihan used to be a talk show host at a Saint Louis radio station, but one word ended his career. He was telling his audience how excited he was at rumors that black Secretary of State
Condoleezza Rice might become commissioner of the National Football League when he said the following: “She’s African-American, which would kind of be a big coon. A big coon. Oh my God. I am totally, totally, totally, totally, totally sorry for that.” Everyone knew he meant to say coup rather than coon, but the station fired him on the spot.\textsuperscript{110}

Tom Burlington used to be a weekend anchor for Fox News. In 2007 he was discussing plans for the evening’s news broadcast, which was to include the NAACP youth council’s decision to “bury ‘the N-word’. ” Mr. Burlington pronounced the word, saying that in a discussion of that kind refusing to use it gave it power it did not deserve. A black woman who was present was offended, and he was suspended and later fired.\textsuperscript{111}

E.D. Hill used to be the anchor of the Fox News program “America’s Pulse.” After Barack Obama secured the Democratic nomination for president he bumped fists with his wife. On the air, Miss Hill said, “A fist bump? A pound? A terrorist fist jab? The gesture everyone seems to interpret differently.” She apologized for using the word “terrorist” but lost her show anyway.\textsuperscript{112}

In 2008, Prof. Donald Hindley, who had taught at Brandeis University for 47 years, told a class that “wetbacks” is a pejorative term for Mexican immigrants. Simply for uttering this word, he was sent to sensitivity training and had a monitor stationed to observe him until Provost Marty Krauss was satisfied that Prof. Hindley was “able to conduct (himself) appropriately in the classroom.”\textsuperscript{113}

In 2005, Oregon state Senator Neil Bryant was nominated to the board of Oregon Health & Science University. As part of the vetting process, Mr. Bryant filled out a three-page form from the governor’s office on “gender and ethnicity.” In answer to a question about “disabilities,” Mr. Bryant wrote “white/male” as a joke. Despite an apology, Mr. Bryant was removed from consideration.\textsuperscript{114}

On January 15, 2005, a police officer in Columbus, Georgia, was helping patrol the route of a march to celebrate the Martin Luther King holiday. The city sent a snack van for hungry officers, and he chose a banana and ate it. A black woman insisted that the officer—who expressed amazement at the charge—was thereby comparing black people to apes. Mayor Bob Poydasheff of Columbus wrote the woman a letter of apology.\textsuperscript{115}

Kelly Tilghman was a reporter on the Golf Channel who was friends with the black golfer Tiger Woods. During a broadcast, her on-air partner joked that Mr. Woods was so dominant that the only way to stop him would be for young players to “gang up” on him. “Lynch him in a back alley,” replied Miss Tilghman, with a laugh. Mr. Woods called the controversy a “non-issue,” but black activist Al Sharpton immediately demanded that Miss Tilghman be fired. The Golf Channel suspended her for two weeks without pay.\textsuperscript{116} When \textit{Golfweek} magazine wrote an article about Miss Tilghman and put a picture of a noose on the cover, editor Dave Seanor was fired immediately because the image was considered insensitive to blacks.\textsuperscript{117}

It is dangerous just to talk about nooses. Travis Grigsby was a drummer in the marching band at Lee’s Summit High School in Lee’s Summit, Missouri. He was discussing the best knots for tying up drum equipment and a fellow drummer asked if he knew how to tie a hangman’s noose. Mr. Grigsby, an Eagle Scout, said he did. A black who overheard the conversation was offended, and the school suspended Mr. Grigsby from the band for two weeks.\textsuperscript{118}

Speedy Gonzales is a cartoon-character mouse who was a Warner Brothers favorite for nearly 50 years. He wore a sombrero, spoke with a Mexican accent, and outwitted foes like Sylvester, “the Greengo Pussygato.” In 1999, when the Cartoon Network got exclusive control of Speedy, it
permanently banned him from American television because of “ethnic stereotypes.” A spokesman
nevertheless conceded that the mouse was “hugely popular” on the Cartoon Network Latin America.  

Promises can be broken in order to punish violations of etiquette. In 2001, officials at Montachusett
Regional Vocational School in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, conducted a survey about race relations at
the school. They told students the survey was confidential, and some whites said minority students got
preferential treatment and were starting fights. School administrators identified five white students
who gave these answers and suspended them for three days for “behavior causing a dangerous
condition” and making “racist comments.”

At a 2008 meeting of Dallas County, Texas, commissioners, Kenneth Mayfield, who is white,
complained about the number of traffic tickets that seemed to be lost in the central collections office,
comparing it to a black hole. Commissioner John Wiley Price, who is black, interrupted with a loud
“Excuse me!” and insisted that the office was a “white hole.” Another black demanded an apology.

Mr. Price did not get an apology, but did not back down. He said other expressions whites should not
use include “angel food cake” and “devil’s food cake.”

Janet Clark, chair of the school board of Pinellas County, Florida, got in trouble when she referred
to chronically disruptive students as “hoodlums.” Black groups accused her of racism, and Ray
Tampa of the St. Petersburg NAACP said he was “disgusted” when she refused to apologize.

Mayor Michael Bloomberg of New York City got the same treatment when he said that heads of the
transit union had “thuggishly turned their backs on New York City” by calling a strike. A black City
Council member and other black leaders complained that since the transit unions were majority non-
white, the word “thuggish” was racist.

In 2003, Grace Fuller and Louise Sawyer, both black, were boarding a Southwest Airlines fight,
when a white attendant, Jennifer Cundiff, urged passengers to take their seats, saying, “Eenie, meenie,
imie, moe; pick a seat, we gotta go.” The second line is usually “catch a tiger by the toe,” but Miss
Fuller and Miss Sawyer said the rhyme was directed at them, since a much older version is “catch a
nigger by the toe.” The flight attendant, who was 22 at the time she recited the lines, said she had
never heard the “nigger” version, and was simply encouraging passengers to sit down. The US
District Court in Kansas City allowed a suit for damages against Southwest but a jury found the
airline not guilty.

Because they are aware of incidents like these, many whites police their language to a remarkable
degree. One woman wrote about paying for food at a Wendy’s drive-through and grabbing madly at a
dollar bill that a gust of wind blew out of her car. “Oh, boy; that was interesting” she said, when she
managed to pin the bill to the side of her car. “I beat myself up as I drove away,” she added. Why?
Because the person she handed the bill to was a young black man and she had used the word “boy.”

Whites impose these rules on themselves because they know blacks, in particular, are so quick to
take offense. Radio host Dennis Prager was surprised to learn that a firm that runs focus groups on
radio talk shows excludes blacks from such groups. It had discovered that almost no whites are
willing to disagree with a black. As soon as a black person voiced an opinion, whites agreed,
whatever they really thought. When Mr. Prager asked his listening audience about this, whites called
in from around the country to say they were afraid to disagree with a black person for fear of being
thought racist.
Attempts at sensitivity can go wrong. In 2009, there were complaints from minority staff in the Delaware Department of Transportation about insensitive language, so the department head, Carolann Wicks, distributed a newsletter describing behavior and language she considered unacceptable. Minorities were so offended that the newsletter spelled out the words whites were not supposed to use that the department had to recall and destroy the newsletter.128

The effort whites put into observing racial etiquette has been demonstrated in the laboratory. In experiments at Tufts University and Harvard Business School, a white subject was paired with a partner, and each was given 30 photographs of faces that varied by race, sex, and background color. They were then supposed to identify one of the 30 faces by asking as few yes-or-no questions as possible. Asking about race was clearly a good way to narrow down the possibilities—whites did not hesitate to use that strategy when their partner was white—but only 10 percent could bring themselves to mention race if their partner was black. They were afraid to admit that they even noticed race.

When the same experiment was done with children, even white 10- and 11-year olds avoided mentioning race, though younger children were less inhibited. Because they were afraid to identify people by race if the partner was black, older children performed worse on the test than younger children. “This result is fascinating because it shows that children as young as 10 feel the need to try to avoid appearing prejudiced, even if doing so leads them to perform poorly on a basic cognitive test,” said Kristin Pauker, a PhD candidate at Tufts who co-authored the study.129

During Barack Obama’s campaign for President, Duke University sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva asked the white students in his class to raise their hands if they had a black friend on campus. All did so. At the time, blacks were about 10 percent of the student body, so for every white to have a black friend, every black must have had an average of eight or nine white friends. However, when Prof. Bonilla-Silva asked the blacks in the class if they had white friends none raised his hand.130 One hesitates to say the whites were lying, but there would be deep disapproval of any who admitted to having no black friends, whereas there was no pressure on blacks to claim they had white friends.

Nor is there the same pressure on blacks when they talk insultingly about whites. Claire Mack is a former mayor and city council member of San Mateo, California. In a 2006 newspaper interview, she complained that too many guests on television talk shows were “wrinkled-ass white men.” No one asked her to apologize.131

Daisy Lynum, a black commissioner of the city of Orlando, Florida, angered the city’s police when she complained that a “white boy” officer had pulled her son over for a traffic stop. She refused to apologize, saying, “That is how I talk and I don’t plan to change.”132

During his 2002 reelection campaign, Sharpe James, mayor of Newark, New Jersey, referred to his light-skinned black opponent as “the faggot white boy.”133 This caused no ripples, and a majority-black electorate returned him to office.134

Names of sports teams are subject to diversity etiquette, but the rules are confusing. A team named the “Rebels” is unacceptable because it glorifies slave-owning Confederates, but “Indians” is unacceptable because it insults Native Americans. It is hard to believe the Army was trying to insult Indians when it named an attack helicopter the Apache or that the Atlanta Braves or Washington Redskins are names that demean Indians. In any case, rebels have been largely wiped out, and activists are hard at work on the few Indians who survive. In 2009 the 17-year suit against the
Redskins finally came to an end only because the US Supreme Court refused to hear the case. In California, activists persuaded the legislature to forbid the use of any Indian-related team name by any public school, except for those near reservations.

The Lehigh Valley Triple-A baseball team, the IronPigs has a large, furry pig mascot. Two days after naming it “PorkChop,” the team had to change it because Hispanics said it was insulting to them. Team owners said they had never heard of the word being used as an ethnic slur but obligingly renamed the pig “Ferrous.”

Houston wanted to name its soccer team the Houston 1836 after the year the city was founded, but Harris County Commissioner Sylvia Garcia led other Hispanics in arguing that this was unacceptable because it was the year Sam Houston defeated Santa Anna’s army at San Jacinto, securing Texas independence. For most Americans, that could hardly be a reason to reject the name, but the team owner switched to the Houston Dynamo.

History is a delicate matter in a diverse country. Shortly after the fall of the Alamo—likewise in 1836—Mexican troops defeated the Texans at the Battle of Coleto Creek near Goliad, Texas. The Texans surrendered, believing they would be treated as prisoners of war. Instead, the Mexicans marched the 300 or so survivors to Goliad and shot them in what became known as the Goliad Massacre. Mexicans resent the term “massacre.” With the city of Goliad now half Hispanic, they insist on “execution.” Many Anglos, said Benny Martinez of the Goliad chapter of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), “still hate Mexicans and using ‘massacre’ is a subtle way for them to express it.”

Watertown, Massachusetts, had a different disagreement about history. In 2007, the town’s more than 8,000 Armenian-Americans were so angry at the Anti-Defamation League’s refusal to recognize the World War I Turkish massacres of Armenians as genocide that they persuaded the city council to cut ties with the ADL’s “No Place For Hate” program designed to fight discrimination. Other towns with a strong Armenian presence—Newton, Belmont, Somerville, and Arlington—were considering breaking with the ADL.

Filmmaker Ken Burns has learned that diversity complicates history. When he made a documentary on the Second World War, Latino groups complained it did not include enough Hispanics—even though none had seen it. Mr. Burns bristled at the idea of changing his film, but Hispanics put enough pressure on the Public Broadcasting Service to force him to.

Even prehistory is divisive. In 1996, two men walking along the Columbia River in Washington State discovered a skeleton that was found to be 9,200 years old. “Kennewick Man,” as the bones came to be called, was one of the oldest nearly complete human skeletons ever uncovered in North America and was of great interest to scientists because his features were more Caucasian than American Indian. Local Indians claimed he was an ancestor and insisted on reburying him. It took more than eight years of legal battles before scientists got full access to the remains.

Holidays are a touchy matter. The Democrat-controlled California legislature commemorates certain holidays on the floor of the assembly. One legislator complained that there were regular celebrations of Cinco de Mayo and Chinese New Year, but when he made a formal request to celebrate the Fourth of July the Democratic leadership turned him down.

There was a flap in Fremont, California, about how to celebrate the Fourth. The city put up American flags, to be sure, but vice mayor Steven Cho thought this was not inclusive enough, so the
American flag shared honors with flags from 25 other countries, including Qatar and Mongolia. San Francisco celebrates diversity with cash. In 1999, the Cinco de Mayo Carnival and Parade got $162,500, the Japanese Cherry Blossom Parade got $40,000, the American Indian Festival got $27,000, Martin Luther King Day got $21,000, Juneteenth got $13,000, Samoan Flag Day got $12,000, and the Min Sok Korean Festival got $7,500. Veterans were angry to be fobbed off with only $1,000 for Veterans Day.

Columbus used to be a hero to Americans, and in 1907, Denver, Colorado was the first city to inaugurate an annual Columbus Day parade. Hispanics and American Indians now say Columbus was a genocidal conqueror, and started protesting the Denver parade in 1991. Police called off the 1992 parade at the last minute because of violence threats. Parades resumed the next year—with massive police protection—and the event has since become a lightning rod for anti-Columbus forces. In 2006, the American Indian Movement planned to pitch camp in downtown Denver without a permit, claiming it did not need permission from “an occupying power.” South Dakota still celebrates the second Monday in October, but calls it Native American Day instead. Alabama celebrates what it calls Columbus Day and American Indian Heritage Day.

In 2007, the Seattle School District sent staff a letter reminding them that many American Indians see Thanksgiving as a “time of mourning,” and asked teachers to bear in mind that the holiday can be a “reminder of 500 years of betrayal.”

The push for diversity can lead to absurd results. Bone marrow donations almost never work unless donor and recipient are the same race, so non-white patients suffer because almost all the people who register as donors are white. In 2008, the National Marrow Donor Program announced that all marrow registries would be required to meet quotas for minority donors. Officials at St. Luke’s Mountain States Tumor Institute in Boise, Idaho said they would have to shut down their donor registry because the demographics of the region made it impossible to find more than a handful of non-white donors.

Likewise, the largely white Amity Regional School District that serves the eastern suburbs of New Haven, Connecticut, stood to lose tens of thousands of dollars in federal money because it did not have enough non-white autistic students. The district had no control over who was diagnosed with the condition, but federal officials said a ratio of 38 whites, one black, and one Asian was “significantly disproportionate,” and threatened to withhold $67,000.

Some people consider autism itself a form of diversity that deserves celebration. Ari Ne’eman, appointed by President Obama to the National Council on Disability, is a leader in the movement to embrace autism rather than cure it. He calls it a form of “neurodiversity” and considers it an important part of his identity.

**ISLAM IN AMERICA**

The United States has traditionally been a Christian nation with a long history of Judaism in certain areas. Because of immigration since the 1960s, things are no longer so simple, and public authorities are under pressure to recognize new religious holidays. In Hillsborough County, Florida, for example, public schools traditionally closed on Good Friday, Easter Monday, and Yom Kippur. In 2005, Muslims demanded a holiday on Eid al Fatr, which marks the end of the month-long, daylight-hours Ramadan fast, and the county decided that the only fair thing to do was to scrap all religious holidays.
Christians and Jews flooded the school board with outraged e-mail, and the board went back to the traditional holidays.\textsuperscript{151}

Every year, Muslims in Baltimore ask the public schools to close for two major Muslim holidays. When, in 2007, the district again announced that schools would stay open, the Baltimore chapter of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee issued a press release denouncing the district’s “racial and religious profiling of Muslim students and teachers.”\textsuperscript{152}

The Sycamore Community School District in Ohio decided to accommodate Jewish students by closing on High Holy Days, but Muslim and Hindu parents complained they had been left out, and the American Civil Liberties Union sued the district. The High Holy Days went back to being school days.

In areas of heavy Muslim concentration in Michigan and New Jersey, schools do close for Muslim holidays. This encourages Muslims in other areas to seek the same treatment, but this stimulates competition from other “non-traditional” religions. When Muslims in the Tampa Bay area of Florida started asking for a day off on Eid al-Fitr, Hindus started pushing for their holidays, and neither group got what it wanted. In many areas, it is common to keep schools open on non-traditional holidays but to give students excused absences if their parents send a note. New Jersey now recognizes 76 such excused religious holidays.

Fordson High School is in heavily Arab Dearborn, Michigan. When the 2010 Ramadan fast came during pre-season football practice, head coach Fouad Zaban decided to hold practices at night between sunset and dawn, so Muslim players could eat and drink during workouts and still fast during the day.\textsuperscript{153}

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, the University of Albany decided to support Muslims by canceling class on Islamic holidays. This continued for four years until Hindus and Buddhists began to demand equal treatment. In 2005 the university dropped the Islamic holidays.\textsuperscript{154}

In 2007, the University of Michigan announced it would spend $25,000 to build footbaths for Muslim students who clean their feet before they pray. Worshippers complained they had to strain to wash their feet in sinks.\textsuperscript{155} The George Mason University student center in northern Virginia has also installed footbaths and a prayer room. In 2008, Harvard decided to set aside workout periods in an athletic center only for women so Muslims could be sheltered from the gaze of men.\textsuperscript{156} One campus—Zaytuna College—has no difficulty making these choices. Founded in Berkeley in 2009, Zaytuna is America’s first Muslim college.\textsuperscript{157}

Islamic modesty conflicts with swimming-pool rules. Many pools require that parents wear bathing suits when they watch their children. This is so they can more easily jump in and rescue a child if necessary, and because shoes track in dirt. Chicago-area Muslims launched a formal protest against this rule,\textsuperscript{158} and in Lincoln, Nebraska, the American Civil Liberties Union filed a similar suit on behalf of Muslims.\textsuperscript{159} Sports leagues, schools, and athletic facilities all over the country are deciding whether they will let Muslim girls take part in basketball, swimming, and track events dressed in long sleeves, pants, and head scarves.\textsuperscript{160}

Americans may have to get used to polygamy. Theoretically, it is still illegal, but according to some estimates, there are thousands of Muslim polygamous unions in New York City alone. “Our mothers accepted it. Our grandmothers accepted it. Why not us?” asked Doussou Traoré of New York’s Association of Malian Women.\textsuperscript{161}
For several years there was a bitter debate at the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport because many taxi drivers serving the airport—80 percent were Somalis—refused to accept passengers with dogs or who had alcohol with them. The dispute went into litigation and even to appeal. Finally, in 2008, the appellate court ruled that the airports commission had the right to suspend the licenses of drivers who refused to pick up certain passengers.¹⁶²

A sudden influx of Muslim workers can destroy workplace morale. In 2006, a meatpacking plant in Grand Island, Nebraska, owned by JBS U.S.A. Inc. replaced 200 illegal-immigrant workers with Somali refugees who were in the country legally. There was immediate tension with the remaining Hispanic workers, who complained they had to take up the slack when Somalis stopped to pray. Hispanics walked off the job in protest, and some of the Somalis filed religious discrimination suits when they were fired for leaving work to pray.

Two years later, the New York Times found “resentment, discomfort and mistrust everywhere” in the town, where the meatpacker was the largest employer. Every group—white natives, Hispanics, Somalis, and Sudanese refugees—resented each other. “Right now, this is a real kindling box,” said Daniel O. Hoppes, president of the local chapter of the United Food and Commercial Workers.

Somali workers caused discord at half a dozen other plants. In October 2008, about 220 Somali Muslims at a JBS packing plant in Greeley, Colorado, walked out in mid-shift, claiming the company would not let them pray, and the company fired about 100 of them.¹⁶³ The same year, a Tysons Foods chicken plant in Tennessee bowed to Muslim pressure and agreed to close on Eid al-Fatr rather than on Labor Day. This made non-Muslim workers so angry the company had to reinstate Labor Day.

Religious discrimination suits are growing faster than any other kind of workplace grievance. At the federal, state, and local levels they doubled from 1992 to 2007 to 4,515 claims.¹⁶⁴

Muslims sometimes win. In 2009, a Minnesota-based poultry packer called Gold’n Plump agreed to pay $1.35 million to Muslim workers, mostly Somalis, because the company would not let them take prayer breaks during work hours and had refused to hire Muslims who would not sign a form agreeing to handle pork.¹⁶⁵

A small but growing number of Muslim employers set their own rules. Rising Star, a Central Florida telecommunications company, banned pork on company premises. In 2004, the company gave Lina Morales a warning for eating a sausage pizza on the job and later fired her when she ate a bacon sandwich.¹⁶⁶

In Hamtramck, Michigan, the Al-Islah Islamic Center successfully petitioned the city to change its noise ordinances to allow a loudspeaker version of the Muslim call to prayer to be sounded five times a day between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. This infuriated non-Muslim residents of what used to be a Polish neighborhood.¹⁶⁷

Some Muslim citizens have disturbing loyalties. Mohammad Juniad, the child of Pakistani immigrants, is a US citizen. His mother was in the World Trade Center at the time of the September 11 attack, but was led to safety by firemen. A week later, Mr. Juniad, 26, bought a one-way ticket to Pakistan, where he planned to volunteer to fight with the Taliban. “I may hold an American passport,” he said, “but I am not an American. I am a Muslim. . . . . I will kill every American that I see in Afghanistan.”¹⁶⁸

Shortly after the September 11 attacks, students at the Muslim Community School in Potomac, Maryland, explained their feelings. “What does it really mean to be an American?” asked seventh-
grader Miriam. “Being American is just being born in this country.” “If I had to choose sides, I’d stay with being Muslim,” said eighth-grader Ibrahim. “Being an American means nothing to me.”

Some American Muslims act on these convictions. Dozens, US-born and naturalized alike, have been indicted for supporting Islamic terrorists and many have actively practiced jihad. Shirwa Ahmed, a Somali-born naturalized citizen who lived in Minneapolis, became the first known American suicide bomber when he blew himself up in an attack in Ethiopia in 2008 that killed 24 people. By February 2010, at least three other Somali-Americans had died fighting for the extremist Al-Shabaab organization in Somalia.

Somali-born naturalized citizen Mohamed Osman Mohamud was arrested in November 2010 for trying to set off what he thought was an enormous car bomb at a crowded Christmas tree-lighting ceremony in Portland, Oregon. He said he wanted to kill as many Americans as possible, including children.

Animus can go both ways. In 2006, five Orthodox Jewish teenagers faced hate-crime charges for attacking 24-year-old Shahid Amber outside a donut store in New York City. “They all beat and kicked me,” he said. “They were screaming ‘Muslim m-f-r. You m-f-ing Muslim terrorists. Go back to your country.’ ”

Americans find some Muslim practices odd but none is so shocking as “honor killing,” or the belief that family members have the right to kill an unchaste woman. There have been honor killings in Europe for some time, but 2008 seems to be the year they came to the United States.

On New Year’s Day, police in Irving, Texas, found the bullet-ridden bodies of two teenage sisters, Sarah and Amina Said. Their father, Egyptian immigrant Yaser Abdel Said, worried that they might start having sex, and averted that possibility by killing them. In July, police in upstate New York charged Waheed Allah Mohammad, an immigrant from Afghanistan, with attempted murder after he repeatedly stabbed his 19-year-old sister. He said she was a “bad Muslim girl” who went to clubs and wore immodest clothing. Later that month, Chaudhry Rashid from Pakistan told Atlanta-area police he strangled his 25-year-old daughter because she wanted to divorce her arranged husband and was involved with another man. He said divorce and adultery were forbidden by Islam.

In 2009 in Peoria, Arizona, Faleh Hassan Almaleki, originally from Iraq, ran down his 20-year-old daughter with a vehicle because she was flouting her family’s traditional values and becoming too Westernized. The daughter went to the hospital with life-threatening injuries.

DIVERSITY IN PERSPECTIVE

The conflicts described in this and the previous chapter—school and prison violence, racial power struggles, discrimination lawsuits, language barriers, religious differences, a complex and unforgiving racial etiquette—are direct consequences of diversity. Whatever their leaders may tell them, ordinary Americans have not failed to notice this. A 2007 poll asked non-whites whether “racial tension” in the United States is either a “very important problem,” “somewhat important,” or not a problem at all. No less than 93 percent of Hispanics thought it was very or somewhat important (79 percent said “very important”), 92 percent of blacks thought it was very or somewhat important (65 percent said “very important”), and 73 percent of Asians thought it was very or somewhat important (37 percent said “very important”). When asked to agree or disagree with the statement, “There is a lot of discrimination against my community in the United States,” 92 percent of blacks, 85
percent of Hispanics, and 57 percent of Asians agreed.\textsuperscript{176}

Many Americans do not expect things to get much better. A 2004 Gallup poll asked, “Do you think that relations between blacks and whites will always be a problem for the United States, or that a solution will eventually be worked out?” Fifty-seven percent of blacks, 44 percent of whites and 42 percent of Hispanics said black-white relations would \emph{always} be a problem.\textsuperscript{177} In 2010, only 36 percent of voters thought relations were improving between blacks and whites; among blacks only 13 percent saw improvement.\textsuperscript{178}

Nor, as we have seen, are relations bad only between whites and non-whites. A 2007 survey found that 61 percent of Hispanics, 54 percent of Asians, and 47 percent of blacks would rather do business with whites than with members of the other two groups.\textsuperscript{179} According to a 2010 Rasmussen poll, 50 percent of voters thought relations were getting worse between whites and Hispanics; only 21 percent thought they were getting better. The same poll found that 34 percent of voters thought black-Hispanic relations were deteriorating while only 16 percent thought they were improving.\textsuperscript{180}

What, then, are the advantages of diversity that not only compensate for agonizing conflicts but justify considering it America’s “greatest strength?” If readers cannot immediately think of any besides ethnic restaurants, they are not alone. A 2007 study by the University of Minnesota found that Americans claim to be positive and even optimistic about the word “diversity” but are unable to explain its value or give examples of its benefits. The researchers found that even people who work in the field of race relations stumble when asked to list its benefits.\textsuperscript{181}

In 2009, a San Francisco radio host named Marty Nemko agreed to host an on-air debate on workplace diversity in which the author of this book was to argue that it was a weakness, not a strength. Mr. Nemko contacted a Georgia-based diversity consultant whose slogan was “Stronger Performance Through Diversity,” fully expecting that he would be happy to argue the other side. The consultant declined, admitting that he did not think diversity was a strength, only that it can be made to work better with “diversity management” of the kind he offers.\textsuperscript{182}

Just about the only serious argument anyone tries to make in favor of diversity echoes Jonathan Alger, a lawyer who has argued before the Supreme Court in favor of racial preferences: “Corporations have to compete internationally,” he says, and “cross-cultural competency is a key skill in the work force.”\textsuperscript{183}

This argument assumes that people get along best with people like themselves, that Koreans, for example, can do business most effectively with other Koreans. Presumably, if the United States has a large population of Koreans they will be a bridge between Korea and the United States.\textsuperscript{184} For that to work, however, Korean-Americans should not fully assimilate because if they do, they will lose the qualities that make them an asset. America should give up the ideal of Americanization that, in a few generations, made Englishmen, Dutchmen, Germans, Swedes, the Irish, and all other Europeans essentially indistinguishable. Do we really want to give up the idea of assimilation? Or should only racial minorities give up on assimilation?

More to the point, is a diverse population really an advantage in trade or international affairs? Japan is one of the most racially homogeneous nations. It would be hard to find a country that so clearly practices the opposite of American-style diversity, but it is one of the most successful trading nations on earth. If diversity were a key advantage, Brazil, Indonesia, Sudan, Malaysia, and Lebanon would be world leaders in trade.
Other great trading nations—Taiwan, Korea and China—are, if anything, even more closed and exclusionist than Japan. Germany is likewise a successful trading nation, but its trade surpluses cannot be attributed to cultural or racial diversity. Only since the 1960s has it had a large non-German minority of Turks who came as guest workers, and there is no evidence that Turks have helped Germany become more of a world presence or even a better trade partner with Turkey.

The world’s consumers care about price and quality, not the race or nationality of the factory worker. American corporations boast about workforces that “look like America,” but they are often beaten in their own market by companies whose workforces look like Yokohama or Shanghai.

If we really took seriously the idea that “cross-cultural competence” was crucially important, we would adjust the mix of immigrants accordingly. We might question the wisdom of Haitian immigration, for example, since Haiti is a small, poor country that is never likely to be an important trade partner. And do 32 million Mexican-Americans help our trade relations with the world—or even with Mexico? Canada is our number-one trading partner. Should we therefore encourage immigration from Canada? No one ever talks about immigration in these terms because at some level everyone understands that diversity has nothing to do with trade or influence in the world. The “cross-cultural competence” argument is artificial.

Does the presence of many races and nationalities give us better international relations? Our history suggests otherwise. In the 1950s, the United States had a population that was far less diverse than today, yet in no other period was American influence greater or our country better liked. It is since the 1970s, as we have grown more diverse, that our relative power has declined, and we have become more disliked. There are many reasons for this, of course, but there is no evidence that diversity makes us better diplomats.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT

Even if there is no connection between diversity and international influence, some people would argue that immigration brings cultural enrichment. This may seem to be an attractive argument, but the culture of Americans remains almost completely untouched by millions of Hispanic and Asian immigrants. They may have heard of Cinco de Mayo or Chinese New Year, but unless they have lived abroad or have studied foreign affairs, the white inhabitants of Los Angeles are likely to have only the most superficial knowledge of Mexico or China despite the presence of many foreigners.

Nor is it immigrants who introduce us to Cervantes, Puccini, Alexander Dumas, or Octavio Paz. Real high culture crosses borders by itself, not in the back pockets of tomato pickers, refugees, or even the most accomplished immigrants. What has Yo-Yo Ma taught Americans about China? What have we learned from Seiji Ozawa or Ichiro about Japan? Immigration and the transmission of culture are hardly the same thing. Nearly every good-sized American city has an opera company, but that does not require Italian immigrants.

Miami is now nearly 70 percent Hispanic, but what, in the way of authentic culture enrichment, has this brought the city? Are the art galleries, concerts, museums, and literature of Los Angeles improved by diversity? Has the culture of Detroit benefited from a majority-black population? If immigration and diversity bring cultural enrichment, why do whites move out of those very parts of the country that are being “enriched”?

It is true that Latin American immigration has inspired more American school children to study Spanish, but fewer now study French, German, or Latin. If anything, Hispanic immigration reduces
what little linguistic diversity is to be found among native-born Americans. As we will see in Chapter 9, many people study Spanish, not because they love Hispanic culture or Spanish literature but for fear they may not be able to work in America unless they speak the language of Mexico. 185

Another argument in favor of diversity is that it is good for people—especially young people—to come into contact with people unlike themselves because they will come to understand and appreciate each other. Stereotyped and uncomplimentary views about other races or cultures are supposed to crumble upon contact. This, of course, is just another version of the “contact theory” that was supposed to justify school integration. Do ex-cons and the graduates—and numerous dropouts—of Los Angeles high schools come away with a deep appreciation of people of other races? More than half a century ago, George Orwell noted that:

During the war of 1914-18 the English working class were in contact with foreigners to an extent that is rarely possible. The sole result was that they brought back a hatred of all Europeans, except the Germans, whose courage they admired. 186

Contact often has the effect of hardening hostilities, not dissolving barriers. This effect is common in politics. When Jesse Jackson was running for the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party, his percentage of the white vote was consistently highest in those states with the fewest blacks. Whites with the most actual contact with blacks were least likely to vote for him. The same was true in 2008 during Barack Obama’s Democratic primary campaigns. He won the highest percentages of the white vote in states such as Iowa, which has few blacks, and the lowest percentages in states with large black populations. Bernard N. Grofman of the University of California, Irvine has found a reliable political correlation: As the number of blacks rises, more whites vote Republican 187—and the less likely they are to vote for black candidates.

It is whites whose knowledge about blacks is filtered by the media rather than gained first-hand who have the most favorable impression of them. The alleged benefits of diversity seem illusory to the people who actually experience it.

Even what are considered the accomplishments of diversity are admissions of its failure. All across America, public organizations such as fire departments and police forces congratulate themselves when they manage to hire more than a token number of blacks or Hispanics. They promise that this will greatly improve service.

And yet, is this not an admission of how difficult the multi-racial enterprise really is? If all across America it has been shown that whites cannot provide effective police protection for blacks or Hispanics, it only proves that diversity is an insoluble problem. If blacks want black officers and Hispanics want Hispanic officers, they are certainly not expressing support for diversity. A mixed-race force—touted as an example of the benefits of diversity—becomes necessary only because of the tensions that arise between officers of one race and citizens of another. The diversity we celebrate is necessary only because of the intractable problems of diversity.

Likewise, if Hispanic judges and prosecutors must be recruited for the justice system, does this mean whites cannot dispense dispassionate justice? If non-white teachers are necessary role models for non-white children, does this mean inspiration cannot cross racial lines? If newspapers must hire non-white reporters in order to satisfy non-white readers, does this mean whites cannot write acceptable news for non-whites? If blacks demand black newscasters and weathermen on television, does it mean they prefer to get their information from people of their own race? If majority-minority voting districts must be established so that non-whites can elect representatives of their own race, does this mean democracy itself divides Americans along racial lines? All such efforts at diversity...
are not expressions of the strength of multi-racialism; they are desperate efforts to counteract its weaknesses. They do not bridge gaps; they institutionalize them.

Let us now see what science teaches us about diversity.
The racial conflict and self-segregation described in the previous chapters are not what we would expect if widespread assumptions about the advantages of diversity are true. The prevailing view in the media and some parts of academia is that race is not even a legitimate biological category, and that it is only because of prejudiced conditioning that we even notice it. This view ignores the large body of scientific work that suggests racial and ethnic consciousness is deeply rooted in human psychology. Our species seems to have an instinct for determining who is in our group and who is not. Studies of individuals point to unconscious processes in the brain that reflect a suspicion of people unlike ourselves, leading some researchers to conclude that ethnocentrism is part of human nature.

At the same time, studies at the group level show that ethnic conflict is universal. In all countries, diversity of religion, ethnicity, or race causes conflict. For the better part of the post-war period, sociologists and political scientists downplayed ethnic conflict, on the assumption that it was a pre-modern relic that would be replaced by competition based on class or professional affiliation. This has not happened. As one researcher has concluded, “ethnicity based on common descent tends to be more important than class based on common interest . . . . Blood runs thicker than money . . . . ”

It is from two directions, therefore, that scientists have begun to question the view that ethnic or racial mixing can be easily achieved. Laboratory investigations of individuals have found what may be tribal or ethnocentric instincts, while analysis of societies suggests that diversity invariably brings conflict.

**GENETIC SIMILARITY THEORY**

There is a theoretical framework that explains ethnocentrism. As the Belgian authority on ethnic relations Pierre L. van den Berghe put it more than 25 years ago, “The degree of cooperation between organisms can be expected to be a direct function of the proportion of the genes they share; conversely, the degree of conflict between them is an inverse function of the proportion of shared genes.” Van den Berghe used the word “organisms” because he found this principle true in animals as well as people. When there is great genetic distance between strangers—in the case of humans, when they are of different races—conflicts are sharper.

It is easy to understand the first part of van den Berghe’s proposition. People everywhere make great sacrifices for their families. The evolutionary explanation is that everyone shares more copies of his distinctive genes with close kin than with strangers. All forms of life can be viewed as striving to pass on their genes to future generations. Each individual therefore has a “genetic interest” in close relatives, which helps explain solidarity and cooperation within families.

The British geneticist J.B.S. Haldane said jokingly in the 1930s, “I would lay down my life for two brothers or eight cousins.” A sacrifice of this kind would be genetically neutral, because each brother would share half his distinctive genes while each cousin would share one eighth.

What about hostility to strangers? Much of our evolution as a distinct species took place before the invention of agriculture, during the millions of years our human and proto-human ancestors lived in hunter-gatherer bands. The members of small bands were usually related to each other, and it was important for them to cooperate and even sacrifice for each other. At the same time, strangers were potentially dangerous competitors for food and territory. As Edward O. Wilson of Harvard has
explained:

The strongest evoker of aggressive response in animals is the sight of a stranger, especially a territorial intruder. This xenophobic principle has been documented in virtually every group of animals displaying higher forms of social organization. 4

Groups that did not defend territory against intruders were less likely to survive. “Our behavioral predisposition to ethnic nepotism evolved in the struggle for existence because it was rational and useful,” explains Finnish scholar Tatu Vanhanen. 5 Today our lives are vastly different from those of hunter-gatherers, but research on human behavior suggests that many basic instincts are unchanged.

Many kinds of animal behavior can be explained by genetic similarity theory. Animals have a preference for close kin, and study after study has shown that they have a remarkable ability to tell kin from strangers. Frogs lay eggs in bunches, but they can be separated and left to hatch individually. When tadpoles are then put into a tank, brothers and sisters somehow recognize each other and cluster together rather than mix with tadpoles from different mothers. 6

Female Belding’s ground squirrels may mate with more than one male before they give birth, so a litter can be a mix of full siblings and half siblings. Like tadpoles, they can tell each other apart. Full siblings cooperate more with each other than with half-siblings, fight less, and are less likely to run each other out of the territory when they grow up. 7

Even bees know who their relatives are. In one experiment, bees were bred for 14 different degrees of relatedness—sisters, cousins, second cousins, etc.—to bees in a particular hive. When the bees were then released near the hive, guard bees had to decide which ones to let in. They distinguished between degrees of kinship with almost perfect accuracy, letting in the closest relatives and chasing away more distant kin. The correlation between relatedness and likelihood of being admitted was a remarkable 0.93. 8

Ants are famous for cooperation and willingness to sacrifice for the colony. This is due to a quirk in ant reproduction that means worker ants are 70 percent genetically identical to each other. But even among ants, there can be greater or less genetic diversity, and the most closely related groups of ants appear to cooperate best. Linepithema humile is a tiny ant that originated in Argentina but migrated to the United States. Many ants died during the trip, and the species lost much of its genetic diversity. This made the northern branch of Linepithema humile more cooperative than the one left in Argentina, where different colonies quarrel and compete with each other. This new level of cooperation has helped the invaders link nests into supercolonies and overwhelm local species of ants. American entomologists want to protect American ants by introducing genetic diversity so as to make the newcomers more quarrelsome. 9

Even plants cooperate with close kin and compete with strangers. Normally, when two plants are put in the same pot, they grow bigger root systems, trying to crowd each other out and get the most nutrients. A wild flower called the Sea Rocket, which grows on beaches, does not do that if the two plants come from the same “mother” plant. They recognize each others’ root secretions and avoid wasteful competition. 10

Higher animals show the same tendencies. Chimpanzees are our nearest living relatives, and offer hints as to how our distant ancestors may have behaved. Chimps live in bands within territories, and show a ferocious in-group out-group consciousness. It has long been known that males drive off intruders from other bands and kill their young if they can. Psychologists watching chimps in Uganda
found that even females are murderously territorial. On three occasions they saw females drive off invaders and kill their babies.  

People often behave according to genetic similarity theory, and the scholar who has probably written most extensively in this field is J. Philippe Rushton of the University of Western Ontario. “Genetically similar people tend to seek one another out and to provide mutually supportive environments such as marriage, friendship, and social groups,” he has written. For example, spouses tend to resemble each other, not just in age, ethnicity, and education \((r = 0.6)\) but in opinions and attitudes \((r = 0.5)\), intelligence \((r = 0.4)\), and even in such things as personality and physical traits \((r = 0.2)\). They are even like each other in undesirable traits such as aggressiveness, criminality, alcoholism, and mental disease. It is possible to predict how happy a couple is by knowing how similar they are. Best friends are as similar to each other and in the same ways as spouses. Likewise, in mixed families of adopted and natural children, the friends of biological siblings resemble each other more than do the friends of adopted siblings.

One of the classic examples of kin preference is the risk of violence children run when they live with a man who is not their biological father. A preschool-age child is 40 times more likely to be assaulted by a step parent than by a biological parent.

For people, the most obvious indicator of genetic similarity is appearance. People of the same race are always genetically closer to each other than to people of different races, and even within the same race, greater physical resemblance usually means more genetic similarity.

Young children learn very early what race they are, and even three-month-old infants prefer faces of their own race. In a joint British-Israeli study, babies sitting on their mothers’ laps were shown side-by-side photographs of white and black faces matched for attractiveness. How long a baby looks at something is considered an indication of preference, and white babies reared in a white environment looked at white faces an average of 63 percent longer than they looked at black faces. Black babies reared in Africa looked at back faces 23 percent longer.

For adults, it is easier to tell people of their own race apart than to distinguish among people of other races. This difference is so well known that psychologists have named it “the other-race effect.” In a 2006 confirmation of the effect, researchers at the University of Texas at El Paso showed subjects an equal number of photos of faces from their own race and from a different race. Some time later, they showed the subjects twice as many photos of people of both races—including the faces they had already seen—and asked which ones they had seen before. All subjects, whatever their race, made about 50 percent more mistakes with the faces of the race that was not their own.

Prof. Edward Seidensticker, who taught Japanese at Columbia University, once overheard a conversation that hinted at the other-race effect. He was touring one of the southern islands of Japan, where about 1,000 monkeys live in the wild but are tame enough to be observed by tourists. A guide mentioned that he could tell every one of the monkeys apart by sight. A skeptic in the crowd wanted to know how anyone could tell 1,000 monkeys apart. “Oh, it’s very easy,” said the guide. “It’s like telling white people apart.”

Three-and-a-half-month-old infants already seem to exhibit the other-race effect. In a study at the University of Kentucky, white babies were very good at distinguishing faces with 100 percent Caucasian features from faces that had been graphically morphed to include features that were 70 percent white and 30 percent Asian. They couldn’t do the reverse: They could not tell 100 percent
Asian faces from those that were morphed to include 30 percent white features. In other words, they could detect small differences between white and not-quite-white faces, but not the same kinds of differences between Asian and not-quite-Asian faces.  

Lawrence A. Hirschfeld of the University of Michigan did some of the pioneering work on how early in life children begin to understand race. He showed children of ages three, four, and seven, a picture of “Johnny:” a chubby black boy in a police uniform, complete with whistle and toy gun. He then showed them pictures of adults who shared two of Johnny’s three main traits of race, body build, and uniform. Prof. Hirschfeld prepared all combinations—policemen who were fat but were white, thin black policemen, etc.—and asked the children which was Johnny’s daddy or which was Johnny all grown up. Even the three-year-olds were significantly more likely to choose the black man rather than the fat man or the policeman. They knew that weight and occupation can change but race is permanent. In 1996, after 15 years of studying children and race, Prof. Hirschfeld concluded: “Our minds seem to be organized in a way that makes thinking racially—thinking that the human world can be segmented into discrete racial populations—an almost automatic part of our mental repertoire.”

When white preschoolers are shown racially ambiguous faces that look angry, they tend to say they are faces of blacks, but categorize happy faces as white. “These filters through which people see the world are present very early,” explained Andrew Baron of Harvard.

Phyllis Katz, then a professor at the University of Colorado, studied young children for their first six years. At age three, she showed them photographs of other children and asked them whom they would like to have as friends. Eighty-six percent of white children chose photographs of white children. At age five and six, she gave children pictures of people and told them to sort them into two piles by any criteria they liked. Sixty-eight percent sorted by race and only 16 by sex. Of her entire six-year study Prof. Katz said, “I think it is fair to say that at no point in the study did the children exhibit the Rousseau type of color-blindness that many adults expect.”

An Australian study of four- and five-year-olds found that white children with essentially no experience with non-whites preferred to play with white dolls, and some even called Aboriginal dolls “yucky.” The children may have picked up prejudices from parents, but their reactions may have reflected innate preferences.

Adults can distinguish race from very minimal clues. Stanford researchers showed subjects just the front slices of plain, black profiles—the face from forehead to chin, without the hair. Subjects could tell the race of the profile (80 percent of the time) more often than they could tell the sex (70 percent), or the age within 10 years (68 percent). Race is commonly equated with skin color, but all the profiles were black. It is obviously important for adults to tell the sexes apart, but they were even better at telling races apart.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has been used to determine that what is called the fusiform region of the brain may be associated with the other-race effect. The fusiform region is involved in expert appraisal. In a bird-watcher’s brain, for example, the region lights up at the sight of a bird. All people have considerable expertise in recognizing human faces, but MRI scans show greater fusiform activity—expert appraisal activity—when they are looking at faces of their own race.

Genetic similarity theory suggests that even among people of the same race, there is greater affinity for people who are physically similar. Lisa DeBruine of the University of Aberdeen in Scotland had subjects play a computer game with an unseen opponent whose face, the subjects were told, was
projected on a screen. The players could trust each other and cooperate to win a large prize, or they
could compete and win a small prize. When the face on the screen the player saw was a morphed
version of his own face—with very similar features—he was more likely to be generous and
cooperative. If the face on the screen did not look like him, the player was more likely to be
suspicious and ungenerous. Prof. DeBruine concluded that players instinctively trust people with
traits that suggest they have close genetic ties. 27

In a different experiment, Prof. DeBruine asked students to choose from among photos of various
faces the person they thought the most trustworthy. Again, unbeknownst to the students, one of the
faces was a morphed version of the subject’s face, and that was the face the majority picked as most
trustworthy. “It means to them, on some level, that this person is ‘family’ and they are more trusting of
them,” said Prof. DeBruine. 28

Steven Platek of Georgia Gwinnett College found that when the subjects’ faces were morphed into
what appeared to be people of other races—but were still very similar to the subjects’ faces—this
did not result in higher ratings of trust. Racial differences canceled out the appeal of similar features.
Dr. Platek also found that when subjects looked at faces similar to their own, MRI scans showed that
the brain’s reward centers were active. He believes he has found the neurological basis for kin
preference, group membership, and racial identification. 29

Research at the University of Pecs in Hungary has found that women tend to choose husbands who
look like their fathers and that men choose wives who look like their mothers. The Hungarian team
did not rely simply on subjective measures but carefully measured facial proportions to determine
similarities. 30

Pet owners choose dogs that look like themselves. Researchers at the University of California at
San Diego found that undergraduates could match photos of purebred dogs with their owners 64
percent of the time. “Like picking a spouse or a friend, you look for dogs who are like you,” said
Nicholas Christenfeld, who led the study. 31

By the same token, white people are more likely to adopt light-colored dogs from the pound than
dark-colored ones. “I would say at least 80 percent of our dog kennel is black 98 percent of the time,”
says Katherine Christenson of Georgia’s Atlanta Humane Society. “People always take the blond
dogs first.” 32

Trust in the familiar seems to be matched by wariness of the unfamiliar. Jennifer Richeson of
Northwestern University has conducted experiments in which white subjects had to interact in some
way with a white or a black man before taking a mental test. Those who dealt with the black man got
lower scores on the test, and their brain scans showed what Prof. Richeson called “heightened
activity in areas of the brain associated with regulating our thoughts and emotions.” She interpreted
this to mean that white subjects were struggling with the “awkwardness” or “exhaustion” of dealing
with a black man, and that this interfered with their ability to take the mental test. 33

Researchers at Harvard and New York University had white and black subjects look repeatedly at
a series of photographs of black and white faces, all with neutral expressions. Every time the subjects
looked at one particular black face and one particular white face they got a mild electric shock. Lie
detector-type devices showed that subjects would sweat—a typical stress reaction—when they saw
the two faces they associated with the shocks. The researchers showed the photo series several times
again, but without the shocks. White subjects quickly stopped sweating when they saw the white face
formerly associated with the shock, but continued to sweat when they saw the black face. Black
subjects had the opposite reaction, continuing to sweat when they saw the white but not the black
face. Mahzarin Banaji, the study’s leader, concluded that this was a sign of natural human wariness of
unfamiliar groups.34

Yale University psychologist Adam R. Pearson set up closed-circuit television conferences
between subjects, some of which were between people of the same race, and some between people of
different races. For half of the conversations, he built in a one-second delay every time there was a
response. The subjects could not tell that the delay was artificial; they would have noticed only a
slight pause before replying.

Both whites and blacks who had conversations across racial lines that had the delay described
themselves and their partners as significantly more anxious than those who had conversations without
the delay. They also expressed less desire to meet the other person. People who had conversations
with someone of the same race reported less anxiety when there was a built-in delay, and this did not
decrease their willingness to meet the other person. Dr. Pearson theorized that people bring a certain
wariness to interactions with people of a different race, and the slightest abnormality in
communication leaves a bad impression.35

MRI testing again shows what may be the underlying brain mechanism. The amygdalae are two
small lobes in the brain associated with fear, arousal, and emotions. When they are active, it is
thought to be a sign of vigilance, meaning that the brain is wary and wants more information. A study
at Massachusetts General Hospital found that when subjects looked at photographs of faces—half
were white, half were black—MRI scans found high amygdala activity. This was considered to be a
normal reaction to unfamiliar faces. When the subjects looked at the photographs a second time the
faces were more familiar; only the other-race faces continued to provoke high amygdala activity. This
was true for both blacks and whites, suggesting that encounters with people of different races keep the
brain at a higher level of watchfulness.36

Amygdalae notice race even when a person does not. William A. Cunningham of Ohio State
University showed white subjects pictures of faces for only 30 milliseconds—not long enough for the
subjects to be conscious of them—but black faces triggered greater amygdala activity than white
faces. When he showed faces for a half a second—long enough for people to notice race—he found
that black faces prompted greater activity in the pre-frontal areas, a part of the brain associated with
detecting internal conflicts and controlling conscious behavior. This suggested the subjects were
trying to suppress certain feelings about blacks.37

Steven Neuberg of Arizona State University attributes instinctive bias to evolution during our
hunter-gatherer past. “By nature, people are group-living animals—a strategy that enhances individual
survival and leads to what we might call a ‘tribal psychology’, ” he says. “It was adaptive for our
ancestors to be attuned to those outside the group who posed threats such as to physical security,
health or economic resources.”38

Wendy Berry Mendes at Harvard found that when subjects played a competitive game with
someone of another race, they showed physical signs of distress, such as lower cardiac efficiency and
constricted arteries. They did not show these signs when they played with someone of their own
race.39

If a person sees someone being injured, for example in the foot, his nervous system reacts as if he,
himself, were hurt in the foot, although he does not feel physical pain. Italian researchers found that
When white subjects watched short film clips of needles pricking black- or white-skinned hands, the sympathetic pain reaction was greater when the white hand was pricked. There was also a greater surge in heart rate and sweat-gland activity, a common measure of emotional reaction. Black subjects had the opposite reaction, responding more when a black hand was pricked.40

Harvard researchers have designed a computer-based test that is supposed to detect racial prejudice. It begins very simply. When a black face appears on the screen the subject hits a key on the left, and when a white face appears he hits a key on the right. He distinguishes in the same way between a series of positive words like “glorious” and “wonderful,” and negative ones like “nasty” and “awful.” The test then combines the two categories, and the subject hits the left key for either a white face or a positive word, and the right key for either a black face or a negative word. Finally, the combination is reversed, and the subject must hit one key when black faces or positive words appear, and the other key when white faces and negative words appear. After tens of thousands of tests, analysis shows that 88 percent of whites are better at associating white faces than black faces with positive words. Many whites who believe themselves to be without bias are crushed by the results.41

Daniel Chirot, professor of international studies at the University of Washington in Seattle says that research of this kind “refutes those naive enough to believe that if it weren’t for bad socializing, we would all be nice tolerant people who accept cultural and ethnic differences easily.”42

There are, in fact, some people who do not appear to have a built-in preference for their own race. They suffer from something called Williams Syndrome, and lack the usual fear of strangers and the unknown. Researchers at the Central Institute of Mental health in Mannheim, Germany, found that normal white children, aged five to seven, matched good characteristics with photographs of people of their own race and negative characteristics with people of other races. Twenty children with Williams Syndrome did not, matching characteristics without regard to race. The syndrome appears to change the way the amygdalae communicate with the pre-frontal cortex, and it eliminates social inhibition. People with Williams Syndrome are “hypersocial,” and do not see danger in the faces of people who may be threats.43 They also tend to be mildly retarded and to suffer from other physical complications.

For the rest of us, a sense of tribal identity runs deep, and can assert itself in heart-breaking ways. Lowri Turner is a British woman whose second marriage was to a man from India. “I am white and I have two sons from my first marriage who are both milky complexioned and golden haired,” she wrote. She then explained how unprepared she was for her feelings when she had a mixed-race child with her new husband:

When I turn to the mirror in my bedroom to admire us together, I am shocked. She seems so alien. With her long, dark eyelashes and shiny, dark brown hair, she doesn’t look anything like me. . . .

I didn’t realise how much her looking different would matter and, on a rational level, I know it shouldn’t. But it does. Evolution demands that we have children to pass on our genes, hence the sense of pride and validation we get when we see our features reappearing in the next generation.

With my daughter, I don’t have that. . . .

Even admitting to having mixed feelings about her not being blonde and blue eyed, I feel disloyal and incredibly guilty.44

An American woman who adopted a baby from India wrote of similar feelings:

When I was trying to decide who and from where to adopt, I had a lot of questions about transracial adoptions, and most people responded to my curiosity with a subtle discomfort. I felt embarrassed voicing possible concerns to my liberal friends, because all of us were adamant that race made no difference to our choice of friends, lovers, or tiny babies up for adoption.

I flew to Bombay and became a mother.

Back home, after a couple of weeks had passed, I stared at Vaishali’s naked bottom—her darkest part—and tried to ignore the insistent whispers of fear. Instead of brimming with pride, I felt like a trespasser, performing ablutions on this private flesh with
... color so foreign from my own. . . . How could this be my daughter? I looked at her and tried to find similarities between us, relieved that her hair was straight, her lips not too full. Just thinking these thoughts made me feel horribly ashamed. I tried to sort emotion from fact: was it the dark color of her skin that was making me uncomfortable, or just that she did not look like me? 

There is a powerful urge to see oneself in one’s children. At least a few fertility clinics are willing to help deaf people or dwarfs have children who are also deaf or are dwarfs. A technique known as embryo screening involves *in vitro* fertilization of a number of eggs and then comparison of the genetic characteristics of the resulting embryos before deciding which one to implant. With enough embryos to choose from, a parent can have what amounts to a custom-designed baby, who may be deaf or a dwarf. Cara Reynolds, a dwarf, was outraged by people who criticized deliberate selection for what most people consider a defect. “You cannot tell me that I cannot have a child who’s going to look like me,” Miss Reynolds said. “It’s just unbelievably presumptuous.”

**THE NEED FOR RACIAL IDENTITY**

It is common to assume that multi-racialism is inevitable, and that racial identity will disappear as races mix. Americans prefer to think that the “tragic mulatto,” welcome in neither community, was either a myth or a reflection of outmoded racist thinking. Research suggests things may not be so simple.

A 2003 study of 90,000 middle-school and high-school students found that black/white mixed-race children had more health and psychological problems than children who were either black or white. They were more likely to be depressed, sleep badly, skip school, smoke, drink, consider suicide, and have sex. White/Asian children showed similar symptoms. The principal author concluded that the cause was “the struggle with identity formation, leading to lack of self-esteem, social isolation and problems of family dynamics in biracial households.”

The authors of a 2008 study reached the same conclusion: “When it comes to engaging in risky/anti-social adolescent behavior, however, mixed race adolescents are stark outliers compared to both blacks and whites. . . . Mixed race adolescents—not having a natural peer group—need to engage in more risky behaviors to be accepted.” A study of white/Asian children found that they were twice as likely as mono-racial children—34 percent vs. 17 percent—to suffer from psychological disorders such as anxiety, depression or drug abuse.

Yoonsun Choi of the University of Chicago found that in Seattle middle schools, a clear racial identity seemed to protect against certain problems. Bi-racial children were the group most likely to smoke, take drugs, have been in fights, hurt someone badly, or carry a gun. Prof. Choi believes mixed-race children suffer because no racial group accepts them. “There is some indication that a strong ethnic identity helps protect kids from these [undesirable] behaviors,” she said.

Prof. Choi also argued that a strong immigrant identity keeps children out of trouble. According to her research, foreign-born children of all races—black, white, Asian, Hispanic—get into less trouble than American-born children of the same groups. She said black immigrants adopted the bad habits of native-born blacks most quickly, while Asians took the longest to reach the levels of misbehavior of American-born Asians. Prof. Choi suggested immigrants should be in no hurry to assimilate.

Lisa Kiang of Wake Forest University found that a strong ethnic identity was tied to a sunny outlook: “Adolescents with a high ethnic regard maintained a generally positive and happy attitude . . . So, having positive feeling about one’s ethnic group appeared to provide an extra boost of positivity in individuals’ daily lives.” She thought society should encourage strong ethnic identity, at
least for Chinese and Mexicans, who were the two groups she studied. Rather than move freely between two groups, mixed-race people may be uncomfortable in both. At Harvard, Paloma Zepeda, who is half-Mexican and half-Russian, said she was not welcome at the campus Mexican-American group *La Raza* because she was half-white. Yalun Tu, half-white and half-Chinese, did not fit in at meetings of Chinese students: “They would talk about how Chinese mothers are overbearing and strict. But my mother is Caucasian and relaxed, so I couldn’t empathize. . . . I just didn’t feel that communal bond that I think often binds these groups.”

Some mixed-race “outcasts,” as they sometimes call themselves, start their own groups. Harvard, Brown, Columbia, Cornell, UCLA, Bryn Mawr and other campuses have groups with names like ReMixed, Half and Half, and Mixed Student Union. One journalist concluded: “Students do not seem to be learning to be more tolerant of people unlike them. They are demanding that they be surrounded and sheltered by people who are exactly like them.”

**DIVERSE SOCIETIES**

What are the implications of ethnic identity for multi-racial and multi-ethnic societies? Tatu Vanhanen of the University of Tampere, Finland, has probably researched the effects of ethnic diversity more systematically than anyone else. In a massive, book-length study, he measured ethnic diversity and levels of conflict in 148 countries, and found correlations in the 0.5 to 0.9 range for the two variables, depending on how the variables were defined and measured. Homogeneous countries like Japan and Iceland show very low levels of conflict, while highly diverse countries like Lebanon and Sudan are wracked with strife.

Prof. Vanhanen found tension in all multi-ethnic societies: “Interest conflicts between ethnic groups are inevitable because ethnic groups are genetic kinship groups and because the struggle for existence concerns the survival of our own genes through our own and our relatives’ descendants.” Prof. Vanhanen also found that economic and political institutions make no difference; wealthy, democratic countries suffer from sectarian strife as much as poor, authoritarian ones: “Ethnic nepotism belongs to human nature and . . . it is independent from the level of socioeconomic development (modernization) and also from the degree of democratization.”

Others have argued that democracy is particularly vulnerable to ethnic tensions while authoritarian regimes like Saddam Hussein’s Iraq or Tito’s Yugoslavia can give the impression of holding it in check. One expert writing in *Foreign Affairs* explained that for democracy to work “the party or group that loses has to trust the new majority and believe that its basic interests will still be protected and that there is nothing to fear from a change in power.” He wrote that this was much less likely when opposing parties represent different races or ethnicities.

The United Nations found that from 1989 to 1992 there were 82 conflicts that had resulted in at least 1,000 deaths each. Of these, no fewer than 79, or 96 percent, were ethnic or religious conflicts that took place *within* the borders of recognized states. Only three were cross-border conflicts. Wars between nations are usually ethnic conflicts as well. Internal ethnic conflict has very serious consequences. As J. Philippe Rushton has argued, “The politics of ethnic identity are increasingly replacing the politics of class as the major threat to the stability of nations.”

One must question the wisdom of then-president Bill Clinton’s explanation for the 1999 NATO
bombing of Serbia: “[T]he principle we and our allies have been fighting for in the Balkans is the principle of multi-ethnic, tolerant, inclusive democracy. We have been fighting against the idea that statehood must be based entirely on ethnicity.”

That same year, the American supreme commander of NATO, Wesley Clark, was even more direct: “There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That’s a 19th century idea and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and we are going to do it with multi-ethnic states.”

People are deeply attached to what they believe to be their land and often refuse to share it with strangers. Robert Pape, a leading expert on suicide bombing, explains that its motive is almost always nationalism, not religious fanaticism. Whether in Sri Lanka, Lebanon, Chechnya, Kashmir, the West Bank, Iraq, or Afghanistan, its main objective is to drive out an occupying enemy.

Research shows the negative effects of diversity on the United States. Robert Putnam of Harvard studied 41 different American communities that ranged from the extreme homogeneity of rural South Dakota to the very mixed populations of Los Angeles. He found a strong correlation between homogeneity and levels of trust, with the greatest distrust in the most diverse areas. He was unhappy with these results, and checked his findings by controlling for any other variable that might affect trust, such as poverty, age, crime rates, population densities, education, commuting time, home ownership, etc. These played some role but he was forced to conclude that “diversity per se has a major effect.”

Prof. Putnam listed the following consequences of diversity:

- Lower confidence in local government, local leaders and the local news media.
- Lower political efficacy—that is, confidence in their own influence.
- Lower frequency of registering to vote, but more interest and knowledge about politics and more participation in protest marches and social reform groups.
- Less expectation that others will cooperate to solve dilemmas of collective action (e.g., voluntary conservation to ease a water or energy shortage).
- Less likelihood of working on a community project.
- Lower likelihood of giving to charity or volunteering.
- Fewer close friends and confidants.
- Less happiness and lower perceived quality of life.

More time spent watching television and more agreement that “television is my most important form of entertainment.”

Other research confirms that people in “diverse” workgroups—not only of race but also age and professional background—are less loyal to the group, more likely to resign, and generally less satisfied than people who work with people like themselves. Carpooling is less common in racially-mixed neighborhoods because it means counting on your neighbors, and people trust people who are like themselves.

In all countries ethnic diversity reduces trust. In Peruvian credit-sharing cooperatives, members default more often on loans when there is ethnic diversity among co-op members. Likewise, in Kenyan school districts, fundraising is easier in tribally homogenous areas. Dutch researchers found that immigrants to Holland were more likely to develop schizophrenia if they lived in mixed neighborhoods with Dutch people than if they lived in purely immigrant areas. Surinamese and Turks had twice the chance of getting schizophrenia if they had to deal with Dutch neighbors; for Moroccans, the likelihood quadrupled.

Dora Costa of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Matthew Kahn of Tufts University analyzed 15 recent studies of the impact of diversity on social cohesion. They found that every study had “the same punch line: heterogeneity reduces civic engagement.”
James Poterba of MIT has found that public spending on education falls as the percentage of elderly people without children rises. He notes, however, that the effect “is particularly large when the elderly residents and the school-age population are from different racial groups.”66 This unwillingness of taxpayers to fund public projects if the beneficiaries are from a different group is so consistent it has its own name—“the Florida effect”—from the fact that old, white Floridians are reluctant to pay taxes or vote for bond issues to support schools attended by blacks and Hispanics. Maine, Vermont, and West Virginia are the most racially homogeneous states, and spend the highest proportion of gross state product on public education.67

Most people believe charity begins with their own people. A study of begging in Moscow, for example, found that Russians are more likely to give money to fellow Russians than to Central Asians or others who do not look like them.68

Researchers in Australia have found that immigrants from countries racially and culturally similar to Australia—Britain, the United States, New Zealand, and South Africa—fit in and become involved in volunteer work at the same level as native-born Australians. Immigrants from non-white countries volunteer at just over half that rate. At the same time, the more racially diverse the neighborhood in which immigrants live, the less likely native Australians themselves are to do volunteer work.69 Sydney has the most diversity of any Australian city—and also the lowest level of volunteerism.70 People want their efforts to benefit people like themselves.

It has long been theorized that welfare programs are more generous in Europe because European countries have traditionally been more homogeneous than the United States, and that people are less resistant to paying for welfare if the beneficiaries are of the same race. Alberto Alesina and Edward Glaeser have used statistical regression techniques to conclude that about half the difference in welfare levels is explained by greater American diversity, and the other half by weaker leftist political parties.71

Americans are not stingy—they give more to charity than Europeans do72—but they prefer to give to specific groups. Many Jews and blacks give largely or even exclusively to ethnic charities. There are no specifically white charities, but much church giving is essentially ethnic. Church congregations are usually homogeneous, which means that offerings for aid within the congregation stay within the ethnic group.

There is a field of study called “happiness research,” which tries to analyze what makes people happy. Prof. Michael Hagerty of the University of California at Davis surveyed decades of international happiness research and found that “for the most part, the top-rated countries are small and homogeneous.” As he explained, such countries “have a similar world view and a similar religion, so that it’s easier for them to communicate and to understand each other’s motives.” He also noted that “they don’t have race problems.”73

In the conclusion of his 148-country diversity survey Tatu Vanhanen wrote, “It is easier to establish harmonious social relations in ethnically homogeneous societies than in ethnically divided ones because people are more helpful towards each other in ethnically homogeneous societies.”74 There can, of course, be many different kinds of division in a country: language, religion, race, class, etc. However, of all these, race seems to be the most difficult to bridge.75

As Bangladeshi human rights lawyer Zia Haider Rahman has written, “Anyone who has worked in the field of international development, as I have, will tell you that nation-building in states that are
ethnically homogenous, all other things being equal, is an easier task than nation-building where there is diversity.”

According to one model of conflict, sectarian violence occurs most easily when one ethnic group is large enough to impose cultural norms in public areas but not large enough to make sure everyone abides by them. Researchers at Brandeis University concluded that when groups are separated in clearly demarcated territories there is little violence because no group tries to force its rules on another.

Milica Zarkovic Bookman, who is an expert on ethnic struggle, especially in the Balkans, underlines the significance of race:

Assimilation takes place in the spheres of religion and language most easily and is most successful among people who are culturally similar to the dominant group. When race is the distinguishing feature, assimilation efforts become irrelevant.

The conclusion that race is a serious and durable social fault line is not a popular one in the social sciences. Many scholars have downplayed its importance, and have insisted that class differences are the real cause of social conflict. Political scientist Walker Connor, who has taught at Harvard, Dartmouth, and Cambridge, has sharply criticized his colleagues for ignoring ethnic loyalty, which he calls ethnonationalism. He wrote of “the school of thought called ‘nation-building’ that dominated the literature on political development, particularly in the United States after the Second World War:”

The near total disregard of ethnonationalism that characterized the school, which numbered so many leading political scientists of the time, still astonishes. Again we encounter that divorce between intellectual theory and the real world.

He explained further:

To the degree that ethnic identity is given recognition, it is apt to be as a somewhat unimportant and ephemeral nuisance that will unquestionably give way to a common identity . . . as modern communication and transportation networks link the state’s various parts more closely.

However: “There is little evidence of modern communications destroying ethnic consciousness, and much evidence of their augmenting it.” Prof. Connor came close to saying that any scholar who ignores ethnic loyalty is dishonest:

[H]e perceives those trends that he deems desirable as actually occurring, regardless of the factual situation. If the fact of ethnic nationalism is not compatible with his vision, it can thus be willed away. . . . [T]he treatment calls for total disregard or cavalier dismissal of the undesired facts.

This harsh judgment may not be unwarranted. Robert Putnam, mentioned above for his research on how racial diversity decreases trust in American neighborhoods, waited five years to publish his data. He was displeased with his findings, and worked very hard to find something other than racial diversity to explain why people in Maine and North Dakota trusted each other more than people in Los Angeles.

Setting aside the reluctance academics may have for publishing data that conflict with current political ideals, Prof. Connor wrote that scholars discount racial or ethnic loyalty because of “the inherent limitations of rational inquiry into the realm of group identity.” Social scientists like to analyze political and economic interests because they are clear and rational, whereas Prof. Connor argues that rational calculations “hint not at all at the passions that motivate Kurdish, Tamil, and Tigre guerrillas or Basque, Corsican, Irish, and Palestinian terrorists.”

As Chateaubriand noted in the 18th century: “Men don’t allow themselves to be killed for their interests; they allow themselves to be killed for their passions.” Prof. Connor adds that group loyalty is evoked “not through appeals to reason but through appeals to the emotions (appeals not to
Academics do not like the unquantifiable, the emotional, the primitive—even if these things drive men harder than the practical and the rational—and are therefore inclined to downplay or even disregard them.

Sigmund Freud founded virtually all of psychotherapy on introspection, so one would expect him to be able to explain his own feelings, no matter how primitive. In one area, however, he baffled himself: He could not explain group loyalty. He wrote that he was “irresistibly” bonded to Jews and Jewishness, by “many obscure and emotional forces, which were the more powerful the less they could be expressed in words, as well as by a clear consciousness of inner identity, a deep realization of sharing the same psychic structure.”

Freud was writing about powerful feelings of kinship to an entire people. These are the feelings of nationalists and fanatics—and of ordinary people—and do not lend themselves to precise analysis. By refusing to take seriously that which they cannot analyze, social scientists misunderstand how real societies work.

Prof. Connor defined a nation as “the largest group that can command a person’s loyalty because of felt kinship ties; it is, from this perspective, the fully extended family.” Families are built on the most primitive emotions and genetic bonds. By calling a nation, ethnicity, or race “the fully extended family,” Prof. Connor captured some of their evocative power.

This view of nationalism—as loyalty to an extended family—helps explain most of the recent changes in international borders. The Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia all split into ethnic nations. Cyprus is divided into Greek and Turkish enclaves. The Flemings want independence from the Walloons of Belgium as do the French-speaking Quebeckers from English-speaking Canada. There are innumerable conflicts—in Sri Lanka, Chechnya, Tibet, Xinjiang, Iraq, Sudan—that reflect the desires of people to govern themselves, to celebrate their own heritage and culture, to live within smaller boundaries where they can be among their own people.

Those rare cases of merger rather than secession are driven by the same ethnic passions. Reunification of the two Germanys and Vietnams demonstrated the power of common heritage. Within the two Koreas, there is a similarly deep yearning for union that will no doubt be satisfied when the aberrant regime in the north collapses.

As noted in Chapter 2, many people believe that diversity—whether of race, language, or ethnicity—is a great advantage for a country. So many people assert this that one would expect it to be supported by extensive research. It is not. There is no good research that suggests diversity increases community cohesiveness, that the brain ignores race, or that diverse countries are happier and more peaceful than homogeneous ones.

Supporters of diversity sometimes point to a 2007 book by Scott E. Page of the University of Michigan as research that supports their position. It has a promising title—*The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies*—but Dr. Page is writing about the importance of different points of view and problem-solving strategies. He warns that mixing race and ethnicity does not automatically achieve this useful kind of diversity. On the contrary, he writes that “lots of strange things can happen in a diverse group that would not be likely to happen among homogeneous people—including physical and verbal violence.”

“The more different we are,” he notes, “the less we agree on what we would like to do,” adding that in diverse settings “group dynamics can create no end of problems. People prefer to hang with people like themselves and tend to stereotype others.”
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What about the workplace diversity of which American companies are so proud? As long ago as 1997, a report sponsored by the non-profit Aspen Institute noted that “the workforce is changing to almost no group’s satisfaction,” adding that “as diversity grows, so do the numbers of US citizens from all walks of life and all racial and ethnic groups who feel threatened and blame each other for what they perceive to be the downsides of change.” The study, entitled _Lashes—Back, Front and Sideways_, warned that as populations becomes older and more diverse people become more pessimistic about race relations.93

Thomas A. Kochan, a professor at MIT’s Sloan School of Management, has probably researched corporate diversity more extensively than anyone. His conclusion after a five-year study? “The diversity industry is built on sand.” Prof. Kochan initially contacted 20 major companies that have publicly committed themselves to diversity, and was astonished to find that not one had done a serious study of how diversity increased profits or improved operations. He learned that managers are afraid that race-related research could bring on lawsuits, but that another reason they do not look for results is “because people simply want to believe that diversity works.”

Like other researchers, he found “the negative consequences of diversity, such as higher turnover and greater conflict in the workplace,” and concluded that even if the best managers were able to overcome these problems there was no evidence diversity leads to greater profits. “The business case rhetoric for diversity is simply naive and overdone,” he says, noting that the estimated $8 billion a year spent on diversity training did not even protect businesses from discrimination suits, much less increase profits.94

Common sense suggests that it is hard to get dissimilar people to work together. Indeed, a large-scale survey called the National Study of the Changing Workforce found that more than half of all workers said they preferred to work with people who were not only the same race as themselves, but had the same education and were the same sex.95

Diversity training does not even increase diversity. A 2007 study sifted through decades of employment statistics companies must file with the federal government and found that training had no effect at all on the number of women or minorities in management. “Companies have spent millions of dollars a year on these programs without actually knowing, ‘Are these efforts worth it?’ ” explained Frank Dobbin of Harvard. “In the case of diversity training, the answer is no.” Sometimes diversity training even appeared to provoke resentment among managers and make advancement more difficult for minorities.96

Another review of 31 years of data from 830 mid- to large-sized companies found that the number of women and minorities in management dropped 7 to 12 percent after diversity training. The leader of the study, Alexandra Kalev of the University of Arizona, concluded that the problem was mandatory training. “Forcing people to go through training creates a backlash against diversity,” she said.97 A massive Princeton-Yale study of 800 companies over three decades found no evidence that diversity training resulted in advancement for minorities and women; again, in many cases it appeared to hold them back.98

What about campus diversity? Attempts to measure its advantages are likewise few and disappointing. Stanley Rothman led a group that used data from the National Center for Education Statistics to find the correlation between white students’ satisfaction with their education and the number of blacks on campus. Their findings:

As the proportion of black students rose, student satisfaction with their university experience dropped, as did their assessments
of the quality of their education and the work ethic of their peers. In addition, the higher the enrollment diversity, the more likely students were to say that they personally experienced discrimination.99

A greater mix of minorities is at least believed to make black students feel more comfortable, but the authors found that “diversity appears to increase complaints of unfair treatment among white students without reducing them among black students.”100

A 2008 Wall Street Journal article entitled “America’s Universities are Living a Diversity Lie” summed up findings in this area:

To this day, few colleges have even tried to establish that their race-conscious admissions policies yield broad educational benefits. The research is so fuzzy and methodologically weak that some strident proponents of affirmative action admit that social science is not on their side.

In reality, colleges profess a deep belief in the educational benefits of their affirmative-action policies mainly to save their necks. They know that, if the truth came out, courts could find them guilty of illegal discrimination against white and Asian Americans.101

The New York Times agrees, noting that decades of promoting diversity have not succeeded in getting students to mix. The article concludes:

No one has a formula for success; there is not even a consensus about what success would look like. Experts say that diversity programs on college campuses amount to a constantly evolving experiment, which in some cases in the past may have done more harm than good.102

Alexander Astin of UCLA has argued strongly for the advantages of racial diversity in universities, yet even he conceded in 2001 that the question of whether “more-diverse campuses better educate their students . . . is yet to be demonstrated. The research still needs to be done that would demonstrate the link.”103

Many observers have pointed out that the search for diversity does not include points of view. One study of the political affiliations of American university professors found very few conservative affiliations, such as Republican or Libertarian: Harvard—4 percent; Penn State—17 percent; Stanford—11 percent; UCLA—6 percent; UC Santa Barbara—1 percent; Brown—5 percent; Cornell—3 percent. The rest were leftist. In the 2000 presidential election, in which George Bush and Al Gore each got 48 percent of the popular vote and Ralph Nader got 3 percent, 84 percent of Ivy League faculty voted for Al Gore, 9 percent for George Bush, and 6 percent for Ralph Nader.104

In 2009, the conservative New Century Foundation proposed a simple text advertisement to several college newspapers: “Is diversity a strength? We think not.” The ad invited readers to visit a web site for “an alternate view.” Every college paper rejected the ad. Diversity is a subject on which diverse views are not welcome.

A MORAL DUTY

It should be clear by now that whatever Americans say about diversity, it is not a strength. If it were a strength, Americans would practice it spontaneously. It would not require “diversity management” or anti-discrimination laws. Nor would it require constant reminders of how wonderful it is. It takes no exhortations for us to appreciate things that are truly desirable: indoor plumbing, vacations, modern medicine, friendship, or cheaper gasoline.

As we saw in Chapter 1, when they are free to do so, most people avoid diversity. The scientific evidence suggests why: Human beings appear to have deeply-rooted tribal instincts. They seem to prefer to live in homogeneous communities rather than endure the tension and conflict that arise from differences. If the goal of building a diverse society conflicts with some aspect of our nature, it will be very difficult to achieve. As Horace wrote in the Epistles, “Though you drive Nature out with a
pitchfork, she will ever find her way back.” Some intellectuals and bohemians profess to enjoy diversity, but they appear to be a minority. Why do we insist that diversity is a strength when it is not?

In the 1950s and 1960s, when segregation was being dismantled, many people believed full integration would be achieved within a generation. At that time, there were few Hispanics or Asians but with a population of blacks and whites, the United States could be described as “diverse.” It seemed vastly more forward-looking to think of this as an advantage to be cultivated rather than a weakness to be endured. Our country also seemed to be embarking on a morally superior course. Human history is the history of warfare—between nations, tribes, and religions—and many Americans believed that reconciliation between blacks and whites would lead to a new era of inclusiveness for all peoples of the world.

After the immigration reforms of 1965 opened the United States to large numbers of non-Europeans, our country became more diverse than anyone in the 1950s would have imagined. Diversity often led to conflict, but it would have been a repudiation of the civil rights movement to conclude that diversity was a weakness. Americans are proud of their country and do not like to think it may have made a serious mistake. As examples of ethnic and racial tension continued to accumulate, and as the civil rights vision of effortless integration faded, there were strong ideological and even patriotic reasons to downplay or deny what was happening, or at least to hope that exhortations to “celebrate diversity” would turn what was proving to be a problem into an advantage.

To criticize diversity raises the intolerable possibility that the United States has been acting on mistaken assumptions for half a century. To talk glowingly about diversity therefore became a form of cheerleading for America. It even became common to say that diversity was our greatest strength—something that would have astonished any American from the colonial era through the 1950s.

There is so much emotional capital invested in the civil-rights-era goals of racial equality and harmony that virtually any critique of its assumptions is intolerable. To point out the obvious—that diversity brings conflict—is to question sacred assumptions about the ultimate insignificance of race. Nations are at their most sensitive and irrational where they are weakest. It is precisely because it is so easy to point out the weaknesses of diversity that any attempt to do so must be countered, not by specifying diversity’s strengths—which no one can do—but with accusations of racism.

This is a very effective way to stop criticism. Race relations are difficult, sometimes agonizing. The harmony for which the country yearns is not at hand, and may never be achieved. Because whites are generally blamed for making race into such an enduring problem, white racism has become not just a moral failing but the worst moral failing. Our society forgives sexual misconduct, abuse of office, dishonesty, and incompetence far more readily than it does any action by whites that could be described as “racism.”

At the same time, promoting diversity is a way for whites to demonstrate virtue. Diversity policies benefit non-whites by encouraging their immigration, employment, promotion, or admission to university, and to support diversity is the most readily recognizable way of demonstrating opposition to racism. For whites, diversity therefore has moral rather than practical goals, and this is why it does not require justification in ordinary terms. Americans attribute unrealistic, exaggerated benefits to diversity because they support it for emotional rather than rational reasons. They call it “America’s greatest strength” not because they have weighed all of America’s strengths and come to a rational conclusion about which is greatest. They are expressing an emotional commitment to something they feel they must support in order to prove they are not racists.
It is because of the power of anti-racism—and the need to avoid appearing racist—that almost no one challenges lofty claims. The CEO of Verizon Communications says that if a company is not diverse it is “not relevant.” If this claim is not obviously untrue it is at least highly debatable, but is anyone in his company going to tell him so? The same anti-racist conformity also explains why even diversity experts cannot give concrete examples of its advantages; no one questions its advantages, so no one ever has to list them.

Immigration has contributed greatly to an environment in which it is obligatory for whites to promote diversity. Almost as an accidental by-product of immigration reform, the United States opened itself to large numbers of non-white newcomers who are now the primary source of diversity. Although immigration is likely to reduce whites to a minority in just a few decades, racial etiquette requires that whites must not think of this as anything but an exciting prospect. The logic of anti-racism means diversity must be a strength because it would be racist to oppose it. For whites to express doubts about the wisdom of policies that ensure their children will be racial minorities is to open themselves to charges of bigotry. To avoid these charges they must speak with enthusiasm about the diversity immigration brings. Their behavior, however, belies their words; they flee the very diversity they are at such pains to praise.

Non-whites promote diversity because they profit from it. It increases their opportunities at the expense of whites. Celebrations of diversity also flatter them. After all, they are providing what is claimed to be America’s “greatest strength.” There is more than a hint of arrogance in this view—that the United States was lifeless and incomplete before Hispanics or Asians came in large numbers—but it is now common even for immigrants to insist that diversity is central to our identity. Whites have been persuaded to support diversity—even if it restricts opportunities for them and reduces their numbers and influence—because they have been taught that not to support it would be racist. This is truly astonishing: Whites are supporting something that is not only against their own interests but that is manifestly untrue.

America’s enthusiasm for diversity therefore cannot be explained by searching for its benefits. It can be understood only as a moral campaign that arises from unsupported but rigidly enforced assumptions about race. There is enormous momentum behind the orthodox view, but even orthodoxies crumble when they are obviously wrong.

J.B.S. Haldane noted with a smile that there are four stages new ideas go through before they are accepted: 1. This is worthless nonsense. 2. This is an interesting, but perverse, point of view. 3. This is true, but quite unimportant. 4. I always said so. The realization that diversity is not a strength is somewhere between stages one and two, but the evidence for it is so strong that it will eventually reach stage four.

When that happens, Western societies will have to answer some very uncomfortable questions: If our efforts to increase diversity were a mistake, what do we do now? Can diversity be reversed humanely? If so, how? Or do we simply carry on, but more humbly and with lower expectations? These are some of the questions we will examine in the concluding chapter.
Chapter 5: Black Racial Consciousness

In the United States, race and racial consciousness are experienced in very different ways by different groups. Most non-whites take pride in their race and cultivate racial consciousness. They show solidarity for other members of their race, and do not hesitate to work for explicitly racial ends. Whites do the reverse: They condemn white racial pride and shun anyone who would work for explicitly “white” goals.

For many blacks, race is a central part of their identity. Their view of politics, history, government, or culture is bound up in a strong sense of themselves as a distinct race with distinct interests. Many assume that the job of a black leader is to work openly for the benefit of blacks. This deeply rooted racial consciousness can express itself as a sense of separateness from “white” America and even as alienation from the United States itself.

Because whites have tried very hard to dismantle their own bonds of racial solidarity and to keep racial considerations out of their decision-making, they assume blacks are—or should be—doing the same thing. Some may find the depth and power of black racial consciousness difficult to grasp. For many whites, America’s primary moral mission is to go beyond race consciousness and embrace all citizens as individuals. Only a tiny number of blacks share this goal.

DIFFERENT WORLDS

Black racial consciousness leads to separation that is as much psychological as physical. To begin with the seemingly innocuous, census records show that 100 years ago the 20 most popular given names for blacks and whites were virtually the same.¹ That began to change in the 1960s, when blacks started giving children distinctly black names like Shaneequa, Latonya, or DeShawn. In California in 1970, the typical black baby girl was given a name that was twice as common among blacks as whites. By 1980, her name was 20 times more common among blacks, and by 2004 more than 40 percent of black girls born in California received a name that was not given to a single one of the 100,000 white girls born that year. By 2003 in New York City, there was no overlap among the top 20 black and white names given to girls. The gap in names for boys was not so great, because neither whites nor blacks are as adventurous with boys’ names, but there has been sharp divergence since the 1960s.²

Another cleavage is in television viewing. Beginning in 1987 and for at least 10 years, with the exception of Monday Night Football, none of the top ten programs blacks watched was the same as the top ten that whites watched. Blacks preferred programs about blacks and whites tended to watch white programs.³ A study of the viewing habits of teenagers published in 2004 found very little overlap in the programs watched by blacks and whites,⁴ though recent “reality” television programs may be attracting a more mixed audience.

The publishing industry markets books by blacks and about blacks as a separate “African-American” category, so that blacks can more easily find what they want. Black book-seller Marva Allen says it also helps whites avoid wasting their time because most will not consider a book if there are black characters on the cover and the author is black.⁵

Today, the best-selling titles for blacks are in a genre most whites have never even heard of: “ghetto lit.” This is the pulp-novel equivalent of rap music—books that glorify drugs, violence, hot
sex, easy money, and the pimping life. Mainstream publishers like Simon & Schuster and St. Martin’s have set up “urban fiction” divisions to promote these books to blacks.

Blacks often have different political views from those of whites. The Bay Area Center for Voting Research surveyed voting patterns for 237 American cities and found that race is a proxy for politics: Blacks are liberal and whites are conservative. It found that overwhelmingly white Provo, Utah, is the most conservative city in America. The most liberal city, Detroit, is overwhelmingly black. The center’s director noted that “While most black voters have consistently supported Democrats since the 1960s, it is the white liberals that have slowly withered away over the decades, leaving African Americans as the sole standard bearers for the left.”

For whites, religious views are the best predictor of whether someone votes Republican: Fundamentalists are most likely to vote Republican and atheists are least likely. This distinction does not hold true for blacks, who support the Democrats whether they are religious or not.

On some questions, the racial gap is stark. No fewer than 74 percent of blacks think it is the government’s responsibility to “assure the availability of jobs,” whereas only 33 percent of whites think so. In 2003, whites supported the Iraq war 78 percent to 20 percent. Blacks opposed it 61 percent to 35 percent. According to a 2001 poll, only 5 percent of whites thought the government should pay blacks reparations for slavery. Sixty-six percent of blacks favored reparations. In 2007, 78 percent of blacks thought the Martin Luther King holiday was one of the country’s most important holidays; only 15 percent of whites thought so.

According to polls reported in 2000, only 13 percent of blacks thought O.J. Simpson was “probably guilty” of killing his wife, but 73 percent believed that “the CIA has imported cocaine for distribution in the black community.” Sixty-two percent said they “believe that HIV and AIDS are being used as part of a plot to deliberately kill African Americans.” Film director Spike Lee has said, “I’m convinced AIDS is a government-engineered disease. They got one thing wrong, they never realized it couldn’t just be contained to the groups it was intended to wipe out. . . . Exactly like drugs when they escaped the urban centers into white suburbia.”

According to a 2007 Gallup poll, only 20 percent of whites thought their fellow whites enjoyed racial preferences in college admissions. Sixty-one percent of blacks, however, thought whites got preferences, and only five percent thought blacks were at an advantage. President Obama’s first years in office produced another large racial divide. At the time of his inauguration, 62 percent of whites approved of him but by December 2009 that figure had plummeted to 39 percent. During the same period, his black approval rating rose from 90 to 91 percent. One year later, at the end of 2010, the gap was wider still. White approval had dropped to 38 percent, and black approval had risen to 94 percent.

**NOT BLACK ENOUGH**

In 1998, Anthony Williams was elected mayor of Washington, DC. Mr. Williams had attended Harvard and Yale, clearly wanted to run an efficient city government, and had considerable white support. Although he was black, Mr. Williams left many blacks wondering if he was “black enough.” A black writer for the *Washington Post* raised “the question of whether whites, assuming they care one way or the other, even understand the concept of ‘How black is a black person?’ ” He went on to say that Mayor Williams had fired incompetents, but that “the firings hurt black workers most of all,
creating the impression—fairly or unfairly—that he has little or no special concern for people who 
look like him.” A black politician who is more concerned about efficiency than about jobs for blacks 
may not be black enough. The writer concluded:

“Blackness . . . is a state of common spiritual idealism that serves to unite the group for the purpose of survival. . . . [T]here is not 
one person of color who can separate himself or herself from the rest of the people of color.”

The mayoral election in Washington 12 years later raised exactly the same question. Incumbent 
Adrian Fenty was black, but not black enough. Like Mr. Williams before him, he hired people for 
their ability, and not one of his top three appointments in public education was black, nor were the 
police chief, fire chief, or attorney general. “How can there not be one African-American leader in 
that cluster?” asked his 2010 challenger, Vincent Gray, also black, in a question that resonated with 
black voters. Mr. Gray went on to win with 80 percent of the black vote. A columnist who is 
himself black explained Mr. Fenty’s loss: “In short, the mayor appointed the best people he could 
find, instead of running a racial patronage system, as a black mayor of a city with a black majority is 
apparently expected to.”

Some people believe blackness requires a certain physical style. A black writer for the 
Washington Post mourned his own loss of that rolling gait known as “the pimp walk.” As a young 
man, he felt authentically black—“Whether the pimp walk was some celebration of male blackness I 
don’t know, but I do know that walking so rhythmically, I never felt so good, or so black”—but at 
some point he started walking normally. This was cause for soul-searching:

Oh, I attend a mostly black church. I have a black wife. Black kids. And as a journalist, I write mostly about black people. My 
mama is black. My car is black. I buy black. I vote black. I think black. Still, I can’t help but wonder if I wasn’t once blacker.

Randall Robinson, who fought South African apartheid and promoted reparations for blacks, 
reported matter-of-factly, “I am obsessively black . . . race is an overarching aspect of my identity.”

Kweisi Mfume, who was president of the NAACP at the time, told the group’s national convention 
that “Race and skin color . . . still dominate every aspect of American life.” Ron Daniels, a 
columnist for the black paper, The St. Louis American, wrote: “Whatever my political or economic 
pursuits in life, however, I am always guided by the dictum to be ‘of the race and for the race.’ ”

In 2010, when board member Eugene Walker of the DeKalb County, Georgia, school board voted 
to spend an additional $1 million to give legal business to a black-owned firm, he explained, “I am a 
very, very race-conscious person. . . . I see color. I appreciate color. I celebrate color and I love 
color.” Pearl Cleage, who has been playwright-in-residence at Spellman College and a columnist 
for the Atlanta Tribune, explained what it takes to be a black woman hero. First and foremost, she 
must “love her people.” She “must be a Race Woman . . . dedicated to the survival and advancement 
of her racial group overall and her sisters specifically.”

Many blacks reject assimilation. Roger Bobb helps run Tyler Perry Studios and was a judge at the 
2009 Miss Black USA pageant. “If you try to assimilate, you will always be looking for validation 
from the majority group,” he said. “That can do damage to your psyche.”

James Bernard is a graduate of Harvard Law School and has been a consultant to the Rockefeller 
Foundation. Instead of practicing law, he decided to start a glossy, hip-hop magazine called The 
Source. His reasons? “Either you identify with white society, and that’s disgustingly empty—not to 
mention you’ll be rejected and go insane—or you look for something that’s rich and real.”

Jazmyn Singleton, who was a senior at Duke University in 2008, explained the racial dynamic on
There is pressure to be black... People will say there are 600 blacks on campus but only two-thirds are ‘black’ because you can’t count blacks who hang out with white people.”

Michelle Burstion-Young of the University of Cincinnati, who has studied race relations on campus, concluded that although whites are intimidated by it, “Separation is an important strategy for cultivating and maintaining a sense of black culture.” She also noted that blacks who have white friends “risk being completely ostracized in the long run.”

Eric J. Moore, a black Milwaukee police officer, filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 2003, accusing his black supervisors of denying him promotions because he associated with whites. He claimed that Police Chief Arthur L. Jones called him a “shuffling-okey-dokey-for-the-white-man type of brother,” and that a supervisor told him he would not be promoted because he “runs around here talking to those damn white people.”

Some blacks assume their culture is beyond the grasp of whites. August Wilson, who died in 2005, was the most successful black American playwright, winning two Pulitzer Prizes and many other awards. He never allowed whites to direct or act in his plays, explaining that whites and blacks “have a different way of responding to the world.” When, in 2008, Lincoln Center in New York chose a white man to direct a production of his play, Joe Turner’s Come and Gone, black director Marion McClinton called the decision “straight-up institutional racism.”

Whites have not turned away from professional football and basketball because black players increasingly dominate them, but many blacks hold the Winter Olympics in contempt because so many competitors are white. As black television anchorman Bryant Gumbel said on the air in 2006:

Finally, tonight, the Winter Games. Count me among those who don’t like them and won’t watch them... Try not to laugh when someone says these are the world’s greatest athletes, despite a paucity of blacks that makes the Winter Games look like a GOP convention.

E.R. Shipp, a black columnist for the New York Daily News, took the same view:

These Winter Olympics, oh, how white they are!... These Olympics are so white that the presumption is that certain white athletes are entitled to gold medals. Now, maybe that’s also American arrogance. To me, it’s a bad case of whiteness.

Of course, many blacks do not take so separatist a stance, but blackness can be a refuge in trying times. Singer Michael Jackson was once a symbol of racelessness, but when he went on trial for child sex abuse in 2005, he surrounded himself with bodyguards and advisors from the Nation of Islam. One writer pointed out that “the racially ambivalent wonder” who once sang “It don’t matter if you’re black or white,” had “now become the supreme black man.”

Although huge majorities of blacks continue to support President Obama, there have been doubts about his blackness from the start. When Mr. Obama initially came to prominence, many blacks thought a man whose mother was white and whose father was a Kenyan could not be “black enough.” Stanley Crouch, a black newspaper columnist, said then-Senator Obama “does not share a heritage with the majority of black Americans, who are descendants of plantation slaves,” and that he had therefore not “lived the life of a black American.” Black radio host George Wilson complained that “there’s a feeling that if white folks like him so much he must not be good for us.”

In 2007, Jesse Jackson complained that Mr. Obama was “acting like he’s white.” “Obama isn’t black,” journalist Debra J. Dickerson said, because “[black] means those descended from West African slaves.” Valerie Smith, a black professor at Princeton, noted that “Obama’s ‘black credentials’ have been questioned as much because of his Kenyan father as his white mother.”
Cornel West, also of Princeton, doubted Mr. Obama’s authenticity because he would not speak out forcefully about the legacy of racism.\textsuperscript{42}

By the time of the election, of course, 95 percent of blacks voted for him. Many assumed he would put black interests first, and were annoyed when he did not. Black journalist Roland Martin complained that there were not enough blacks on the White House press staff\textsuperscript{43}—at a time when the administration was about three weeks old. Mr. Obama had not even been in office for three months before the Congressional Black Caucus criticized him for not channeling enough economic bailout money through black accountants, lawyers, and bankers.\textsuperscript{44}

A year into Mr. Obama’s first term, members of the Congressional Black Caucus who had wept to see him inaugurated, were deeply frustrated that he was not pushing an explicitly racial agenda, but tried to avoid criticizing him publicly.\textsuperscript{45} Other blacks were less restrained. Georgetown University Professor Michael Dyson complained that Mr. Obama should “stand up and use his bully pulpit to help us,” adding that “this president runs from race like a black man runs from a cop.”\textsuperscript{46} New York City councilman Charles Barron complained that “this hope and change rap has not been a reality for black people.” Omali Yeshitela of the Black is Back coalition, who led a protest march of 200 blacks outside the White House, said Mr. Obama was “white power in black face.”\textsuperscript{47} Many blacks are suspicious of someone who seems too comfortable with whites, who does not make race the center of his identity.

\textbf{SEPARATION AND SOLIDARITY}

Part of building an identity around race was touched on in Chapter 2: the rejection by many blacks of integration. If the material gains integration was supposed to bring can be achieved without integration, then integration should be abandoned.

Roy Brooks, who teaches at the University of San Diego Law School, makes this case in his book, \textit{Integration or Separation}? “There is nothing intrinsically good about racial mixing. Its appeal comes from its social utility.”\textsuperscript{48} He continued: “African Americans need to spend less time trying to live next to whites and employ more energy striving to live together.”\textsuperscript{49} He wrote that the black personality develops better in a homogeneous setting\textsuperscript{50} and that integration is endlessly wearying: “[M]any African-American students believe it is futile to attempt to educate white people, and they do not see the races ever living together in harmony.”\textsuperscript{51} He proposed “limited separation:” Blacks must always have the right to live in the white world, but should have the right to separate completely from whites if they choose.\textsuperscript{52}

Many white educators still believe integration would improve black school performance, but many blacks prefer to promote black culture and racial separation. Derrick Bell, who teaches at New York University Law School, has argued that the Supreme Court’s 1954 decision in \textit{Brown v. Board of Education} was a mistake. He wishes the court had maintained “separate but equal,” and simply enforced genuine equality of resources.\textsuperscript{53}

As the sole black man in the Nebraska state house, Ernie Chambers spent years supporting busing and school integration, but in 2006 he changed course and introduced a bill to divide the Omaha public schools into three largely segregated districts, one each for blacks, whites, and Hispanics. “I don’t think there needs to be integration,” he said. “It’s not education’s job.”\textsuperscript{54} He said his black
constituents wanted a district of their own that they could control.\textsuperscript{55}

Roland G. Fryer, a black researcher who teaches at Harvard, says the stigma against blacks who get good grades—and are taunted for “acting white”—is absent in black schools. He found that in integrated schools the popularity of white students rises with their grades, while that of blacks and Hispanics falls. Prof. Fryer did not find this popularity decline in heavily non-white schools.\textsuperscript{56}

Another scholar concludes that the “acting white” problem may be “a defense mechanism for black students who had been forced to compete with better-prepared whites and Asians.”\textsuperscript{57}

Some people think courses in black history are the answer. In 2005, two thirds of Philadelphia’s 185,000 students were black. That year, Philadelphia became the first major school district to require classes in black history. Blacks were ecstatic\textsuperscript{58} but Pennsylvania State House Speaker John Perzel noted that even when the Irish dominated Philadelphia no one thought it necessary to require classes in Irish history.\textsuperscript{59}

Terri Shepard, who was on the African-American Student Achievement Committee of the Evanston/Skokie district in 2006, argued that Afro-centric education was the solution: “I always believed the reason white children achieved is because everything was for and about them.”\textsuperscript{60}

“Black people are the only ones who can teach black children, it’s as simple as that,” says Taki Raton, who founded Blyden Delany Academy in Milwaukee. He says the secret is an all-black staff, all-black student body, and all-black school board. “The bottom line is we are not all the same,” he adds. “Black children are not going to grow up and be white.”\textsuperscript{61}

In Kansas City, Missouri, J. S. Chick Elementary School has been “African-centered” since 1991. All parts of the curriculum are based on the history and culture of blacks. Every Monday morning, the entire school participates in a \textit{harambee}, a Swahili word for “coming together.” Students beat drums while others dance and chant. The school considers itself an African village, and parents must sign statements of commitment to its principles. In 1995, a judge overseeing a Kansas City desegregation case approved a similar African-centered theme for the Sanford B. Ladd Elementary School, and a middle school has since adopted a similar curriculum. Supporters claim that black studies improve grades and reduce absenteeism.\textsuperscript{62}

Hales Franciscan School is an all-back Catholic high school in Chicago. Before basketball games, the school sings “Lift Ev’ry Voice and Sing,” written by James Weldon Johnson and considered the unofficial black national anthem. Before home games, the school has been known to sing “Lift Ev’ry Voice and Sing” but forget “The Star Spangled Banner.” Hanging in the gymnasium, are both the American flag and the red, black, and green flag of Marcus Garvey’s back-to-Africa movement.\textsuperscript{63}

Oklahoma City’s Millwood public school district has two pledges of allegiance, the familiar one to the American flag, and one to Garvey’s flag. The latter pledge, written by the founder of Kwanzaa, Maulana Ron Karenga (born Ronald Everett), goes like this:

\begin{quote}
We pledge allegiance to the red, black and green
Our flag, the symbol of our eternal struggle, and to the land we must obtain
One nation of Black people, with one God for us all
Totally united in the struggle for Black Love, Black Freedom, and Black Determination.
\end{quote}

Gloria Griffin, superintendent of the 99-percent black district, did not think the pledge was separatist. She said she focused on the words “united in love, freedom and determination.”\textsuperscript{64}

In Halifax, Canada, Vice Principal Wade Smith of St. Patrick’s High School said in 2006 that blacks would be better served by a separate, all-black school.\textsuperscript{65} In 2008 the Toronto School Board
voted to approve plans for an Afro-centric school. “It’s not about segregation, it’s about self-
determination,” explained Angela Wilson, a black woman who promoted the idea.66

The chairman of Britain’s Commission for Racial Equality, Trevor Phillips, announced in 2005 that
racial problems in integrated schools were so bad that the time had come to establish separate
schools for black boys.67 Lee Jasper, a black man who advised former London Mayor Ken
Livingstone on race relations, called in 2008 for segregated schools run by and for blacks.68

OTHER FORMS OF SEPARATION

In the United States there are hundreds of organizations explicitly for blacks. The Congressional
Black Caucus is one of the best known, but a recent Internet search on the words “association of black . . .” turned up more than 3,800 pages of results. On just the first three pages were explicitly black associations for the following groups, in the following order:

Accountants, MBAs, Engineers, Nurses, Journalists, Social Workers, Telecommunications
Professionals, New York Journalists, Women Historians, Women Lawyers of New Jersey,
Professional Fire Fighters, California Lawyers, Dallas-Fort Worth Communicators, Sociologists,
Storytellers, School Educators, Scuba Divers, Journalists, Anthropologists, Actuaries, Philadelphia
Journalists, Sign Language Interpreters, Yoga Teachers, Foundation Executives, Law Enforcers,
Southern Region Accountants, and Psychologists. There is probably a black association for every
profession, and members can join the white/integrated association if they choose.

Blacks often keep their groups closed to others. For two terms during the 1990s, Thomas Murphy, a
white man, represented the majority-black 18th ward of Chicago. Blacks expected to take the seat
when redistricting gave it an 85 percent black “super-majority.” However, in 1999, Mr. Murphy won
57 percent of the vote in a nine-candidate race, and remained on the council. He asked to join the
council’s black caucus, but the members refused. Mr. Murphy pointed out that he represented more
blacks—47,000—than some of the other blacks, but he was denied membership.

One black alderwoman, Dorothy Tillman, did not want Mr. Murphy on the city council at all. “We
want that seat to belong to an African American,” she said. “We want to make sure to take that seat.”69
For a 2000 fund-raising event at the Chicago hotel, the Palmer House, Miss Tillman’s staff asked the
management to make sure all the waiters were black. The hotel agreed.70

The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) refuses to admit non-blacks. In the fall of 2006, its 43
members fretted that two whites running in majority-black districts had a good chance of winning and
might want to join. Missouri congressman and founder of the CBC, William Lacy Clay, Sr., warned
the group that “it is critical that membership remain exclusively African American.”71

Steve Cohen was elected in his 60-percent black Tennessee district and applied for membership.
He was turned down. As Representative Clay explained in an official statement on behalf of the
caucus:

Quite simply, Rep. Cohen will have to accept what the rest of the country will have to accept—there has been an unofficial
Congressional White Caucus for over 200 years, and now it’s our turn to say who can join “the club.” ...He does not, and cannot,
meet the membership criteria, unless he can change his skin color. Primarily, we are concerned with the needs and concerns of
the black population, and we will not allow white America to infringe on those objectives.72

In 2008, when Vietnamese-American Anh “Joseph” Cao was elected to a 64-percent black district
in Louisiana and tried to join the caucus, he too was told that it was for blacks only.73

The National Association of Black Social Workers will not even let non-blacks attend its
conferences. Brian Parnell is a social worker in Bakersfield, California. He wanted to know why so many blacks are in the child welfare system, and thought he might find answers at the black social workers annual convention, held in New Orleans in 2005. Mr. Parnell was barred at the door when an organizer told him, “You’re white. You can’t attend this conference.” Five black colleagues who arrived with Mr. Parnell stayed, but he had to fly home.74

Some forms of exclusion are illegal. In 2003, Eddie Jordan became the first black district attorney in New Orleans. He promptly fired 43 whites and replaced them with blacks. The whites sued, and in 2006, a judge ordered the DA’s office to pay the white workers $3.58 million.75 The city of Milwaukee was ordered to pay 17 white police officers $2.2 million after a federal jury found that Milwaukee’s first black police chief, Arthur Jones, had discriminated against them.76

During the 2001/2002 school year, historically-black Delaware State University settled two discrimination suits by whites for undisclosed sums. Kathleen Carter, who chaired the education department, said blacks told her she was usurping their right to govern themselves, and that one colleague called her a “white bitch.” Another white, Jane Buck, reported that a search committee once got 100 applications for a position but did not fill it because none of the candidates was black. When the search was reopened, the lone black applicant got the job.77

In early 2009, the New York State Senate got its first black majority leader. Frederic Dicker, a veteran state-house reporter for the New York Post, wrote that the new leadership promptly fired nearly 200 white workers and replaced them almost entirely with minorities, “many of whom were seen by their fellow workers to be unskilled at their new jobs.” He added that a high-level Democratic staffer had confided, “We’ve been told to only hire minorities.”78 Also in 2009, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission forced historically-black Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina to pay $55,000 each to three white faculty members who were fired or denied jobs because of race.79

In Atlanta, eight white librarians were awarded nearly $25 million from the Atlanta-Fulton County Library System after a jury decided they were given undesirable assignments because black supervisors thought there were too many whites working in the downtown branch. This was the fourth time the county was found guilty of discriminating against white librarians.80

In 2007 a white man named Mark Pasternak who worked for New York State as a social worker won $150,000 when jurors found that his black boss, Tommy Baines, had created a hostile workforce by calling him names such as “cracker,” “Pollack,” and “stupid white boy.” Mr. Baines reportedly told him, “You’re a white boy, and I don’t like white boys. Handle it.”81

In July 2009, the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals found that DeKalb County, Georgia had “embarked on a wholesale plan to replace its white managers with African Americans,” and that there was “shocking” evidence of “an overt and unabashed pattern of discrimination.” Vernon Jones, the first black CEO of the county reportedly said he wanted a “darker administration” to reflect “the new DeKalb County,” and took vigorous measures to push whites out.82

Many blacks simply don’t hire whites. In Los Angeles, only eight percent of workers are black, but in a survey of black-owned companies, 41 percent reported that their workforces were “mostly black,” something not likely to happen by chance. A survey of black-owned businesses in Philadelphia found similar results. Their total employee base was 81.8 percent black, and not a single business reported having a workforce that was less than 50 percent black.83*
Not long before Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans in August 2005, one city councilman proposed
that the city scrap its requirement that police officers live in the city. He thought this would make it
easier to find qualified officers for a notoriously corrupt force, but the plan was shouted down by
blacks who were afraid it would attract whites. Blacks in New Orleans were so hostile to mixing
with whites that when white activists tried to join an anti-racism demonstration, blacks drove them
away. “This is really two cities,” explained Anthony Mitchell, a black Baptist preacher.85

In 2002 in Riviera Beach, Florida, a white woman named Sandy Trammel produced tremendous
improvement in her fourth-grade class at overwhelmingly black West Riviera Elementary School. The
school district made her a “peer assistance teacher,” assigned to help other teachers, and the Palm
Beach Post wrote up her successes. Later, when Mrs. Trammel showed up for her first peer-teaching
assignment at another black school, the black principal turned her away. She said black teachers
would not accept a “great white hope” who had come to rescue black children.86

POLITICS

For many blacks, politics is primarily about race. Representative Steve Cohen of Memphis,
Tennessee, who was the wrong race for the Congressional Black Caucus, was also the wrong race for
many of his constituents. “He’s not black and he can’t represent me, that’s just the bottom line,” said
Rev. Robert Poindexter of Mt. Moriah Baptist Church.87 The black ex-mayor of Memphis, Willie
Herenton, planned to run against Mr. Cohen in 2010, saying he could not accept a white
representative. “This seat was set aside for people who look like me,” said Mr. Herenton’s campaign
manager, Sidney Chism.88

In 2003, there were five Democratic candidates for mayor of Baltimore, three black and two white.
An organization of black ministers sponsored a debate for candidates, but did not invite the whites.
Rev. Russell Johnson of the Baptist Ministers’ Conference explained that the group did not want to
offer whites a platform.89

Likewise, in 2010, when a black media organization called Newsmakers Live held a debate for
candidates in Georgia’s fourth congressional district, white candidate Liz Carter asked to take part.
The moderator, Maynard Eaton, told her the debate was for black candidates only.90

Black Congressman Danny Davis of Illinois decided to run for mayor of Chicago in 2011. He was
once a close ally of Bill Clinton but when it appeared that the former president would back a white
candidate, Mr. Davis complained that Mr. Clinton was trying to “to thwart the legitimate political
aspirations of Chicago’s Black community.” Black former Senator Carol Mosely Braun, also a
candidate, told Mr. Clinton to stay away, warning that he could lose the respect of blacks if he
supported a white. President Clinton had appointed her ambassador to New Zealand when she lost
reelection to the Senate in 1999.91

After Hurricane Katrina, Mayor Ray Nagin of New Orleans said he wanted to rebuild a “chocolate
New Orleans.” “This city will be a majority African American city,” he said. “It’s the way God
wants it to be.”92 Later, when he ran for reelection against whites, he warned a black audience that his
opponents “don’t look like us.”93 As Bishop Paul Morton of the St. Stephen Full Gospel Baptist
Church explained, the prospect of a white mayor was one that could “take us back so many years,”
adding, “There’s a lot of people that are really, really concerned.”94 When, in 2010, it appeared that a
white man, Mitch Landrieu, would become the first white mayor in 32 years, Paul Beaulieu, a popular
morning host on the black AM talk radio station WBOK, castigated any black who would even think of voting for a white: “How could you even say that? . . . That a white man—in this city, in this state, in this country—could represent you better than a black man?”

Majority-black Washington, DC, likes to think of itself as a “chocolate city,” too. Natalie Hopkinson, a black staff writer for the Washington Post, wrote that as whites began to move back into the district, many blacks started wondering: “Is the chocolate city turning vanilla?” She explained how she would answer that question: “Not if I have anything to say about it.”

John Street, the black mayor of Philadelphia addressed a large NAACP audience in 2002. The audience roared with approval as he bragged: “Let me tell you: The brothers and sisters are running the city. Oh yes. The brothers and sisters are running this city. Running it! . . . We are in charge!” Four days later, he appointed a black police chief. In 2004, again before the NAACP, Mayor Street brushed off complaints about his “we are in charge” speech. “We should never be ashamed of supporting African-Americans,” he said. “I will never apologize. . . .”

Whites may be surprised by the strength of black voter solidarity. Chris Bell, a white Democratic congressman from Texas, was redistricted into a largely black area and promptly crushed in the 2004 Democratic primary by the former head of the Houston chapter of the NAACP. He felt betrayed: He said he had spent his entire career “fighting for diversity, championing diversity,” and was dismayed that “many people do not want to look past the color of your skin.” This only demonstrated how little Mr. Bell understood blacks. As Bishop Paul Morton of the St. Stephen Full Gospel Baptist Church in New Orleans said of black voters, “I’ve talked to some people who say, ‘I don’t care how bad the black is, he’s better than any white.’”

Many blacks also expect all blacks to vote the same way. Jesse Jackson criticized Alabama congressman Artur Davis for voting against Mr. Obama’s signature medical insurance legislation, saying, “You can’t vote against healthcare and call yourself a black man.”

Racial consciousness explains why President Barack Obama drew support even from blacks who ordinarily vote Republican. No fewer than 87 percent of blacks who identified themselves as conservatives said they would vote for him. In the three states that track party registration by race—Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina—blacks were dropping off the Republican rolls in record numbers and rallying to the Democrats.

As one GOP black explained during the primaries, “Most black Republicans who support John McCain won’t tell you this, but if Barack Obama is the nominee for the Democratic ticket, they will go into the voting booth in November and vote for Obama.” “Among black conservatives, they tell me privately, it would be very hard to vote against him [Obama] in November,” said black conservative radio host Armstrong Williams. During the campaign, former San Francisco mayor Willie Brown said, “I think most white politicians do not understand that the race pride we [blacks] all have trumps everything else.”

The black-themed cable network TV One planned to break from its usual entertainment programming to cover the Democratic National Convention, but not the Republican Convention. Johnathan Rodgers, president of TV One, explained why: “My audience is 93 percent black. I serve my audience.”

Some blacks break the law in the name of politics. In 2006, the Justice Department charged the black chairman of the Democratic Party of Noxubee County, Mississippi, with voting rights violations.
against whites. The next year, U.S. District Judge Tom Lee found that Ike Brown and his associates had recruited black candidates to run even when they knew the candidates did not meet residency requirements, switched political meeting sites so whites would not know where to go, unfairly challenged white voters’ registrations, and rejected absentee ballots from whites while accepting them from blacks.  

Many blacks see racial preferences in hiring and college admissions as part of their birthright and do not care if they may be unfair to whites. When a white man explained to Willie Brown, then mayor of San Francisco, that racial preferences hurt whites, he replied, “I don’t care about your idiot kids.”

In Michigan, when a court recognized that the required number of signatures had been gathered to put a ban on racial preferences on the state ballot, it should have been a routine matter for the Michigan Board of Canvassers to approve it. However, a rowdy crowd of 250 black high school students invaded board premises, where they stood on chairs, stamped their feet, and shouted, “They say Jim Crow; we say hell no.” Some surged toward the front, knocking over a table, and the Board of Canvassers was so intimidated it was unable to do its job. Only at a later session was it able to put the initiative on the ballot.

The NAACP grades companies strictly on what they do for blacks: number of blacks hired, level of charity to black organizations, number of black-owned suppliers, etc. Any company that does not disclose this information gets a failing grade. At the 2006 national convention, NAACP president Bruce Gordon blasted the Target chain of retailers. “They didn’t even care to respond to our survey,” he said. “Stay out of their stores.”

The pursuit of racial interests can verge on self-absorption. Under the headline, “Global Warming Could Spell Disaster for Blacks,” Black Entertainment Television warned that “unless the United States gets real about the threat of global warming, African Americans and other people of color can expect a repeat of disasters like Katrina.” The article went on: “Citing Katrina as a case-in-point, some environmentalists say global warming impacts minorities and the disadvantaged harder than other groups.”

Katrina gave rise to other complaints. Red Cross shelters in nearby states opened their doors to refugees, many of them black. Some complained that the shelters had too many white staff, and Joyce Searcy of the Bethlehem Centers in Nashville called for the Red Cross to establish black-run shelters in black neighborhoods. The Red Cross pointed out that its shelters are run by volunteers, and that nothing prevented blacks from stepping forward.

When the black owners of Community Bank of Lawndale in Chicago sold it to Asian-American-owned International Bank, customers and former shareholders demanded that regulators maintain black ownership because the bank served a mostly-black neighborhood. As Rev. Marvin Hunter, leader of the protest explained somewhat confusingly, “this is not a race issue. This is an economic issue. We don’t believe other people can look out for the interests of black people.”

Blacks are quick to see race in any conflict. During a weigh-in against white boxer Joe Calzaghe, black boxer Bernard Hopkins bragged that he would “never lose to a white boy,” adding, “I couldn’t go back to the projects if I let a white boy beat me” (he lost). Muhammed Lawal, a prominent black mixed-martial-arts fighter, explained, “If I’m watching a fight and it’s a black guy and a white guy, I’m gonna root for the black guy. I have a connection with the black guy.”
COLOR OR CULTURE?

Most whites assume that culture is independent of race, that anyone of any color can participate in any civilization. Many blacks disagree. Camille Hernandez-Ramdawar’s father was black but her parents separated and she was reared by her white mother. She recognized that her mother loved her, but complained that her mother could not give her “a culture that matched her color.”

Heather Green, a Canadian of black-white parentage, explained her own embrace of blackness:

If I do anything short of vigilantly embracing my African identity . . . then I may be swept away, co-opted, consumed and sucked into the European power structure, culture and mindset . . . . Identifying as an African woman, as a daughter of African people and African ancestors, I vow that I am not and will not become part of any value system which seeks to crush other races through its way of life.

The assumption that culture follows biology is at the root of the official black view of cross-racial adoption. In 1972, the National Association of Black Social Workers—the one that holds exclusively black conferences—officially declared that adoption of blacks by whites was “genocide.” It withdrew the charge of genocide in 1994 when Congress passed the Multiethnic Placement Act, forbidding agencies that receive federal assistance from denying adoptions for racial reasons, but it still opposed adoption by whites, asserting that “black children in white homes are cut off from the healthy development of themselves as black people.” In 2008, it tried to overturn the 1994 law, insisting that “color consciousness—not ‘color blindness’—should help to shape policy development.”

The unspoken rule within adoption agencies is still to try to place children with adoptive parents of the same race.

The tie between race and culture is evident among Ethiopian Jews who have emigrated to Israel. Although most have never been to the United States or even seen an American black, they are passionate fans of rap music, hip-hop fashion, and “gangsta” demeanor, and show no interest in Israeli pop culture.

Two recent American movements—Kwanzaa and the Black Muslims—show the link between race and culture. Both started from nothing and now have millions of supporters—essentially all black. Kwanzaa, invented in 1966 by a black activist named Maulana Ron Karenga, is a black holiday for the Christmas season. US Presidents now deliver official Kwanzaa greetings, and the Postal Service issues Kwanzaa stamps. According to a survey by the National Retail Foundation, 4.7 million Americans celebrated the holiday in 2004.

The Nation of Islam is the best known Black Muslim group, though its actual numbers may be no more than 100,000. However, many blacks who are not, themselves, Muslims have great respect for the group’s leader, Louis Farrakhan. Users of the Internet arm of Black Entertainment Television, BET.com, chose him as the black “person of the year” for 2005. Mr. Farrakhan was elected over Oprah Winfrey, then-Senator Barack Obama, Robert L. Johnson, who started BET, and the victims of Hurricane Katrina. “An overwhelming percentage of our users agreed that Minister Farrakhan made the most positive impact on the Black community over the past year,” explained a BET spokesman.

What did Mr. Farrakhan do to deserve that honor? He received heavy news coverage twice that year. Once was when he promoted the theory that whites blew up the New Orleans levees to destroy black neighborhoods. The other was when he organized a “Millions More Movement” on the National Mall to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Million Man March. On that occasion, Michael
Muhammad, National Youth Minister for the Nation of Islam declaimed: “We want to say to our young brothers of the Crips and the Bloods that we are one family. The real enemy doesn’t wear blue, but white, even when he’s butt naked.”

Ayinde Baptiste of the Nation of Islam added: “We are at war here in America. . . . We need soldiers now. We need black male soldiers, we need black feminist soldiers, we need Crips and Bloods soldiers . . . soldiers in the prisons, soldiers in the streets.” The Congressional Black Caucus endorsed the event, and five black congressmen attended it.\(^\text{124}\)

Many blacks oppose interracial dating, and most interracial couples report more open hostility from blacks than whites. *Interrace* magazine, published for mixed-race couples, found in a reader poll that heavily-black Detroit was the major US city least receptive to black-white couples. They generally found the whitest cities the most welcoming.\(^\text{125}\)

“I give interracial couples a look,” movie director Spike Lee once explained. “Daggers. They get uncomfortable when they see me on the street.”\(^\text{126}\)

Kim Parks, a white woman married to a black man, reported that although some whites disapproved, the worst opposition came from her black in-laws. “Everything was race,” she said. “I was called ‘the white devil.’ ”\(^\text{127}\) Becca Knox, who in 2009 had been married to a black man for six years, found that talking honestly about race was “a constant, constant struggle and process,” especially when she tried to talk to blacks.\(^\text{128}\)

Some white men do not like the sight of mixed couples, but blacks are more likely to react violently. Rashard Casey was the star quarterback of the Penn State football team. In 2000, he and another black visited a Hoboken, New Jersey, nightclub and were angry to find a black woman with a white man. When the white man, Patrick Fitzsimmons, left the bar, they kicked him nearly to death. Mr. Fitzsimmons was a tolerance training instructor for the Hoboken Police Department.\(^\text{129}\)

Brian Milligan, Jr. lived in a mixed neighborhood in Buffalo, New York, and was often taunted for dating a black woman. In 2009, after he walked her home, a group of blacks attacked him with a chunk of concrete, sending him to the hospital with a swollen and bleeding brain, a broken jaw, and a destroyed sense of smell. “You white motherfucker,” they shouted. “We told you to stay away from our women.” Blacks in the neighborhood reportedly refused to come forward with evidence against the attackers.\(^\text{130}\)

Blacks understand that marrying outside their race brings a serious risk of being “not black enough.” Tyler Perry is one of America’s most successful black playwrights and movie producers. “African-American women are the most loyal fan base you’ll ever have,” he explained. “As long as you don’t marry outside the race, you are in.”\(^\text{131}\)

Black congresswoman Diane Watson of California opposed California businessman Ward Connerly’s efforts to dismantle racial preferences for blacks, but she had another complaint against him: “He’s married to a white woman. He wants to be white. . . . He has no ethnic pride. He doesn’t want to be black.”\(^\text{132}\)

No less a person than W.E.B. Du Bois, founder of the modern black civil rights movement, fell in love with a German girl named Dora Marbach when he was young, but decided not to marry her. He knew that a white wife would discredit him as a black leader.\(^\text{133}\)

**RACISM**
A common aspect of black racial consciousness is the conviction that whites are deeply racist. Undoubtedly, there are whites who do not like blacks, but the sentiments many blacks attribute to whites are a caricature. Film producer Spike Lee, for example, explained to *Playboy* in 2004 why he would never go to an event sponsored by the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing: “I just imagine hearing some Country-and-Western song over a loudspeaker at NASCAR: ‘Hang them nigger up high! Hang them nigger up high!’ I’m not going to no NASCAR.”

When a white South Carolina congressman, Joe Wilson, interrupted President Obama during a September 2009 address to Congress by shouting “You lie,” black Georgia congressman Hank Johnson said that if Mr. Wilson were not formally sanctioned, “we’ll probably have folks putting on white hoods and white uniforms again and riding through the countryside intimidating people.”

In a 2005 survey of blacks carried out by Oregon State University and the Rand Corporation, one third said medical institutions use minorities as “guinea pigs” to try out new birth control methods. Almost one-fourth agreed that “poor and minority women are sometimes forced to be sterilized by the government,” and 22 percent thought that “the government’s family-planning policies are intended to control the number of black people.”

Only 36 percent of blacks—as opposed to 61 percent of whites—support doctor-assisted suicide. Mary Evans, one of two black members of the board of a non-profit group that advocates physician-assisted suicide, explained that blacks see death with dignity as just another way for whites to eliminate them.

A 2004 BET/CBS poll found that only 41 percent of black registered voters had “a lot” of confidence that their votes would even be counted in the elections that November, and no fewer than 68 percent agreed with the statement that there are “deliberate attempts to disrupt African American voting.”

It was widely reported during the relief efforts that followed Hurricane Katrina that many blacks believed New Orleans had been neglected because many victims were black. Seventy percent of blacks—and 30 percent of whites—believed this. Nor was it only Louis Farrakhan who claimed the government had blown up the New Orleans levees to flood black neighborhoods. A black *Washington Post* columnist explained:

> I was stunned in New Orleans at how many black New Orleanians would tell me with real conviction that somehow the levee breaks had been engineered in order to save the French Quarter and the Garden District at the expense of the Lower Ninth Ward, which is almost all black. . . . These are not wild-eyed people. These are reasonable, sober people who really believe that.

The late Carl Rowan was a syndicated columnist, head of the USIA, ambassador to Finland, and served on the National Security Council. In a 1996 book called *The Coming Race War in America*, he wrote that whites are so hopelessly racist that blacks would soon rise up in massive violence. He claimed that “corporate boardrooms, local governments, education districts, are full of powerful men and women who are virulent bigots,” and wrote of the “cruelly bigoted rhetoric that often befouls the well of the House of Representatives.” He gave no examples.

Pearl Cleage, playwright and columnist, explained how racism frames the debate in America:

> In discussions of *race* between black people and white people the conscious black person is *always* right; is *always* the ultimate authority on questions having to do with race and racism; must *always* be regarded as the “injured party,” or the oppressed. . . . [Whites] cannot possibly be expected to be objective about questions of race . . . .

Ellis Cose is a black journalist who writes for *Newsweek*. He insists that racism is so pervasive that “despite its very evident prosperity, much of America’s black middle class is in excruciating
He has written that “decent black people” with good, white-collar jobs “are themselves in a state of either silent resentment or deeply repressed rage,” and are as angry as those in the ghetto.

Some blacks recognize that “excruciating pain” and “repressed rage” may be hard to explain when no white institutions and very few white individuals can plausibly be described as actively persecuting blacks. Three black social workers, Sekou Mims, Omar Reid, and Larry Higginbottom, have come up with a name for this feeling: “post traumatic slavery disorder (PTSD).” Mr. Reid runs support groups for black men who are filled with rage and anxiety despite the fact that there are no obvious white oppressors. He explains that past oppression is the cause, and PTSD takes the form of crime, illegitimacy, drug-taking, and school failure.

Other blacks believe white oppression is still very common. In 2007, Solomon Burnette wrote in the campus publication of North Carolina Central University that “white people still murder us with impunity. White people still beat us with impunity. White people still rape us and get away with it.” In 2008, Josh Myers wrote in the Howard University campus paper that “to truly understand the Democratic party is to understand that it is a white supremacist institution. To have any type of understanding of the Republican Party is to know that it is a white supremacist institution.”

Black author Patricia Turner has written an eye-opening book called *I Heard it Through the Grapevine* about some of the terrible things blacks think whites are doing to them. She reported that in the 1980s many blacks believed Church’s fried chicken was laced with chemicals that would sterilize blacks (and only blacks). A black boycott weakened the chain, and it merged with Popeye’s Chicken and Biscuits. In the 1990s, a soft drink called Tropical Fantasy had to mount a long, hard campaign to squelch the same sterilization rumor.

Blacks in upscale Shaker Heights are convinced they are victims. They are professionals who moved to the Cleveland suburb because of its good schools, but found that black children had an average grade point average of 1.9 compared to a white average of 3.45. John Ogbu, a Nigerian immigrant who is an expert at UC Berkeley on race differences in school performance, moved to Shaker Heights for nine months and researched the schools. He concluded that most of the problem was that black students were not interested in studying—they considered it “acting white”—and that their parents did not push them.

Blacks were outraged. One parent called him “an academic Clarence Thomas,” and the National Urban League said his conclusions were an effort to “blame the victims of racism.” One reporter could not find a single black person in Shaker Heights who had anything good to say about Prof. Ogbu’s conclusions. For blacks, there was only one explanation for black failure: white racism.

John McWhorter is a black author who marvels at how entrenched among blacks is the view that whites still wish to oppress them:

In every race-related debate—whether over Rodney King, O. J. Simpson, the Million Man March, Ebonics, or affirmative action—almost every black person I knew, many with backgrounds as comfortable as my own, started from the fierce conviction that, decades after the Civil Rights Act, whitey’s foot remains pressed upon all black Americans’ necks.

Doubtless some black leaders mouth the ideology of victimhood for political advantage: “Confrontation works,” as Al Sharpton has calculatedly observed. But most rank-and-file exponents of the “racism forever” worldview really mean it.
In my experience, trying to show many African-Americans how mistaken and counterproductive these ideas are is like trying to convince a religious person that God does not exist: the sentiments are beyond the reach of rational, civil discourse.\textsuperscript{152}

**HATE**

If people believe the government is giving them AIDS and blowing up levees, and that white-owned companies are trying to sterilize them, they would be lacking in normal human emotions if they did not—to put it bluntly—hate the people they believed responsible.

Indeed, vigorous expressions of hatred go back to at least the time of W.E.B. Du Bois, who once wrote, “It takes extraordinary training, gift and opportunity to make the average white man anything but an overbearing hog, but the most ordinary Negro is an instinctive gentleman.”\textsuperscript{153}

On another occasion he expressed himself in verse:

\begin{verbatim}
I hate them, Oh!
I hate them well,
I hate them, Christ!
As I hate hell!
If I were God,
I’d sound their knell
This day!\textsuperscript{154}
\end{verbatim}

Such sentiments are still common. Amiri Baraka, originally known as LeRoi Jones, is one of America’s most famous and well-regarded black poets, but his work is brimming with anti-white vitriol. These lines are from “Black Dada Nihilismus:”

\begin{verbatim}
Come up, black dada nihilismus.
Rape the white girls.
Rape their fathers.
Cut the mothers’ throats.
\end{verbatim}

Here are more of his lines:

\begin{verbatim}
You cant steal nothin from a white man,
he’s already stole it he owes
you anything you want, even his life.
All the stores will open up if you
will say the magic words. The magic words are:

Up against the wall motherfucker this is a stick up!\textsuperscript{155}
\end{verbatim}

In “Leroy” he wrote: “When I die, the consciousness I carry I will to black people. May they pick me apart and take the useful parts, the sweet meat of my feelings. And leave the bitter bullshit rotten white parts alone.” When he was asked by a white woman what white people could do to help the race problem, he replied, “You can help by dying. You are a cancer. You can help the world’s people with your death.”\textsuperscript{156} In July, 2002, Mr. Baraka was appointed poet laureate of New Jersey.\textsuperscript{157}

The celebrated black author James Baldwin once said:

\begin{verbatim}
[T]here is, I should think, no Negro living in America who has not felt, briefly or for long periods, . . . simple, naked and unanswerable hatred; who has not wanted to smash any white face he may encounter in a day, to violate, out of motives of the cruelest vengeance, their women, to break the bodies of all white people and bring them low . . . .”\textsuperscript{158}
\end{verbatim}

Toni Morrison is a highly-regarded black author who has won the Nobel Prize. “With very few exceptions,” she has written, “I feel that White people will betray me; that in the final analysis they’ll give me up.”\textsuperscript{159} Author Randall Robinson concluded after years of activism that “in the autumn of my life, I am left regarding white people, before knowing them individually, with irreducible mistrust and dull dislike.” He wrote that it gave him pleasure when his dying father slapped a white nurse, telling...
her not “to put her white hands on him.”

Leonard Jeffries is the chairman of the African-American studies department of the City College of New York and is famous for his hatred of whites. Once in answer to the question, “What kind of world do you want to leave to your children?” he replied, “A world in which there aren’t any white people.”

In June 2006, Professor Jeffries spoke at a “Unity in Diversity” forum at New York City’s Department of Housing Preservation and Development. He told the 100 or so mostly black city workers that blacks have absorbed too much white thinking: “If every white person in the world dropped dead, the system [that oppresses you] would continue to go on, because it’s in you now.” To roars of approval, he said blacks should avoid white milk, white bread and white sugar, and that coffee-drinkers should “take it black.” For more than an hour, he mocked and ridiculed whites.

Khalid Abdul Muhammed, an assistant to Louis Farrakhan once spoke about movies he would like to see:

Let’s make some revolutionary movies where we kill white people in the movie. Kill ’em so hard you have to cover up your popcorn from the blood spraying out of the screen.

In March 2003, two policemen died in a shootout at the heavily-black Stapleton Houses in New York City. Grace Watkins, an 18-year-old resident, said that when people heard about the killings they thought the policemen got what they deserved. When they learned the policemen were black, however, she said “their attitude changed totally,” adding, “And they started expressing concern for the police officers’ families.”

Here is just a small sampling of anti-white lyrics from rap recordings:

“They got us brainwashed to be the minority, but when we kill them off we gonna be the majority. . . . I’m inciting riots, so let’s start the looting. . . . in this revolution I loathe my enemy . . . .”

“A fight, a fight, a nigger and a white, if the nigger don’t win then we all jump in. . . . smoking [killing] all America’s white boys . . . .”

“I kill a devil [white] right now. . . . I say kill whitey all nightey long. . . . I would kill a cracker for nothing, just for the fuck of it. . . . catch that devil slipping; blow his fucking brains out.”

“I prey on these devils [whites]. . . . filling his body up with lead, yah; cracker in my way; slitting, slit his throat; watch his body shake; watch his body shake; that’s how we do it in the motherfucking [San Francisco] Bay. . . .”

Jazz musician Miles Davis once said, “If somebody told me I had only one hour to live, I’d spend it choking a white man. I’d do it nice and slow.” bell hooks, a black professor of English at City College of New York who spells her name in lower case, once wrote, “I am writing this essay sitting beside an anonymous white male that I long to murder.” Demond Washington, a star athlete at Tallassee High School in Tallassee, Alabama, got in trouble for saying over the school intercom, “I hate white people and I’m going to kill them all!” Later he said he did not mean it.

Someone who probably did mean it was Maurice Heath, who heads the Philadelphia chapter of the New Black Panther party. He once told a crowd, “I hate white people—all of them! . . . You want freedom? You’re gonna have to kill some crackers! You’re gonna have to kill some of their babies!” Another one who probably meant it is Dr. Kamau Kambon, black activist and former visiting professor of Africana Studies at North Carolina State University in Raleigh. In 2005, Prof.
Kambon told a panel at Howard University Law School that “white people want to kill us,” and that “we have to exterminate white people off the face of the planet to solve this problem.”

In 2005, James “Jimi” Izrael, a black editorial assistant for the Lexington, Kentucky, Herald-Leader, was on a radio program to talk about Prof. Kambon. Another guest mentioned other blacks who have written about the fantasy of killing whites, and Mr. Izrael began to laugh. “Listen,” he said, “I’m laughing because if I had a dollar for every time I heard a black person [talking about] killing somebody white I’d be a millionaire.”

For some, killing whites is not fantasy. Although the press was quiet about this aspect of the story, the two snipers who terrorized the Washington, DC, area in 2002 had a racial motive. Lee Malvo testified that his confederate, John Muhammad, was driven by hatred of America because of its “slavery, hypocrisy and foreign policy.” His plan was to kill six whites every day for 30 days.

For a 179-day period in 1973 and 1974, a group of Black Muslim “Death Angels” kept the city of San Francisco in a panic as they killed scores of randomly-chosen “blue-eyed devils.” Some 71 deaths were eventually attributed to them. Four of an estimated 14 Death Angels were convicted of first-degree murder. Most Americans have never heard of what became known as the Zebra Killings.

A 2005 analysis of crime victim surveys found that 45 percent of the violent crimes blacks committed were against whites, 43 percent against blacks, and 10 percent against Hispanics. There was therefore slightly more black-on-white than black-on-black crime. When whites committed violence they chose black victims only 3 percent of the time.

Violence by whites against blacks, such as the 1998 dragging death of James Byrd, is well reported, but racial murder by blacks is little publicized. For example, in Wilkinsburg, near Philadelphia, 39-year-old Ronald Taylor killed three men and wounded two others in a 2000 rampage, in which he targeted whites. At one point, he pushed a black woman out of his way, saying “Not you, sister. I’m not going to hurt any black people. I’m just out to kill all white people.”

The same year, Obie Weathers of San Antonio, Texas, attacked but did not manage to kill two elderly white men. Less than 24 hours later, he found 82-year-old Norma Petrash in her home and beat her to death. “I hate all white people,” he explained to a detective.

Also in 2000, a black man named Gregory Devon Murphy walked into a residential neighborhood in Alexandria, Virginia, and slit the throat of an eight-year-old white boy playing in his front yard. When police searched the man’s belongings they found a note that said “Kill them raceess whiate kidd’s anyway.” Mr. Murphy had already served time for an unprovoked racial attack on a white man.

In 2005, Philip Grant, who is black, stabbed Concetta Russo-Carriero to death in a shopping mall parking lot in White Plains, New York. In a video-taped confession, he explained, “I was thinking that the first person I see this morning that looks white, I’m killing them. I have no remorse whatsoever because she was white.”

In 2007, Steven Johnson was sentenced to 240 years in prison for shooting and wounding three white people and spraying kerosene on several others while he shouted that “white people are going to burn tonight.” He told police he was seeking revenge for the mistreatment of blacks.

In 2007, two black men carjacked a white Knoxville couple and raped and tortured them both for several hours before killing them. The woman, Channon Christian, suffered what the Knox County
medical examiner called “horrific injuries to her vagina, anus, and mouth,” and the men rubbed these areas with a cleaning chemical. They then stuffed her into trash bags, where she slowly smothered to death. The men shot her boyfriend to death.\(^{183}\)

A Knoxville organization called Black Poverty Speaks sponsored a party to fete the killers. “We’re celebrating underprivileged Knoxville blacks who victimize privileged Knoxville whites,” explained the group’s leader. “There’s going to be a party in Knoxville and America every time black poverty speaks and privileged whites suffer.”\(^{184}\) Until it was suspended, there was a website called the National Black Foot Soldier Network. It argued that what was described as black-on-white crime was really reparations for slavery, and that black skin was a “receipt” for legitimate repayment.\(^{185}\)

In 2008, a white woman wept on the witness stand as she described her rape at the hands of a black man who broke into her apartment in Raleigh, North Carolina. He repeatedly told her he was punishing her for the historic crimes of whites.\(^{186}\)

In 2010, Theron Lacey was on trial in Dallas for stabbing a 67-year-old white woman to death and stealing her wallet and cell phone. His girlfriend LaShaunda Johnson testified that he told her not to feel sorry for the victim because “I could just think she was prejudiced” and that “her family probably owned slaves.”\(^{187}\)

In 2009, Los Angeles police arrested a black man, John Floyd Thomas, Jr., thought to have been the most prolific serial killer in the city’s history. Over a period of more than a decade he raped and killed an estimated 30 older women. All were white.\(^{188}\)

These crimes would no doubt have gained greater publicity if the races had been reversed. One crime that did gain some attention was the 2009 killing of four Oakland police officers—three white, one Asian—by Lovelle Mixon, a black multiple offender, who was shot by police. A crowd of about 20 blacks taunted police at the spot where two of the officers fell, and a shrine honoring Mixon later appeared there. Bahari Olatunji of the International People’s Democratic Uhuru Movement organized a vigil to “uphold the resistance of the African community as represented by Brother Lovelle Mixon.”\(^{189}\) Wilson Riles, a former member of the Oakland City Council, said many young blacks in Oakland told him, “That’s the way I want to go out.”\(^{190}\)

Some in the NAACP seem to share this view. In 2009, a black man named Christopher Monfort ambushed and killed four white Seattle police officers who were sitting in a coffee shop.\(^{191}\) Later, the head of the Seattle NAACP, James Bible, called the police “occupiers,” and said he thought resistance to them was legitimate.\(^{192}\)

Young blacks have started a new trend: violent humiliation of whites that does not go so far as murder. In 2009, Denver police arrested 32 suspects in what had become the fashion: surrounding lone whites late at night in the LoDo entertainment district and attacking them. Rev. Leon Kelly, who runs a Denver gang-prevention program explained that gang members like to videotape assaults, in which they try to knock a young white man out with a single blow. They watch the videos over and over, laughing at the big punch, and sell the clips on the underground market as entertainment.\(^{193}\) In Champaign, Illinois, blacks have a name for attacks of this kind: “polar bear hunting.”\(^{194}\)

There is a tradition of free, outdoor movies in Atlanta’s Piedmont Park called “Screen on the Green.” In 2010 the screening was stopped 20 minutes early, ostensibly for “technical reasons.” The real reason was that blacks were fighting each other and attacking whites.\(^{195}\)

So-called “flash mobs” drew attention in 2010. Young blacks, alerted by cell phones and text
messaging, converged by the hundreds in largely-white shopping and entertainment areas, where they shouted, ran wild, started fights, robbed people, and vandalized property. Philadelphia was particularly hard hit, as were Boston, Brooklyn, Kansas City, and South Orange, New Jersey. It was clear to many people that “flash mobs” chose locations where they could intimidate as many whites as possible.196

On Halloween night, 2006, three white women, ages 19 and 21, attended a block party in Long Beach, California. Unprovoked, blacks began shouting, “We hate white people. Fuck white people.” Witnesses said an estimated 25 to 40 people—including many girls and women—then attacked the women. The three whites later told reporters they thought they would have been killed if a tall, strong black man had not come to their rescue.197

In 2009, Marty Marshall was with a small group who had just watched a neighborhood fireworks display in South Akron, Ohio. Dozens of teenaged boys suddenly attacked them, shouting, “This is our world,” and, “This is a black world.” The attack put Mr. Marshall in critical care for five nights.198 Greg Alchier, who was also beaten, said blacks attack whites every year after the fireworks, adding “It’s just swept under the rug.”199

In his autobiography, Makes Me Wanna Holler, black Washington Post journalist Nathan McCall remembered an episode from his early years:

The fellas and I were hanging out on our corner one afternoon when the strangest thing happened. A white boy . . . came pedaling a bicycle casually through the neighborhood. . . . Somebody spotted him and pointed him out to the rest of us. ‘Look! What’s that motherfucker doin’ ridin’ through here?! Is he crraaaazy?!’ . . . We caught him on Cavalier Boulevard and knocked him off the bike. . . . Ignoring the passing cars, we stomped him and kicked him. My stick partners kicked him in the head and face and watched the blood gush from his mouth. I kicked him in the stomach and nuts, where I knew it would hurt. Every time I drove my foot into his balls, I felt better . . . one dude kept stomping, like he’d gone berserk . . . When he finished, he reached down and picked up the white dude’s bike, lifted it as high as he could above his head, and slammed it down on him hard. . . . We walked away, laughing, boasting, competing for bragging rights about who’d done the most damage.

Mr. McCall expressed no regrets for his brutality,200 and this and subsequent books were such successes he had to leave the Post to meet the demand for his lectures.201

Black hatred can turn up anywhere. Gloria Alfonzo was a student at Prince George’s Community College in Largo, Maryland. In one class, in which the instructor and all but one classmate were black, she said she was a Republican and did not support Barack Obama. Then, according to Miss Alfonzo, “They got up from their chairs, they started pointing at me and, um, saying, ‘You are a daughter of a,’ you know, ‘expletive deleted’ and ‘expletive deleted white girl.’ ” A classmate, Charles Monroe, confirmed the foul language, adding, “I have never seen so much hate for one person.”202

Frank Ahrens wrote in the Washington Post of walking through a lively part of Washington, DC, and admiring the music of a black sidewalk saxophonist. As he was about to compliment the man, the black said to him, “After 42 years in this life, I learned one thing: White people suck!” Mr. Ahrens later watched as a white woman dropped a bill into the man’s saxophone case only to be met with a snarling racial slur. “She staggered in response, as if shoved,” he wrote.203

Robert Mugabe, president of Zimbabwe, has made a name for himself by driving white farmers off the land and calling for the expulsion of all whites. “Zimbabwe,” he says, “is for black people, not white people.”204 Some American blacks admire Mr. Mugabe. In 2002, at New York’s City Council chambers, he explained his anti-white policies to the City Council’s Black and Hispanic Caucus. Charles Barron, the Brooklyn council member who had invited Mr. Mugabe to City Hall, hugged him
and held his hand aloft like a victorious boxer. Mr. Barron was welcoming a kindred spirit. At a rally for reparations for slavery, he once said he sometimes wants to go up to a white person, tell him, “You can’t understand this, it’s a black thing,” and then “slap him just for my mental health.”

In 2010, blacks in New York state established a new political party to promote the interests of blacks. The Freedom Party easily qualified for the ballot, with 45,300 petition signatures, three times the number required. Its first slate of candidates included the same Charles Barron for governor.

LOYALTY

Shortly after the September 11 attacks, black author Brian Gilmore wrote that blacks were “not feeling that deep sense of patriotism that most Americans feel.” He wrote that blacks “were Americans, but not quite as American as white Americans.” He added what was to him the most important consequence of the attacks: “[N]ot only was the black agenda taken off the table for the foreseeable future, the table itself was taken down.”

Three months after the attacks, at the State of the Black World Conference in Atlanta, Al Sharpton mocked the American military for being unable to find Osama bin Laden. “This country can’t find a guy who comes out every two weeks to cut a video, and then you challenge us to stand under one flag?” he asked, to thunderous applause from 700 black delegates.

For some time after September 11, many fire crews flew American flags on their trucks in tribute to the hundreds of New York City firemen who died. On September 15, two black members of the Miami-Dade department refused to ride on a truck flying the flag. Thomas Steinfatt, a professor at the University of Miami, said their sentiments were common. “Black Americans perceive a lot of areas of discrimination that are not evident to whites,” he said. “To some, the flag represents white America, not all of America.”

Blacks who do not like the American flag can buy different versions from a black-run company called Us For Once. The designs are the same as Old Glory but in black, red, and green—the colors of Marcus Garvey’s flag. One version, called the Middle Passage Flag, “honors those ancestors who rebelled, were tortured, brutalized and died in the crossing.”

In 2008, a black player for the Dallas Mavericks basketball team, Josh Howard, participated in a charity flag-football game, where the television cameras caught him making faces as the National Anthem was played. “‘The Star-Spangled Banner’ is going on,” he said. “I don’t celebrate this shit. I’m black, goddammit.”

Also in 2008, when Mayor John Hickenlooper of Denver asked black jazz singer Rene Marie to sing the National Anthem before his annual State of the City address, Miss Marie sang the first verse from the Black National Anthem “Lift Ev’ry Voice and Sing” instead. When Mr. Hickenlooper later accused her of deceiving the city, she explained, “I want to express how I feel about living in the United States, as a black woman,” adding that she did not “feel like an American.”

In 2000, state legislators in New Jersey tried to pass a bill to have school children recite this passage from the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” Every black state senator opposed the bill because “all men are created equal” did not apply to blacks in 1776.
Also in 2000, Chicago alderman Bernard Stone thought it would be a patriotic gesture if city council sessions began with the Pledge of Allegiance. Black council members complained that the final phrase, “with liberty and justice for all” is hypocritical because it does not include blacks. The council did vote to open meetings with the pledge, but several black members abstained, and when the group recited the pledge for the first time, at least one black member stayed out of the room.\textsuperscript{214}

As filmmaker Spike Lee has explained, “When talking about the history of this great country, one can never forget that America was built upon the genocide of Native Americans and enslavement of African people. To say otherwise is criminal.”\textsuperscript{215}

A group of black congressmen were convinced that the presidential election of 2000, in which there was a dispute about the vote count in Florida, reflected systematic racism and corruption in the American electoral system. Texas Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson, led the group in sending a letter to Secretary General Kofi Annan asking the United Nations to send observers to monitor the vote in 2004, in order to “ensure free and fair elections.”\textsuperscript{216}

A different form of alienation is reflected in the unwillingness of many blacks to cooperate with the police, even when they investigate crimes committed against blacks. “Stop Snitching” T-shirts became popular in 2006. They bore a large red “stop” symbol with “stop snitching” in block letters inside. Blacks put them on and loitered around crime scenes when the police came to investigate.\textsuperscript{217}

Busta Rhymes is a hip-hop star who, along with as many as 50 other blacks, probably saw someone shoot his bodyguard in 2006. No one was willing to talk to the police. This was also the case in the unsolved murders of other prominent rappers: Tupac Shakur, the Notorious B.I.G., and Jam Master Jay.\textsuperscript{218}

At least 20 people were within sight of a 2007 gunfight between black gang members in Trenton, New Jersey, in which a seven-year-old girl was shot. The case could not be solved because no one would tell investigators what they saw.\textsuperscript{219} According to a 2007 survey of mostly black and Hispanic teenagers by the National Center for Victims of Crime, only 11 to 15 percent said they would report a gang crime to police, even if they themselves were the victim.\textsuperscript{220}

It is not only rappers and criminals who flout the law. Paul Butler is a former US Attorney-turned-law-professor, who thinks that when black juries decide the fate of black defendants who are clearly guilty, they should first decide whether it is good for black people if the accused goes to prison. If not, they should acquit. He openly promoted “jury nullification,” whereby jurors make decisions without regard for the evidence. “I do want to subvert the criminal justice system,” he said unapologetically.\textsuperscript{221}

\textbf{UNCLE TOMS}

There are, of course, blacks who do not put race first, who oppose racial preferences, who want Americans of all colors to overcome the divisiveness of the past. They have the same ideals about race as most whites. Many other blacks despise them.

The most hated black man in America is undoubtedly Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. Rather than taking pride in his achievements, blacks heap scorn on him because he does not have a strong racial consciousness, and does not favor racial preferences for blacks. Black commentator Julianne Malveaux once said of him, “I hope his wife feeds him lots of eggs and butter and he dies early, like many black men do, of heart disease.”
Donna Brazile, also black, who managed Al Gore’s presidential campaign in 2000, explained that “there’s so much animosity and hatred toward Clarence Thomas as someone who has betrayed the race.” Abigail Johnson, a retired educator in Savannah, Georgia, once recognized Justice Thomas chatting with friends in a public library in Savannah. She approached them and announced, “I just wanted to see what a group of Uncle Toms looks like,” and walked away. Black essayist Debra Dickerson writes that Justice Thomas “is the lowest of the low in sort of official blackdom.” Emerge, a black-oriented magazine that has since disappeared, put Justice Thomas on its cover twice—once as a lawn jockey and once in an Aunt Jemima-style head scarf. Ebony refuses to include Justice Thomas in its regular list of 100 most influential blacks.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Hawaii once considered inviting Justice Thomas to take part in a debate on racial preferences, but a black member of the local ACLU board, Eric Ferrer, complained that it would be like “inviting Hitler to come speak on the rights of Jews.” Former mayor of San Francisco, Willie Brown, called Justice Thomas “a shill and cover for the most insidious form of racism.”

Another black “traitor” is Jesse Lee Peterson, who runs a Los Angeles boys’ home called the Brotherhood Organization of a New Destiny (BOND). When he urges blacks not to use racism as an excuse for their own failings he gets the same treatment as Justice Thomas. As Michael Eric Dyson, a black, tenured professor at University of Pennsylvania says, “If you’ve ever wondered what a self-hating black man who despises black culture and worships at the altar of whiteness looks like, take a gander at the Rev. Jesse Lee Peterson.”

Gary Franks of Connecticut was one of a very small number of black Republicans in Congress, and did not join the Black Caucus or support racial preferences. When his six years of service ended with defeat in 1996, the black Democratic congressman from Missouri, William Clay, wrote a six-page letter of celebration. He called Mr. Franks “a Negro Dr. Kevorkian, a pariah who gleefully assists in suicidal conduct to destroy his own race.”

A more recent example of repudiation came in the wake of the 2009 arrest of black Harvard professor, Henry Louis Gates, by a white police officer in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Mr. Gates claimed he was the victim of racial profiling whereas the white officer, James Crowley, said he was simply following procedure. A black officer, Sergeant Leon Lashley, was present at the arrest and stated publicly that Sergeant Crowley had acted properly. Blacks called him an “Uncle Tom” and widely derided him for “betraying his heritage.”

Some readers may feel that this chapter reflects selective reporting, and has concentrated on atypical expressions of black solidarity and animus towards whites. The vast majority of interactions between blacks and whites in America today are polite, and it is impossible to portray a group of more than 30 million people in a way that is comprehensive.

And yet, can readers think of instances in which blacks publicly urged other blacks to set aside racial concerns, to consider themselves Americans first, and to work for the good of all? When have black authority figures expressed regret for even the most horrific anti-white crimes? When have blacks praised diversity if it meant giving up black majorities? How many wealthy blacks make charitable donations to broadly American rather than explicitly black institutions? When has a black
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And yet, can readers think of instances in which blacks publicly urged other blacks to set aside racial concerns, to consider themselves Americans first, and to work for the good of all? When have black authority figures expressed regret for even the most horrific anti-white crimes? When have blacks praised diversity if it meant giving up black majorities? How many wealthy blacks make charitable donations to broadly American rather than explicitly black institutions? When has a black
person publicly chided other blacks for excessive concern with narrowly black issues? Blacks differ from whites both in what they say and do and what they do not say or do.

We find among many blacks—perhaps the majority—a view of race sharply at odds with what the civil rights movement was presumably working for: the elimination of race as a relevant category in American life. White racism is commonly alleged to be the great obstacle to harmonious race relations in the United States, but whites are the only group that actually subscribes to the goal of eliminating race consciousness and that actively polices its members for signs of such consciousness. If whites were the great obstacle to harmony, it would be they who unapologetically put their interests first, who fantasized about killing blacks, who were careful to show they were “white enough,” and ostracized those who were not. Instead, any white person who spoke or acted in ways blacks take for granted would be hounded out of public life and scorned in private.

Anyone who looks closely at black racial thinking and behavior will see that 50 years after the civil rights movement, blacks are as far as ever from adopting the race-blindness that whites assume all Americans must achieve for multi-racialism to work. Blacks nourish and take pride in an intense, combative racial consciousness. It is only a matter of time before this gives rise to an increasingly explicit white racial consciousness.
Traditionally, when Americans thought about race relations, they thought about the painful history of relations between blacks and whites. This view is out of date; the United States now has multiple racial fault lines rather than just one. The scarcely-noticed handful of Hispanics present in the 1950s has become the largest racial minority in America.

Like blacks, many Hispanics have identities—racial, ethnic, or national—that can prevent primary identification as Americans. Immigrants from Mexico, who account for two thirds of all Hispanics, are especially ambivalent towards the United States. It is part of their national culture to see their northern neighbor as an imperialist power that humiliated and dismembered Mexico after the Mexican-American War of 1846 to 1848. Some openly preach *reconquista* or reconquest—at least culturally, and perhaps even politically—of lands that were once Mexican. There are already parts of the United States in which people live in Spanish-speaking environments, where they have no need to be part of the larger culture. If Hispanic immigration, both legal and illegal, continues at its current pace, these areas will expand, and become increasingly isolated. In the meantime, as their numbers grow, Hispanics are changing the culture and politics of the entire country.

Blacks have been part of the United States for hundreds of years. Brought involuntarily, they have a historic claim on America. Hispanics, whose presence in large numbers is recent and unplanned, have been quick to assume the black mantle of victimhood, to attribute poverty or social failure to racism, and to take advantage of preference programs originally established for descendants of slaves. Many Mexicans become more militant the longer they live in the United States. First-generation immigrants are often grateful merely to be in a developed country rather than one that is badly governed and falling into the hands of drug traffickers. It is the second- and third- generation Hispanics who claim to be victims of oppression and exploitation.

Hispanics therefore resemble blacks in their vivid sense of their own group interests, their tendency to see the world in racial/ethnic terms, and their reluctance to adopt the broader American identity whites think necessary for integration and assimilation. This identity is kept fresh by the continuous arrival of new immigrants. However, even if immigration were to stop tomorrow, there are now enough Hispanics—especially Mexicans—to maintain a particularist, parochial identity indefinitely. In the space of just a few decades our country has established a second group of Americans that are racially distinct, with an inward-looking identity, and who suffer disproportionately from poverty, crime, and school failure.

**WHO ARE THE HISPANICS?**

In 2009 there were 48.4 million Hispanics in the United States, and they accounted for 16 percent of the population. They were the fastest-growing group in the country, having more than doubled from 22.4 million in 1990. The United States has the second-largest Hispanic population of any country in the world, after Mexico. Sixty-six percent of American Hispanics are of Mexican origin, which means that the equivalent of 30 percent of the population of Mexico lives in the United States.¹ According to a 2005 survey, almost half of all Mexicans said that they would move to the United States if they had the chance.²

The 33 percent of Hispanics who are not from Mexico have mainly the following origins: 17
percent Latin American, nine percent Puerto Rican (this does not include the four million Puerto Ricans who live in Puerto Rico), and four percent Cuban. The characteristics of these populations are often quite different, with Cuban immigrants generally more economically successful than other Hispanics.

Between 2000 and 2005, the Hispanic population increased at an annual rate of 3.7 percent, no less than 14 times the growth rate for whites, and more than three times the black rate. This increase was due both to high birthrates and to immigration of about 800,000 Hispanics every year. Much of that immigration was illegal.

The Pew Hispanic Center estimated in 2009 that 12.7 million Mexican citizens were living in the United States in 2008, and that they accounted for 60 percent of the 11.9 million or so illegal immigrants in the country. The center has estimated that other Hispanics account for another 20 percent of illegal immigrants.

Most Americans believe that a willingness to learn English is a prerequisite to full participation in American life, but this does not appear to be a high priority for many Hispanics. According to a 2006 poll conducted by Investor’s Business Daily, 81 percent of Hispanics spoke mostly or only Spanish at home. Even Hispanics who are comfortable in English prefer Spanish; according to a poll by P.C. Koch, nearly 90 percent of bilingual Hispanics get their news exclusively from Spanish-language sources. In 2003, 44 percent of Hispanics did not speak and read English well enough to perform routine tasks, up from 35 percent in 1992. English illiteracy therefore increased for Hispanics during the decade, whereas it declined for every other major population group.

Many Hispanics consider Spanish vital to their identity. Raul Yzaguirre is former president of the Hispanic advocacy group, National Council of La Raza. “U.S. English,” he has said, referring to the English-only advocacy group, “is to Hispanics as the Ku Klux Klan is to blacks.” An attachment to a minority language is always a sign of something broader. As one expert on ethnic conflict explains:

When minorities demand linguistic parity, they are not only asking for language rights, but rather a broad range of cultural rights that have come to be an extension of language. . . . The language program is crucial because it is viewed both as an instrument of history . . . and it is the symbol of the future, through which a program for the future may be formulated and executed.

Some Hispanics defend Spanish to the death. Charlie Guzman and Mauricio Escalante lived in the same apartment complex in Immokalee, Florida. They fell into conversation at the laundry room and Mr. Escalante became angry because Mr. Guzman preferred to speak English. Mr. Escalante went to a nearby apartment, got a knife, and stabbed Mr. Guzman to death.

The city of Miami has gone through phases of recognizing Spanish as the city’s official language, and many residents are uncomfortable in English. Since 2003, the state of Florida has required that all students pass the 10th-grade-level Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test or FCAT in order to get a high-school diploma. At Miami Senior High, nearly 90 percent of students were not native speakers of English, and 100 of 500 seniors failed. In May 2003, 200 students demonstrated outside the school, waving signs and chanting “No FCAT.” Their main complaint was that they had to take the test in English. “We are a Hispanic-based society,” said Gerrter Martin, who failed twice. “My dreams are [over],” said Jessica Duran. “I want to be a doctor and because of that I can’t do it.”

“In Miami there is no pressure to be American,” explained Cuban-born Lisandra Perez, head of the Cuban Research Institute at Florida International University. “Our parents had to hassle with Anglo society,” explained another US-born Cuban, “but we don’t; this is our city.” “They’re outsiders,”
said one successful Hispanic of non-Hispanics.\textsuperscript{17}

This sentiment is not new. Jorge Mas Canosa was chairman of the influential Cuban American National Foundation in Miami. In 1994, he gave an interview to \textit{El País}, one of Spain’s leading newspapers, about post-Castro Cuba. When asked whether the United States might once again dominate Cuba, he replied: “That’s bullshit. They haven’t even been able to take over Miami! If we have kicked them out of here, how could they possibly take over our own country?”\textsuperscript{18} For people living in Miami, a state requirement that high school graduates be able to speak English is an alien imposition.

It is now common for Hispanics to expect the United States to adjust to them rather than the other way around. Salt Lake City, Utah, is hardly a traditional Hispanic stronghold, but it saw its Hispanic population increase during the 1990s, from 84,597 to 201,559. Early immigrants tried to learn English and American ways, but once there were enough Hispanics to create a parallel society, many gave up the effort. As Archie Archuleta, a city employee who worked in minority affairs explained, “Most of us don’t push for assimilation. We push for accommodation.”\textsuperscript{19}

Dan Pena, an American-born Hispanic who was a chef at a restaurant in Chaska, Minnesota, said it was silly to expect Hispanics to assimilate. “When Europeans came here, home was an ocean apart. For Mexicans, it’s a river, just 60 feet wide.” Jose Salinas, another Mexican immigrant to Minnesota agreed: “I maybe want to stay here. But even if I do, I can’t forget my country, my family, my traditions.”\textsuperscript{20}

Sporting events bring out deep loyalties. During the 2010 soccer World Cup, Los Angeles was bristling with Mexican flags, with the stars and stripes hardly in sight. The flags made Mexicans homesick. “[It] reminds you of what you left behind—your friends, your family and, above all else, your homeland,” said 26-year-old Oscar Barranco. Jorge Ramos, 41, was walking with his three American-born children, all clutching Mexican flags. “It reminds me that we’re far from home, but we always have Mexico in our heart,” he said.\textsuperscript{21}

In a poll taken only a few months after the September 11 attacks, at a time when most Americans were feeling deeply patriotic, only 33 percent of Hispanic citizens considered themselves first or only American. Forty-four percent continued to describe themselves as their original, pre-immigration nationality (Mexican, Salvadoran, etc.), and another 22 percent considered themselves first or only “Latino or Hispanic.”

Mexican-Americans have a weaker American identity than other Hispanics because they are surrounded by compatriots and their country of origin is nearby. When citizens and non-citizens are taken together, 55 percent consider themselves first or only Mexican, 25 percent Latino or Hispanic, and only 18 percent think of themselves first or only as Americans.\textsuperscript{22}

Rodolfo Acuna, professor of Chicano studies at California State University at Northridge prefers the term “Chicano” to Mexican-American because it “eliminates the American from the Mexican-American identity.”\textsuperscript{23}

Dominicans, one of the largest immigrant groups in New York City, appear to be no different. Nelson Diaz, a Dominican activist, explained that “we are always thinking about going back. The first thing everybody does as soon as they make some money here is to buy a house back home and then a car. Dominicans don’t buy houses here because they don’t think they live here.”\textsuperscript{24}

Young Salvadorans who grew up in the United States streamed back to a country many had never
visited in order to try to influence the elections that took place in 2009. Many had little interest in American politics but were drawn to El Salvador. “It’s my country as much as it is my parents’ country,” explained Siris Barrios, who grew up in the United States.25

“Rich Latinos remain ambivalent toward America just as much as poor ones,” explained Roberto Suro, formerly of the Washington Post and now at the Pew Hispanic Trust. “In fact, wealth may make it even easier to avoid full engagement with the new land.”26 Mr. Suro noted that as many Hispanics as blacks rioted in Los Angeles in 1992 after the verdict in the Rodney King beating trial. Why? “To most [Hispanic] people here, this is still a foreign place that belongs to someone else.”27

Some Hispanics insist there is really nothing in America to which immigrants could assimilate anyway. David E. Hayes-Bautista, a sociologist at UCLA, explained that “being American simply means buying a house with a mortgage and getting ahead—there is no agreement anymore on culture, only on economics.”28 Jorge Ramos, anchorman for the Spanish-language television network Univision puts it in slightly different terms: “I believe that this country’s two main characteristics are its acceptance of immigrants and its tolerance of diversity. . . . That’s what it means to be American.”29 In other words, what Americans have in common is a willingness to have nothing else in common.

The claim that there is nothing to assimilate to is disingenuous; many Hispanics scorn those who assimilate too far. At one time George W. Bush considered Linda Chavez as a possible labor secretary. Hispanics mocked her as the “Hispanic who doesn’t speak Spanish.” Nor can a conservative be truly Hispanic. “It’s kind of like if you are black and conservative, there is no way you are really black,” explained Rosemarie Avila, a trustee on the Santa Ana, California, school board. “If you are going to be Latina, you have to be a Democrat. Otherwise you are not truly Latina.”30

Younger Hispanics may be assimilating even less than their elders. An important 2009 study by the Pew Hispanic Center of young Hispanics (defined as between the ages of 16 and 25) found that they are more likely than older Hispanics (60 percent to 47 percent) to say their parents encouraged them to speak Spanish.31 Forty-two percent of young Hispanics say their parents spoke to them of pride in their country of origin and only 29 percent say parents spoke of pride in America. (p. 8) Thirty-two percent of young immigrants say they or an acquaintance experienced racism. That figure rises to 40 percent for second-generation young Hispanics, and 42 percent for the third generation. (p. 56) In other words, the longer they are here, the more racism they detect. Thirty percent of older Hispanics call themselves white; only 16 percent of younger Hispanics do. (p. 8)

Hispanics show typical patterns of ethnic solidarity. Arab employees successfully sued Azteca Mexican restaurants because they wanted only Hispanic employees.32 Compare Foods is a chain of groceries that cater to Hispanics. In 2009, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission forced two of its stores in North Carolina to pay damages to white and black employees they fired or mistreated because they were not Hispanic.33 At the same time, Hispanic groups routinely monitor employers, demanding proportionate hiring of Hispanics.34

There is solidarity in housing. A black woman named Aretha Jackson, who worked for the San Fernando Valley Fair Housing Council tracking discrimination in apartment rentals, quit her job in disgust, convinced that Hispanic discrimination against blacks was so widespread nothing could be done about it.35
Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez of Orange County, California, quickly learned the importance of Hispanic consciousness. When she campaigned under her married name of Brixey, she lost a bid for a seat on the Anaheim City Council. She found that her maiden name of Sanchez had much more appeal to the voters she needed to reach.36

Like blacks, Hispanics have set up organizations to advance narrow interests. The oldest is the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), founded in 1929 in Corpus Christi, Texas. As the word “citizen” suggests, it was originally open only to US citizens, and promoted assimilation and patriotism. It supported President Eisenhower’s “Operation Wetback,” which deported one million illegal aliens to Mexico. LULAC has since changed dramatically, and membership is now open to illegal aliens. It wants Hispanics to speak Spanish, and fights recognition of the central role of English. It supports preferences for Hispanics in hiring, contracting, and college-admissions, and its attitude toward immigration is summed up in how a former director, Jose Velez, characterized the Border Patrol: “the enemy of my people and always will be.”37 (emphasis added)

The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), set up in 1968 by breakaway LULAC members, was modeled on the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. It has filed lawsuits in support of social benefits for illegal aliens and affirmative action for Hispanics, and against border control. One of its first executives was Mario Obledo, who also served as California secretary of health and welfare. In an interview on radio station KIEV in Los Angeles on June 17, 1998, he warned listeners: “We’re going to take over all the political institutions of California. California is going to be a Hispanic state and anyone who doesn’t like it should leave. If they [whites] don’t like Mexicans, they ought to go back to Europe.” That same year, President Bill Clinton awarded Mr. Obledo the Medal of Freedom.38

The third major national Hispanic organization, also founded in 1968, is National Council of La Raza. La raza literally means “the race” in Spanish. Hispanic activists often use this term for Hispanics as a group, just as blacks call other blacks “brothers.” Like the other groups, La Raza promotes official recognition of Spanish, increased immigration, preferences for Hispanics, and amnesty for illegal immigrants.

La Raza was delighted when Alberto Gonzalez was appointed the nation’s first Hispanic attorney general. At a reception for him in 2005, Janet Murguia, a former vice chancellor at the University of Kansas and at that time president of La Raza, chaired the event, announcing, “We are going to put our people first.”39

In 1994, La Raza gave its “Chicano of the Year” award to University of Texas professor Jose Angel Gutierrez, who has said, “We have got to eliminate the Gringo, and what I mean by that is that if the worse comes to the worst, we have got to kill him.”40 Professor Gutierrez has also said: “We have an aging white America. They are not making babies. They are dying. It’s a matter of time. The explosion is in our population. You must believe that you are entitled to govern . . . . Se estan cagando cabrones de miedo! (They [whites] are shitting in their pants with fear.) I love it!”41 In 2004, at a Latino Civil Rights Summit, he added, “We are the future of America. . . . We’re going to Latinize this country.”42

A smaller group, the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund (now called LatinoJustice PRLDEF) attracted national attention when it became known that Sonia Sotomayor, originally from Puerto Rico and now a US Supreme Court justice, was an active board member from 1980 to 1992.
Like other advocacy groups, it promoted the particularist interests of Puerto Ricans. Miss Sotomayor does not believe judges always can or should rise above personal circumstances. “Whether born from experience or inherent physiological or cultural differences,” she says, “our gender and national origins may and will make a difference in our judging.” She has questioned whether impartiality that goes beyond sex or race “is possible in all, or even in most cases.” She claims that a parochial perspective leads to better decisions: “I would hope that a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn’t lived that life.”

Many Hispanics take it for granted that it is only a matter of time before they push aside the “Anglo” power structure. As Armando Navarro, a professor at the University of California at Riverside, boasted in 1995: “[T]ime is on our side, as one people as one nation within a nation as the community that we are, the Chicano/Latino community of this nation. What that means is a transfer of power. It means control.” Mike Hernandez of the Los Angeles City Council said in 1996: “Somos Mexicanos (we are Mexicans)! Mexico, some of us say, is the country this land used to belong to! . . . We are the future, we will lead the Western hemisphere!”

In 2007, Ron Gochez, who teaches history at Santee High School in Los Angeles, addressed a rally at UCLA for the National Council of La Raza. “Where we stand is stolen, occupied Mexico,” he said, and referred to Hispanics as “40 million potential revolutionaries north of the border inside the belly of the beast” who would rise up against “frail, racist white people.”

“We are everywhere, and there is no occupation or activity in this country that escapes our influence,” wrote anchorman Jorge Ramos for the Spanish-language TV network Univision. “This century is ours.” Aida Alvarez, who was head of the Small Business Administration for President Bill Clinton, campaigned for Al Gore against George Bush in 1999, proclaiming that “the 21st century will be a Latino century, no doubt about it.”

“The long-anticipated Latino majority has arrived,” says David Hayes-Bautista, director of UCLA’s Center for the Study of Latino Health and Culture. “They [Hispanics] will be defining the American dream.” In 2009, Arturo Vargas, executive director of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, agreed: “We are the future of the United States.”

How do Hispanics plan to use their power? Gloria Molina, Los Angeles county supervisor, explained: “[W]e are politicizing every single one of those new [Hispanic] citizens that are becoming citizens of this country. . . . But I gotta tell you that a lot of people are saying, ‘I’m going to go out there and vote because I want to pay them back.’” “Them,” of course, meant whites.

Hispanics are not likely to “celebrate diversity” quite the way whites do. John Fernandez is a teacher at Roosevelt High School in Los Angeles and spokesman for the Coalition for Chicano and Chicana Studies. He wanted the staff and curriculum to reflect the new Hispanic majority and nothing else: “Under the guise of diversity comes a disempowerment of the Latino community. I don’t see how people unfamiliar with our language and culture and customs can deal with our problems.” His conclusion: “Educating for diversity is a crock.”

Because Hispanics see sustained mass immigration as the key to power, many fight any measure to control even illegal immigration. In the spring of 2006, in response to immigration-control measures voted in the US House of Representatives but rejected in the Senate, hundreds of thousands of demonstrators thronged the streets of American cities, demanding amnesty for illegal immigrants and
an end to border controls. Despite appeals from organizers that they refrain from doing so, many demonstrators carried Mexican or other Latin American flags.\textsuperscript{54} Tens of thousands of demonstrators were, themselves, in the country illegally.

Large numbers of Hispanics believe that the United States has no right to control its southern border. Beginning in 2000, listeners to KROM, the leading Spanish-language radio station in San Antonio, Texas, began calling in to report where they had seen Border Patrol activity. The on-air hosts then broadcast the information so illegal border-crossers could avoid those areas. Spanish-language stations in other cities started doing the same thing.\textsuperscript{55} For 12 years beginning in 1996, a coalition of Hispanic groups has emphasized the illegitimacy of the American border with Mexico with concerts and street fairs on Independence Day, which they call the “Farce of July.”\textsuperscript{56}

Even Hispanics whom one would expect to respect the law take a similar view. Luis Gutierrez is a nine-term US congressman from Illinois, representing a heavily Hispanic district in Chicago. He does not like the word “amnesty” to describe legalization of illegal immigrants: “[T]here’s an implication that somehow you did something wrong and you need to be forgiven.”\textsuperscript{57} The Pew Hispanic center ranks Congressman Gutierrez as the second most important American Hispanic leader after Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor. He works tirelessly for amnesty for illegal immigrants and opposes any increase in border security. “I have only one loyalty,” he says, “and that’s to the immigrant community.”\textsuperscript{58}

American cities with large Hispanic populations commonly refuse to cooperate with federal immigration authorities. In 2006 the predominantly Hispanic Los Angeles suburb of Maywood passed a unanimous resolution to prohibit its police from working with immigration authorities, and rejecting in advance any future federal law that might require such cooperation.\textsuperscript{59} In the Texas cities of Brownsville, Del Rio and El Paso, mayors have denied access to city property, turning away federal employees who were doing preliminary work on a barrier to keep out illegal immigrants.\textsuperscript{60}

The Minuteman Project gained national attention with “citizens’ border patrols,” which camped out at the border to report illegal crossings. The Minutemen did not oppose legal immigrants—who are overwhelmingly non-white—and denounced racism. Their sole aim was to enforce immigration laws, but Hispanic opponents invariably called them “racist.” The LULAC website called the Minutemen “racists, cowards, un-Americans, vigilantes, domestic terrorists.”\textsuperscript{61}

Juan Maldonado, the Democratic Party chairman of Hidalgo County, Texas, said that “the Minutemen are the epitome of hate, fear and ignorance. We are unified to stop this racist movement from entering our region.”\textsuperscript{62} Hispanic activists clearly see immigration as a racial/ethnic power struggle.

In October 2006, demonstrators rushed the stage and prevented Minuteman Project founder Jim Gilchrist from speaking at Columbia University. They shouted down a black spokesman for the movement, Marvin Stewart, calling him a “black white supremacist.” They celebrated shutting down the talk with chants of “\textit{Sí, se pudo. Sí, se pudo} (Yes, we could).”\textsuperscript{63}

Some local authorities are desperate to do something about the overcrowding, loitering, and drain on social services often associated with an influx of illegal immigrants (see Chapter 9). Predictably, Hispanics attack such measures as “racism.” Hazleton, Pennsylvania, was among the first towns to pass an ordinance that would fine landlords or employers who rent to or hire illegal immigrants. Anna Arias, a Hispanic who served from 2003 to 2005 on the Pennsylvania Governor’s Advisory
Commission on Latino Affairs, warned that the ordinance would make Hazleton “the first Nazi city in the country.”

Many Hispanic voters support candidates strictly on the basis of their position on immigration. Some who would otherwise support Republicans have abandoned the party because it opposes illegal immigration. Hispanic pastors traditionally pushed the GOP because of its position on abortion and same-sex marriage, but ethnic identity often comes first. Danny de Leon is pastor of Templo Calvario in Santa Ana, considered the biggest bilingual Hispanic church in America. “A lot of people are saying, ‘Forget being a Republican,’ ” he explained. “It’s a shame that one issue [immigration] has divided many of us that have been in the Republican Party for a long time.”

Pastor Luciano Padilla, Jr. of the Bay Ridge Christian Center in Brooklyn is a social conservative, but turned against Republicans when they began to oppose illegal immigration and amnesty. Reverend Luis Cortes, Jr. is a Republican who showcased President George Bush every year from 2002 to 2006 at his National Hispanic Prayer Breakfasts, and his Philadelphia-based Esperanza USA claimed a national affiliate network of more than 10,000 churches. “If voting is about personal interest, how are Hispanics to vote?” he asked. “They will vote against those guys [Republicans who oppose illegal immigration].”

Because immigration is so important to them, many Hispanics were deeply disappointed that President Obama took no action to grant amnesty to illegal immigrants during this first year in office. “Our community is angry. Our members feel betrayed,” said Brent Wilkes, executive director of the League of United Latin American Citizens. “No legalization. No reelection,” added Emma Lozano, executive director of the Chicago-based Centro Sin Fronteras.

In 2010, the state of Arizona passed a law that made illegal immigration a state offence, but the prospect of even one American state taking illegal immigration seriously was anathema to Hispanic groups. The National Council of La Raza said the Arizona law reflected “the rhetoric of hate groups, nativists, and vigilantes.” MALDEF (the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund) said the law “launches Arizona into a spiral of pervasive fear.” The president of LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens), Rosa Rosales, called it a “racist law,” and an official with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus said it would “open the door to discrimination and racial profiling.” One of Arizona’s congressmen, Democrat Raul Grijalva, called for a boycott of his own state.

The law, of course, said nothing about race; it merely paralleled largely unenforced provisions of federal immigration law. The people of Arizona were tired of playing host to an estimated half million illegal immigrants no matter where they came from. Hispanic groups were furious because they feared fellow Hispanics might be deported. We can assume they would have had no objections to the law if most illegal immigrants were Irishmen or Poles. There was irony but nothing unusual when Hispanics, who were acting out of pure racial solidarity, accused Arizonans, who were trying to enforce federal law, of racism.

Like blacks, Hispanics simply put their people first. Bill Richardson, Democratic governor of New Mexico, identifies with his mother’s ethnicity, and calls himself Hispanic. In 2007, when Republican Attorney General Alberto Gonzales was under near-unanimous attack from Democrats for firing US attorneys, Mr. Richardson was a holdout, insisting that Mr. Gonzales be given the benefit of the doubt. “The only reason . . . is because he’s Hispanic,” he explained to a reporter. “I’m honest.”

MEXICO AND AMERICAN HISPANICS
One of the most obvious ways Mexican-Americans show continued loyalty to Mexico is by sending money. In 2005, an estimated $20 billion left the country for Mexico, making immigrant remittances the second largest source of foreign exchange, after oil imports and ahead of tourism. These remittances are so important to the economy that former Mexican president Vicente Fox called Mexicans living in the United States “national heroes.”

In 2005, immigrants sent another $12 billion to Central America and $22 billion to other South American countries, which meant that Hispanic immigrants sent approximately $55 billion out of the US economy.

Remittances to Mexico reached a high of $24 billion in 2007, but because of the economic crisis they declined slightly in 2008. Mexican Secretary of the Interior Juan Camilo Mourino urged Mexicans to stay in the United States and keep sending money. “[T]heir commitment to Mexico is vital to this country,” he said.

A lot of the money goes straight to Mexican governments at various levels. In 2004, there were an estimated 500 Mexican mutual aid societies in the United States that raised money for Mexican towns or states. That year, they helped fund 1,435 public works projects in 300 municipalities. These included installing street lights, paving roads, and putting in sewers.

States like Zacatecas that send many workers to the United States depend on this money. In 1997, when the officers of the Federation of Zacatecas Clubs in North Texas were sworn in, Zacatecas Lieutenant Governor Jose Manual Maldonado Romero was on hand to encourage contributions. “You may be here, but your hearts, your blood, part of your spirit is over there with us,” he said.

He was no doubt right. As Efrian Jimenez, an official with the Federation of Zacatecan Clubs of Southern California, explained in 2005, “The dream that most of us hold on to is the Mexican dream. . . Four-fifths of Mexicans here would say that if they had a job in Mexico, they’d go back right away.” Some Mexicans actually send more money home to Mexico than they spend in the United States. As John Herrara of the Latino Community Credit Union, which has five branches in North Carolina, explains, “[T]hese working-class folks are sending real money back home.”

Hispanics are nevertheless the ethnic group least likely to buy medical insurance, and therefore the most likely to seek treatment at public expense. Thirty-one percent of Hispanics are uninsured, vs. 11 percent of whites and 19.1 percent of blacks. In 2002, the majority of immigrants from Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala lacked medical insurance.

Immigrants from other countries naturalize after an average of seven years of eligibility, but until recently, Mexicans waited an average of 21 years before becoming American. “For many Mexican natives, it was like you’re giving up your life, your heritage, if you apply to become an American,” said Leonel Castillo, federal commissioner of immigration and naturalization under President Jimmy Carter.

In 1998, however, Mexico changed its law to allow citizens to retain Mexican nationality even if they naturalize, and Mexicans who had already lost their citizenship by naturalizing could reapply for it at a Mexican consulate. Magdalena Flores Gonzalez, who had come to America 33 years earlier, had four children in the United States, and became a citizen in 1992, applied immediately. “We were born in Mexico,” she said, gesturing to others who were in line at the consulate to get their citizenship back. “This is all about going back to a reality, the reality that we are Mexicans.”

Ericka Abraham Rodriguez felt the same way. “When I gave up Mexican nationality, I felt like a lost person,” she said. “You lose part of your roots, part of your history.” “I feel born again as a
Mexican,” said Juan Campos, a US citizen, who had been living in the United States for 25 years, when he regained his Mexican nationality.⁷⁹

Maria Jacinto, who naturalized in 1998 and therefore could keep her Mexican nationality, said she still felt Mexican. “When my skin turns white and my hair turns blonde, then I’ll be an American,” she explained.⁸⁰ Mexican-Americans were eager to reclaim Mexican citizenship despite the fact that when they naturalized, they took a citizenship oath “absolutely and entirely [to] renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty.”

In January 2006, Mexican pop singer and actress Thalia (her real name is Ariadna Thalia Sodi) became a naturalized American but assured Mexican fans that she didn’t really mean it. Speaking in Spanish, she explained: “This morning I acquired United States citizenship. Nevertheless, under the laws of my country, Mexico, I can also have Mexican citizenship. . . . Just like some of my Latino friends such as Salma Hayek, who is just as Mexican as I, and Gloria and Emilio Estefan, among others, I feel that this step will give me the opportunity to contribute to and support even more the Latin community in the United States. I am of Mexican nationality, and I will always be a proud Mexican in heart and soul.”⁸¹

She was only doing what her countrymen expect. In a 2009 poll, 69 percent of Mexicans said they thought Mexican-Americans’ primary loyalty should be to Mexico; only 20 percent said it should be to the United States.⁸²

Cain Velasquez is typical. He was born and reared in the United States and is, of course, an American citizen. In the run up to a mixed-martial-arts fight against a white defending champion, he left no doubt about his loyalties: “The Latin people here in the US, the Mexicans in Mexico need a champion. . . . I’m glad that I’m in a position to give that to them.”⁸³ Mr. Velasquez fights with a large tattoo on his chest that says “Brown Pride.”

Some of those who remain emotionally Mexican have surprising names. George P. Bush, nephew of George W. Bush is only half-Mexican—his father, former Florida governor Jeb Bush, married a Mexican-born woman—but when George campaigned for his uncle in 2000 he sounded altogether Hispanic. He appeared in a television ad in which he said, in fluent Spanish, “I’m a young Latino in the United States and very proud of my bloodline.”⁸⁴ At a Republican rally he again explained in Spanish that his mother had instilled in him the values of Cesar Chavez. “She told me we have to fight for our race, we have to find the leaders who represent us.”⁸⁵

George P. Bush does not have dual citizenship but some of those who do exercise it in surprising ways. In 2003, four American citizens living in the United States ran for at-large seats in the Mexican Congress, and on July 6, Manuel de la Cruz of Norwalk, California, became the first US citizen to win a seat in the Congreso de la Unión. The next year, 2004, he was elected to the legislature of the Mexican state of Zacatecas. When he was naturalized 33 years before, the Los Angeles resident took the oath of allegiance. Each time he took his seat in a Mexican legislature, Mr. de la Cruz swore an oath of allegiance to Mexico.⁸⁶

Jose Jacques Medina fled to the US in the 1970s because of alleged “political crimes.” In the 2003 elections for the Mexican congress the resident of Maywood, California, lost by just a few votes. He said that if he had won he would have kept his home in Maywood. “I am Mexican,” he explained, “but I will always live in California, fighting for the emigrant Mexicans who live here.”

In 2006, naturalized American citizen Andres Bermudez was elected to the lower house of
Mexico’s congress. There have also been a number of naturalized Americans elected as mayors of Mexican cities.\textsuperscript{87}

Because so many Mexican-Americans vote in Mexican elections, politicians routinely cross the border to campaign. There was discussion about making the United States a formal voting district for the presidential election in 2006, but Mexican Foreign Relations Secretary Luis Ernesto Derbez opposed the idea. He was not worried that Americans would be insulted if their country were treated like a Mexican electoral district. He was afraid American authorities might use Mexican election day to identify and catch illegal immigrants who turned out to vote.\textsuperscript{88}

On Feb. 15, 1998, the US and Mexican national soccer teams met at the Los Angeles Coliseum. An estimated 90 percent of the crowd of 91,000 were Mexican-American and overwhelmingly pro-Mexican. One journalist, noting the sea of Mexican flags, wrote ironically, “It’s safe to say the stadium hasn’t witnessed such a showing of national fervor since the 1984 Olympics.”\textsuperscript{89} There were boos and catcalls during the National Anthem, and Hispanics threw trash at the American players. Anyone in the stands who supported the American team was hooted at, and some were punched or spat on. “It seemed like we were playing in Mexico City,” said midfielder Preki Radosavijevik.\textsuperscript{90}

One sign of Mexican loyalty is the inextinguishable desire to go home some day, even if it’s in a box. When illegal immigrants die in the United States, their families nearly always manage to have the bodies shipped home, and the majority of naturalized US citizens report they want their final resting place to be Mexico. Mexican-American US soldiers who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan have been flown back to Mexico for burial. As one Mexican explained, what emigrants “want is to find a way back to be here, even if they come back dead.” In 2002, more than 1,200 corpses left for Mexico from Los Angeles airport alone, despite the $1,500 fee to ship a body.\textsuperscript{91} In 1996, more than half of the Mexicans and Dominicans who died in New York City were sent home for burial.\textsuperscript{92}

Some Mexicans living in the United States cannot rest easy unless they take out insurance to be buried in their home country. A Mexican company called Grupo Servicios Especiales offers policies that will pay to get the body to even the remotest home town and pay for a funeral. Porfilia Reyes, who first came to the United States in 1975 and later became a US citizen, bought a policy to be sure she would end up in her home state of Nayarit. “I’m not home if I’m not in Mexico,” she explained.\textsuperscript{93}

Now that Mexicans can retain their nationality, activist groups encourage them to naturalize and become active in Hispanic causes. There was a huge push in 2007 to naturalize in time for the 2008 elections. Newspapers and television joined church groups and Hispanic activists in a campaign called \textit{Ya Es Hora. ¡Ciudadania!} (It’s time. Citizenship!). \textit{La Opinion}, a Los Angeles newspaper, published full-page advertisements explaining how to apply for citizenship, and the Spanish-language network Univision’s KMEX television station in Los Angeles promoted citizenship workshops on the air. A popular radio personality named Eddie Sotelo ran a call-in contest called “Who Wants to be a Citizen?” in which listeners could win prizes by answering questions from the citizenship exam.

In 2008, Janet Murguia, president of La Raza, was frank about why she was part of a widespread effort to register Hispanics to vote: She wanted them to “help shape the political landscape.”\textsuperscript{94} In California, where 300,000 people—overwhelmingly Hispanic—were naturalized in 2008, whites were expected to be a minority of the electorate in 2026.\textsuperscript{95}*

Joannuen Llamas, who immigrated legally in 1998, naturalized in 2008 after attending the massive 2006 demonstrations in support of illegal aliens. She said she was inspired by one of the pro-amnesty
slogans she had heard: “Today we march, tomorrow we vote.” Hispanics like her are not naturalizing because they love America but because they want to change it.

**RECONQUISTA**

If some Mexican-Americans have their way, they will not have to go back to Mexico for burial; Mexico will come to them. What is called the *Reconquista* movement aims to break the Southwest off from the United States and reattach it to Mexico or establish it as an independent, all-Hispanic nation, thus reversing the territorial consequences of the Mexican-American war. *Reconquista* is widely promoted on college campuses.

Charles Truxillo, a professor of Chicano studies at the University of New Mexico, thinks “Republica del Norte” would be a good name for a new Hispanic nation, which would contain all of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas and the southern part of Colorado. The Albuquerque-born Prof. Truxillo says the new nation is “an inevitability,” and should be created “by any means necessary.” He doubts violence will be necessary, however, because shifting demographics will make the transition seem natural.

Armando Navarro, Hispanic activist and professor at the University of California at Riverside is another *Reconquista* advocate, noting that if current social and demographic trends continue, secession is inevitable. “One could argue that while Mexico lost the war in 1848, it will probably win it in the 21st century, in terms of the numbers,” he explained. Xavier Hermosillo, a prominent businessman and leader of a Hispanic activist group in Los Angeles, explained that “we’re taking it [California] back, house by house, block by block.” He adds: “People ought to wake up and smell the refried beans.”

Probably the best known *Reconquista* organization is the Chicano Student Movement of Aztlan, better know by its Spanish acronym of MEChA. The word Aztlan in the organization’s name means “the bronze continent,” the name of the nation members plan to carve out of the United States. One of its founding documents, El Plan de Aztlan, describes white people as “the brutal ‘gringo’, ” and calls for Mexicans to reclaim “the land of their birth.” The group’s motto is *Por la Raza todo. Fuera de La Raza nada:* “For the race, everything. For those outside the race, nothing.”

Founded in 1969 at the University of California at Santa Barbara, MEChA now has chapters on nearly every California college campus and in most high schools. It has a considerable presence in other Western states as well. The official symbol of MEChA is an eagle holding an Incan battle axe and a lighted stick of dynamite. Its slogan, *Hasta la victoria, siempre!* (Until victory, always!) was a perennial favorite of Fidel Castro and the Cuban revolution.

On some campuses, conservatives have called attention to MEChA’s racially divisive message, and Stanford students voted by a narrow margin to withhold university funding from the group. At the University of California at Los Angeles, the campus Republicans tried at least to get the group to denounce the explicitly secessionist El Plan de Aztlan, but it refused. “We will stand by the ‘El Plan de Aztlan’, ” MEChA chairwoman Elizabeth Alamillo explained.

*Reconquista* and Aztlan ideals are taught in some high schools. The Tucson Unified School District, for example, has a Raza/Chicano studies department. In 2008, it asked John Ward to be “teacher of record” for a history course in the department that was to be taught by Raza studies staff who were not credentialed. Mr. Ward refused simply to rubber stamp the grades and found that “the
basic theme of the curriculum was that Mexican-Americans were and continue to be victims of a racist American society.” Another theme was that “the Southwest is ‘Atzlan,’ the ancient homeland of the Aztecs, and still rightfully belongs to their descendants.” When Mr. Ward complained about denigration of American sovereignty, the Raza studies department persuaded allies at the district level to remove him from the course.\textsuperscript{102} The Raza program could not be ended until the Arizona legislature itself targeted it in 2010 with a bill that outlawed school classes that promote racial resentment and advocate the overthrow of the US government.\textsuperscript{103}

Like blacks, some Hispanics see charter schools as a way to establish separatist institutions. Academia Semillas del Pueblo Charter School in Los Angeles was set up in 2001 and backed by MEChA. Principal Marcos Aguilar promoted segregation, saying, “We don’t want to drink from a white water fountain.” The “white way, the American way,” he said, “will eventually lead to our own destruction.” He saw his school as “a continuous struggle for our cultural life.”\textsuperscript{104}

Mexicans have had visions of \textit{Reconquista} for decades. In 1982, the former governor of the Mexican state of Yucatan, Carlos Loret de Mola, wrote in the Mexican paper \textit{Excelsior} that the US Southwest “is slowly returning to the jurisdiction of Mexico without the firing of a single shot, nor requiring the least diplomatic action, by means of a steady, spontaneous, and uninterrupted occupation.”\textsuperscript{105} The Mexican writer Elena Poniatowska remarked in 2001 that Mexico was recovering lands lost to the United States through immigration and that “this phenomenon fills me with jubilation.”\textsuperscript{106}

At a symposium in Los Angeles on the 150th anniversary of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which marked the end of the Mexican-American War, the Mexican consul general, Jose Angel Pescador Osuna observed, “Even though I am saying this part serious and part joking, I think we are practicing \textit{la Reconquista} in California.”\textsuperscript{107} Arturo Vargas, executive director of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials—elected and appointed in the United States—meant the same thing when he said, “We will overwhelm.”\textsuperscript{108}

In 2005, \textit{Reconquista} got a public airing when 75 billboards appeared in Los Angeles advertising Spanish-language KRCA-TV. The billboards showed the downtown skyline, with “Los Angeles, CA” written above it. The “CA” was crossed out, and “Mexico” was stamped over it in bright red letters. Even a few gringos got the message. “The joke here is, ‘We’re taking back California’, ” explained Stuart Fischoff, of California State University at Los Angeles. “Underneath the joke is part of the truth.”\textsuperscript{109}

In March 2006, when there were massive demonstrations of Mexicans in Los Angeles for legalization of illegals, Mexican television reporter Alberto Tinoco described himself as “almost giddy,” adding, “With all due respect to Uncle Sam, this shows that Los Angeles has never stopped being ours.”\textsuperscript{110}

Part of the great appeal Fidel Castro long enjoyed in Mexico was his unwavering support for Mexican irredentism. In a 1997 speech in Mexico City, he renewed his call for the United States to return Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico.\textsuperscript{111}

In 2001, the Dallas City Council nearly did away with Presidents Day to make room for Cesar Chavez Day,\textsuperscript{112} but in the end settled for adding the farm labor organizer’s name to Labor Day. That same year, Hispanic legislators introduced a bill in the New Mexico legislature that would have officially changed the state’s name to Nuevo Mexico. When the bill was defeated in committee,
sponsor Miguel Garcia said “covert racism” might explain the defeat. Congressman Joe Baca of California and other Hispanic congressmen have regularly introduced bills in the House that would make the Mexican holiday Cinco de Mayo an American national holiday. So far, these bills have gone nowhere, but in California in 2000, Hispanic legislators pushed through a bill establishing Cesar Chavez Day as a state holiday. In 2004, the city of Austin canceled the annual Texas Independence Day parade, claiming the it didn’t have the money. Somehow, it manages to fund celebrations for Cinco de Mayo and Mexican Independence Day.

Some Hispanic leaders prefer not to call attention to Reconquista sentiment. In 2008, President Janet Murguia of the National Council of La Raza, announced plans to pressure broadcasters to prevent anyone from talking about it on the air. She said that “hate groups and extremists have taken over the immigration debate,” and that even to mention Reconquista was “hate speech.”

Some people are not listening. America Libre (Free America), a novel by Raul Ramos y Sanchez, is set in a near future in which heroic Hispanics slaughter repulsive whites wholesale on their way to creating an independent all-Hispanic nation in the American West. America Libre won the 2009 International Latino Book Award and was promoted in Latina magazine.

THE OFFICIAL MEXICAN VIEW

It is official Mexican policy is to urge all Mexicans to remain loyal to Mexico for ever. This policy applies to naturalized and even US-born citizens of Mexican origin, and perhaps especially to Mexican-Americans who hold elected office. In 1995, for example, then-president of Mexico Ernesto Zedillo told a group of Mexican-American politicians, “You’re Mexicans—Mexicans who live north of the border.” Two years later in Chicago, he took the same message to the National Council of La Raza. He “proudly affirmed that the Mexican nation extends beyond the territory enclosed by its borders and that Mexican migrants are an important—a very important—part of this.”

Vicente Fox, who succeeded Mr. Zedillo and was president of Mexico from 2000 to 2006, institutionalized the policy of ensuring that Mexican-Americans remained Mexican. In 2002, his government established the Instituto de los Mexicanos en el Exterior (Institute for Mexicans Abroad) to promote “a more comprehensive approach” to promoting Mexican loyalty. One method was to invite Mexican-American elected officials to Mexico, to deepen their Mexican identity. In October 2003, for example, the Instituto invited 30 American state legislators and mayors for two days in Mexico City, where they met lawmakers, ministry officials, scholars, and advocates for immigrants. The Instituto had plans to bring 400 Mexican-American officials on similar trips every year.

The Instituto also sends representatives to the United States. Jacob Prado, counselor for Latino affairs at the Mexican Embassy, explained to the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials that it was in “Latino officials like yourselves that thousands of immigrants from Mexico find a political voice.” He went on to explain: “Mexico will be better able to achieve its full potential by calling on all members of the Mexican Nation, including those who live abroad, to contribute with their talents, skills and resources.” American citizens who hold elective office in the United States are still expected to be “members of the Mexican Nation.”

One Instituto official is Juan Hernandez. Born in the United States, and therefore a US citizen, Mr. Hernandez was at one time a professor at the University of Texas at Dallas, but made no secret of his
real loyalties. In 2002 he wrote that he had “been commissioned to bring a strong and clear message from the president to Mexicans abroad: Mexico is one nation of 123 million citizens—100 million who live in Mexico and 23 million who live in the United States.” On ABC’s Nightline on June 7, 2001, he explained, “I want the third generation, the seventh generation, I want them all to think ‘Mexico first.’”

Adolfo Aguilar Zinser, who later became national security advisor to Vicente Fox, wrote in the Mexican newspaper El Siglo de Torreon that the Mexican government should work with the “20 million Mexicans” in the United States to advance Mexican “national interests.” Vicente Fox’s interior secretary Santiago Creel once complained, “It’s absurd that (the United States) is spending as much as it’s spending to stop immigration flows that can’t be stopped . . . .” When he took over in 2004 as the man in charge of border relations with the United States, Arturo Gonzalez Cruz explained that his ultimate goal was to see the border disappear entirely. Mr. Fox himself insisted that any measure the United States took to arrest or deport illegal immigrants was a violation of human rights.

At the time of the massive US demonstrations for amnesty for illegal immigrants in May 2006, Mexicans showed their solidarity by organizing a boycott of American products and franchises such as McDonald’s and Wal-Mart. Mexican unions, political and community groups, newspaper columnists, and government officials issued the call: “Remember, nothing gringo on May 1.” The goal was an end to border control and amnesty for illegal immigrants.

In 2004, the Mexican government printed up millions of free copies of The Guide for the Mexican Migrant, a comic-book-format set of instructions on how to sneak into the United States. It explained what to pack for a desert or river crossing, techniques for surviving extremes of heat or cold, and how to avoid the Border Patrol.

Grupo Beta is a government-funded organization set up in the early 1990s to help illegal border-crossers. It maintains hundreds of staging areas just south of the border, marked with blue pennants to indicate that drinking water is available. Mexicans planning a run for the border can flag down its bright orange trucks any time for help. Grupo Beta gives lectures on safety and concealment, typically ending with the words, “Have a safe trip, and God bless you.”

In 2006, Jaime Obregon, the coordinator for the Commission for Migrants of the state of Puebla, said the state would give hand-held satellite navigation devices to border-crossers to keep them from getting lost. He said he expected the state to hand out 200,000 devices during the following year.

Needless to say, Mexico carefully controls its own borders. In 2005, it caught and deported nearly a quarter million illegals, mostly from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador.

Mexico thinks so little of our border, however, that its soldiers have made hundreds of incursions. In 2008, Edward Tuffy, head of the Border Patrol’s largest union called on President Bush to stop illegal crossings in which Mexican soldiers have threatened and even fired on US agents. On August 3 of that year, four Mexican soldiers crossed the clearly marked border and held a Border Patrol agent at gunpoint. “Time after time they have gotten away with these incursions,” said Mr. Tuffy, “and time after time our government has not taken a forceful stand against them.”

All political factions in Mexico are united in the view that the United States has no right to control its southern border. Felipe Calderon, who succeeded Mr. Fox, unwaveringly maintained this policy. During his first state-of-the-nation address in 2007, he won a standing ovation by repeating the
The view that Mexicans have a natural right to enter the United States explains the vitriol that met American discussions in 2006 about ways to stop illegal crossings, and an eventual congressional vote to build a wall along certain parts of the border. President Vicente Fox called the plan for a wall “disgraceful and shameful,” and promised that if it were ever built it would be torn down like the Berlin Wall. Interior Minister Santiago Creel boasted that “there is no wall that can stop” Mexicans from crossing into the US. Foreign Secretary Luis Ernesto Derbez warned that “Mexico is not going to bear, it is not going to permit, and it will not allow a stupid thing like this wall.” He even said he would ask the United Nations to declare the American plan illegal.

Ordinary Mexicans were furious. “It’s against what we see as part of our life, our culture, our territory,” exclaimed Fernando Robledo of the state of Zacatecas. Jose Luis Soberanes, head of the Mexican National Human Rights Commission, didn’t think the government was being forceful enough. “I would expect more energetic reactions from our authorities,” he said. “It’s preferable to have a more demanding government, more confrontation with the United States.”

Other Latin American countries were equally outraged. Guatemalan Vice President Eduardo Stein said a wall would be “absolutely intolerable and inhuman.” The foreign ministers of Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and the Dominican Republic gathered in Mexico City to denounce American plans and coordinate strategy to make sure the border remained open to illegal immigrants. Late in 2010, Mexico quietly admitted it was building its own wall along its southern border with Guatemala in order to keep out drugs and illegal immigrants. Costa Rica also has a wall to keep out illegal immigrants from Nicaragua.

INFLUENCING AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mexico takes a broader, more forceful interest in domestic American policies than does any other country. As of 2008, Mexico had 57 consulates and consular agencies in the United States—including one in Anchorage, Alaska—making it the largest such system maintained by any country anywhere. This network lobbies for driver’s licenses, in-state tuition, and welfare benefits for illegal immigrants, and to prevent local police from enforcing immigration law. The Instituto de los Mexicanos en el Exterior works with the consulates to maintain a database of Mexican activists who can be counted on to pack the galleries of state legislatures and city councils whenever there is a vote that affects immigrants.

Such a crowd was on hand during the California legislature’s debates in 2003 over whether to grant driver’s licenses to illegals. When an assemblyman complained, “This bill paves the way to Aztlan!” everyone in the gallery stood up and applauded. When the city council of Holland, Michigan, debated whether to accept Mexican consular identification cards issued to illegal immigrants, a Mexican official brought a crowd of compatriots who caused such a disturbance the city council was unable even to deliberate.

In 2000, the consul in Atlanta urged Hispanics to start a national boycott of any company that does not offer services in Spanish. In 2004 in San Diego, the consul urged Mexicans who work as janitors to join a class-action lawsuit against the state’s largest supermarket chains. Consul Luis
Cabrera Cuaron was especially eager for illegal immigrants to join as class members. Consulates monitor American welfare programs and make sure Mexicans make the most of them. Some programs are closed to illegal immigrants but food stamps (the program is known since 2008 as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP) are not. Many illegal immigrants hesitate to apply for them for fear their status will be discovered and they will be deported. Mexican Consul Luis Miguel Ortiz Haro of Santa Ana in Orange County, California, went on Spanish-language television to tell Mexicans it was safe to apply. “It won’t affect your immigration status,” he explained. More than 1,200 people applied for food stamps the next day.

Consulates also have a program called Ventanillas de Salud (Health Windows), which publicizes American hospitals and clinics that treat illegal immigrants for free. In 2007, the consul in Los Angeles proudly noted that 300,000 Mexicans in the area had benefited from the consulate’s medical advice. Cost to taxpayers for medical treatment for illegal immigrants in Los Angeles Country runs to about $400 million a year.

In 2005, as it does every year, the consulate in Los Angeles gave the school district nearly 100,000 textbooks. The history books are the ones used in Mexico. They refer to the American flag as “the enemy flag” and say “we love our country because it is ours.” In Salinas, California, the consul general for the area organized a “Mexican Flag Day” to promote Mexican patriotism at an American public school.

Torres Sarmiento is a community affairs coordinator who works in the consulate in Santa Ana. She visits Orange County schools to promote a Mexican government contest called Este Es Mi Mexico (This is My Mexico). Children draw pictures depicting the “history, culture, natural resources, people, or traditional holidays [of] our beloved and beautiful country.” Winners get a free trip to Mexico City.

At the time of the huge demonstrations against proposed measures to control immigration in 2006, the Mexican legislature issued a near-unanimous declaration of support for the demonstrators, and voted to send a delegation to Los Angeles to show solidarity. When California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger denounced a plan to grant temporary driver’s permits to illegal immigrants the legislative assembly of Baja California promptly voted him “persona non grata,” theoretically barring Gov. Schwarzenegger from visiting the neighboring Mexican state.

When Arizona passed its 2010 law making illegal immigration a state offense, the government of Mexico lead the governments of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Chile in filing briefs in support of a suit to strike down the law.

No other nation intervenes so frequently at so many different levels in the affairs of the United States. As Mark Krikorian, head of the Center for Immigration Studies, has written, “Our situation with regard to Mexico does not seem to have any precedent in world history—a stronger country allowing itself to, in effect, be colonized by ceding sovereignty to a weaker power.

Virtually every Mexican institution nurtures unfavorable views of the United States. As one American noted:

I was visiting the Museum of National History in Mexico City where I observed a class of perhaps forty 10-year-old school kids sitting on the ground in front of a huge mosaic map that was labeled “Mexico Integral,” or “Greater Mexico.” Their teacher expounded on how the Norteamericanos stole half of Mexico in 1847 in what the Mexicans refer to as the North American Intervention. The map showed Mexico to include Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, California, most of Idaho, and Oregon and Washington up to the Alaska panhandle.
The illegal crossing into America is so much a part of the Mexican psyche that in Ixmiquilpan, in the central state of Hidalgo, there is a theme park devoted to reproducing the experience. For $15.00, Mexicans could spend an evening crossing a fake Rio Grande and squishing through mud while a fake people-smuggler in a ski mask shouted “Hurry up! The Border Patrol is coming!”

There are so many people who need to get to the US border that between 2005 and 2007 no fewer than six Mexican discount airlines sprang up to offer cheap trips north. In 2007, an airline named Avolar was offering direct flights to the border from three cities in the interior—but no flights south. Another airline, Volaris, was charging two-thirds the north-bound rate for south-bound flights.

There is a great deal of money to be made shepherding illegal immigrants into the United States, and people-smugglers take drastic measures to keep entry routes clear. In 2007, they set forest fires to burn out Border Patrol observation posts and surveillance routes. In the Coronado National Forest in Arizona, which runs for 60 miles along the border, Forest Service firefighters had to be escorted by armed guards to protect them from Mexicans who did not want the fires put out.

Many Mexicans believe the United States cannot function without them. In a 2004 Mexican film called *A Day Without a Mexican: The Gringos Are Going to Weep*, all the Hispanics in California suddenly disappear. In just 24 hours, pompous, helpless whites find that schools have closed, grocery shelves are empty, and piles of garbage clog the streets. Martial law is declared. The Hispanics miraculously reappear the next day, and are greeted with hugs and kisses—even by the Border Patrol.

Mexican disdain for America starts at the top. Near the end of his term, former president Vicente Fox, who frequently boasted of his close friendship with George W. Bush, explained to Mexicans why they should be thankful they are not American. “We are already a step ahead, having been born in Mexico,” he said. “Imagine being born in the United States; oof!”

When Mexicans in the United States get in trouble, the usual explanation is that they were corrupted by America. As Jesse Diaz of the League of United Latin American Citizens explained, US popular culture undermines the “conservative Catholic values” they brought with them from Mexico. This is the typical Mexican view. According to a 2006 Zogby poll, 84 percent of Americans said they had a positive view of Mexicans, but only 36 percent of Mexicans had a positive view of Americans. Forty-two percent of Americans thought Mexicans were honest, but only 16 percent of Mexicans thought Americans were honest.

Rachel Smith represented the United States at the Miss Universe contest in Mexico City in 2007, where she was repeatedly booed by Mexican audiences. When she answered questions as part of the final five contestants, the studio audience of 9,000 booed so loudly her answers were inaudible. When the 1993 Miss Universe contest was held in Mexico, the American contestant Kenya Moore got the same treatment.

Mexicans are devoted soccer fans, and sports bring out their true feelings. On February 11, 2004, the American Olympic soccer team played a qualifying match against Mexico in the Mexican town of Guadalajara. The crowd drowned out “The Star Spangled Banner” with boos, and shouted “Osama! Osama! Osama!” as the US players left the field. This only repeated the treatment the Americans got just a few days earlier when they played a match in Zapopan: hooting down the National Anthem, booing when the Americans scored, and shouting “Osama! Osama!” That game was not even against Mexico. The Americans were playing Canada.
Why Are We Passive?

With the possible recent exceptions of Iran and North Korea, no other country treats us with such contempt. Mexican officials subvert our policies, ordinary Mexicans jeer at us, and some Mexicans even appear to have designs on part of our territory. Why are we so passive? Why do American universities say nothing when Hispanic faculty and students advocate breaking up the United States? Why do no politicians complain when Hispanics send home three-quarters of their pay and then seek medical treatment at taxpayer expense? Why are we silent when Mexicans take US citizenship while openly proclaiming loyalty to Mexico?

Much of the answer lies in the fact that most Hispanics are not white, and that whites are so fearful of being called “racist” they dare not take a stand against any non-white group. Let us imagine that France was sending us millions of poor, uneducated Frenchmen who made no effort to learn English, who celebrated French holidays rather than American holidays, who sent money out of the country but demanded free services, who expected ballot papers and school instruction in French, who ignored our immigration laws, who insisted on hiring and college admissions preferences because they offered us “diversity?” What if some of them talked openly about taking over parts of the United States? Would our press and politicians remain silent?

What if the French government openly encouraged all this? What if it offered French-American elected officials free, loyalty-boosting trips back to France, and encouraged French-Americans everywhere to work and vote for French rather than American interests? What if the French jeered at our National Anthem and chanted “Osama, Osama” when our athletes took the field?

We would recall our ambassador. We would deport French illegal aliens, and stop immigration from France. There would be calls to strip naturalized Frenchmen of US citizenship, especially if they had maintained French citizenship. There would be universal outrage and immediate countermeasures because we would not be paralyzed by the fear of being called racists.

Another reason for our passivity is the fact that Hispanics are now 16 percent of the population, and their numbers are growing. Politicians from both parties say they cannot afford to alienate Hispanics because of their increasing power at the ballot box. But what do Hispanics want? Amnesty for illegal immigrants and yet more Hispanic immigration. It is folly for white politicians to think they will win the loyalty of Hispanic voters by endorsing policies that increase Hispanic power. As Hispanics gain in numbers and influence, they will replace non-Hispanic politicians with Hispanics. Foolish whites will be shoved out just as blacks shoved out Chris Bell, the white Democratic congressman from Texas mentioned in the previous chapter who was left sputtering that blacks forgot all about his career of “fighting for diversity” once they had a chance to vote for a black.

It is already nearly impossible to discuss immigration rationally, or even enforce laws that are on the books. If we are afraid to take measures that might upset 16 percent of the population, what are our chances of defending larger interests if Hispanics are 20, 30, or even 40 percent of the country?

We already have tens of millions of citizens whose primary loyalty is not to the United States but to Mexico. If there were a crisis with Mexico is there any doubt which side they would take? The United States already finds it difficult to advance its own interests against Mexican opposition. As the Mexican-American population grows, it could become impossible.

Entirely aside from the question of foreign loyalties, as we will see in the last chapter, Hispanics have become a new underclass, one whose demands are sharpened by nationalist as well as racial
resentments. After decades of accepting responsibility for the failures of blacks, whites should have learned that multi-racialism leads to accusations, resentments, demands, failures, and conflicts. It was profoundly unwise needlessly to have established yet another minority to tread this bitter, all-too-familiar ground.

More and more Americans recognize that massive Hispanic immigration means that they are giving parts of their country away to foreigners who care little for them or for their traditions. It is this largely inchoate realization that drives ordinary Americans and even a few in positions of authority to see that we face what is nothing short of a civilizational crisis: Will we remain a united country or one fractured by language, race, and divided loyalties? America still has a choice.
Asian Americans have long been known as the “model minority.” This is for two reasons: First, only a few Asian groups suffer from the social problems associated with blacks and Hispanics. Second, Asians have not made forceful demands on American society in the name of race. Asian Americans have stayed away from identity politics and generally tried to assimilate.

The first of these reasons is not likely to change. With the exception of a few small groups such as the Hmong and certain Pacific Islanders, Asians continue to be hardworking, successful and law abiding. However, the past few decades have seen a marked increase in the willingness of Asians to band together across ethnic lines and to make demands in the name of race. Rather than trying to melt into the majority society as they did during the post-war period, Asians are beginning to adopt the tactics that other groups have found successful. They are not nearly so focused on racial identity as blacks or Hispanics, but a group that showed every sign of downplaying the significance of race—of genuinely working toward a nation in which race did not matter—is now moving in the opposite direction.

One reason for this is that the United States has changed. When whites were 85 percent of the population, there was a clear majority culture for Asians to join. Now, especially in California, whites are just one minority among many, and there is no obvious model for what it means to be American. Another reason is the increase in the number of Asians. When minority communities grow they exert a powerful attraction on their members that fosters parochial loyalties. At the same time, when other minorities turn their backs on assimilation and carve out alternative identities for themselves—and gain clear advantages from doing so—the temptation to do likewise is strong.

“Our parents told us don’t make a fuss, stay out of the public eye,” explains Frank Wu, an Asian-American activist and law professor at Howard University, “but that advice serves no purpose in a diverse democracy.” It serves no purpose when every other group is making a fuss and pushing ethnic interests.

Even the term “model minority” is under attack, but not from the quarter one might expect. It would be logical for blacks and Hispanics to object to the term, since it implies that they are less desirable minorities, but they are not the critics. It is the younger generation of Asians who now spurn a label of which their elders were proud.

**WHO ARE THE ASIANS?**

Asians are still a small minority—14.5 million (including about one million identified as part Asian) or 4.7 percent of the population—but their impact is vastly disproportionate to their numbers. Forty-four percent of Asian-American adults have a college degree or higher, as opposed to 24 percent of the general population. Asian men have median earnings 10 percent higher than non-Asian men, and that of Asian women is 15 percent higher than non-Asian women. Forty-five percent of Asians are employed in professional or management jobs as opposed to 34 percent for the country as a whole, and the figure is no less than 60 percent for Asian Indians.

The Information Technology Association of America estimates that in the high-tech workforce Asians are represented at three times their proportion of the population. Asians are more likely than the American average to own homes rather than be renters. These successes are especially
remarkable because no fewer than 69 percent of Asians are foreign-born, and immigrant groups have traditionally taken several generations to reach their full economic potential.

Asians are vastly overrepresented at the best American universities. Although less than 5 percent of the population they account for the following percentages of the students at these universities: Harvard: 17 percent, Yale: 13 percent, Princeton: 12 percent, Columbia: 14 percent, Stanford: 25 percent.\(^5\) In California, the state with the largest number of Asians, they made up 14 percent of the 2005 high school graduating class but 42 percent of the freshmen on the campuses of the University of California system.\(^6\) At Berkeley, the most selective of all the campuses, the 2005 freshman class was an astonishing 48 percent Asian.\(^7\)

Asians are also the least likely of any racial or ethnic group to commit crimes. In every category, whether violent crime, white-collar crime, alcohol, or sex offenses, they are arrested at about one-quarter to one-third the rate of whites, who are the next most law-abiding group.\(^8\)*

It would be a mistake, however, to paint all Asians with the same brush, as different nationalities can have distinctive profiles. For example, 40 percent of the manicurists in the United States are of Vietnamese origin\(^9\) and half the motel rooms in the country are owned by Asian Indians.\(^10\) Chinese (24 percent of all Asians) and Indians (16 percent), are extremely successful, as are Japanese and Koreans. Filipinos (18 percent) are somewhat less so, while the Hmong face considerable difficulties. Hmong earn 30 percent less than the national average, and 60 percent drop out of high school.\(^11\) In the Seattle public schools, 80 percent of Japanese-American students passed Washington state’s standardized math test for 10th-graders—the highest pass rate for any ethnic group. The group with the lowest pass rate—14 percent—was another “Asian/Pacific Islanders” category: Samoans.\(^12\) On the whole, Asians have a well-deserved reputation for high achievement.

**PAN-ASIAN IDENTITY**

Asian immigrants started coming to the United States in the 1850s. Like many other immigrant communities, they established self-help and other associations along national lines. These organizations fought discriminatory policies but were mainly vehicles for mutual assistance, not the cultivation of racial consciousness or the pursuit of political power. Recently, however, a tendency has appeared to establish broadly Asian organizations that can be seen as expressions of racial solidarity.

Don Nakanishi, director of the UCLA Asian American Studies Center, explains that this is especially true in politics. What he calls a “pan-Asian” perspective is increasingly common, with Asians funneling money and votes to candidates who are of the same race but may be of a different national origin.\(^13\) “A lot of it has to do with maximizing their political clout,” explains demographer William Frey. “They want to identify themselves as a pan-Asian group rather than segment themselves. . . . It makes sense for Asians to band together.”\(^14\)

OCA is the name of an influential Asian-American organization that grants scholarships only to Asian students and makes awards to outstanding Asian-American business executives. It was founded in 1973 as the Organization of Chinese Americans, but as part of its current pan-Asian emphasis, it is now known almost exclusively by its initials.\(^15\) Likewise, when C.C. Yin, a San Francisco businessman, started an organization in 2009 to nurture future political leaders, he did not limit it to Chinese, but called it the Asian Pacific Islander American Political Association.\(^16\) When the Asian
Real Estate Association of America opened a chapter in Las Vegas in 2008, its president, John Fukuda, noted that although Las Vegas has a Chinatown, “it’s really Asiatown.” It represents all Asian nationalities.  

Asians are drawn to other Asians. Irvine, California, which used to be a typical white suburb, was 37 percent Asian in 2006, and has become a place where one need never speak English. Chinese are the most numerous Asian group, but Irvine also attracts Koreans, Japanese, and Vietnamese. Asians continue to increase in numbers and many schools have become heavily Asian. The University of California at Irvine (UCI) was 40 percent Asian in 2007 and sometimes jokingly referred to as the University of Chinese Immigrants.

Businesses have followed Asian communities, offering the familiarity of dealing with fellow ethnicities and services in Asian languages. In 2006, two Chinese-oriented banks, Cathay General Bancorp and East West Bancorp were the second- and third-largest banks in Los Angeles County. Both started in Chinatown but were marketing themselves to all Asians.

Asian identity seldom takes on the hostile, anti-white tone sometimes seen among blacks and Hispanics, but it is not entirely absent. In 1997, Vietnamese-born Peter Nguyen was president of the UCLA Law School student bar association. To a suggestion that California had taken in too many immigrants, he replied, “Be warned: There is a lot of diversity here, and if you don’t like it, there are 49 other states and plenty of islands” to move to.

At about the same time, there were reports of Asians in high schools in Santa Clara County, California, who had joined gang-like groups called “Asian Pride.” They took collective revenge against slights from whites, did not socialize with whites, and harassed other Asians who did. They had an explicitly Asian identity, and had Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Filipino members. This tendency does not appear to be nearly so widespread or hard-edged as the racial identification of school-aged blacks and Hispanics.

In 2000, a Chinese-American named Carrie Chang started an angry magazine for Asians called Monolid. In language that seemed borrowed from black racial consciousness, the magazine urged all Asians to “rise up and grasp their identity” so as to fight “that ugly racism which is accosting us at every moment.” One of Miss Chang’s favorite themes was the need for Asian women to stop dating white men. About three-fourths of white-Asian marriages involve white men and Asian women, and according to C. N. Le, at the University of Massachusetts, “Some of the men view the women marrying whites as sellouts.” Monolid went further. One article quoted Samuel Lin, a student at UC Berkeley, who wrote of white men who dated Asians: “I think we should f—in’ kill them all,” adding, “Stick to your own flavor.” More significant than the aggressive tone of Monolid is the fact that it lasted only a year or two.

Another important difference between Asian and black identity can be found in Congress. There has been a Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus since 1994, but unlike the black caucus, it admits non-Asians whose districts include large numbers of Asian-Pacific constituents. White representatives from Hawaii and Guam have been members.

Asians are nevertheless joining the non-white mainstream when it comes to making demands in the name of race. In 2000, for example, Asian actors were complaining that they were underrepresented in casting decisions and that they were too often typecast as martial arts experts or seductresses. Counting right down to tenths of a percent, they argued that since they were 3.8 percent of the
Asians have also begun to act more like blacks and Hispanics on college campuses. In 2000, 100 Asian students demonstrated at the University of Illinois at Chicago, demanding the establishment of an Asian-American studies program, an Asian cultural center, and a special academic support network for Asians. They were also furious because the university had put out a press release bragging it had received an award for supporting diversity, but had failed to mention Asians. “We will not tolerate being treated that way,” said Haley Nalik, president of the Coalition for Asian American Studies.

In California, which has by far the largest number of Asian university students, activists were frustrated by the assumption that Asians were doing well and did not need special assistance. They pointed out that Bangladeshis and Malaysians, as well as islanders from Guam and Tonga were underrepresented on campuses, and demanded that administrators stop pretending all Asians are successful. In a sign of pan-Asian solidarity, the overrepresented Asians, such as Chinese and Koreans, insisted that the underrepresented ethnicities be aggressively recruited. In 2007, the University of California system agreed to start counting no fewer than 23 Asian and Pacific Islander categories to ensure that no one got short shrift.

Increasingly, like “non-model” minorities, Asians keep a sharp eye out for perceived slights, as the Ladies Professional Golf Association (LPGA) discovered in 2008. Interviews, endorsements, socializing with sponsors, and professional-amateur rounds are important sources of revenue for the LPGA Tour, and organizers announced that players would not be allowed to compete if they did not speak English well enough to take part in these activities. Asian organizations immediately went on the offensive, and Asian-American state legislators in California threatened to pass a law that would ban such a policy in California. The LPGA quickly backed down.

In 2008, CNN commentator Jack Cafferty complained that China made “junk with lead paint” and exported “poisoned pet food,” and called Chinese leaders “basically the same bunch of goons and thugs they’ve been for the last 50 years.” In a rare act of unity, throngs of Chinese and Taiwanese gathered outside the CNN offices in Hollywood to denounce Mr. Cafferty.

Joseph Groh, the owner of a popular Philadelphia restaurant, was proud of keeping things the way they were since the diner was founded in 1959—the same soda fountain, ceiling fans, and wooden booths. Asians, however, were offended because he kept the restaurant’s original name—Chink’s—the nickname of the man who started it. In 2008, Asians succeeded in persuading a city agency to deny a lease for a second location. “We actually stopped it [the restaurant] from expanding,” said Tsiwen Law, general counsel of the Greater Philadelphia OCA.

In 2009, OCA also slammed the singer Miley Cyrus for what it claimed was gross insensitivity to Asians. A snapshot of the then-16-year-old taken with a group of friends showed her and several others pulling their eyes into a slanted position that is supposed to look Asian. A Los Angeles Asian American Lucie Kim even filed a civil rights claim for $4 billion. Actions of this kind, which have been staples of black and Hispanic activism, would have been unthinkable to Asians leaders of a generation ago.

Asians are also beginning to push racial-ethnic interests in politics. Gautam Dutta is executive director of the Asian-American Action Fund. “Historically, they [Asians] are less focused on politics,” he says, “but they are an emerging bloc, suddenly in the last few years in both state and
national elections.”

The California state legislature has had an Asian Pacific Islander Legislative Caucus since 2001, and it joined the black and Hispanic caucuses in threatening to cut off funding for the state judicial system if Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger did not appoint more non-white judges. Caucus member Ted Lieu argued that it was manifestly unfair that although Asian Americans made up 12.6 percent of the state’s population, they accounted for only 4.6 percent of the governor’s 260 judicial appointments. (He was unconcerned by the fact that the state bar, from which all appointments must come, was 85 percent white.) He also introduced legislation that would require the state to keep track of 21 different Asian ethnicities to make sure all were getting the attention they deserved. “To the extent that I can help out on issues statewide affecting Asian Pacific Americans, I’m going to try and do that,” he explained.

Some more-recently-arrived Asian groups are not yet at the pan-Asian level of organization and make narrowly ethnic political appeals. In 2007, two independent Vietnamese candidates set off what was called a “political earthquake” by beating both the Republican and Democratic candidates—one white, the other Hispanic—for a place on the powerful Orange County, California, Board of Supervisors. They upset the favorites by shrewdly courting ethnic loyalties.

That same year, the Orange County town of Westminster became the first in the nation to have a city council that was majority Vietnamese. They were not a majority of voters—under 40 percent—but they voted overwhelmingly for fellow ethnics while non-Vietnamese split their votes among a number of candidates.

Some Asian office-holders, however, are discovering the limits of single-ethnicity politics. In San Jose, California, Madison Nguyen became the standard bearer for the Vietnamese community when she was elected in 2006 to the city council on the strength of a massive ethnic vote. Three years later she was fighting for her political life after Vietnamese voters turned on her because she would not stick to a narrowly Vietnamese agenda. “I can’t say yes all the time,” she said. “I’m not just a daughter in the Vietnamese American community alone.” Her opponents put a recall petition on the ballot, but in March 2009, Miss Nguyen managed to keep her seat.

Asian Indians are organizing politically as well. Sikhs have won election to low-level offices in New York City, and the Sikh Coalition managed to get a bill pending in the city council to allow city employees to wear turbans. The American Association of Physicians of Indian Origin is now the biggest doctors group in the nation after the American Medical Association.

At the pan-Asian level, the most successful political force is probably the 80-20 initiative, established in 1998 with the aim of delivering a massive 80 percent of the Asian vote to candidates who agree to its demands. Its founders include S. R. Woo, former lieutenant governor of Delaware, and Chang-lin Tien, former chancellor of UC Berkeley. National politicians take 80-20 seriously. During the 2004 presidential elections, nine of the 11 candidates, including John Kerry, John Edwards, Howard Dean, Joseph Lieberman, and Dennis Kucinich, signed an 80-20 statement saying that if elected they would order the Labor Department to hold public hearings on discrimination against Asians and would meet with Asian leaders to discuss discrimination.

For the 2008 election, Chris Dodd, Joe Biden, and Mike Gravel agreed to the 2004 pledge but went further, promising to appoint enough Asian-American judges to triple their number on the bench. John Edwards, Bill Richardson, and Hillary Clinton signed a statement agreeing to keep appointing
Asians “until the current dismal situation is significantly remedied.” “What is the secret that 80-20 can get such perfect answers from presidential candidates?” asked the 80-20 website. “Its ability to deliver a bloc vote!” Asians are becoming yet another pressure group whose demands must not be ignored.

THE CASE OF WEN HO LEE

For many Asian Americans, especially Chinese Americans, the Wen Ho Lee spying case pushed them decisively in the direction of racial consciousness. Mr. Lee was a Taiwan-born scientist who became a naturalized US citizen and worked at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. In 1999, he was accused of spying for China and was held for nine months in solitary confinement during an investigation.

The case never came to a conclusion, partly because the New York Times leaked his identity and the resulting coverage derailed the investigation. Espionage charges were withdrawn as part of a plea bargain, in which Mr. Lee confessed to one felony count of improperly downloading classified information to unsecured computers. He never gave a plausible explanation for why he needed the information. It also came to light that Chinese authorities had asked him to spy for them, and he had violated regulations by not reporting this.

The federal judge who handled the case pointed out that Mr. Lee was guilty of a serious crime but he also apologized for prosecutorial misconduct. Mr. Lee eventually won a judgment of $1.6 million from the US government and five different media companies because his identity as a suspect had been leaked.

It is a murky case, and certainly seems to have been mishandled by the government, but many Asian organizations were convinced it was a case of pure racial profiling. Asian Week wrote about Mr. Lee’s “martyrdom,” and charged that Asians had been “singled out and looked upon with suspicion.” Albert Wang, a California doctor who championed Mr. Lee, called his prosecution “the major Chinese-American civil rights case in the last 30 years.” Karen Narasaki, executive director of the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium called Mr. Lee’s case a “watershed.” “This community [Asians] bought into the notion that if you work hard, pay attention to your family, you will be accepted,” she said. “This case says it’s not true.”

Supporters created the Wen Ho Lee Defense Fund and raised $100,000 for his legal bills. The Association for Asian American Studies and a group called Asian Pacific Americans in Higher Education called on all Asian Americans to refuse to work for federal nuclear laboratories. They argued that because Asians and Asian Americans account for a quarter of all doctorates awarded in the US in science and technology, a boycott would seriously hurt the labs.

In 2004, four years after the plea bargain, the Asian legislative caucus in the California state house announced it would publicly honor Mr. Lee with a “profiles in courage” award. It backed down after a furious reaction from what Mr. Lee’s supporters called “racist, right-wing zealots.”

Nearly 10 years after charges were initially filed, Chinese-Americans were still angry about the Lee case, and fought President-elect Barack Obama’s choice of former New Mexico governor Bill Richardson as commerce secretary. Mr. Richardson was energy secretary at the time of the Lee accusations and had cabinet-level responsibility for Los Alamos. Asian Week was convinced Mr. Richardson had encouraged the prosecution for racial reasons: “Richardson found a way to use fear
of Asians to whip up hysteria against Asian Americans not seen since World War II.” If Mr. Richardson had not withdrawn his nomination for other reasons, Asian groups were determined to fight it to the end.

The case raised sensitive questions. Could Mr. Lee have been tempted to spy for China because of a feeling of kinship? As we saw in Chapter 4, loyalties, whether national, ethnic, or racial are deeply rooted. It may not be unreasonable to wonder about Mr. Lee’s loyalties.

What are we to make of Shi Yigong, for example? He was a 42-year-old star in the life sciences at Princeton, who won a prestigious $10 million grant in 2008. Just a few months later, the naturalized US citizen announced he was leaving for good and going back to his native country to build Chinese science up to the US level. Rao Yi, 47, another promising biologist left Northwestern University in 2007, went to work for Beijing University, and renounced his US citizenship. James Mulvenon of the Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis in Washington notes that China is successfully wooing back Chinese scientists who have trained or worked in the United States.

At least those who return to China are acting honorably, in accordance with their true loyalties. Many are less straightforward. In 1999, the American women’s soccer team met the Chinese team in Los Angeles for the finals of the Women’s World Cup. Los Angeles has long had large Chinese communities from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the mainland that felt little love for each other, but they set aside their differences to root with one voice for the Chinese team. “There are political differences, but because the team is Chinese, that’s all we think about,” explained Louis Wong, who was from Hong Kong.

The Chinese consulate and the conservative Chinese business organizations called a truce and arranged to buy seats in the same area so thousands of Chinese-Americans could sit together and make a tremendous din for the Beijing team. The idea of coming together to root for their new homeland appears not to have occurred to them. “I’m a U.S. citizen, but I’m Chinese,” explained businessman Edward Chang.

When China hosted the Olympic Games in 2008 the sentiment of Canadian Chinese was the same. Andrea Chun, a Toronto lawyer and television host, explained that “when it comes to the games, most Chinese-Canadians are rooting for China, to be honest,” adding, “They won’t admit it if you ask them, but for sure they are.” Rich Chan, who had lived his entire life in Canada, was happy to admit it. “I’m going with China. China all the way,” he said.

Would it be so surprising if Chinese expressed their loyalty in other ways? China is hungry for American technology, and devotes a major part of its huge espionage effort to the United States. The Chinese method of spying is different from that of the classic, Soviet technique of sending trained professionals to burrow deep into enemy organizations. Beijing gets intelligence from thousands of part-time, amateur spies: students, businessmen, and Chinese citizens of the target countries. According to the US government Intelligence Threat Handbook, 98 percent of the Americans the Chinese approach for information are Chinese-Americans: “Ethnic targeting to arouse feelings of obligation is the single most distinctive feature of PRC [Peoples Republic of China] intelligence operations.”

A joint FBI/CIA report reports notes that “when approaching an individual of Chinese origin, the Chinese intelligence services attempt to secure his or her cooperation by playing on this shared ancestry.” David Szady, chief of FBI counterintelligence operations explained that Chinese spies
“don’t consider anyone to be American-Chinese. They’re all considered overseas Chinese.” He noted that the politically correct pretense that American citizens never fall for this appeal interferes with the FBI’s counterespionage work.55

Actual arrests, which, according to government sources, “are just the tip of the iceberg of an already-large and increasingly capable PRC intelligence effort,”56 show that some Chinese-Americans are, indeed, susceptible to racial-nationalist appeals. In 2004, the presidents of Universal Technologies and Manten Electronics of New Jersey were arrested along with five other employees for transferring sensitive information on radar, smart weapons, and electronic warfare to Chinese government research institutes. Five of those arrested were naturalized Chinese-Americans and the other two were permanent-resident Chinese.57 Likewise in 2004, Ting-Ih Hsu, a naturalized US citizen and president of Azure Systems, pleaded guilty in Orlando, Florida, to exporting to China low-noise amplifier chips used in Hellfire missile systems.58

In 2005, Chi Mak, a naturalized Chinese American who held a “secret” level security clearance, was arrested for stealing classified details of submarine propulsion systems from his employer, Power Paragon, of Anaheim, California. His wife and a number of other family members helped him copy the information and deliver it to China. Mr. Mak was convicted and sentenced to 24½ years in prison.59 Also in 2005, Zhao Xin Zhu was sentenced in Boston to two years in prison and three years of supervised release after pleading guilty to trying to send night vision equipment and satellite technology to China.60 That same year, Jinghua and Xiuwen Liang, both naturalized citizens living in Thousand Oaks, California, were sentenced to 2½ years imprisonment for exporting parts of F-14 fighters and various missile systems to China.61 Likewise in 2005, naturalized citizens Ning Wen and his wife, Hailin Lin, were arrested in Wisconsin for smuggling electronics for use in missiles and radar systems.62 In 2006, Mr. Wen was sentenced to five years in prison and ordered to pay a $50,000 fine.63

In 2006, Xiangdong Sheldon Meng, a naturalized US citizen living in Cupertino, California, was arrested for stealing night vision training software from a Silicon Valley defense contractor and trying to sell it to military buyers in Thailand, Malaysia, and China. That same year Fei Ye, a naturalized US citizen, and Ming Zhong, a permanent US resident, pleaded guilty to stealing civilian chip technology from Silicon Valley firms for delivery to China.64

In February 2007, China-born naturalized citizen Hanjuan Jin of Schaumburg, Illinois, was stopped at Chicago’s O’Hare airport with a one-way ticket to Beijing, $30,000 in cash, and an estimated $600 million worth of trade secrets stolen from Motorola and another Chicago-area electronics firm, Lemko. In March 2008, she was charged with stealing trade secrets to take to China.65

In 2008, the president of a Virginia-based high-tech company, Quan-Sheng Shu, pleaded guilty to selling rocket technology to China. A naturalized citizen, he was fined $400,000 and received a sentence of four years and three months.66 Likewise in 2008, naturalized citizen Tai Shen Kuo pleaded guilty in Alexandria, Virginia, to selling sensitive data on Taiwan’s air defenses to China.67

In February 2009, Yaming Nina Qi Hanson of Maryland was caught trying to take flight controls for miniature reconnaissance planes to China. She said she wanted to help China in its development efforts.68

In July 2009, a federal judge found Dongfan “Greg” Chung guilty of delivering space-shuttle secrets to China. Since 1973, when he started work at Rockwell International, he had stored more
than 300,000 pages of secret documents in his home. “Mr. Chung has been an agent of the People’s Republic of China for over 30 years,” Judge Cormac Carney wrote, noting that the naturalized US citizen “proudly proclaimed [China] as his ‘motherland’. “69

Robert Kim is a Korean who served seven years of a nine-year sentence for spying for the South Korean government. A naturalized citizen, he was working as an intelligence analyst for the Navy. On his release in 2004, he explained to a Korean reporter that he considered himself a Korean above all.70

In 1996, Congress passed a new law making theft of industrial secrets a federal crime. The offense rises to espionage if the secrets are handed over to a foreign government. Every single person arrested or convicted under this law has been Asian, and the vast majority have been Chinese.71

There is no official count of the number of Chinese-American citizens who have been convicted of spying or helping the Chinese arms industry but there must be scores of them. Only Wen Ho Lee ever became a cause célèbre or prompted accusations of racial profiling. Was he really the victim of an anti-Asian witch hunt or was he a spy whose investigation was bungled? Whatever his supporters may say, racial and national ties are strong, and American counterespionage efforts must take them into consideration.

Clearly, only a small minority of Chinese-Americans are spies. However, there can be no doubt that they are more likely to spy for China than are other Americans, and if they are going to be spies they are far more likely to spy for China than for Russia, for example. National bonds are strong.

This is not to place special blame on Asians. If Mexico were trying to develop sophisticated weapons and Mexican Americans were in a position to help them, they would undoubtedly be just as active as Asians. Indeed, if roles were reversed, whites would probably be just as likely to be disloyal citizens of Asian countries. Questions of loyalty are inevitable in any heterogeneous nation, and security breaches will always be more common in such a nation than in one that is homogeneous.

At the same time, the very diversity of the United States and the openly parochial identities of so many non-whites have encouraged Asian Americans to reverse course on the road to assimilation. They are a group that at one time made great efforts to assimilate, but as blacks, Mexicans, and other Hispanics cultivate distinctive identities—and win political power, cultural recognition, and “affirmative action” benefits by doing so—why should Asians remain the “model minority” that does not thrust itself forward? It is no wonder that younger Asians now reject a label their elders worked hard to earn.

The Japanese-American poet Amy Uyematsu, who was born after the war, criticized her parents’ and grand-parents’ generations for trying to gain acceptance by “denying their yellowness” and complained that they were “white in every respect but color.”72

Bill Seki, a Los Angeles lawyer born in the early 1960s, says his Japanese-American parents tried hard to assimilate, to become “Americans first,” but the result was that “people take Japanese Americans for granted.” Mr. Seki does not want to be taken for granted. Instead, he says: “One comment you commonly get is, ‘You’re just like another white guy.’ No, that’s completely wrong.”73

Presumably Mr. Seki’s parents would have considered it high praise to be thought no different—and treated no differently—from whites, but that view is passé. Race or ethnicity is now more important than a common American identity. The one racial group in addition to whites that at one time seemed committed to transcending race is moving away from that commitment.
Most whites in America have a consciousness of race that is very different from that of minorities. They do not attach much importance to the fact that they are white, and they view race as an illegitimate reason for decision-making of any kind. Many whites have made a genuine effort to transcend race and to see people as individuals. They often fail, but their professed goal is color-blindness. Some whites have gone well beyond color-blindness and see their race as uniquely guilty and without moral standing. Neither the goal of color-blindness nor a negative view of their own race has any parallel in the thinking of non-whites.

Most whites also believe that racial equality, integration, and “diversity” flow naturally from the republican, anti-monarchical principles of the American Revolution. They may know that Thomas Jefferson owned slaves but they believe that the man who wrote “all men are created equal” had a vision of the egalitarian, heterogeneous society in which we now live. They are wrong. Earlier generations of white Americans had a strong racial consciousness. Current assumptions about race are a dramatic reversal of the views not only of the Founding Fathers but of the great majority of Americans up until the 1950s and 1960s. Change on this scale is rare in any society, and the past views of whites are worth investigating for the perspective they provide on current views.

It is possible to summarize the racial views that prevailed in this country until a few decades ago as follows: White Americans believed race was a fundamental aspect of individual and group identity. They believed people of different races differed in temperament, ability, and the kind of societies they built. They wanted America to be peopled by Europeans, and thought only people of European stock could maintain the civilization they valued. They therefore considered immigration of non-whites a threat to whites and to their civilization. It was common to regard the presence of non-whites as a burden, and to argue that if they could not be removed from the country they should be separated from whites socially and politically. Whites were strongly opposed to miscegenation, which they called “amalgamation.”

Many injustices were committed in defense of these views, and many of the things prominent Americans of the past said ring harshly on contemporary ears. And yet the sentiment behind them—a sense of racial solidarity—is not very different from the sentiments we find among many non-whites today.

JEFFERSON AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Among the Founders, Thomas Jefferson wrote about race at greatest length. He thought blacks were mentally inferior to whites and biologically distinct: “[They] secrete less by the kidnies [sic], and more by the glands of the skin, which gives them a strong and disagreeable odor.”

He hoped slavery would be abolished, but he did not want free blacks to remain in America: “When freed, [the Negro] is to be removed from beyond the reach of mixture.” Jefferson was one of the first and most influential advocates of “colonization,” or returning blacks to Africa.

He also believed in the destiny of whites as a racially distinct people. In 1786 he wrote, “Our Confederacy [the United States] must be viewed as the nest from which all America, North and South, is to be peopled.” In 1801 he looked forward to the day “when our rapid multiplication will expand itself . . . over the whole northern, if not the southern continent, with a people speaking the same
language, governed in similar forms, and by similar laws; nor can we contemplate with satisfaction either blot or mixture on that surface.”

Jefferson studied his Saxon forebears and learned that they were said to have originated in the Cimbric Chersonesus of Jutland. When he proposed the name Cherronesus [sic] for the area between Lakes Huron and Michigan he was thinking in terms of the steady westward expansion of the Germanic peoples.

Jefferson was nevertheless far too liberal in the eyes of many, who were suspicious of the implications of the “all men are created equal” phrase of the Declaration; Federalists attacked him repeatedly for egalitarian leanings. They also circulated rumors that he had had children with his black slave, Sally Hemings, charging that for a self-proclaimed separatist, such a liaison was intensely hypocritical.

Benjamin Franklin wrote little about race, but had a sense of racial loyalty. “[T]he Number of purely white People in the World is proportionally [sic] very small,” he observed. “. . . I could wish their Numbers were increased.”

James Madison, like Jefferson, believed the only solution to the problem of racial friction was to free the slaves and send them away. He proposed that the federal government sell off public lands in order to raise the money to buy the entire slave population and transport it overseas. He favored a Constitutional amendment to establish a colonization society to be run by the President. After two terms in office, Madison served as chief executive of the American Colonization Society, to which he devoted much time and energy.

At the inaugural meeting of the society in 1816, Henry Clay described its purpose: to “rid our country of a useless and pernicious, if not dangerous portion of the population.” The following prominent Americans were not merely members but served as officers of the society: Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, Stephen Douglas, William Seward, Francis Scott Key, Winfield Scott, and two Chief Justices of the Supreme Court, John Marshall and Roger Taney.

All opposed the presence of blacks in the United States and thought expatriation was the only long-term solution. James Monroe was such an ardent champion of colonization that the capital of Liberia is named Monrovia in gratitude for his efforts.

As for Roger Taney, as chief justice he wrote in the Dred Scott decision of 1857 what may be the harshest federal government pronouncement on blacks ever written: Negroes were “beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the White race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior that they have no rights which a White man is bound to respect.”

Abraham Lincoln considered blacks to be—in his words—“a troublesome presence” in the United States. During the Lincoln-Douglas debates he expressed himself unambiguously:

“I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will for ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality.”

His opponent, Stephen Douglas, was even more outspoken, and made his position clear in the very first debate:

“For one, I am opposed to negro citizenship in any form. [Cheers—Times] I believe that this government was made on the white basis. [‘Good,’—Times] I believe it was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and I am in favor of confining the citizenship to white men—men of European birth and European descent, instead of conferring it upon negroes and Indians, and other inferior races. [‘Good for you. Douglas forever,’— Times]”
Douglas, who took the more firmly anti-black view, won the election to the Senate. After Lincoln became president he campaigned for colonization, and even in the midst of war with the Confederacy found time to work on the project, appointing Rev. James Mitchell as Commissioner of Emigration, in charge of finding a place to which blacks could be sent. On August 14th, 1862, he invited a group of black leaders to the White House to try to persuade them to leave the country, telling them that “there is an unwillingness on the part of our people, harsh as it may be, for you free colored people to remain with us.” He urged them to lead their people to a colonization site in Central America. Lincoln was therefore the first president to invite a delegation of blacks to the White House—and did so to ask them to leave the country. Later that year, in a message to Congress, he argued not just for voluntary colonization but for the forcible removal of free blacks.

Lincoln’s successor, Andrew Johnson, shared these anti-black sentiments: “This is a country for white men, and by God, as long as I am President, it shall be a government for white men . . . .” Like Jefferson, he thought whites had a clear destiny: “This whole vast continent is destined to fall under the control of the Anglo-Saxon race—the governing and self-governing race.”

Before he became president, James Garfield wrote, “[I have] a strong feeling of repugnance when I think of the negro being made our political equal and I would be glad if they could be colonized, sent to heaven, or got rid of in any decent way . . . .”

Theodore Roosevelt blamed Southerners for bringing blacks to America. In 1901 he wrote: “I have not been able to think out any solution to the terrible problem offered by the presence of the Negro on this continent . . . .” As for Indians, he once said, “I don’t go so far as to think that the only good Indians are the dead Indians, but I believe nine out of ten are, and I shouldn’t inquire too closely into the health of the tenth.”

William Howard Taft once told a group of black college students, “Your race is adapted to be a race of farmers, first, last, and for all times.”

Woodrow Wilson was a confirmed segregationist, and as president of Princeton he refused to admit blacks. He enforced segregation in government offices and was supported in this by Charles Eliot, president of Harvard, who argued that “civilized white men” could not be expected to work with “barbarous black men.” During the presidential campaign of 1912, Wilson took a strong position in favor of excluding Asians: “I stand for the national policy of exclusion. . . . We cannot make a homogeneous population of a people who do not blend with the Caucasian race. . . . Oriental coolieism will give us another race problem to solve and surely we have had our lesson.”

Warren Harding also wanted the races kept separate: “Men of both races [black and white] may well stand uncompromisingly against every suggestion of social equality. This is not a question of social equality, but a question of recognizing a fundamental, eternal, inescapable difference. Racial amalgamation there cannot be.”

Henry Cabot Lodge took the view that “there is a limit to the capacity of any race for assimilating and elevating an inferior race, and when you begin to pour in unlimited numbers of people of alien or lower races of less social efficiency and less moral force, you are running the most frightful risk that any people can run.”

Congressman William N. Vaile of Colorado was a prominent supporter of the 1924 immigration legislation that was designed to keep the country majority white. He explained his reasons for opposing immigration from non-northern European sources:
The northern European, and particularly Anglo-Saxons made this country. Oh yes, the others helped. But that is the full statement of the case. . . . They added to it, they often enriched it, but they did not make it, and they have not yet greatly changed it. We are determined that they shall not. It is a good country. It suits us. And what we assert is that we are not going to surrender it to somebody else or allow other people, no matter what their merits, to make it something different. If there is any changing to be done, we will do it ourselves.28

In 1921, Vice President-elect Calvin Coolidge wrote in Good Housekeeping about the basis for sound immigration policy: “There are racial considerations too grave to be brushed aside for any sentimental reasons. Biological laws tell us that certain divergent people will not mix or blend. . . . Quality of mind and body suggests that observance of ethnic law is as great a necessity to a nation as immigration law.”29

Harry Truman is remembered for having integrated the armed services by executive order. Yet, in his private correspondence he was as much a separatist as Jefferson: “I am strongly of the opinion Negroes ought to be in Africa, yellow men in Asia and white men in Europe and America.”30 In a war-time poll taken in 1943, 90 percent of Americans reportedly said they would rather lose the war than give full equality to American blacks.31

As recent a president as Dwight Eisenhower argued that although it might be necessary to grant blacks certain political rights, this did not mean social equality “or that a Negro should court my daughter.”32 It is only with John Kennedy that we finally find a president whose public pronouncements on race begin to be acceptable by today’s standards.

Perhaps one of the last statements of a politician that reflected the traditional white view was by Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina in 1965. Congress was then about to pass the Hart-Celler bill that abolished the national-origins immigration policy designed to maintain a white majority. “What is wrong with the national origins of the American people?” asked the senator. “What is wrong with maintaining them? What is wrong with preferring as immigrants one’s own kinsmen?”33 Ervin was, of course, on the losing side of the vote.

What now seem to be shocking views on race were held not just by conservatives but also by socialists, labor leaders, and other reformers. William Jennings Bryan, for example, was certainly no reactionary but he believed blacks should be prevented from voting “on the ground that civilization has a right to preserve itself.” At the 1924 Democratic convention he spoke strongly against a motion to condemn the Ku Klux Klan, and helped defeat it.34

Ordinary working people, certainly as represented by the Socialist Party, were not liberal about race. The socialists reached the height of their power during the early part of the 20th century and at one time could claim 2,000 elected officials. The party was split on the Negro question, but the anti-black faction was stronger. The party organ, Social Democratic Herald, wrote on September 14, 1901, that blacks went “around raping women [and] children.” The socialist press dismissed any white woman who consorted with blacks as “depraved.”

There was a strong view within the party that it was capitalism that forced the races to live and work together, and that under socialism the race problem would be solved through segregation. At the 1910 Socialist Party Congress, the Committee on Immigration called for the “unconditional exclusion” of Chinese and Japanese on the grounds that America already had problems enough dealing with Negroes.35

Samuel Gompers is probably the most famous labor leader in American history, and fought tirelessly to improve the lives of working people, but he was not a liberal on race or immigration. He
once wrote: “It must be clear to every thinking man and woman that while there is hardly a single reason for the admission of Asiatics, there are hundreds of good and strong reasons for their absolute exclusion.”

Literary figures felt no differently. Walt Whitman wrote: “Who believes that Whites and Blacks can ever amalgamate in America? Or who wishes it to happen? Nature has set an impassable seal against it. Besides, is not America for the Whites? And is it not better so?” Ralph Waldo Emerson believed that “it is in the deep traits of race that the fortunes of nations are written.” Mark Twain wrote of the American Indian that he was “a good, fair, desirable subject for extermination if ever there was one.”

From its earliest days, laws established the racial basis of the republic. Indians were outside the Constitutional system: denied citizenship, untaxed, and not counted in the apportionment of representatives. As for blacks, Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, stated that the Constitution was written for white men, and that its protections were not intended for blacks, whom he never expected would be recognized as citizens. The first naturalization law passed in 1790 made citizenship available only to “free white persons.”

States that entered the Union in the years leading up to the Civil War hoped to avoid race problems by remaining all white. The people of the Oregon Territory voted not to permit slavery, but voted in even greater numbers not to permit blacks in the state at all. In language that survived until 2002, Oregon’s 1857 constitution provided that “[n]o free negro, or mulatto, not residing in this state at the time of the adoption of this constitution, shall come, reside, or be within this State, or hold any real estate.”

Blacks were officially granted US citizenship only in 1868 under the 14th Amendment but this did not apply to other races. In 1884, the Supreme Court officially determined that the 14th Amendment did not confer citizenship on Indians associated with tribes. Indians did not receive blanket citizenship until an act of Congress in 1924.

State and federal laws explicitly excluded Asians from citizenship, and as late as 1914 the Supreme Court upheld the principle that citizenship could be denied to foreign-born Asians. The ban on immigration and naturalization of Chinese, established in 1882, continued until 1943. It was only when the United States found itself allied with China in the fight against Japan that Congress repealed the Chinese exclusion laws—but set an annual Chinese immigration quota of only 105 people.

The history of the franchise reflects a clear conception of the United States as a nation ruled by and for whites. Before the federal government took control of voting rights in the 1960s, the states determined who could vote, and every state that entered the Union between 1819 and the Civil War excluded blacks from the franchise.

In 1855, blacks could vote only in Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, and Rhode Island, which states together accounted for only 4 percent of the nation’s black population. The federal government prohibited free Negroes from voting in the territories it controlled, and in the 1857 Dred Scott decision, the Supreme Court ruled that blacks, free or slave, could not be citizens of the United States, even though they might be citizens of states.

The 15th Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibited withholding the franchise on racial grounds, was not an expression of egalitarianism so much as an attempt to punish the former
Confederacy—where most blacks lived—and a political calculation by Republicans that blacks would vote for them. In the West, there was much opposition to the amendment for fear it would mean Asians could vote, and in Rhode Island ratification nearly failed for fear it would mean the Irish “race” would be allowed to vote.48

**MISCEGENATION**

The strongest and most abiding reason for racially exclusionary laws was opposition to miscegenation. Since colonial times, the great fear of whites was that if other races were not held at a distance the result would be mixing that would denature the race. It is only in this context that we can understand the abolitionist movement. Today the campaign to free the slaves is seen as a conscious step towards complete racial equality. In fact, the majority of ante-bellum Americans favored abolition only if it was coupled with colonization. This was Jefferson’s and Lincoln’s view, and was articulated by many abolitionists.

Henry Ward Beecher, brother of Harriet Beecher Stowe who wrote *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, expressed the majority view: “Do your duty first to the colored people here; educate them Christianize them, and then colonize them.”49 Most abolitionist activism therefore reflected a deep conviction that slavery was wrong, not a desire to establish blacks as social and political equals. Although William Lloyd Garrison and Angelina and Sarah Grimké are now heralded for favoring equal treatment for blacks in all respects, theirs was a minority view.

Early Americans wrote their opposition to miscegenation into law. Between 1661 and 1725, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and all the southern colonies passed laws prohibiting inter-racial marriage and, in some cases, fornication.50 Of the 50 states, no fewer than 44 had laws prohibiting inter-racial marriage at some point in their past.51 Many Northern whites were horrified to discover that some Southern slave owners had black concubines.52

Massachusetts prohibited miscegenation from 1705 to 1843, but repealed the ban because most people thought it was unnecessary. As the new law noted, inter-racial relations were “evidence of vicious feeling, bad taste, and personal degradation,” so were unlikely to become a problem.53

Anti-miscegenist feeling was so strong in the North that the easiest way to stir up opposition to abolitionists was to claim that what they really wanted was inter-racial marriage. Many abolitionists repeatedly expressed strong disapproval of miscegenation, but to no avail. For opponents, the fact that speakers at abolitionist meetings addressed racially mixed audiences was sufficiently shocking to make any charge believable. Only those abolitionists who firmly and publicly linked their proposals to colonization were safe from the charge of race mixing. There were 165 anti-abolition riots in the north during the 1820s alone, almost all of them prompted by the fear that abolition would lead to intermarriage.54

The 1830s saw sustained violence as well. Beginning on July 4, 1834, New York City suffered 11 days of anti-abolitionist rioting, violence of a kind not seen again until the anti-draft riots of 1863. After the American Anti-Slavery Society had read its Declaration of Sentiments to a mixed-race audience, rioters broke up the meeting and went on a rampage. Days later, the National Guard managed to bring peace only after the society issued a “Disclaimer,” the first point of which was: “We entirely disclaim any desire to promote or encourage intermarriages between white and colored persons.”55
Philadelphia suffered a serious riot in 1838 after abolitionists, who had had trouble renting space to hold their meetings, built their own building. On May 17, the last day of a three-day dedication ceremony, several thousand people—many of high social standing—gathered at the hall and burned it down. For many years, Americans used the term “amalgamation” to refer to the mixing of races, but a new word appeared in 1863. Two Democrats who opposed Lincoln’s reelection published a 72-page pamphlet called *Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro*. The authors, writing pseudonymously, pretended to be Republican supporters of the president. Lincoln had just issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and the two wanted to stir up opposition to Lincoln by promoting the idea that Republican and abolitionist policies would lead directly to intermarriage—for which they proposed the new term “miscegenation.” The pamphlet was wildly popular among Democrats, who trumpeted it as a revelation of what the dastardly Republicans really wanted.

Legal opposition to miscegenation lasted many years. In 1967, when the Supreme Court finally ruled anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional in *Loving v. Virginia*, 16 states still had them on the books. Even though the laws were only sporadically enforced, state legislatures were unwilling to rescind them. A number of Southern states banned miscegenation in their constitutions. Although *Loving v. Virginia* made these provisions unenforceable, the language remained until removed by amendment.

Voters in South Carolina and Alabama expunged the (by then illegal) bans only in 1998 and 2000, respectively, but substantial minorities in both states voted to keep them: 38 percent in South Carolina and 41 percent in Alabama. In a 2002 vote in Oregon to strike out the passage in the constitution that banned blacks from even visiting the state, nearly 29 percent voted to keep the prohibition.

The racial views of previous generations of Americans were shared by whites elsewhere. The British Empire was a consciously racial undertaking. As Cecil Rhodes explained, “We are the first race in the world, and the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race.” Rudyard Kipling, often called the poet of empire, wrote passionately about race in such poems as “A Song of the White Man,” “The Stranger,” “The White Man’s Burden,” and “Two Races.” It is in “Recessional” that he wrote of “lesser breeds without the law,” and the highest compliment he paid Gunga Din was to say “An’ for all ’is dirty ’ide/’E was white, clear white, inside.” These are the opening lines of his short story, “Beyond the Pale:” “A man should, whatever happens, keep to his own caste, race and breed. Let the white go to the white and the black to the black.”

Robert Louis Stevenson’s famous collection of poems, *A Child’s Garden of Verses*, includes “Foreign Children,” in which an English child says:

```
Little Indian, Sioux or Crow,
Little frosty Eskimo
Little Turk or Japanee,
```

O! don’t you wish that you were me?

Similar sentiments can be found in other European languages. For example, the great Alsatian Protestant missionary to Africa, Albert Schweitzer (1875 - 1965) was the Mother Theresa of his time, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize admired for his saintly qualities. Not long before his death, he wrote of Africans:

```
They have neither the mental or emotional abilities to equate or share equally with White men in any functions of our civilization. I have given my life to try to bring unto them the advantages which our civilization must offer, but I have become well
```
aware that we must retain this status: White the superior, and they the inferior. For whenever a White man seeks to live among them as their equals, they will destroy and devour him, and they will destroy all his work. . . .

Never fraternize with them as equals. Never accept them as your social equals or they will devour you. They will destroy you.63

DIVERSITY

As we saw in Chapter 2, it is now common to describe racial and ethnic diversity as one of America’s greatest strengths. It is therefore easy to forget that this is a change in thinking that dates back only to perhaps the 1970s. For most of their history Americans preferred sameness to diversity. In 1787, in the second of The Federalist Papers, John Jay gave thanks that “Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people, a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs . . . .”64

Thomas Jefferson was suspicious of the diversity that even white immigrants would bring:

In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its directions, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass. . . . Suppose 20 millions of republican Americans thrown all of a sudden into France, what would be the condition of that kingdom? It would be more turbulent, less happy, less strong. We believe that the addition of half a million foreigners to our present numbers would produce a similar effect here.65

Alexander Hamilton shared his suspicions:

The opinion is . . . correct, that foreigners will generally be apt to bring with them attachments to the persons they have left behind; to the country of their nativity, and to its particular customs and manners . . . . The influx of foreigners must, therefore, tend to produce a heterogeneous compound; to change and corrupt the national spirit; to complicate and confound public opinion; to introduce foreign propensities.66

The United States nevertheless did permit immigration, but only of Europeans, and they were to turn their backs on past loyalties. As John Quincy Adams explained to a German nobleman: “They must cast off the European skin, never to resume it.”67

The immigration laws that were in force until 1965 were a continuation of earlier laws written to maintain a white majority. However, after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited racial discrimination in employment and accommodation, a racially restrictive immigration policy was an embarrassment. The Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965—also known as the Hart-Celler Act—abolished national origins quotas and opened immigration to all parts of the world.68

Its backers, however, emphasized that they did not expect it to have much impact. “Under the proposed bill,” explained Senator Edward Kennedy, “the present level of immigration remains substantially the same. Secondly, the ethnic mix will not be upset. Contrary to charges in some quarters, it will not inundate America with immigrants from any one country or area.” The senator suggested that at most 62,000 people a year might immigrate. When President Lyndon Johnson signed the bill into law, he also downplayed its impact: “This bill that we sign today is not a revolutionary bill. It does not affect the lives of millions. It will not reshape the structure of our daily lives . . . .”69

The backers were wrong. In 1996, for example, there were a record 1,300,000 naturalizations and perhaps 90 percent of the new citizens were non-white. Large parts of the country are being transformed by immigration. But the larger point is that “diversity” of the kind that immigration is now said to provide was never proposed as one of the law’s benefits. No one dreamed that in just 20
years ten percent of the entire population of El Salvador would have moved to the United States or that millions of mostly Hispanic and Asian immigrants would reduce whites to a racial minority in California in little more than 20 years.

In 1965—before diversity had been decreed a strength—Americans would have been shocked by the prospect of demographic shifts of this kind. Whites were close to 90 percent of the American population, and immigration reform would have failed if its backers had accurately predicted its demographic consequences.

**CURRENT VIEWS**

Needless to say, what whites now think and say about race has undergone a revolution. In fact, it would be hard to find other opinions broadly held by Americans that have changed so radically. What whites are now expected to think about race can be summarized as follows: Race is an insignificant matter and not a valid criterion for any purpose—except perhaps for redressing wrongs done to non-whites. The races are equal in every respect and are therefore interchangeable. It thus makes no difference if a neighborhood or nation becomes non-white or if white children marry outside their race. Whites have no valid group interests, so it is illegitimate for them to attempt to organize as whites. Given the past crimes of whites, any expression of racial pride is wrong. The displacement of whites by non-whites through immigration will strengthen the United States. These are matters on which there is little ground for disagreement; anyone who holds differing views is not merely mistaken but morally suspect.

By these standards, of course, most of the great men of America’s past are morally suspect, and many Americans are embarrassed to discover what our traditional heroes actually said. Some people deliberately conceal this part of our history. For example, the Jefferson Memorial has the following quotation from the third president inscribed on the marble interior: “Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people [the Negroes] shall be free.” Jefferson did not end those words with a period, but with a semicolon, after which he wrote: “nor is it less certain that the two races equally free, cannot live under the same government.”

The Jefferson Memorial was completed in 1942. A more contemporary approach to the past is to bring out all the facts and then repudiate historical figures. This is what author Conor Cruise O’Brien did in a 1996 cover story for *The Atlantic Monthly*. After detailing Jefferson’s views, he concluded: “It follows that there can be no room for a cult of Thomas Jefferson in the civil religion of an effectively multiracial America . . . Once the facts are known, Jefferson is of necessity abhorrent to people who would not be in America at all if he could have had his way.”

Columnist Richard Grenier likened Jefferson to Nazi SS and Gestapo chief Heinrich Himmler, and called for the demolition of the Jefferson Memorial “stone by stone.”

It is all very well to wax indignant over Jefferson’s views 170 years after his death, but if we expel Jefferson from the pantheon where do we stop? Clearly Lincoln must go, so his memorial must come down too. Washington owned slaves, so his monument is next. If we repudiate Jefferson, we do not just change the skyline of the nation’s capital, we repudiate practically our entire history.

This, in effect, is what some people wish to do. American colonists and Victorian Englishmen saw the expansion of their race as an inspiring triumph. Now it is cause for shame. “The white race is the cancer of human history,” wrote Susan Sontag. The wealth of America used to be attributed to
courage, hard work, and even divine providence. Now, it is common to describe it as stolen property. Robin Morgan, a former child actor and feminist, has written, “My white skin disgusts me. My passport disgusts me. They are the marks of an insufferable privilege bought at the price of others’ agony.”

In 1892, the 400th anniversary of the Columbus’ discovery of the New World was feted as one of history’s great moments. By 1992, at the time of the 500th anniversary, it was common to treat the discovery as the tragic first step in a chronicle of despoliation and rapine. The tone of apology is evident in a University of Oklahoma book, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival*. A similar book called *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World* argues that the pioneers were the moral equivalents of Nazi mass-murderers.

The US government sponsors a publication called *Managing Diversity*, which is supposed to help federal employees work better in an increasingly mixed-race workplace. One of its 1997 issues published a front-page story called “What are the Values of White People?” The author, Harris Sussman, explained that merely to speak of whites is “to invoke [a] history and experience of injustice and cruelty. When we say ‘white people,’ we mean the people of greed who value things over people, who value money over people.”

Noel Ignatiev, formerly of Harvard, endorsed such sentiments in a publication called *Race Traitor*, which promoted the slogan, “Treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity.” The lead article of the first issue of *Race Traitor* was called “Abolish the White Race—by any Means Necessary.” By this Prof. Ignatiev did not mean that whites should be physically eliminated, only that they should “dissolve the club” of white privilege whose alleged purpose is to exploit non-whites.

Christine Sleeter, President of the National Association for Multicultural Education, explains what whiteness means: “ravenous materialism, competitive individualism, and a way of living characterized by putting acquisition of possessions above humanity.”

In 2000, there were bomb threats and anti-black e-mail at the University of Iowa that turned out to be a fake hate crime staged by a black woman. Ann Rhodes, a white woman who was vice president for university relations was surprised: “I figured it was going to be a white guy between 25 and 55 because they’re the root of most evil.”

In some circles, all whites are thought to benefit from something called “white skin privilege,” or undeserved advantages that come automatically with being white. Emily Hiestand, writing in *Atlantic Monthly*, made a common argument when she bemoaned “the myriad built-in affirmative-action programs for white America, all those privileges so nearly invisible to many Americans.”

In his book, *Long Way to Go*, Jonathan Coleman wrote about attending therapy sessions of a group called Beyond Racism. Whites sat in a circle and unpacked “an invisible weightless knapsack” that contained no fewer than 44 “unearned assets” from which all whites unconsciously benefit. Some of these alleged benefits seem either trivial (whites “can choose blemish cover or bandages in ‘flesh’ color”) or simply the result of living in a country with a white majority (“I can turn on the television or open to the front page of the paper and see people of my race widely represented”). Similar exercises are common at the “diversity seminars” conducted in American corporations, in which whites are reminded of their sins and privileges.

Columnist Maggie Gallagher has written that she thinks of herself as an American, a Catholic, and sometimes an Irish-American but adds:
I hate the idea of being white... I never think of myself as belonging to the ‘white race.’ Those who do, in my experience, are invariably second-raters seeking solace for their own failures. I can think of few things more degrading than being proud to be white.88

Science writers Po Bronson and Ashley Merryman have found that ethnic pride is an important element of self-esteem for other races but they draw the line at whites: “It’s horrifying to imagine kids being ‘proud to be white’.”89

Many intellectuals believe whites are collectively guilty. As James Traub of The New Yorker wrote, when it comes to any discussion about race, whites must acknowledge that they are the offending party: “One’s hand is stayed by the knowledge of innumerable past hurts and misdeeds. The recognition of those wrongs, along with the acceptance of the sense of collective responsibility—guilt—that comes with recognition is a precondition to entering the discussion [about race].”90

Joe Klein, in New York Magazine, wrote that any conversation about race must begin with a confession: “It’s our fault; we’re racists.”91 “Black anger and white surrender have become a staple of contemporary racial discourse,” writes another commentator.92 Most blacks endorse this view. James Baldwin wrote that any real dialogue between the races requires a confession from whites that is nothing less than “a cry for help and healing.”93

Popular culture casually denigrates whites. Jay Blumenfield, an executive producer for the Showtime cable network, was working in 2004 on a reality program tentatively titled “Make Me Cool,” in which a group of blacks were to give “hipness makeovers” to a series of “desperately dweebie” whites. Why whites? Mr. Blumenfield explained that the purpose of the program was to correct “uncoolness,” and that “the easiest way to express that is they’ll be white.”94 Gary Bassell, head of an advertising agency that specializes in reaching Hispanics explained that “we’ve been shaped by an American pop culture today that increasingly proves that color is cool and white is washed out.”95

Miss Gallagher noted above that there are “few things more degrading than being proud to be white.” The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) agrees. In 2005, it refused to grant a trademark on the phrase “White Pride Country Wide.” It explained that “the ‘white pride’ element of the proposed mark is considered offensive and therefore scandalous.” The USPTO has nevertheless trademarked “Black Power” and “Black Supremacy,” and apparently finds nothing scandalous in “African Pride,” “Native Pride!” “Asian Pride,” “Black Pride,” “Orgullo Hispano” (Hispanic Pride), “Mexican Pride,” and “African Man Pride,” all of which have been trademarked.96

The racial sensibilities of whites and blacks often work in the opposite direction. In Chapter 4 there is an account of a computer-based test designed to uncover unconscious racial bias by determining whether subjects more easily associate blacks or whites with negative words like “awful,” or “bad.” The testers reported that when whites found they had a bias in favor of whites they were embarrassed and humiliated; blacks were proud to learn they had a bias in favor of blacks (although a slight majority actually had a bias in favor of whites).97

A few non-whites think the suppression of white racial pride has gone too far. David Yeagley is a Comanche Indian and former humanities professor at Oklahoma State University. He said whites should feel proud of the accomplishments of their ancestors, just as he takes pride in his. “White guilt,” he said, “is the biggest flaw in the American psyche.”98

Although the parameters of American cultural values are still largely set by whites, they set them in
ways that often slight whites. In 2008, researchers at Stanford and the University of Maryland asked a sample of 2,000 high school students to pick the most famous American heroes who were not presidents or first ladies. The top seven were, in order, Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, Harriet Tubman, Susan B. Anthony, Benjamin Franklin, Amelia Earhart, and Oprah Winfrey. A survey of 1,200 students by the American Enterprise Institute found that only 43 percent knew the Civil War was fought some time between 1850 and 1900, but, 97 percent knew Martin Luther King, Jr. gave the “I Have a Dream” speech, and 77 percent knew *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* “helped end slavery.” Nathan Glazer of Harvard reported in 1991 that more American 17-year-olds could correctly identify Harriet Tubman than either Winston Churchill or Joseph Stalin.

In Clovis, New Mexico, teacher Anne Corsey taught her students at Bella Vista Elementary School about Cesar Chavez and led them in a year-long campaign to persuade the city to rename a nearby street in his honor. Whose name had to be taken down? Thomas Jefferson. “We didn’t really know what Jefferson did,” explained Vernon Hunter, age 13. “We just knew he was a president. Cesar Chavez inspired people who were down.”

People of all other races are recognized as having legitimate group interests but not whites, who must not band together for any purpose. As the black columnist William Raspberry put it, “It’s always illegitimate for white men to organize as white men.” Shelby Steele, another black commentator explained further: “[B]eyond an identity that apologizes for white supremacy, absolutely no white identity is permissible. In fact, if there is a white racial identity today it would have to be white guilt—a shared, even unifying, lack of racial moral authority.” It seems harsh to require a group to think of itself collectively only for the purpose of self-reproach and apology—we even try to boost the self-esteem of drunks and criminals—but Mr. Steele is accurately describing current thinking.

The only occasion on which it is acceptable for whites to speak collectively as whites is to apologize. In the three years leading up to 2008, the state legislatures of Alabama, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida officially apologized for having permitted slavery. Colorado never had slavery, but in 2008 the state officially apologized for treating the Indians with “cruelty and inhumanity.” In June 2009, the United States Senate itself unanimously passed a resolution apologizing for slavery and segregation.

The city of Chicago has apologized for slavery. The American Medical Association has apologized to black doctors. The Aetna insurance company apologized for writing life insurance policies on slaves, and the Hartford, Connecticut, *Courant* apologized on its own front page for accepting ads for slave sales. President Bill Clinton apologized to Africans for slavery. Virtually every Christian denomination has apologized for slavery.

Whites in other countries apologize. In 2007, London mayor Ken Livingstone shed tears as he apologized for the city’s role in the slave trade. Australia has apologized to its aboriginal people, as has Canada. Queen Elizabeth II herself apologized to the Maori in 1995 (but refused to apologize to the Boers for the Boer War). There have been “reconciliation walks,” in which Christians walk through Muslim countries asking forgiveness for the Crusades.

Why all this apologizing? People do not normally apologize for things they, themselves, did not do. Whites apologize because racism is considered a mortal offense, and this is a way to demonstrate opposition to racism. As black commentator Shelby Steele points out, for whites to have any moral authority they must prove they are not racist, and this is an attention-getting way of trying to prove...
moral legitimacy. It is also precisely the kind of negative racial identity Mr. Steele prescribes for whites: just enough racial consciousness to assume collective guilt for things other whites did centuries ago. The same purpose is served when whites explain the failures or shortcoming of blacks by evoking white racism, past and present.

There is, of course, no more effective way to encourage blacks to hate whites than to remind them constantly of slavery and Jim Crow, and to explain to them that the only reason they are not more successful is because white people persecuted their ancestors and continue to persecute them today. As we saw in Chapter 5, many blacks have absorbed this lesson very well. Poets and intellectuals fantasize about killing whites, and even common criminals justify rape and murder as payback for oppression.

It is obviously bad for race relations for society constantly to tell one group that another group brought them low and keeps them there, but whites do not do this because they want to improve race relations. They do it because they want to prove their own virtue, even if it poisons race relations and encourages blacks—and now Hispanics—to hate whites.

**FADING AWAY**

It would be logical for any group whose only sense of identity is the negative one of wickedness and oppression to dilute its wickedness by mixing with more virtuous groups. This is, upon reflection, exactly what celebrating diversity implies. James Carignan, a city councilor in Lewiston, Maine, encouraged the city to welcome refugees from the West African country of Togo, writing, “We are too homogeneous at present. We desperately need diversity.” He said the Togolese—of whom it was not known whether they were literate, spoke English, or were employable—“will bring us the diversity that is essential to our quest for excellence.” Likewise in Maine, long-serving state’s attorney James Tierney wrote of racial diversity in the state: “This is not a burden. This is essential.” An overly white population is a handicap.

Gwynne Dyer, a London-based Canadian journalist, also believes whites must be leavened with non-whites in a process he calls “ethnic diversification.” He noted, however, that when Canada and Australia opened their borders to non-white immigration, they had to “do good by stealth” and not explain openly that the process would reduce whites to a minority: “Let the magic do its work, but don’t talk about it in front of the children. They’ll just get cross and spoil it all.” Mr. Dyer looked forward to the day when politicians could be more open about their intentions of thinning out whites.

President Bill Clinton was open about it. In his 2000 State of the Union speech, he welcomed predictions that whites would become a minority by mid-century, saying, “this diversity can be our greatest strength.” In 2009, before a gathering of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, he again brought up forecasts that whites will become a minority, adding that “this is a very positive thing.”

David Lawrence, publisher of the *Miami Herald*, wrote that he hoped to hear the *Star Spangled Banner* sung in Spanish and Creole. “This country’s future, previewed in South Florida, is a future of many colors, many faiths, a variety of tongues.” Harvard University professor Robert Putnam says immigrants should not assimilate. “What we shouldn’t do is to say that they should be more like us,” he says. “We should construct a new us.” When Marty Markowitz became the new Brooklyn
borough president in 2002, he took down the portrait of George Washington that had hung in the 

president’s office for many years. He said he would hang a picture of a black or a woman because 

Washington was an “old white man.” In 2006, Governor Mike Huckabee of Arkansas welcomed the arrival in the United States of large numbers of Hispanics. He said whites had treated blacks in a “pathetic manner,” adding, “I think, frankly, the Lord is giving us a second chance to do better than we did before.” In 2000, John Sharp, a former Texas comptroller and senator told the state Democratic Hispanic Caucus that whites must step aside and let Hispanics govern, “and if that means that some of us gringos are going to have to give up some life-long dreams, then we’ve got to do that.”

When Robert Dornan of California was still in Congress, he welcomed the changing demographics of his Orange County district. “I want to see America stay a nation of immigrants,” he said. “And if we lose our Northern European stock—your coloring and mine, blue eyes and fair hair—tough!”

Frank Rich, columnist for the New York Times, appears happy to become a minority. He wrote this about Sonya Sotomayor’s Senate confirmation hearings:

“[T]his particular wise Latina, with the richness of her experiences, would far more often than not reach a better [judicial] conclusion than the individual white males she faced in that Senate hearing room. Even those viewers who watched the Sotomayor show for only a few minutes could see that her America is our future and theirs is the rapidly receding past.”

It is impossible to imagine people of any other race speaking of themselves this way.

All white nations now have sub-replacement fertility and almost all are receiving large numbers of non-white immigrants. Many say this should not be a cause for concern. Charles A. Price, Australia’s senior demographer, described in 2000 the change his country was going through: “Some people think that a steady replacement of Anglo-Celts by other ethnic groups is highly desirable. . . . Personally, [replacement] does not worry me . . . .” Jozef Ritzen, Dutch Minister of Education, Culture, and Science, explained that “this is the trend worldwide. The white race will in the long term become extinct . . . . Apparently we are happy with this development.”

Tim Wise is a white person who has lectured on the evils of racism on more than 600 college campuses, and the Utne Reader named him one of “25 visionaries who are changing your world.” In an open letter to white American conservatives, he looked forward to the day when whites will be outnumbered by other races:

We just have to be patient. And wait for your hearts to stop beating. And stop they will. And for some of you, real damned soon truth be told. Do you hear it? The sound of your empire dying? Your nation, as you knew it, ending, permanently? Because I do, and the sound of your demise is beautiful.

Whites need not disappear simply through low fertility. They can hasten the process through interracial marriage. “Amalgamation,” or the disappearance of whites through miscegenation was the consequence earlier generations of Americans most wanted to avoid. Now, it is common to propose it as the solution to race problems that refuse to go away. Neo-conservative intellectual Normal Podhoretz offered it as a solution as early as 1963, writing, “[I]n my opinion the Negro problem can be solved in this country in no other way.”

“It would be a lot easier if each of us were related to someone of another color and if, eventually, we were all one color,” wrote Morton Kondracke in The New Republic. “In America, this can happen.” Jon Carroll of the San Francisco Examiner agreed: “I think intermarriage may be the only way out [of our racial problems].” Ben Wattenberg, noting the increase in interracial marriages wrote happily, “Does all this mean that as we move into the next century race will be much
less of an issue? That we will all end up bland and blended? That (as I believe) we will fulfill our difficult destiny as the first universal nation?” Nicholas Kristof wrote in the New York Times that “the breakdown of the barriers of love will be a far more consequential and transformative kind of integration” than anything attempted so far. Douglas Besharov of the American Enterprise Institute said intermarriage may be “the best hope for the future of American race relations.” In a recent book, Stephen and Abigail Thernstrom wrote that the “crumbling of the taboo on sexual relations between the two races [black and white]” is “good news,” because it will make it impossible to draw racial distinctions. Michael Barone, conservative pundit for U.S. News and World Report, agrees. “My great wish,” he wrote, “is that 50 years from now we will be so mixed there will be no more racial categories.”

John Miller is a reporter for National Review, long known as the foremost conservative magazine in America. He wrote that miscegenation is inevitable and will finally put an end to group conflict. “Perhaps the best way to undermine the ideology of group rights is to permit this natural process of assimilation to work its way down the generations as people of mixed background marry and have children.” “In the future,” he added, “everyone will have a Korean grandmother.”

This appears to be government policy. Robert Groves, head of the US Census Department, was looking forward to a large increase in the number of Americans who would report themselves as “multi-racial” in the 2010 census. “I can’t wait to see the pattern of responses on multiple races,” he said. “That’ll be a neat indicator to watch.”

Mixing will no doubt greatly improve us. After the election of the mixed-race Barack Obama as president, novelist Elizabeth Wurtzel wrote in the Wall Street Journal, “Most of the multiracial people I know seem more beautiful and talented than those of us boring folks who are just one dull thing.”

The French appear to feel the same way. In 2000, interior minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement said Europe should become a place of race-mixing (métissage) and that governments should make efforts to persuade Europeans to accept this. In 2007, both candidates in the French presidential election took the same view. Socialist Ségolène Royale, said that “miscegenation is an opportunity for France,” adding that she would encourage immigration and would be “president of a France that is mixed-race and proud of it.” Nicolas Sarkozy, the conservative candidate who won the election, said he was proud of “a France that understands that creation comes from mixing, from openness, and from coming together—I’m not afraid of the word—from miscegenation.”

It is common to project contemporary views upon the past. George Washington University professor Amitai Etzioni has written that people who marry across racial lines are “accepting the core American value of openness and living up to its tenets.” Andrew Sullivan, former editor of The New Republic has written that “miscegenation has always been the ultimate solution to America’s racial divisions.”

These two got it wrong. For most of American history, miscegenation was the ultimate nightmare for whites. That whites should now see it as the ultimate solution to racial conflict is a sign not only of how radically our thinking has changed but also of how stubborn racial conflict turned out to be. Civil rights laws were supposed to usher in a new era of racial harmony. To propose now that the only solution to racial enmity is to eliminate race itself through intermarriage is to admit that different races cannot live together in peace.
Of course, widespread miscegenation would not eliminate race; it would eliminate whites. Whites are no more than 17 percent of the world’s population and are having perhaps seven percent of the world’s children. No one is proposing large-scale intermarriage for Africa or Asia. Nor would mixing eliminate discrimination. Blacks, South Americans, and Asians discriminate among themselves on the basis of skin tone even when they are the same race.

Thomas Jefferson looked forward to the day when whites would people the Americas from north to south. Today such a view would be universally scorned because it would mean the displacement of other populations, but the revolution in thinking among today’s whites leaves no grounds to argue against their own displacement through immigration or disappearance through intermarriage. Whites may have a sentimental attachment to the notion of a white America, but if races are interchangeable that attachment is irrational. If the only legitimate group sentiment for whites is guilt, perhaps it is only right that they should retreat gracefully before the advances of peoples they have wronged.

There could hardly be more striking proof not only of how the thinking of whites has changed but how different it is from that of every other racial group. All non-whites celebrate their growing numbers and influence—just as whites once did. Whites—not only in America but around the world—cheerfully contemplate their disappearance as a distinct people.
Many laws passed by Congress have grandiose names and are hailed by their sponsors as far more important than they really are. In one case, however, legislators promised little of consequence for a law that reshaped the country. The Hart-Celler Act of 1965, also known as the Immigration and Nationality Act, abolished the national-origins immigration quotas set up in 1924 to preserve the European character of the American population.

As we saw in the previous chapter, the promoters of the act insisted it would have little effect on the ethnic mix of the country, which was then nearly 90 percent white. By 2008, however, whites had already fallen to 65 percent of the population, and the Census Bureau was predicting they would become a minority in 2042—just 77 years after enactment. This would be a more dramatic long-term effect than perhaps that of any other legislation passed in the 20th century.

Post-Hart-Celler immigration has also enormously increased the population of the United States, which is the only industrial nation that is growing like a developing country. In 2010, the population was expanding by about 7,500 people every day—nearly three million a year—and immigrants and their children accounted for 75 percent of the 27.3 million increase from 2000 to 2010. Growth at this rate requires enormous amounts of new infrastructure, including about 8,000 new schools every ten years. In 2008, the Census Bureau projected that the population would expand from 302 million to 439 million by 2050, assuming immigration continues at current rates. If immigration stopped after 2009, there would be much more moderate growth, with the population reaching 345 million rather than 439 million.
If immigration continues, Hispanics will nearly double their share of the population by 2050, increasing from 16 percent to 30 percent. Their numbers will rise to 130 million, a figure equal to the entire US population of 1940. Blacks will increase from 14 to 15 percent, and Asians from 5.1 to 9.2 percent. Whites will be the only group to decline, dropping to 46 percent by mid-century. The bureau projected an absolute decline in the white population, beginning in 2030, when deaths of whites were expected to exceed births. Every other racial group was projected to increase continually, with their numbers augmented by an estimated 1.2 to 2 million immigrants every year. The Census Bureau projected virtually no white immigration. In 2010, whites were already a minority in four states: California, Texas, New Mexico, and Hawaii. In 2009, whites were a minority in about 300 counties—close to one in 10. Starr County, Texas, was the most heavily Hispanic county: 97 percent Latino.
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Because whites are older than other groups and have the lowest birthrates, minority status is coming quickly for younger age groups. In 2005, whites were 85 percent of the population 85 and older but just 55 percent of children under age five.\(^8\)

By 2010, white children were a minority in seven states—Arizona, California, Hawaii, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas—and were poised to become minorities in five more: Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, and New York.\(^9\) That same year, 2010, was expected to be the first in which non-white births would exceed white births, making all white children born that year minorities at birth.\(^10\) Nationwide, whites were likely to become a minority of the under-18 child population by 2023—in just a dozen years—and were expected to become a minority of the workforce by 2039.\(^11\)

The future will therefore be increasingly Hispanic and black. What will this mean for the country? Many argue that change of this kind is desirable because it will bring more diversity. Even if diversity were desirable, no one believes that crime, poverty, illegitimacy, and school failure are desirable. Blacks have long suffered disproportionately from these problems and now, through immigration, the United States has added another group—Hispanics—that suffers from them as well.

Our country has made tremendous efforts to improve opportunities for both blacks and Hispanics, but progress has been disappointing, and it is not realistic to expect dramatic breakthroughs. Americans may even be reaching a point of moral and economic exhaustion that makes massive efforts to bridge racial gaps less likely than in previous decades. The demographic logic is therefore clear. Certain populations suffer disproportionately from certain problems. As these populations increase, those problems will become more widespread.

**POVERTY**

Blacks and Hispanics are considerably poorer than whites or Asians. In 2008, despite the very substantial assistance programs that have been available since the 1960s, blacks had a median per capita income of just 59 percent that of whites: $18,406 as opposed to $31,313 per year. Hispanics, who are the fastest-growing racial group in the country, had an even lower per capita income of only $15,674 or about half the white median.\(^12\) An estimated 97 percent of the day laborers working on any given day are Hispanic, and day laborers have to work every day to make as much as $15,000 a year.\(^13\) Nearly a quarter of Hispanics—23.2 percent—live in poverty, a rate close to that of blacks (24.7 percent), and 2.7 times the white rate.\(^14\)

Part of the difficulty for immigrant Hispanics is adjustment to a new country. Their incomes rise as they become better assimilated, but the white/Hispanic gap stops narrowing after the second generation. A California study found that first-generation Hispanic immigrants who arrived before 1980 were making only 56 percent of the average white income even after they had been living in the United States for 20 years or more. Second-generation Hispanics saw that percentage rise to 79 percent, but this closing of the gap then slowed greatly, with third-generation immigrants earning 81 percent of the wages of California whites. By contrast, by the third generation, Asian immigrants earned 12 percent more than whites.\(^15\)

Group differences in wealth are even more striking. The median net worth of black households in 2004 (the latest figures that were available in 2010) was $8,650, or just 7.6 percent of the median white household net worth of $113,822. The figure for Hispanics was better but also low: $13,375.\(^16\)
This was not just a matter of adjusting to a new country. According to the Pew Hispanic Center, the 2002 median net worth of Hispanics who had been in the United States for three generations was not much higher than the overall Hispanic median ($10,425 versus $7,932).\textsuperscript{17} Twenty-six percent of Hispanic and 32 percent of black households had negative or zero net worths.\textsuperscript{18} Repeated studies have shown that even when they have the same income as whites, blacks and Hispanics save less.\textsuperscript{19}

Blacks and Hispanics are less likely than whites to use credit and more likely to have been denied credit and therefore have no credit rating. Those who do have credit ratings score low: The average black credit rating is less than one half, and the average Hispanic score is less than three quarters of the average white rating. The Asian average is almost exactly the same as the white average.\textsuperscript{20}

Although Hispanics have the reputation of accepting work others will not, in late 2009—in the midst of the recession—their unemployment rate of 12.7 percent was 40 percent higher than that of whites (9.0 percent), though lower than that of blacks (15.4 percent).\textsuperscript{21} Native-born Hispanics are choosier about work than immigrants. Native-born young Hispanics were more likely to be unemployed than young immigrants (22.6 percent v. 16.7 percent), despite far greater familiarity with the United States.\textsuperscript{22}

The US poverty rate dropped sharply during the 1950s and ’60s, but has been growing again since the 1970s. Economist Robert J. Samuelson points out that the main reason is immigration of poor Hispanics.\textsuperscript{23} He adds that “only an act of willful denial can separate immigration and poverty.”\textsuperscript{24} A study by Oakland-based Children Now found that children of immigrant families were more than three times more likely than children of American-born parents to be poor: 35 percent versus 11 percent.\textsuperscript{25}

Hispanic households are more likely than blacks to use “means-tested” programs, or what we consider welfare. In 2005, fully half of all Hispanic families used welfare programs as opposed to 47 percent for black, and 18 percent for whites.\textsuperscript{26} Welfare use \textit{rises} from the second to the third generation of Mexican immigrants.\textsuperscript{27}

The Center for Immigration Studies found that every household of illegal immigrants consumed an estimated $2,700 more in federal government services in 2002 than it paid in federal taxes, adding about $10.4 billion to the deficit. The largest federal costs were Medicaid ($2.5 billion), medical treatment for the uninsured ($2.2 billion), food assistance ($1.9 billion), prisons ($1.6 billion), and school aid ($1.4 billion). These figures do not include state and local spending. Non-citizens are ineligible for many forms of welfare. The study therefore concluded that if illegal immigrants were legalized, their increased welfare use would nearly triple the net federal outflow per family from $2,700 a year to $7,700 a year.\textsuperscript{28}

Some defenders of immigration claim it will save social security. It will not. Immigrants grow old, just like everyone else, and many bring their aged parents from their home country. They would contribute to the health of social security only if their earnings were well above the native average, which they are not. A study by the Center for Immigration Studies concludes that there is likely to be a Social Security payments crunch, but immigration will not be the solution: “Americans will simply have to look elsewhere to deal with this problem.”\textsuperscript{29}

In any case, non-whites may not want to support white retirees. As Rodolfo Acuna, professor of Chicano studies at California State University at Northridge, has put it, “There’s a growing feeling, ‘Why should we pay for all these senior citizens if the majority of them are white and all they were
willing to pay for was prisons?”

Retirement payments may well fall as the nation’s population changes. Prichard is a small city on the outskirts of Mobile, Alabama. For years, it had been warned that its pension fund would run out and it did, exactly as predicted, in 2009. The city then broke a state law and stopped writing checks, plunging many former city employees into penury. Prichard had many problems, but one was demographic. Originally, largely white, it lost population and became increasingly black. By the time it stopped making pension payments, 84 percent of its 27,000 residents were black and the city government was overwhelmingly black. Many of the retirees it cut off were white.

One of the most ominous signs for the future is low high-school graduation rates for blacks and Hispanics. In 2007, 93.5 percent of white and 93.1 percent of Asian 18- to 24-year-olds not still in school had a diploma. The figures for blacks and Hispanics were 88.8 percent and 72.7 percent, respectively. Hispanics were therefore more than four times more likely than whites and 2.4 times more likely than blacks to be dropouts.

US-born Hispanics do better than immigrants. However, the chances of graduating slightly decrease for the second US-born generation, so that in 2007, even third-generation Hispanic-Americans had a dropout rate that was 2.3 times the white rate and 33 percent higher than the black rate. Hispanic dropouts are the least likely group eventually to get a General Educational Development (GED) credential: just 10 percent as opposed to 20 percent for blacks and 30 percent for whites.

Another way to measure dropout rates is to calculate how many freshmen get a diploma four years later. In Detroit in 2006 the figure was an appalling 26.8 percent. Other poor performers were Philadelphia: 39.1 percent, Dallas: 40.7 percent, Los Angeles: 47.7 percent, and Washington, DC: 48.8 percent.

Hispanics who stay in school have low test scores, and the performance gap begins before school age. A nationwide study found that already as toddlers, Hispanics trail whites by the equivalent of six months in understanding words, speaking in sentences, and solving puzzles. By fourth grade, blacks and Hispanics are two years behind whites and Asians on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading test. By 12th grade, the average black or Hispanic is reading and doing math at the level of the average white 8th-grader. There are about 16,000 school districts in the United States, but not one has been able to eliminate this gap. Blacks and Hispanics score in equivalent ranges, whether they account for fewer than 5 percent of a state’s student population or more than 20 percent.

In 2009, the 95-percent-black Detroit School District placed last in the country on the NAEP test. No student scored at the “advanced” level, only 3 percent were “proficient,” 28 percent were “basic,” and 69 percent were “below basic.” Michael Casserly of the Council of the Great City Schools said the scores were “just above what one would expect by chance alone—as if the kids simply guessed at the answers.”

From 2000 to 2004 there was some narrowing of NAEP scores, but the racial gap grew wider from 2004 to 2008. SAT results for the high school class of 2009 showed that the gap widened again that year.

There are differences in student behavior. A 2008 Centers for Disease Control survey found that 63 percent of black students watch three hours or more of television every day, as opposed to 43 percent
of Hispanics and 27 percent of whites. Hispanic students were more likely than blacks or whites to have used cocaine, heroin, or ecstasy; to have accepted a ride from a drunk driver or to have attempted suicide.\textsuperscript{43} Despite very strong pressure to bring the disparities down, in the nation as a whole, black students are three times more likely than white students to be suspended and Hispanics are about 1.5 times more likely (Asians are suspended at about half the white rate).\textsuperscript{44}

Hispanics are the group least likely to attend college. In 2003, 28 percent of Hispanics aged 18 to 24 were enrolled in college, compared to 38 percent of blacks and 52 percent of whites. Most groups have been increasing their college attendance rates, but between 1974 and 2003, rates for Hispanic men declined.\textsuperscript{45} Again, the problem is not simply one of adapting to the United States. The college enrollment rate for Hispanics drops 17 percent from the second to the third generation.\textsuperscript{46} College graduation rates for US-born Hispanics are therefore only slightly better than those for the foreign born, and Hispanics who have been in the United States for three generations or more are still less likely than blacks to graduate from college.\textsuperscript{47}

Blacks and Hispanics are even less well represented in graduate schools, largely because they do poorly on standardized tests for admission. On the major exams—Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT), Graduate Record Examination (GRE), etc.—the black average score runs from a low at the white 10th percentile to a high at the 18th, depending on the exam (the average white score would be close to the 50th percentile). Average Hispanic scores run from a low at the 19th white percentile to a high at the 29th. Both groups are only about half as likely as whites to take the tests, so their scores reflect the high end of their performance distributions.\textsuperscript{48}

In all racial groups, students from wealthy households tend to score better than those who are poor, but income does not explain group differences. A study by McKinsey and Company found that white fourth graders living in poverty scored higher—by the equivalent of about half-a-year’s instruction—than black fourth graders who were not poor.\textsuperscript{49} These differences increase in high school. On the 2009 math and verbal SAT tests, whites from families with incomes of less than $20,000 not only had an average combined score that was 117 points (out of 1600) higher than the average for all blacks, they even outscored by 12 points blacks who came from families with incomes of $160,000 to $200,000.\textsuperscript{50}

Educators and legislators have not ignored the problem. The race gap in achievement is such a preoccupation that in 2007, 4,000 educators and experts attended an “Achievement Gap Summit” in Sacramento. They took part in no fewer than 125 panels on ways to help blacks and Hispanics do as well as whites and Asians.\textsuperscript{51}

Overwhelming majorities in Congress passed the No Child Left Behind Act in 2002 to improve student performance and bridge achievement gaps. The government budgeted $24.4 billion for the program for fiscal year 2007,\textsuperscript{52} and its requirements for “Adequate Yearly Progress” have forced change on many schools. This is only the latest effort in more than 25 years of federal involvement. The result? In 2009, Chester E. Finn, Jr., a former education official in the Reagan administration, put it this way: “This is a nearly unrelenting tale of woe and disappointment. If there’s any good news here, I can’t find it.”\textsuperscript{53}

**RADICAL SOLUTIONS**

Because the achievement gap begins well before school age, some education experts propose
radical solutions. David J. Armor of George Mason University believes professionals should take over the rearing of black and Hispanic infants and children for several hours a day. He recognizes that mothers do not like to be separated from toddlers but wrote that blacks and Hispanics should “let others become, in effect, ‘surrogate’ parents who provide the type of care that the parents should be providing.”

President Obama was saying much the same thing in 2008 when he said government should “make quality, affordable early childhood care and education available to every American child from the day he or she is born.”

Kym Worthy, a black prosecutor in Wayne County, Michigan, which includes Detroit, thinks one way to improve school performance is to make sure parents get involved. In 2010 she proposed up to three days in jail for parents who repeatedly missed parent-teacher conferences.

Black Florida state senator Frederica Wilson blames standardized tests. At a 2010 press conference, surrounded by dozens of black leaders and educators, she called for the repeal of Florida’s Comprehensive Assessment Test, or FCAT, which requires students to be able to read and do math at a 10th-grade level in order to get a standard diploma. She said that the test discourages blacks who then drop out.

A non-profit group in Chicago has filed a complaint with the US Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights making the same claim: Blacks and Hispanics are demoralized and drop out because they are more likely than whites to be held back in public schools for doing poorly on standardized tests. The tests should therefore be eliminated.

In 2006, Noma LeMoine was in charge of closing the achievement gap in Los Angeles public schools. She believed black children do not do as well as whites because schools do not recognize the black style of speaking known as “ebonics,” which she wanted recognized, along with standard English.

In Atlanta, dozens of teachers were under criminal investigation in 2010 for altering answers to improve student scores on state standardized tests. A group of prominent black pastors held a press conference to denounce what they called a “witch hunt,” and to explain that teachers were just trying to help the children.

The Oklahoma City School district has invested in “hip hop” lessons to try to improve black student performance in everything from math to social studies. “Old Dead White Men” is a history-lesson “rap” that contains lines such as the following:

Andrew Jackson, thinks he’s a tough guy./ Killing more Indians than there are stars in the sky./ Evil wars of Florida killing the Seminoles./ Saying hello, putting Creek in the hell holes./ Like Adolf Hitler he had the final solution./ “No, Indians, I don’t want you to live here anymore.”

In heavily non-white schools in New York, Chicago, and Washington, DC, experimental programs pay children cash to come to school, turn in homework, and get better grades. In Washington, in 2009, a program jointly funded by the district and Harvard University was paying students as much as $100 every two weeks. A 2008 program paid students at the 81 percent-non-white Wilby High School in Waterbury, Connecticut, $100 for each Advanced Placement test they could pass.

At Pima Community College in Tucson, Arizona, only 11 percent of Hispanic men were getting their two-year degree within three years, so a group of private foundations set up a program, available only to Latinos, they would pay them $1,500 if they stayed in school for the year and used certain support services. There were similar cash programs at community colleges in New York, Ohio, New Mexico and California.
In heavily non-white areas of Los Angeles, the city is trying to encourage recycling by awarding points that can be redeemed at local stores. Doctors at three medical centers in Massachusetts are trying to get low-income women to eat more fruit and vegetables by giving them “prescriptions” that are really coupons for free groceries at local farmers’ markets.

Payments of this kind do not appear to be effective. During 2008, the Council of Urban Professionals paid students in certain heavily-minority New York City schools as much as $1,000 if they passed AP tests. The number of passing grades dropped slightly from the previous year.

In 2007, New York City launched a three-year pilot project that paid parents for such things as going to the dentist ($100) and holding down a full-time job ($150 a month). Children got $25 to $50 a month for regular school attendance and $600 for passing certain standardized tests. In 2010, $40 million later, the city had such poor results it cancelled the program.

**OUR CHANGING SCHOOLS**

Many theories have been advanced to explain racial gaps in performance, of which these are the most common: black and Hispanic schools do not get enough money, their classes are too big, students are segregated from whites, minorities do not have enough teachers of their own race. Each of these explanations has been thoroughly investigated. Urban schools, where non-whites are concentrated, often get more money than suburban white schools, so blacks and Hispanics are not short-changed in budget or class size. Teacher race has no detectable effect on learning (Asians, for example, outperform whites regardless of who teaches them), nor do whites in the classroom raise or lower the scores of students of other races.

Money is not the problem. From the early 1970s to the 2006-2007 school year per-pupil spending more than doubled in real terms. The Cato Institute calculates that when capital costs are included, the Los Angeles School District spends more than $25,000 per student per year, and the District of Columbia spends more than $28,000. Neither district gets good results.

Demographic change can become a vicious cycle: As more minorities and immigrants enter a school system average achievement falls. More money and effort is devoted to these groups, squeezing gifted programs, music and art, and advanced placement courses. The better-performing students leave, and standards fall further. This cycle helped feed the resegregation described in Chapter 1.

In 2010, the South became the first region in the country where more than half of public school students are poor and more than half are members of minorities. Other regions will follow. Non-whites are expected to become a majority of all public school students by 2020, and the share of students poor enough to qualify for free or reduced-price lunches is rising in every state.

Why do schools not get better results? In 2006, the *Los Angeles Times* published a long report on Birmingham High School in Van Nuys, north of downtown Los Angeles. The newspaper chose it because it represented the new demographics of southern California: Two-thirds of the 4,000 students were Hispanic, 15 percent were white, and most of the rest were black.

“There’s no love of learning,” said one teacher, explaining that if students do not have it, it cannot be instilled. Another teacher described a huge sense of entitlement, with many students convinced they deserved passing grades just for showing up. Many students’ lives were chaotic. They became pregnant, they got in trouble with the law, they took drugs. Parents became sick or died, sometimes
violently. A boyfriend might be killed in a shootout. When friends dropped out, it was a great temptation to follow them. There was constant racial tension between Hispanics, Armenians, and blacks.

Birmingham had a full-time truant officer, whose job was to try to keep students in school. He spent the day calling the parents of absent students, often to find the phone was disconnected or the number he had was wrong. If he drove to a student’s address, he often found the family had moved or had never even lived there.  

It was with considerable hope, therefore, that Los Angeles opened a new, model high school in July 2005 that was to help solve these problems. It had a heated pool, a ballet studio, a fully-equipped chef’s kitchen, and shiny new computers, all divided into five “learning communities” of 600 to 700 students who would have a sense of belonging. In its first nine months, South LA Area High School No. 1 was tops in the district in violent crimes. There were so many fistfights in the restrooms that classrooms were locked during class and adults escorted students to the restroom. Lunchtime riots in December 2005 resulted in 34 arrests and sent 10 students to the hospital. The halls of the school were decorated with posters that pointed to the source of most of the violence: “Black and Brown = Peace.” The Los Angeles Times headlined its article, “Chaos Reigns at a Model School.”

At Intermediate School 172 in Harlem, all students go through metal detectors, but classrooms are still dangerous. “I have told teachers to lock their [classroom] doors for their personal safety,” explained Sandy Haiman, who trained teachers at the school. “I have to wear earplugs—that’s how bad the noise level is.”

In November 2004, at Stetson Middle School in Philadelphia, an 11-year-old Hispanic student dragged another sixth-grade boy into a hallway and raped him. That same week, police charged a 12-year-old boy at a West Philadelphia elementary school with forcing an eight-year-old girl to give him oral sex. During the 2003/2004 school year, Philadelphia public school students committed 310 indecent assaults, 56 indecent exposures, 10 rapes or attempted rapes, and 86 other acts of sexual misconduct. Nearly a third of these incidents were in elementary schools.

In Chicago, during the 2008/2009 school year, 37 public school students were shot dead. In 2009, the head of the district announced a $30-million-a-year profiling plan—on top of the $55 million a year it already spent on school security—to identify and protect students who are most likely to be shot. The school district had also located the most dangerous gang boundaries children must cross on their way to school and assigned extra parent and police patrols. Despite these efforts, five Chicago school children were killed in the first three weeks of the 2009/2010 school year.

Many urban schools have “anger management programs.” In 2004, ninth graders at Woodlawn High School in Baltimore attended an assembly on how to solve problems without fighting. As students on stage acted out non-violent solutions, girls in the audience got into fistfights, and the audience of 750 erupted in chaos. Police arrived and arrested two students. All Baltimore schools teach anger management.

Teachers face terrible conditions. Ray Culberson, director of youth services for the San Bernardino School District in California, said teachers must desensitize their personal “fuck you meters,” by which he meant teachers must get used to being sworn at, especially by students from “difficult backgrounds.” He said he can tolerate about 100 “fuck you’s a day, and warned that anyone with a
low tolerance could not handle the job. He called his approach the “new professionalism.”

At heavily-black James Gholson Middle School in Prince George’s County, Maryland, the only way to control food fights and brawls in the cafeteria was to require complete silence at lunch. Principal Jeffrey J. Parker sat on a stage, ordering anyone who spoke to stand against the wall. Prince George’s is the wealthiest and best educated majority-black county in the nation.

Denver, Colorado, has so many pregnant and new-mother students that it has set up a special school for them, Florence Crittenton School, but it has a long waiting list for places.

Some schools cannot attract teachers. Los Angeles offers a $5,000 bonus to teachers who are willing to work at its worst schools, and in 2009, Guilford County, North Carolina, was offering bonuses of up to $10,000 in certain schools. “It’s challenging to teach in these high-needs schools,” said Mark Jewell, president of the local teachers union. “These new teachers will have a trial by fire, and then it’ll be a revolving door.” The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future says teacher turnover has never been higher; nearly half of all new teachers are gone after five years.

Immigration affects schools. A report by the Federation for American Immigration Reform found that from 1995 to 2005, the number of children in public schools listed as Limited English Proficient (LEP) rose by some 1.2 million to approximately 4.5 million. The annual bill for extra help in English was more than $4 billion. Between 1995 and 2005, 11 states saw their LEP enrollments double, while eight saw them triple.

The local effect can be dramatic. In Harrisonburg, Virginia, the number of immigrant school children rose 829 percent in the 10 years to 2004, and the 4,000-student district had to use 26 trailers for new classrooms. In the 10 years from 1997 to 2007, the schools in Dodge City, Kansas went from 70 percent white to 25 percent white, and the city found itself with a serious gang and drugs problem.

In the early 1970s, whites outnumbered Hispanics six to one in the public schools of San Diego County, California. By 2002, Hispanics were in the majority, and academic standards had plummeted. Ed Brand, in charge of boosting Hispanic performance, did not expect much change. “It’s no longer Latinos or Hispanics entering the mainstream,” he said. “They are the mainstream.”

CONSEQUENCES FOR WHITES

As whites cease to be the mainstream, their interests become less important. In 2008, the College Board, the New York-based non profit that administers Advanced Placement (AP) tests, announced it was dropping AP courses and exams in Italian, Latin literature, and French literature. Blacks and Hispanics are not interested in those subjects, and they were the groups the College Board wanted to reach.

In Berkeley, California, the governance council for the school district came up with a novel plan for bridging the racial achievement gap: eliminate all science labs, fire the five teachers who run them, and spend the money on “underperforming” students. The council explained that science labs were used mainly by white students, so they were a natural target for cuts.

Many schools have slashed enriched programs for gifted students because so few blacks and Hispanics qualify for them. Evanston Township High School in Illinois prides itself on diversity and academic excellence but, like so many others, is dismayed that the two do not always go together. In 2010 it eliminated its elite freshman honors courses in English because hardly any blacks or
Hispanics met the admission criteria. The honors biology course was scheduled for elimination the next year.  

As noted in Chapter 1, many whites flee from diversity, but a few welcome it. Joe and Jessica Sweeney of Peoria, Illinois, had been sending their children to private school but decided the multi-racial experience of public school would be valuable. After the switch, their eight-year-old son and nine-year-old daughter were taunted with racial slurs, and became withdrawn. One day, a black student threatened to kill the girl with a box cutter. The same day, the boy showed his parents a large bruise he got when he was knocked down and called “stupid white boy.” The school reacted with indifference. The Sweeneys sent their children back to private school.  

Fourteen-year-old James Tokarski was one of a handful of whites attending Bailly Middle School in Gary, Indiana, in 2006. Black students called him “whitey” and “white trash” and repeatedly beat him up. They knocked him unconscious twice. The school offered James a “lunch buddy,” to be with him whenever he was not in class, but his parents took him out of Bailly. The mother of another white student said it was typical for whites to be called “whitey” or “white boy,” and to get passes to eat lunch in the library rather than face hostile blacks in the lunch room.  

On Cleveland’s West Side, ever since court-ordered busing began in the 1970s, blacks and Hispanics have celebrated May Day by attacking whites. In 2003, Elsie Morales, a Puerto Rican mother of two, told reporters that when she took part in May Day violence as a student in the 1970s she justified it as payback for white oppression. Her daughter Jasmine said it was still common to attack whites: “It’s like if you don’t jump this person with us, you’re a wimp and we’ll get you next.”  

In the late 1990s, whites were 41 percent of students in Seattle public schools, blacks were 23, and the rest were Hispanic and Asian. In 1995 and 1999, schools conducted confidential surveys about racial harassment. In both years, a considerably larger percentage of white than black students complained of racial taunts or violence. Only an “alternative” newspaper reported the findings, and school representatives refused to discuss them.  

White faculty may feel unwelcome in today’s schools. “Whites feel uncomfortable talking about it,” said a white teacher in the Los Angeles School District, “but we wouldn’t encourage our kids to become teachers in this district, because they wouldn’t be given a fair shot. . . . You’re not wanted here.”  

Elizabeth Kandrac was a white teacher in largely black Brentwood Middle School in North Charleston, South Carolina. Her students routinely called her “white bitch,” “white mother-fucker,” “white cunt,” and “white ho.” When she complained, black administrators told her this was black culture and that if she couldn’t handle it she should work elsewhere. During a 2007 trial against the school for creating a racially hostile workplace, the school argued that this was the language children heard at home and that it was beyond the school’s control. They may well be right, but Miss Kandrac still received a settlement of $200,000.  

**THE WORKFORCE**  

An increasingly black and Hispanic workforce will be less productive. In recent times, American workers have been the best educated in the world; 85 percent of adult Americans are high school graduates, up from just 25 percent in 1940. Twenty-eight percent have a college degree, a fivefold
increase since 1940. Better education helped raise real average per capita income in the United States 40 percent between 1980 and 2000.\textsuperscript{98}

The rise in incomes is forecast to reverse as aging white workers retire and blacks and immigrants take their places. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) predicts a drop in reading and math ability in all states. Senior Researcher Irwin Kirsch says that because of an increasingly non-white and immigrant workforce “we have the possibility of transforming the American dream into the American tragedy.” He warns of a threat, not just to our standard of living, but to the very concept of democracy based on an informed middle class. Andrew Sum of Northeastern University in Boston helped the ETS in its research. “There is no time that I can tell you in the last hundred years” when literacy and numeracy have declined, he says, “but if you don’t change outcomes for a wide variety of groups, this is the future we face.”\textsuperscript{99}

California will be particularly hard hit because of its large Hispanic population. During the 2009-2010 school year, almost 50.4 percent of the state’s public school students were Hispanic; only 27 percent were white.\textsuperscript{100} Nearly three quarters of the 700,000 children in the Los Angeles Unified School District were Hispanic.\textsuperscript{101} The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education predicts that by 2020 the average per capita income for the nation as a whole will have fallen by two percent, with the biggest loss for any state in California: 10.8 percent.\textsuperscript{102} “The implication of these trends is really stark,” said Patrick Callan, president of the center.\textsuperscript{103}

According to a 2007 report from the Migration Policy Institute, an estimated 400,000 legal immigrants and 350,000 illegal immigrants to California were illiterate in their native languages, and certainly in English.\textsuperscript{104} This contributed to the fact that for the first time in its history, California is suffering a decline in literacy. In 2003, its adult illiteracy rate of 23 percent—up 50 percent over a decade—made it the most illiterate state.\textsuperscript{105} It is also the state with the highest proportion of non-English-speakers; 53 percent of working-age residents in Los Angeles County have trouble reading street signs or filling out a job application in English.\textsuperscript{106}

In 1970, California had the seventh-best-educated work force of all the states, in terms of the number of workers with high-school diplomas. By 2008, it ranked last: one in six workers were high-school dropouts. Immigration was the single largest reason for the decline, since immigrants were six times more likely than natives to be dropouts.\textsuperscript{107}

In 2009, the California Dropout Research Project at UC Santa Barbara estimated that because dropouts commit more crime than students who stay in school, they cost the state of California $1.1 billion annually in law enforcement and victim costs while they are still minors.\textsuperscript{108}

Texas faces similar problems. State demographer Steve H. Murdock notes that if immigration continues, the Texas public schools will be 80 percent minority by 2040, up from 57 percent in 2000. He calculates that if black and Hispanic graduation rates do not improve, by 2040 Texans will see real, average per capita income fall by $6,500. Pia Orrenius, an economist with the Federal Reserve who has studied Hispanics in Texas, notes that Hispanics are not paid less than whites because of discrimination. “They’re paid less because they have less education.” These experts warn of the prospect of a permanent Hispanic underclass of crime, poverty and other social problems.\textsuperscript{109}

For the nation as a whole, McKinsey and Company estimates that if black and Hispanic students had been able to close the achievement gap in 1998, ten years later American GDP would have been up to half-a-trillion dollars greater.\textsuperscript{110}
A recent Harvard University Press book reaches stark conclusions: “With no evidence of an imminent turnaround in the rate at which Latino students are either graduating from high school or obtaining college degrees, it appears that both a regional and national catastrophe are at hand.” The authors conclude that without a change in course our “very democracy is at peril.”

The US is slipping badly in comparison with other developed countries. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) has analyzed the results of the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS), which measures the math and verbal abilities of adults in the 20 richest countries. The United States ranked 12th out of 20; Australia and Belgium are among the countries that score better. However, if blacks, Hispanics, and immigrants are excluded from the American results, performance rises from 12th on both tests to second highest in reading and 5th in math. Likewise, the oldest Americans (56 and older) came in second in reading while younger Americans, those 26-35 and 16-25 years old, ranked only 11th and 14th, respectively. The oldest age groups—the ones with the most whites—do the best while the youngest groups with the fewest whites do worst.

Student scores fit the same pattern. Every three years, the OECD’s Program for International Student Assessment tests the abilities of 15-year-olds in many different countries. American scores have been steadily declining. In 2006, the United States ranked 29th on the science/math ability scale, behind Latvia and Croatia. However, if the scores only of whites were considered, the US ranked 10th, in the company of Japan, Hong Kong, and New Zealand. Hispanics-only scores fall to 40th, and blacks-only scores to 50th, just ahead of Indonesia. American scores are worse than they seem. By age 15, many of the worst-performing students have dropped out, which means those who are tested are not a fully representative sample.

CRIME

For as long as statistics have been kept, blacks have had higher crime rates than whites. Containing crime is one of the top priorities of any society, so it is perplexing that the United States has added to its crime problem through immigration. Hispanics, who have been by far the most numerous post-1965 immigrant group, commit crimes at rates lower than blacks but higher than whites.

Some people claim that all population groups commit crimes at the same rates, and that racial differences in incarceration rates reflect police and justice system bias. This view is wrong. The US Department of Justice carefully tracks murder, which is the violent crime for which racial data on victim and perpetrator are most complete. In 2005, the department noted that blacks were six times more likely than whites to be victims of murder and seven times more likely to commit murder.

There are similar differences for other crimes. The United States regularly conducts a huge, 100,000-person crime study known as the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), in which Americans are asked to describe the crimes of which they have been victim during the year, and to indicate race of perpetrator. NCVS figures are therefore a reliable indication of the racial distribution of violent criminals. The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) is another huge database that records the races of all suspects reported to the police as well as those arrested by police. Both these data sets prove that blacks commit a vastly disproportionate amount of violent crime. In fact, blacks are arrested less frequently than would be expected from reports by crime victims of the race of perpetrator. Racial differences in arrest rates reflect racial differences in crime rates, not police bias.
Justice Department figures show that blacks commit crimes and are incarcerated at roughly 7.2 times the white rate, and Hispanics at 2.9 times the white rate. (Asians are the least crime-prone group in America, and are incarcerated at only 22 percent of the white rate.) Robbery or “mugging” shows the greatest disparities, with blacks offending at 15 times and Hispanics at just over four times the white rate.

There are practically no crimes blacks and Hispanics do not commit at higher rates than whites, whether it is larceny, car theft, drug offenses, burglary, rape, or alcohol offenses. Even for white-collar crimes—fraud, racketeering, bribery/conflict of interest, embezzlement—blacks are incarcerated at three to five times the white rate, and Hispanics at about twice the white rate. \(^{117}\)

Racial differences in crime rates are such an embarrassment they can interfere with law enforcement. In 2010 the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority had a problem with scores of young people openly beating fares—which cuts into revenue and demoralizes other riders. It considered a crackdown, but decided against it. The scoff-laws were overwhelmingly black, and the transit authority did not have the stomach to take any action that would fall heavily on minorities. \(^{118}\)

Some Hispanics assimilate more readily to the criminal subculture than to the mainstream. Native-born Hispanics between the ages of 15 to 26 are 1.5 times more likely than young immigrant Hispanics to be incarcerated, and twice as likely to have carried a weapon or to have been threatened with one. They are twice as likely to have ties to a gang or to have been in a fight. \(^{119}\) US-born Hispanic high-school dropouts are more than eleven times more likely to be incarcerated than Hispanic dropouts who immigrated to the United States. \(^{120}\)

High crime rates produce tragic outcomes. “Another ‘Super Safe Sunday’ Ends in Violence,” read a 2005 headline from Shreveport, Louisiana. Super Safe Sunday is a series of entertainments geared to young blacks to keep them off the streets and prevent violence. Unfortunately, large gatherings of blacks produce the very violence the authorities want to stop. \(^{121}\)

In 2006, the city of Oakland planned a “Get Hyphy [sic] Against Violence” rap concert to condemn recent killings. At the last minute the city canceled the program of music, dance, free food, and anti-violence speeches for fear that a crowd of young blacks—even one gathered for the purpose of denouncing violence—could not be controlled. \(^{122}\)

At its worst, crime turns parts of our country into what one journalist calls “budding Mogadishus,” named after the capital of Somalia where, for years, there has been no government:

> L.A.’s hot zones are tiny, intensely dangerous areas where nothing works, where law has broken down and mainstream institutions simply fail. Places where mail carriers and meter readers balk when the bullets fly. Where paramedics and firefighters are hesitant to enter because of the crossfire. Where police officers go in only heavily reinforced or with helicopters . . . . \(^{123}\)

Race is part of it. According to one calculation of homicide victimization rates for men, ages 15 to 29, Hispanics in Los Angeles are killed at seven times the white rate and blacks at 21 times the white rate. \(^{124}\) Hardly any are killed by whites.

Calling these places “Mogadishus” may be an insult to the Somalis. When CNN compiled a list of the ten most dangerous cities in the world in 2010, Mogadishu was not on it. Detroit and New Orleans were—in third and fourth places, after Baghdad and Caracas and ahead of Kinshasa and Beirut. \(^{125}\)

Much of the crime is gang related. Heather Mac Donald of the Manhattan Institute has studied the spread of Hispanic gangs:

> In Chicago, gangs start recruiting kids at age nine, . . . . The result is a community in thrall. Non-affiliated children fear
traveling into unknown neighborhoods and sometimes drop out of school for lack of protection. Adults are just as scared.

... Ernesto Vega, a 19-year-old Mexican illegal who grew up in New York City, estimates that most 12- to 14-year-old Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in New York are in gangs for protection. “If you’re Mexican, you can’t go to parties by yourself,” he says. ... But if it’s 20 of you, and 20 of them, then it’s OK.” 126

A 2009 report by the US Justice Department’s National Gang Intelligence Center estimated that criminal gangs had more than 1 million members—an increase of 200,000 since 2005—and, in some communities, accounted for up to 80 percent of the crime.127 By one count, Los Angeles County had more than 714 gangs and 80,000 gang members—one for every 100 residents.128

One of the most notorious gangs is MS-13, which originated in El Salvador. Initiation rites may require shooting a member of the rival Salvadoran gang SWP-18, and members are famous for unprovoked violence. “We get Bloods and Crips who tell us, ‘Why don’t you do something about those MS-13 guys—they’re crazy!’ ” explained Jason Robles of the Long Island anti-gang taskforce. One member, outnumbered by Bloods ten-to-one in a prison holding cell, bit one in the face just to show his contempt for them.129

The rise of gangs means crimes are harder to solve. Despite the use of DNA analysis and other modern techniques, the homicide clearance rate, or percentage solved, has declined steadily from 91 percent in 1963—the first year national records were kept—to 61 percent in 2007. Police say this is because there are so many anonymous drug- and gang-related killings. These crimes are harder to solve than murders with traditional motives in which murderer and victim know each other.130

Crime has a gruesome side-benefit: military medics get realistic combat training at city emergency rooms. Since 2001, the Army has trained medics at Jackson Memorial Hospital in downtown Miami, where they see gunshot wounds and stabbings, and often have to work through interpreters. “That’s exactly what we’re going to see over there [in Iraq],” explained Army medic Joshua McCann. The Navy and Air Force also train medics in city hospitals.131

Gangs are moving into such areas as Westchester and Suffolk counties in New York, and rural parts of North Carolina and Virginia, where police have no experience with organized crime, and do not know how to respond.132 The Pocono Mountains of northeastern Pennsylvania are a traditional getaway from New York and Philadelphia, but are now colonized by black and Hispanic gangs. By 2006, there were 61 confirmed or suspected gang members in local jails.133

Likewise in 2006, military commanders in Iraq reported seeing gang graffiti on military buildings and vehicles.134 The armed forces had to lower standards to get people to fight in Iraq and Afghanistan, and by 2009, an estimated two percent of recruits were gang members.135

Employees of the office-supplies retailer, Staples, wear red polo shirts, but at several of its 190 stores in California the company had to change its color. Gangs claimed red was their color, and attacked employees.136

Gangs have a powerful attraction for some middle-class children. Mawuli Malcolm Davis, an Atlanta defense lawyer who has gang members as clients, partly blames the media-generated “thug culture,” but notes that for a middle-class black who joins a gang, “It is almost like a kid who is embarrassed by his privilege, trying to show he is as hard as those guys.” Atlanta detention officer Bruce Griggs says gangs “used to be a ‘hood problem;’ now it’s everybody’s problem.”137

It is not everybody’s problem; gangs are overwhelmingly a black and Hispanic problem. Hispanics are nearly 19 times more likely than whites to be members of youth gangs, and blacks are 15 times more likely. Asians are nine times more likely.138 According to CAL/GANG, the California
Department of Justice’s gang database, Los Angeles County had 39,032 gang members; only 1.4 percent were white. In Dallas, Texas, the gang unit does not even have a category for white gangs. Fifty-nine percent were Hispanic, 39 percent were black, and 2 percent were “other,” including Asians.

Gangs are changing what it means to grow up in America. The US Census Bureau found that no fewer than 34 percent of black children and 37 percent of Hispanic children are kept indoors by their parents for fear of violence in their neighborhoods. The figure for white children was 13 percent, and the Census Bureau did not explain whether they feared violence from whites or non-whites.

Most Americans can name a few black or Hispanic gangs. If pressed to name a white gang, they may mention the Aryan Brotherhood, but this is strictly a prison gang. It was formed by white prisoners mainly to defend against blacks and Hispanics, many of whom enter prison as members of established gangs and therefore have built-in protective networks. The Aryan Brotherhood has virtually no presence outside prison walls.

It is sobering to visit the websites for the FBI and various state police agencies and look at the photographs of the “most wanted” criminals. There is a huge preponderance of blacks and Hispanics, and sometimes not a single picture of a white criminal.

The Hispanic gang problem is increasingly serious for three reasons: our proximity to Mexico, our porous southern border, and our burgeoning Hispanic population. The Justice Department’s National Drug Intelligence Center lists 230 American cities in which Mexican drug cartels maintain distribution hubs. Mexicans can now dominate the trade because, as the Atlanta chief of the Drug Enforcement Administration put it in 2009, there are so many Hispanics in so many parts of the country that traffickers can “blend in in plain sight.”

Ninety percent of the cocaine sold in the United States comes through Mexico and is distributed by Mexican traffickers. Mexican poppies supply most of the heroin on the American market. American police stamped out the methamphetamine laboratories that were once common in California, but the industry moved to Mexico, which now supplies an estimated 80 percent of the American market.

When improved enforcement stopped huge shipments of marijuana coming in from Mexico, growers moved operations across the border. They clear remote areas in American national parks, plant marijuana, and recruit Mexicans to grow it. Mexican marijuana farmers are suspected of starting the La Brea fire that burned more than 88,000 acres of the Los Padres National Forest northwest of Los Angeles in 2009. That summer, federal agents seized nearly $55 million worth of marijuana in national parks in California, Colorado, and Idaho. The US Forest Service asks campers to report suspicious, Spanish-speaking people who appear to be “long-term campers,” but Hispanic advocacy groups oppose what they call “racial profiling.”

In Mexico itself, the drug cartels now appear to have more to fear from each other than from the authorities. Mexican President Felipe Calderon vowed to control the narcotics trade when he took office in December 2006, but by the summer of 2010, it was estimated that an astonishing 28,000 people had been killed on both sides of the drug war. Most of the killing took place in seedy places like Tijuana where, in a single day in 2009, gunmen ambushed and killed seven policemen and wounded three others.

No place is immune, however. In June 2009, there was a two-hour gun fight in the hotel district of Acapulco. Tourists cowered in their rooms as gunmen sprayed bullets and threw some 50 grenades at
In early 2011, the drug wars killed 31 people in just four days in the Pacific resort city, including two policemen gunned down in front of tourists in the main hotel district. The killings also set a record for the largest single group of headless bodies: 14. The previous record of 12 was set in 2008 outside the Yucatan capital of Merida.

In August 2010, members of the Beltran Leyva cartel hung the decapitated, mutilated bodies of four rivals from a bridge in Cuernavaca, a popular weekend getaway for residents of Mexico City.

Parts of Mexico have become so lawless that citizens escape to the United States. Between 2008 and 2010 at least 30,000 Mexicans were estimated to have fled the violence of Ciudad Juarez to El Paso, Texas, just across the Rio Grande. So many people have abandoned nearby El Porvenir and Guadalupe Bravos that they were said to resemble ghost towns. In the early days of the drug wars, it was mostly journalists, police, and officials who feared for their lives, but by 2010 it was ordinary people. During a single weekend in November 2010, at least 20 people were killed in Ciudad Juarez. Drug criminals and police have shot it out so close to US territory that stray bullets have hit and damaged the El Paso city hall.

In the four years from 2006 to 2010, more than 30 journalists were killed or disappeared, and a Mexican group called the Committee to Protect Journalists reports “vast self-censorship” because writers and editors fear for their lives. A tragic example of this was a 2010 front-page open letter to the drug cartels published by El Diario, the Ciudad Juarez newspaper, after several of its journalists were killed: “Explain to us what you want from us,” the letter said. “What are we supposed to publish or not publish, so we know what to abide by? You are at this time the de facto authorities in this city . . . .” Ciudad Juarez is no whistle stop; before the current exodus it was a city of 1.4 million people.

The state of Tamaulipas, which shares 230 miles of border at the other end of Texas, was also tipping into anarchy by 2010. Cartel gunmen had their own checkpoints on highways, and had run the Mexican national oil company off of several gas fields. They had silenced newspapers and television broadcasters. In the summer of 2010, the candidate who was likely to win the governor’s election was shot dead in broad daylight along with his four bodyguards in the state capital of Ciudad Victoria. In November, 660 Mexican special forces men fought 300 Gulf Cartel gunmen in a 10-hour battle in the streets of Matamoros. Just across the river, the University of Texas at Brownsville canceled classes for fear of stray bullets.

Mexico has one of the highest rates of kidnapping in the world, and Mexicans have brought the practice to border regions of the United States. In 2006, Americans living in south Texas were estimated to have as high a chance of being kidnapped as residents of Mexico. During 2008, the Phoenix police department was aware of 359 kidnappings—more than one a day—and 300 home invasions. Mexican criminals mainly target Hispanics, whom they consider less likely to call the police. Mexico is also a convenient ditching point for stolen goods. Every year, an estimated 200,000 cars stolen in the United States disappear into Mexico.

The worst Mexican criminals often disappear the same way because they know they will not be extradited. Mexico claims that because it does not have the death penalty it has no obligation to extradite criminals who might face death in the United States. In 2004, California prosecutors complained that Mexico refused to extradite 360 people who had committed murder or other serious crimes in the state and had fled to Mexico. That year, the attorneys general of all 50 states joined in a
petition to the federal government, asking for help in persuading the Mexican authorities to extradite criminals—to no avail.\textsuperscript{162}

**CORRUPTION MOVES NORTH**

Corruption is widespread in Latin America, especially in Mexico. In 2005, for example, federal authorities arrested 700 of the 1,200 police officers in Nuevo Laredo for suspected collaboration with drug cartels.\textsuperscript{163} Police corruption was so bad in Tijuana that in 2007, soldiers and federal police disarmed the entire 2,000-man police force. They made officers patrol the tourist district with slingshots instead of pistols.\textsuperscript{164}

What does this mean for us? Under the headline, “Bribe Culture Seeps Into South Texas,” the *Houston Chronicle* described how payoffs have become common, everywhere from school districts to building inspections to municipal courts. The bribe—*la mordida*—as a way of life is moving north. Anthony Knopp, who teaches border history at the University of Texas at Brownsville, said that as America becomes more Hispanic, “corruption will show up here, naturally.”\textsuperscript{165}

The same thing is happening in California. Small towns south of Los Angeles, such as South Gate, Lynwood, Bell Gardens, Maywood, Huntington Park, and Vernon were once white suburbs but have become largely Hispanic. They have also become notorious for thieving, bribe-taking politicians. Mayors, city council members, and treasurers have paraded off to jail. “When new groups come to power, and become entrenched … then they tend to rule it as a fiefdom,” explained Jaime Regalado, of California State University, Los Angeles.\textsuperscript{166}

Maywood, which was 96 percent Hispanic by 2010, was so badly run it lost insurance coverage and had to lay off all its employees. The California Joint Powers Insurance Authority (JPIA), composed of more than 120 cities and other public agencies to share insurance costs, declared the Maywood government too risky to insure. It was the first time in its 32-year history that the JPIA had ever terminated a member.\textsuperscript{167} It has been reported that black elected officials are 5.3 times more likely to be arrested for crimes than white elected officials.\textsuperscript{168}

Hispanics may be especially susceptible to corruption if they work along the US-Mexico border. There are no comprehensive data on this problem, but incidents reported in just one year—2005—are disturbing. Operation Lively Green was an FBI drug smuggling sting that led to 33 guilty pleas. Twenty-four of the guilty were Hispanic and most of the rest were black. All were police officers, port inspectors, prison guards, or soldiers. They waved drug shipments through ports, prevented seizures by the Border Patrol, and sold fake citizenship documents.\textsuperscript{169}

Also in 2005, Juan L. Sanchez, a Border Patrol agent in Nogales, Arizona, was indicted for smuggling two tons of marijuana into the US in his official Border Patrol vehicle.\textsuperscript{170} Another Border Patrol agent, Luis Higareda, who worked near Calexico, California, pleaded guilty to picking up 750 lbs. of marijuana at a border area in his official vehicle and trying to drive it inland for sale.\textsuperscript{171} In October, Border Patrol agent Robert Espino was sentenced to eight years for taking a $5,000 bribe to let a shipment of cocaine pass through a Texas checkpoint. He also let smugglers sneak 750 illegals through his checkpoint. Three more Border Patrol agents, David Garcia, Jesus Delgado, and Aldo Erives, were charged in the case.\textsuperscript{172}

US soldiers Daniel Rosas, Victor Portales, and Kevin G. Irizarry-Melendez, who were sent to
Colombia to fight drug smuggling became smugglers themselves, loading cocaine along with their equipment onto army planes back to Texas.\textsuperscript{173} In October 2005, Lizandro Martinez, a senior customs inspector, pleaded guilty to letting a Hispanic smuggling ring repeatedly drive shipments of marijuana past his inspection lane on the Texas border.\textsuperscript{174} In August 2005, Border Patrol agent Oscar Antonio Ortiz and two confederates were indicted for smuggling in 30 to 50 immigrants at a time at $2,000 per head. Mr. Ortiz proved to be an illegal himself. The Border Patrol hired him on the strength of a fake birth certificate.\textsuperscript{175} In April 2005, Customs and Border Protection official Fabian Solis pleaded guilty to letting smugglers pay him $300 per person to allow trucks filled with aliens through the border at Rio Grande, Texas.\textsuperscript{176} In August 2005, El Paso Border Patrol agent Noe Aleman got six months in jail for smuggling three of his teenage nieces from Mexico.\textsuperscript{177} Also in 2005, three more Hispanic Border Patrol agents—Pablo Sergio Berry, Ramon Sanchez, Jr., and Jesus de Jose Ruiz—were caught harboring illegal aliens in their homes.\textsuperscript{178} Was 2005 simply a bad year for Hispanic agents? Probably not. In 2009, arrests of agents were up 40 percent over the previous few years, whereas the number of agents had grown by only 24 percent.\textsuperscript{179} From 2006 to 2010 the number of corruption investigations in Customs and Border Patrol more than tripled from 245 to 775.\textsuperscript{180} James Tomsheck, assistant commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, said the situation is so bad that agents require continuous monitoring, “the never-ending background investigation, if you will.”\textsuperscript{181}

And why not? The lure of Hispanic gangs and cartels, the culture of corruption, and the close identification many Hispanics feel for their countries of origin mean that Hispanic officers face temptations others do not. Most uniformed Hispanics are no doubt good officers, but just as Chinese are far more likely than other Americans to spy for China it is unlikely that the corruption patterns of Hispanic Border Patrol agents are identical to those of other groups. By 2008, the Border Patrol was 52 percent Hispanic.\textsuperscript{182} Today’s orthodoxies require that we consider this a triumph to be celebrated rather than a source of wrenching conflicts of interest. An increasingly Hispanic force also means that drug cartels now send their operatives to apply for border patrol jobs.\textsuperscript{183} Needless to say, limiting Hispanic postings on the Mexican border or subjecting Hispanic applicants to heightened scrutiny would not be acceptable in today’s climate.

FAMILIES

Virtually all observers agree that it is a terrible disadvantage for a child to come into the world without a father. Fatherless children are much more likely than those from two-parent homes to be poor, fail in school, commit crime, and, in turn, have fatherless children.\textsuperscript{184} By 2008, illegitimacy had reached extraordinary levels: 72 percent for blacks, 66 percent for American Indians, 53 percent for Hispanics, 29 percent for whites, and 17 percent for Asians.\textsuperscript{185} A majority of black, Hispanic, and Indian children are therefore coming into the world without the support of a married couple.

Joy Jones is a black school teacher, who worries about fatherlessness. She once told her 12-year-old students she wanted to invite adults to speak to the class about marriage and child-rearing. Several students said they did not want to be told about marriage, including a boy who said, “Marriage is for white people.” Miss Jones wrote that he spoke “as if the words left a nasty taste in
In 2005, Congress approved the Healthy Marriage Initiative, with a mandate to spend $100 million to promote marriage and “active fatherhood” among Hispanics. Congress also funds the African-American Healthy Marriage Initiative. It is not clear how government can encourage marriage, but at least this is recognition of a serious problem.

Teen births are also a disadvantage for both mother and child, and Hispanics are most at risk. The Mexican-American teenage birthrate is 93 per every 1,000 girls, compared to 65 for blacks, 27 for whites, and 17 for Asian girls. France’s teenage birthrate is 10 per 1,000, Italy’s is 6.9, and Japan’s is 3.9. In the United States, the greatest racial differences are found in births to very young women. In 2003, black girls ages 10 to 14 were eight times more likely than white girls to have children, and Hispanic girls were over six times more likely. For Hispanics, teenaged parenthood rates decline from the first to the second generation, but then go up again in the third, as does poverty. In North Carolina, more than half of all Hispanic girls are expected to become pregnant before they turn 20.

Heather Mac Donald of the Manhattan Institute has studied Hispanic teen pregnancy:

Social workers report that the impregnators of the younger Hispanic women are with some regularity their uncles, not necessarily seen as a bad thing by the mother’s family. Alternatively, the father may be the boyfriend of the girl’s mother, who then continues to stay with the grandmother. Older men seek out young girls in the belief that a virgin cannot get pregnant during first intercourse, and to avoid sexually transmitted diseases.

A University of Delaware study of the costs to the country of teenage childbearing—medical bills, foster care, child welfare, food stamps, greater likelihood of incarceration, lost tax revenue through lower earnings—“conservatively” calculated that the bill for 2004 was $9.1 billion. The author noted that it was impossible to measure all public-sector costs.

The ratio of Hispanic males to females in the United States is 107 to 100, in sharp contrast to the nation as a whole, in which there are 97 males to every 100 females. This imbalance may complicate family relations.

Black and Hispanic men are at least twice as likely as whites to batter their wives and girlfriends. One 2005 study found that Hispanic women were nine times more likely than white women to report domestic violence. Blacks are 8.4 times more likely than whites to kill their spouses.

Many immigrants come from countries where domestic violence is the norm. Muslims, in particular, may take wife-beating for granted. “How else can I teach her how to behave?” asked a bewildered Yemeni who was in court in Buffalo, New York, for throwing his wife down the stairs. “We come from another planet,” explained Law Eh Soe, a refugee from Burma. “In Burma, you can hit your wife or kid, but here, it’s a crime.” Many immigrants also refuse family counseling as culturally alien; to them it is interrogation.

**HEALTH**

There are considerable group differences in disease rates, and as the demographic mix changes, the costs of care will rise. The Centers for Disease Control estimated that in 2006, black men were six times more likely than white men to have HIV, and Hispanics were 2.2 times more likely. Black women were 18 times more likely than white women, and Hispanic women were 4.2 times more likely to be infected. In 2005, non-whites accounted for 83 percent of all AIDS cases in women.
and the disease was the leading cause of death for black women aged 25-34 years. The CDC devotes more than $300 million—almost half its domestic HIV prevention budget—to fighting HIV among blacks.

In 2006, the United States set a record for new cases—over one million—for the sexually transmitted disease, chlamydia. Infection rates were seven times higher for black than for white women and 3.5 times higher among Hispanics than whites. According to a 2009 report by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), blacks had gonorrhea rates 19 times higher than whites, and were more than seven times more likely to have syphilis than non-blacks. Blacks are more than three times more likely than whites to have herpes: 39 percent as opposed to 12 percent.

All sexually transmitted diseases are avoidable. Fetal alcohol syndrome, caused by excessive drinking by the mother, is also avoidable, but is 30 times more likely in blacks and American Indians than in whites.

Eighty percent of black women are overweight or obese. During the period 2006 to 2008, blacks were 51 percent more likely than whites to be obese and Hispanics were 21 percent more likely. The CDC found that blacks and Hispanics exercise less than whites, and that black and Hispanic women care less than white women about being overweight and therefore do not try as hard to lose weight. A study of the greater Boston area reported that Hispanics were the group least likely to eat balanced meals.

The CDC has determined that black women are getting shorter. The average white woman born in the 1980s was about half an inch taller than her mother. This is the trend in all industrial countries. The average height of a black woman born in the 1980s, however—just under 5 feet 4 inches—was about half an inch shorter than that of her mother. “The only reasonable explanation we can come up with is diet and the obesity epidemic,” said John Komlos, an economist and historian who studies human heights, adding that “such a steep decline is practically unprecedented in modern U.S. history.”

Racial differences show up early. A study by Ohio State University and Temple University found that one in five American four-year-olds is obese, with black children 31 percent more likely, Hispanic children 38 percent more likely, and American Indian children almost twice as likely as white children to be obese. Asian children were 19 percent less likely than whites to be obese. “[I]t is surprising to see differences by racial groups present so early in childhood,” said Sarah Anderson of Ohio State University. Dr. Glenn Flores, a professor at University of Texas Southwestern Medical School in Dallas, noted that “because within just a few decades, America will become a ‘minority majority’ nation,” the “next generation will be at very high risk for heart disease, high blood pressure, cancers, joint diseases and other problems connected with obesity.”

One obesity-related disease is diabetes. These are the opening paragraphs of a 2006 New York Times article:

One in three children born in the United States five years ago are expected to become diabetic in their lifetimes, according to a projection by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The forecast is even bleaker for Latinos: one in every two. New York, perhaps more than any other big city, harbors all the ingredients for a continued epidemic. It has large numbers of the poor and obese, who are at higher risk. It has a growing population of Latinos, who get the disease in disproportionate numbers, and of Asians, who can develop it at much lower weights than people of other races.

The American Diabetes Association says the disease could actually lower the average life expectancy of Americans for the first time in more than a century.

The problem is largely Type 2 diabetes, or what used to be called adult-onset diabetes but which
now often affects young people. Hispanics—particularly Mexicans and Puerto Ricans—get the disease at close to twice the white rate. Many appear to have a metabolism that is not geared to American affluence. In the developing world they stay slim, but in a land of plenty and inactivity, they put on weight. A federal study concluded that 58 percent of all new cases of diabetes could be avoided if people lost weight. Women are now getting the disease during child-bearing years, and this results in frequent birth defects. Mothers rearing these difficult babies will, themselves, be suffering from the crippling and costly effects of diabetes. Older Hispanics already have the highest rates of blindness and visual impairment of any racial or ethnic group, and higher diabetes rates will make this worse.

According to the American Diabetes Association, in 2007, people with diabetes had average annual medical expenses 2.3 times higher than people without it: $11,744 a year as opposed to $5,106. A 2007 study by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that Hispanics and blacks are admitted to hospital with out-of-control diabetes at 3.3 and 5.6 times the white rate. Asians are 33 percent less likely.

There are other racial differences in other disease rates. Blacks are about twice as likely as whites, and Hispanics are 1.5 times more likely to develop Alzheimer’s disease and other forms of dementia. Hispanics also tend to get the disease about seven years earlier than whites. The Alzheimer’s Association calls the threat to Hispanics “a looming but unrecognized public health crisis.”

Blacks are the group with the highest chances of getting cancer and of dying from it, yet are also the group that worries the least about it. At 32.7 deaths per 100,000 pregnancies, blacks are more than three times more likely that whites to die from childbirth or pregnancy. Blacks are 3.7 times more likely than people of other races to be awaiting a kidney transplant—largely because tissue typing works best for people of the same race and blacks are reluctant organ donors—and they suffer more complications after they donate a kidney.

Immigration from Third-World countries has reintroduced diseases that had been eradicated, and brought new ones for which American doctors are ill prepared. Many of these diseases are associated with living conditions common in poor countries and now becoming more common in the United States: overcrowding, malnutrition, poor sanitation, and close contact with animals receiving little veterinary care.

Tuberculosis (TB) is a fearsome killer in Third-World countries—it caused 1.7 million deaths in 2003 according to the World Health Organization—but had been eliminated in the United States by the 1970s. Americans forgot about TB until 1985, when it suddenly reappeared in cities that receive many immigrants. By 1993, the US-born population had a TB infection rate of 5.8 cases per 100,000, but immigrants from Vietnam and Haiti, for example, had rates 24 and 21 times higher. Legal immigrants are supposed to produce chest X-rays to prove they are healthy, but there is a brisk trade in phony X-rays, and illegal immigrants do not bother with X-rays at all. In 2008, the foreign-born were eight times more likely to have TB than native-born Americans.

Ordinary TB takes about six months to cure with a combination of four drugs that cost about $2,000. Drug-resistant TB takes 24 months with drugs that cost about $250,000 and have toxic side effects. In 2004, California led the nation with 2,989 new cases of TB. Immigrants accounted for three quarters of these cases, as well as eight in 10 cases of drug-resistant TB.
Patients must complete a full course of treatment—a partially cured strain of TB can mutate into a new, drug-resistant strain—so some health departments must practice “directly observed treatment.” The Los Angeles health department, for example, has workers who do nothing but drive around town making sure patients take their medicine.\textsuperscript{224}

Some cases require incarceration. Feliciano Morelos, a 19-year-old Mexican farm worker living in Santa Barbara County, California, was quarantined after he infected 56 people. He refused to go voluntarily, so police arrested him and put him in a special cell with air filters to keep him from infecting other prisoners.\textsuperscript{225} Samantha Ornelas, a Cambodian living in Stockton, California also had to be jailed—likewise in a special quarantine cell—when she refused home isolation.\textsuperscript{226}

In 2003 in New York City, a nurse from the Philippines who worked in the maternity ward at Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center infected at least four infants with TB, and exposed as many as 1,500 patients. Two years later, the hospital was still trying to contact patients who might have been exposed.\textsuperscript{227}

In 2007, the country got its first case of so-called extremely drug-resistant (XXDR) TB. Oswaldo Juarez, a 19-year-old from Peru, had to be treated in isolation for a year and a half at a cost of $500,000 to Florida taxpayers. “He is really the future,” explained Dr. David Ashkin, an expert on TB.\textsuperscript{228}

Rubella is another disease that essentially disappeared from the United States but immigrants have brought it back. In 1998, an outbreak among Hispanic immigrants that started in Port Chester, New York, spread to White Plains, Mount Kisco, Tarrytown, Sleepy Hollow, and Ossining. Health officials launched an emergency program of roving vaccination vans.\textsuperscript{229}

Leprosy has been so rare in the United States that until recently there had been only 900 cases in 40 years. Suddenly, from 2002 to 2005, the number of cases grew to 7,000.\textsuperscript{230} The foremost American expert on the disease, William R. Levis of New York, says immigrants bring it in and are infecting Americans.\textsuperscript{231} In 2008 in Springdale, Arkansas, Marshall Islanders were the source of an outbreak. Springdale doctor Jennifer Bingham noted that the Marshall Islands have one of the highest rates of leprosy in the world.\textsuperscript{232}

Tapeworms, which have also returned to the United States, can spread to the brain and are the leading cause of seizures among American Hispanics. Dr. Peter Hotez, a tropical disease expert at George Washington University, said that more than 2 percent of adult Hispanics are infected, which could add up to tens of thousands of cases.\textsuperscript{233}

Cysticercosis is caught by ingesting tapeworm larvae, which can travel through the bloodstream and damage the heart, lungs, and brain. There are an estimated 3,500 new cases every year, almost exclusively among Hispanic immigrants, and patients must stay on medication for years. The disease is now turning up in places where it had been unknown, including Iowa, Missouri, Ohio and Oregon.\textsuperscript{234}

Chagas disease is a parasitic illness passed to humans from a blood-sucking insect called conenose. Found, until recently, only in Latin America, it is appearing among immigrants in the United States. Over decades, the parasite can attack the heart and gastrointestinal system, and is the leading cause of heart failure in Latin America. The treatment is awful: three doses a day of a drug that can cause insomnia, nausea, and memory loss. By 2007, Chagas was so common in Los Angeles that the county opened the first clinic in the country devoted entirely to studying and treating it.\textsuperscript{235} “This is no
longer an exotic disease,” said Dr. Seba Meymandi of Sylmar, California.\textsuperscript{236}

Autism can be reason for political asylum. In 2001, ten-year-old Umair Choudry won asylum on the grounds that in his home country of Pakistan, he would be persecuted because of his condition. As an asylee, Umair became eligible for publicly-funded treatment, which can run from $8,000 to $100,000 per year, depending on the degree of affliction.\textsuperscript{237} For more than 20 years, a federal law kept out foreigners with AIDS, but in 2008, as part of a bill that pledged $48 billion to combat the disease worldwide, Congress removed the ban.\textsuperscript{238}

**COSTS TO THE MEDICAL SYSTEM**

Runaway costs are crushing the American medical system. Hispanics are the group least likely to have medical insurance, with 30.7 percent uninsured. Ten point eight percent of whites and 19.1 percent of blacks are without insurance.\textsuperscript{239}

Illegal immigrants rarely have insurance, but hospitals cannot turn them away. In 1985, Congress passed the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act, which requires hospitals to treat all emergency patients, without regard to legal status or ability to pay. Anyone who can stagger within 250 yards of a hospital—a distance established through litigation—is entitled to “emergency care,” which is defined so broadly that hospital emergency rooms have become free clinics. Emergency-room care is the most expensive kind.

Childbirth is an emergency, and hospitals must keep mother and child until both can be discharged. If the mother is indigent the hospital pays for treatment, even if there are expensive complications. Any child born in the United States is considered a US citizen, so thousands of indigent illegal immigrants make a point of having “anchor babies” at public expense. The new American qualifies for all forms of welfare, and at age 21 can sponsor his parents for American citizenship. In 2006 in California, an estimated 100,000 illegal immigrant mothers had babies at public expense, and accounted for about one in five births. The costs were estimated at $400 million per year, and in the state as a whole, half of all Medi-Cal (state welfare) births were to illegal immigrant mothers.\textsuperscript{240} In 2003, 70 percent of the babies born in San Joaquin General Hospital in Stockton were anchor babies.\textsuperscript{241}

In Los Angeles and other cities with heavy gang activity, hospitals must deal with “dump and run” patients—criminals wounded in shootouts who are rolled out of speeding cars by fellow gang members.\textsuperscript{242} Illegal-immigrant patients often show up without papers of any kind, and doctors have no idea whom they are treating.\textsuperscript{243}

Mexican hospitals routinely turn away uninsured Mexicans, and if the US border is not far, may tell the ambulance driver to head for the nearest American hospital. “It’s a phenomenon we noticed some time ago, one that has expanded very rapidly,” said a federal law enforcement officer.\textsuperscript{244}

Treating foreigners is expensive. A study of 56 Florida hospitals, which represented one fourth of the state’s acute-care hospitals, found that indigent non-citizens ran up costs of $40.2 million in the first six months of 2002. The average bill was $63,000 and the average stay was 22 days. The most expensive non-paying patient was a Jamaican who had a bill for $3.3 million.\textsuperscript{245}

Alberto Jimenez was an indigent, uninsured illegal alien from Guatemala who was severely injured in a car crash in Florida in 1999. For the next 3½ years, he ran up more than $1 million in bills at Martin Memorial Medical Center in Stuart, Florida, but was not healthy enough to be discharged.
Federal law requires that a hospital in the home country agree to take a patient, so Martin Memorial had to negotiate with the Guatemalan government and even get a federal judge to issue a discharge order. Mr. Jimenez’s relatives fought the discharge; they liked the free care he was getting in Florida.\textsuperscript{246}

Hospitals cannot continue to hemorrhage. For the country as a whole, medical insurance premiums include a surcharge that pays for treating the uninsured. However, if the proportion of uninsured indigent patients exceeds a certain figure, a hospital has no choice but to close. In California alone, the heavy cost of free medicine for foreigners forced no fewer than 60 hospitals to shut down between 1993 and 2003; many others were on the verge of collapse.\textsuperscript{247} From 1994 to 2004, the number of hospital emergency rooms in the country as a whole dropped by more than 12 percent.\textsuperscript{248}

In May 2010, Miami’s health care system was so strapped, it was considering closing two of its five public hospitals. This would mean laying off 4,487 employees and the loss of 581 acute-care beds. Experts explained that treating uninsured patients had stretched the system to the breaking point.\textsuperscript{249}

Houston is a good example of a city whose hospitals are barely making ends meet. In the nation as a whole, about 15 percent of the population has no medical insurance, but Texas, with its large population of Hispanics, has the highest percentage at 24 percent. In Houston, the figure is 30 percent. The safety net cannot accommodate so many people who cannot pay. “Does this mean rationing?” asks Kenneth Mattox, chief of staff at Ben Taub General Hospital. “You bet it does.”

There is such a crush at Houston’s emergency rooms that ambulances often wait for one or two hours before they can even unload patients. The record wait is six hours. Twenty percent of the time, hospitals end up sending patients to other hospitals, and some have died after being diverted. Politicians and businessmen pull strings so friends can cut in line.\textsuperscript{250}

Americans who fall sick in Mexico do not get free treatment. The State Department warns that Mexican doctors routinely refuse to treat foreign patients unless paid in advance, and that they often charge Americans for services not rendered.\textsuperscript{251}

\textbf{LANGUAGE}

Chapter 3 described some of the problems that result when so many Americans cannot speak to each other. In many cases, however, English is simply being replaced as immigrants displace natives. In 1980 there were 67 Spanish-language radio stations; by 2008 there were 900.\textsuperscript{252} Because virtually all the broadcast frequencies are filled, Spanish-language stations are replacing English-language stations. Most stations that go Spanish do not carry news, public affairs, or classical music. The typical format is Hispanic/urban or “Hurban,” a mix of Latin music styles.\textsuperscript{253}

Stations often change formats without warning. Listeners to Oldies Radio 100.3 FM in Orlando, Florida, got the switch at noon on Feb. 3, 2005. “People are kind of mad,” said Linda Conner. “It seems like we are a minority now and this is being shoved in our face everywhere we turn.”\textsuperscript{254} On January 11, 2006, “Supertalk” WKY, the first radio station west of the Mississippi and the oldest in Oklahoma, switched to Spanish. This left Oklahoma City with local news and talk only in the early morning and late afternoon.\textsuperscript{255}

Loyal listeners don’t like this sort of thing. Program director Bob Barnett of WKIS radio in Miami, which was still broadcasting in English in 2007, said that even to do a brief, bilingual station ID
produced “significant listener backlash” from “whites who feel that the Hispanics have ‘pushed’ their culture and language on everyone else.”

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) does not monitor Spanish-language broadcasting as it does English-language stations. Although the agency spent part of 2004 cracking down on “shock jocks” and others it considered obscene, far worse was reportedly going out over the air in Spanish.

Television is turning Hispanic, with the number of Spanish-language stations rising from just 17 in 1985 to 252 in 2002. In 1998, a Spanish station became the number-one channel watched by Miamians—the first time a foreign-language station achieved that rating in a major US city. In Los Angeles, by 2005, no fewer than nine of the top 10 prime-time shows were Spanish-language telenovelas, or soap operas. In 2008 in New York City, the Spanish-language station WXTN pulled ahead of all other competitors and became the most popular newscast among viewers younger than 49. The news is specifically geared to Hispanics.

When ABC introduced a new sitcom called “Freddie” in 2005, it had one of its main characters speak only Spanish. Everyone else on the program was assumed to understand her but there were subtitles for viewers.

The number of daily newspapers published in English declined 17 percent from 1970 to 2003, while the number of Spanish or Spanish/English bilingual dailies rose from eight to 36. Several American cities offer a choice of Spanish-language dailies, an increasingly rare luxury for English-speakers.

In some areas, Asian immigrants learn Spanish rather than English. Martin Paik from Korea writes a column in the Los Angeles Korean Times for Korean-speakers who want to learn Spanish. He said there is no need to learn English. Yoon Seong, also Korean, felt the same way: “I don’t need English here. All that you need in California is Spanish.”

The same has long been true for Miami and surrounding Dade County. In the 1950s, non-Hispanic whites were more than 80 percent of county residents, but by 2006, they were only 18.5 percent. “The Anglo population is leaving,” said Juan Clark, a sociology professor at Miami Dade College. “They resent the fact that (an American) has to learn Spanish.”

In 1999, the dusty border town of El Cenizo did the logical thing and declared Spanish the official language of government. Many of its 7,800 residents could speak little or no English, including its mayor, Rafael Rodriguez, who admitted he came as an illegal alien 20 years earlier.

Samuel Huntington, late of Harvard, thought El Cenizo was a sign of things to come. He thought Spanish was taking root so quickly that in many states anyone aspiring to political office would soon have to be bilingual, and that eventually Congress would permit debate in both Spanish and English. He noted that in cities like Phoenix and Las Vegas, bilingual police officers were paid more than those who spoke only English. His conclusion? “For the first time in U.S. history, increasing numbers of Americans (particularly black Americans) will not be able to receive the jobs or the pay they would otherwise receive because they can speak to their fellow citizens only in English.”

That day has arrived. In 2008, three black teenagers from San Bernardino High School, east of Los Angeles, applied for summer jobs. Wherever they went, the first question was usually, “Do you speak Spanish.” “It’s hard when you can’t even get an interview because you don’t speak Spanish,” said Jazanique Jackson. Elva Gomez, a former manager for the Del Taco national food chain, noted that
blacks are suffering more from the invasion [of Spanish] than whites because they have fewer resources with which to run away from immigration.” In Miami, it has long been accepted that many jobs are closed to anyone who speaks only English.

Crews that fight forest fires in Oregon are now so heavily Hispanic that in 2003, the Oregon Department of Forestry required that crew chiefs be bilingual. In 2006, the department started forcing out veterans. Jaime Pickering, who used to run a squad of 20 firefighters, says the rule means “job losses for Americans—the white people.”

Zita Wilensky, a 16-year veteran, was the only white employee of Miami-Dade County Domestic Violence Unit. Her co-workers made fun of her and called her gringa and Americana. Miss Wilensky says her boss gave her 60 days to learn Spanish, and fired her when she failed to do so.

It is increasingly common, therefore, for Americans to be penalized because they cannot speak Spanish, but employers who insist that workers speak English are guilty of discrimination. In 2001, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission forced a small Catholic college in San Antonio to pay $2.4 million to housekeepers who were required to speak English at work. There are now about 45 million Hispanics in the country. What will the status of Spanish be when there are 130 million Hispanics, as the Census Bureau projects for 2050?

In 2000, President Bill Clinton decided that the prohibition against discrimination because of “national origin” in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 meant that if a foreigner cannot speak to a government agency in his own language he is a victim. Executive Order 13166 required all local governments that receive federal money (all of them, essentially) to translate official documents into any language spoken by at least 3,000 people in the area or 10 percent of the local population. It also required interpreters for non-English speakers.

In 2002, the Office of Management and Budget estimated that hospitals alone would spend $268 million every year implementing Executive Order 13166, and state departments of motor vehicles would spend $8.5 million. OMB estimated that communicating with food stamp recipients who don’t speak English would cost $25.2 million per year.

Both government and private companies make it easy for people to dispense with English. Americans can push a button to choose a language at automatic teller machines and for recorded telephone messages. The US government requires local authorities to print ballot papers in any foreign language spoken by five percent of the local population or 5,000 people—even though one of the requirements for naturalization is the ability to speak English. There are even officially bilingual US Post Offices. In 2006, one opened in Memphis, Tennessee, staffed by nine Hispanic agents.

The costs of dealing with foreign languages are rising everywhere. In Cobb County, Georgia—its largest city is Marietta—the school district alone spent $1.2 million in 2007 because of students and parents who could not speak English.

New York City is such a babble of languages that pharmacists at Walgreens provide medication labels in 14 languages, and keep a national database of bilingual pharmacists so they can telephone them to help a customer. CVS offers telephone interpreting in 150 languages. This was not enough for immigrant advocates, who sued 16 pharmacies for not offering “equal access” interpreters on premises at all times, and documentation in all languages.

**CULTURAL CHANGE**
Demographic change means cultural change. Oakland, California, once had a world-class symphony orchestra that made fine recordings, but it declared bankruptcy in 1986 after 53 seasons. By then, only 39 percent of the population was white, and blacks were setting city priorities. The Detroit Symphony Orchestra has held on by extraordinary means despite demographic change, but its days may be numbered. It was expected to run up a $9 million operating deficit by the end of 2010. The Detroit Institute of Arts and the Michigan Opera Theater—rarely patronized by blacks—were also in serious trouble. Before Hurricane Katrina, the New Orleans symphony went under as city demographics changed, though it managed to revive after promising to put on hip concerts to attract blacks.

Blacks and Hispanics do not listen to country music. As New York City’s population changed, it lost its last country station in 2002. San Francisco followed suit in 2005.

When Atlanta’s black mayor, Shirley Franklin, decided the city needed a theme song, she commissioned “an up-tempo hip-hop and R&B fusion song” called “The ATL.” Some whites complained the language was so aggressively black they could understand only one line: “Get ’em up, get ’em up, get ’em up, get ’em up, get ’em up, let’s go.”

A National Endowment for the Arts survey found that although just over half of whites read fiction, the figure for blacks is 37 percent and for Hispanics only 27 percent. Perhaps this helps explain why Miami does not have a single bookstore. They have all moved to places like Pinecrest and Coral Gables, where whites still live.

Prospects may be dimming for the Boy Scouts and even the national park system. Scouting is overwhelmingly white, and the organization cannot figure out how to interest Hispanics in camping, boating, and knot-tying. Recruitment in Spanish and an emphasis on soccer have not worked. “We either are going to figure out how to make Scouting the most exciting, dynamic organization for Hispanic kids, or we’re going to be out of business,” said Rick Cronk, chairman of the World Scout Committee. The Girl Scouts are equally desperate for Hispanic recruits.

For years, the National Park Service has tried to attract black and Hispanic visitors. Civil War battlefields now emphasize the problem of slavery almost as much as battle strategy, and the Park Service has arranged visits by minority children and sent them home with vouchers so their parents can bring them back for free. Nothing works. David Barna, a Park Service spokesman in Washington, thinks that as the number of blacks and Hispanics increases, the day may come when voters no longer value parks enough to pay for their upkeep.

Different groups have different priorities. Because Hispanics tend to have low incomes, they support increases in government services, even at the cost of more taxes for others. Most Hispanics supported all five spending initiatives on the May, 2005 California ballot; most whites opposed all five.

Prof. Nikolai Roussanov of the Wharton School has found that both blacks and Hispanics spend 50 percent less on medical care than do whites with similar incomes, and that blacks and Hispanics spend 16 percent and 30 percent less, respectively, on education than do whites with similar incomes. Many studies have also found that blacks and Hispanics save less than whites for future goals like retirement. How do they spend their money? Blacks are more likely than whites to buy lottery tickets and to spend disproportionately more money doing so. Prof Roussanov says the biggest difference, however, is that blacks and Hispanics spend 30 percent more than whites with the same income on
what he calls “visible goods” meant to convey status, such as clothing, cars, and jewelry.\textsuperscript{289}

Different groups have different buying patterns. In 2004, Sears decided to turn 97 of its 870 locations into “multicultural stores,” in which clothing, signs, décor, and displays were geared to Hispanics and blacks, who do not have the same tastes and body sizes as whites. Hispanics want “stylish,” form-fitting clothing in bright, loud colors, and the highest heels available. Blacks need more “plus” sizes. In the multicultural stores, Sears displays the loud clothing prominently, near entrances. Clothing white women are likely to buy, such as the more traditional Land’s End line, is in the back.\textsuperscript{290}

For years there was a Roy Rogers-Dale Evans Museum in Victorville, California, filled with Roy Rogers memorabilia and even his horse Trigger—stuffed, of course. That part of California is now heavily Hispanic, and no one is interested in Roy Rogers. The museum moved to Branson, Missouri, which has become a resort catering to bluegrass and country music fans, who are overwhelmingly white. Victorville immigrant Rosalina Sondoval-Marin did not miss the museum. “Roy Rogers? He doesn’t mean anything,” she said. “There’s a revolution going on, and it don’t include no Roy Rogers.”\textsuperscript{291}

American eating habits are changing. An estimated 15,000 pounds of “bushmeat”—wild animals commonly eaten in Third-World countries—are smuggled into the country every month. Monkey, cane rat, and bat are the most common bushmeats, and according to the Centers for Disease Control, all can carry lethal diseases. Anyone who handles or eats the meat can get sick. Only a tiny portion of the trade—like the three charred monkeys found in an African’s baggage at Dulles International Airport in 2008\textsuperscript{292}—is intercepted.\textsuperscript{293}

No one knows what was intended for 2,000 baboon noses found in an abandoned trunk at Amsterdam airport after they began to stink. They were en route from Nigeria to the United States, where someone apparently had a use for them.\textsuperscript{294}

Immigrants from East Africa and Yemen have introduced a new controlled substance: khat, which is a plant that is chewed for its narcotic effect. There have been khat arrests in Michigan, New York, Georgia, Connecticut, Minnesota, Washington, DC, and Washington state. In 2004, federal agents seized 3,000 pounds of khat, worth more than $5 million at the Port of Baltimore alone. Police suspect that khat sales in the United States finance terrorism.\textsuperscript{295}

Hispanics like to live with animals. South Los Angeles used to be the center of California’s black population, but by 2000 it was 74 percent Hispanic and 24 percent black. Along with the Hispanics came chickens, goats, geese, ducks, pigs, and even ponies. Zoning laws ban farm animals as health hazards, and roosters because of the noise, but the city does not have the manpower to enforce regulations. Callers light up city phone lines to complain of the noise. Jose Luiz couldn’t understand why anyone would complain. “It’s natural to have roosters,” he said. “I’m Mexican.”\textsuperscript{296} By 2009, the city had just about given up and had decided to regulate chickens—one rooster per property, for example—rather than ban them.\textsuperscript{297}

Since 2003, Miami has had a code enforcement squad that chases down illegal chickens. In 2007, it was catching 60 to 70 a day.\textsuperscript{298} In Buffalo, New York, there was so much pressure from Hispanics that in 2009 the city was considering legalizing backyard chicken coops.\textsuperscript{299}

Hispanics also keep chickens for cockfighting. In Los Angeles, Detective Susan Brumagin of the Animal Cruelty Division reported that from 2006 to 2009 she investigated more than 200 cockfighting
operations, some with as many as 900 birds. She said cockfights attract prostitution and drug-selling.\footnote{300}

By 2009, Hispanics accounted for more than one fourth of the population of Waterbury, Connecticut, and beginning in 2005, the city was making one major cockfighting arrest a year. Jose Duran, a 34-year-old native of the Dominican Republic, could not understand why cockfighting was illegal. “It’s just birds, man,” he said. “That’s all it is: birds.”\footnote{301}

Because of crackdowns on cockfighting, there has been a shift to finch fighting. Finches are smaller, quieter, cheaper to raise, and easier to hide and transport. Finch-fighting rings—run almost exclusively by Brazilians—have been broken up in Connecticut and Massachusetts.\footnote{302}

In Davidson County, Tennessee, which includes Nashville, an influx of immigrants resulted in complaints about noisy roosters and goats being slaughtered in backyards.\footnote{303} The town of Sanford, North Carolina, banned the slaughter of farm animals after Mexicans began killing goats for barbecues and nailing their heads to trees.\footnote{304}

Immigrants bring strange religions—Voodoo, Santeria, Palo Mayombe—that sometimes dismay natives. In Tampa in 2006, a grieving widow visited her newly-buried husband’s grave to find it decorated with a dead chicken, a set of goat hoofs, and four headless puppies. Authorities suspected they were the remains of a Latino-Caribbean rite, and noted that a few months earlier grave-robbers had dug up the body of a six-year-old boy, probably to use in rituals.\footnote{305}

In Newark, New Jersey, prosecutors charged Cuban immigrant and Palo Mayombe priestess Miriam Mi\-rabel with ordering her followers to break into a cemetery and dig up corpses to use in rituals.\footnote{306}

In 2006, Maritza Tamayo, principal of the Unity Center for Urban Technologies in Manhattan decided to root out negative energy in her school. She hired a Santeria priestess, and the two dressed up in white dresses and sprinkled chicken blood on the building. The New York City Department of Education said Miss Tamayo would be fired—not for the ceremony but for making other teachers help pay for it.\footnote{307}

In 2009, a Santeria priest, Jose Merced, won a federal appeal against the city of Euless, Texas, which prohibited animal slaughter in private homes. He successfully argued that sacrificing goats was an essential part of his religion.\footnote{308} That same year, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals found the remains of more than 500 animals in a house in Philadelphia. Although most of the animals were chickens—a Santeria favorite—investigators found the bones of dozens of sheep, goats, and other farm animals, as well as two primates that appeared to be monkeys.\footnote{309}

In Florida, custodians at courthouses often find what is left of attempts to put spells on judges and juries. In 2004, police partially evacuated part of a Palm Beach County courthouse and had the bomb squad blow up a suspicious package left along with a bag of dead birds and turtles.\footnote{310}

Many Chinese believe in \textit{feng shui}, or rules for construction and design. \textit{Feng shui} dictates such things as the placement of doors and staircases and the positions of buildings so as to increase the flow of \textit{chi}, or positive energy. In 2004, Assemblyman Leland Y. Lee of San Francisco introduced a measure in the state legislature urging the California Building Standards Commission to require builders to conform to \textit{feng shui}.\footnote{311}

Hispanics often live in crowded, unsafe conditions, but as their numbers increase, it becomes difficult to enforce housing codes. Immigration advocates invariably call the codes racist. The city of
Santa Ana, California, has grown rapidly, due mainly to Hispanic immigration, but in 2003 had only half as many building inspectors as it did in 1984, and was enforcing codes half-heartedly.

That year, Gloria Valadez lived with her daughter and six grandchildren in a rundown, rented two-bedroom house. She sublet one bedroom to a family of three and the other to a family of five. Sixteen people were living in her 950-square-foot house, which was one of four on a one-third acre lot. The neighbors were also subletting, for a total of 42 people in four small houses. Fifty-five people had been living there, but the city made 13 people move out of garages. The Santa Ana fire department worried about fire hazards and the health department worried about vermin. Crime goes up in very dense housing, and children who live with strangers are much more likely to be molested or abused.\(^\text{312}\)

Tim Rush, a white man living in Santa Ana, kept busy reporting violations of the laws the city still tries to enforce. It took him a year, but he finally got the city to shut down Pedro Reyes Rios, who was running a used-car business on the streets and in his front yard. Mexican neighbors considered Mr. Rush a racist busybody.\(^\text{313}\) In Los Angeles County, it was estimated in 2009 that hundreds of thousands of people were living illegally in garages.\(^\text{314}\)

In Manassas, Virginia, the city government passed a law in 2006 to stop overcrowding after complaints from neighbors about noise, and streets and yards jammed with cars. Most violators were immigrants, whose spokesmen called the law racist. The charges were effective; the city withdrew the ordinance.\(^\text{315}\)

In New York City in 2004, 66 percent of Mexicans, 61 percent of Bangladeshis, and 38 percent of Dominicans lived in what was officially considered overcrowding. The figure for natives was 7.5 percent.\(^\text{316}\)

Cobb County, Georgia, saw its Hispanic population double from 1996 to 2006, and a corresponding surge in complaints about overcrowding. One inspector found a dozen cots lined up in the basement of a 1,300-square-foot house. “Ninety-five percent of the complaints I get are white folks complaining about Hispanic folks,” said Rob Hosack, who was enforcing the code despite accusations of racism.\(^\text{317}\)

In Cicero, Illinois, community activist David Boyle explained the consequences of Hispanic immigration: “You can walk into almost any bungalow in Cicero and you will find that the front room and dining room are crowded with mattresses. The landlords have figured out that they can charge $150 a month for a little baby mattress for an adult male.”\(^\text{318}\)

The Mexican way of life has arrived in Texas in the form of colonias, or illegal, unregulated slums. They sprout on land with no running water, electricity, or sewers. As the Hispanic population grows, dozens of colonias—literally, “colonies”—have appeared around Corpus Christi, Austin, Houston, Beaumont, and San Antonio. They are dumps. “This is just like Guatemala or Africa,” said Lionel Lopez, who organized the South Texas Colonia Initiative to call attention to what he counted as 88 colonias in Nueces County. “You see kids with all kinds of sores on their little legs, and the dogs—they don’t even bark, and they have mange.”\(^\text{319}\)

In Arizona, the area known as the Old Nogales Highway Colonia is a slum on a tract of desert, with no water lines, sewers, sidewalks, or streetlights. Whenever it rains, the roads wash out and the area is inaccessible by car. There is no garbage service, so burning trash sends up acrid smoke. In 2000, the colonia’s population was about 3,500.\(^\text{320}\)
The Coachella Valley, east of San Diego, California, may have as many as 500 illegal trailer parks. Sewage runs between rundown trailers that have no heat or hot water. People burn their trash. In some areas, trash, tires, and car parts are piled 10 feet high, and homes may be hard to tell from scrap heaps. Wild dogs and barefoot children skulk through the mud. Almost all the inhabitants are Hispanics, though some are Purepecha, an indigenous people from the Mexican state of Michoacan who speak neither Spanish nor English. Other Mexicans scorn them.

The worst Coachella Valley slums are on the Torres Martinez Indian Reservation, where they are not subject to zoning laws and county officials cannot monitor them. One tribe member who was a co-owner of a park played down the squalor. “You can’t expect the poorest to live like the wealthiest,” he said. “They feel comfortable here; it’s like being back in Mexico. They tell me that.”

Colonias are new to the United States, but they are the equivalent of something old: black slums. Despite decades of welfare, Section 8 housing, and urban renewal, many heavily black parts of American cities have gone into a tailspin from which they may never recover. Detroit is only the best-known example, with a declining population (now at about half its 1950 peak of 1.85 million), blocks of boarded-up and burned-out houses, and schools and city services that barely function. The astonishing dereliction of its train station, hotels, and skyscrapers has been memorialized in a photo essay in Time magazine. In 2009, the median house price was $7,100.

Detroit does not have a single chain supermarket. The last one, an A&P, left in 2007. Shoplifting and employee theft were big problems, as was the peculiar nature of Detroit’s economy. Many residents buy most of their groceries at the beginning of the month when welfare checks arrive, and come back only occasionally during the rest of the month. Small stores can more easily lay off staff during the slow weeks.

Flint, Michigan, is another majority-black city on the ropes. Its population is declining as people move out, and many of its crumbling streets peter out into woods or meadows with no trace of the houses that once stood there. There are too few people to pay for services across its 34 increasingly vacant square miles. Dan Kildee, treasurer of Genesee County, which includes Flint, says that as much as 40 percent of the city should be returned to nature.

The Obama administration was intrigued by this idea and asked Mr. Kildee to come up with plans for other failing cities. Together with the Brookings Institution, he identified 50 candidates for downsizing, including Detroit, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore and Memphis. The neighborhoods to be razed were overwhelmingly black. Such places as East Saint Louis; Camden, New Jersey; and North Philadelphia would collapse into almost unthinkable squalor were it not for state and federal aid.

Since at least the 1960s, the United States has had a black underclass, to which most of the norms of civil society do not apply. Immigration has now given rise to a Hispanic underclass that suffers from the same mix of crime, poverty, and illegitimacy. Our country has tried very hard to solve these problems, largely through government assistance programs and public education, but in certain communities destructive behavior resists change.

The United States is now a nation that can produce headlines such as these:

Baby Dies in Bucket of Mom’s Vomit; 99-Year-Old Woman Among Rapist’s Victims; Mom Allegedly Microwaves Baby; Town Stunned As 8-Year-Old Charged in Two Killings; Woman Accused of Using Infant as Car Down Payment; L.A. Police Say Killing of 3-Year-Old in Gang
The people in these stories are about evenly split between blacks and Hispanics. As America’s population changes, headlines like these will become more common.

**AMERICA'S FUTURE**

This book will have been a success if at least a few readers have become open to the possibility that the following statements are true: People of all races generally prefer the company of people like themselves. Racial diversity is a source of conflict, not strength.* Non-whites, especially blacks and Hispanics, nurture a strong sense of racial pride and solidarity. Whites have little sense of racial solidarity, and most whites strongly condemn any signs of it. Immigration from non-European countries is changing the United States in profound ways, many of which whites find disagreeable. To the extent that these statements are true, they have serious implications both for the country as a whole and for whites as a group.

Clearly, our immigration policies should be reexamined. A convincing case can be made on environmental grounds alone that a nation of 300,000,000 needs no more people, especially since it would enjoy natural growth if the borders were closed tomorrow. How can we possibly claim to be fighting environmental degradation or hope for energy independence when we import a million or more people every year? How can we claim to be fighting poverty, crime, school failure, or disease when we import people who are more likely than natives to be poor, criminals, school failures, and to suffer from strange diseases? Immigration is even harder to justify when many newcomers speak no English, maintain foreign loyalties, or practice disconcerting religions. It is profoundly unwise to add yet more disparate elements to a population already divided by diversity.

As noted earlier, demographers and economists are making dire projections based on the lower likelihood of blacks and Hispanics to become productive workers. These people go on to insist that the solution is to improve education for blacks and Hispanics, but the United States has already made enormous efforts to that end. There is no reason to think some kind of breakthrough is imminent.* Clearly, the solution to the problems posed by an increasing Hispanic population is to stop Hispanic immigration. However, as we saw in Chapter 6, our policy-makers are too afraid of accusations of racism to draw such an obvious conclusion.

Americans must open their eyes to the fact that a changing population could change *everything* in America. The United States could come to resemble the developing world rather than Europe—in some places it already does. One recent book on immigration to Europe sounded a similar alarm when the author asked: “Can you have the same Europe with different people?” His answer was a forthright “no.” It should be clear from the changes that have already taken place in the United States that we cannot have the same America with different people, either.

Different populations build different societies. The principles of European and European-derived societies—freedom of speech, the rule of law, respect for women, representative government, low levels of corruption—do not easily take root elsewhere. They were born out of centuries of struggle,
false starts, and setbacks, and cannot be taken for granted. A poorer, more desperate America, one riven with racial rivalries, one increasingly populated by people who come from non-Western traditions could turn its back on those principles.

Many people assert that all people can understand and assimilate Western thinking—and yet cultures are very different. Can you, the reader, imagine emigrating to Cambodia or Saudi Arabia or Tanzania and assimilating perfectly? Probably not; yet everyone in the world is thought to be a potential American. Even if there is only a small chance that non-Western immigrants will establish alien and unsettling practices, why take this risk? Immigration to the United States, like immigration to any nation, is a favor granted by citizens to foreigners. It is not a right.

Immigration advocates often point to the objections Anglo-Americans made to turn-of-the-century immigrants from Italy, Ireland, Hungary, and other “non-Nordic” countries. They point out that these immigrants assimilated, and insist that Mexicans and Haitians will do the same. Those advocates overlook the fundamental importance of race. They forget that the United States already had two ill-assimilated racial groups long before the arrival of European ethnics—blacks and American Indians—and that those groups are still uncomfortably distinct elements in American society. Different European groups assimilated across ethnic lines after a few generations because they were of the same race. There are many societal fault lines in “diverse” societies—language, religion, ethnicity—but the fault line of race is deepest.

Many immigration advocates will continue to argue that if certain newcomers do not succeed it is only because of racism, and that white malevolence causes high rates of crime, disease, school failure, illegitimacy, etc. Even if this were true—and there are very strong reasons to doubt it—that would not justify immigration. If whites really were vicious oppressors, it would be absurd to bring in yet more non-whites who would only swell the ranks of the victims and bring out the worst in whites. The purpose of immigration is not to set a moral test for natives.

Our current immigration policies will make the United States a poorer, grimmer, more dangerous country for everyone. Hispanics expect to gain increasing power by increasing their numbers, but they will find they have gained power in a country that increasingly resembles the failed nations from which they thought they had escaped. It is in everyone’s interests to cut immigration close to zero.

Immigration is not a uniquely American problem. Aside from the former Communist countries, nearly every white country has accepted large numbers of immigrants, so there is a huge flow from non-white to white countries. There are two reasons for this. First, whites have built the most successful countries in the history of the world and others want to take part in that success. Second, only white countries permit large-scale immigration; others keep their territories exclusively for their own people.

Different national views on immigration therefore parallel expressions of racial consciousness in the United States. Whites—the only people who dare not express racial pride—let in large numbers of immigrants who are changing their societies. Non-whites, who have a strong sense of racial consciousness, maintain their boundaries.

No non-white nation praises diversity, nor do immigrants come to the West with the intention of sharing this gift with us. Most never heard of diversity before they came here. They come because their countries are unsuccessful. Once they are here, most probably want to live their lives essentially as they did before, but with a First-World rather than Third-World income. They want to keep their languages, religions, folkways, and loyalties rather than shed their foreign skins and become
Prosperous non-white nations such as Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea would be very desirable destinations for Third-World immigrants, and if those countries opened their borders, they would quickly be filled with foreigners. They keep their borders closed because they know they cannot have the same Japan or Taiwan with different people. Israel, likewise, is determined to remain a Jewish state because Israelis know they cannot have the same Israel with different people. In 2010, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu approved tough measures to deport illegal immigrants, calling them a “threat to the character of the country.”

Linguistically, culturally, and racially, Japan is homogeneous. This means Japanese never even think about a host of problems that torment Americans. Since Japan has only one race, no one worries about racism. There was no civil rights movement, no integration struggle, and no court-ordered busing. There is no bilingual education, and no affirmative action. There is no tyranny of “political correctness,” and no one is clamoring for a “multi-cultural curriculum.” When a company needs to hire someone, it doesn’t give a thought to “ethnic balance;” it just hires the best person. No Japanese are sent to reeducation seminars because of “insensitivity.”

Japan has no Civil Rights Commission or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. It has no Equal Housing Act or Voting Rights Act. No one worries about drawing up voting districts to make sure minorities are elected. There are no noisy ethnic groups trying to influence foreign policy. Japanese do not know what a “hate crime” would be. And they know that an American-style immigration policy would change everything. They want Japan to remain Japanese.

This is a universal view among non-whites. Those countries that send the largest numbers of emigrants to the United States—Mexico, India, China—permit essentially no immigration at all. For them, their nations are exclusive homelands for their own people.

Most people refuse to share their homelands. Robert Pape, a leading expert on suicide bombing, explains that its motive is almost always nationalism, not religious fanaticism. Whether in Sri Lanka, Lebanon, Chechnya, Kashmir, the West Bank, Iraq, or Afghanistan, its main objective is to drive out occupying aliens.

It is only Western nations—and only within the last few decades—that have ever voluntarily accepted large-scale immigration that could reduce the inhabitants to a racial minority. What the United States and other European-derived nations are doing is without historical precedent. To put this unprecedented behavior in perspective, let us imagine a mirror image of what is happening today. What if millions of white Americans were pouring across the border into Mexico, taking over parts of cities, speaking English rather than Spanish, celebrating the Fourth of July rather than Cinco de Mayo, sleeping 20 to a house, demanding bilingual instruction and welfare for immigrants, opposing border control, and demanding ballots in English? What if, besides this, they had high rates of crime, poverty, and illegitimacy? Can we imagine the Mexicans rejoicing in their newfound diversity?

And yet, that is what Americans are asked to do. For whites to celebrate diversity is to celebrate their own declining numbers and influence, and the transformation of their society. For every other group, to celebrate diversity is to celebrate increasing numbers and influence. Which is a real celebration and which is self-deception?

Whites—but only whites—must never take pride in their own people. Only whites must pretend they do not prefer to associate with people like themselves. Only whites must pretend to be happy to
give up their neighborhoods, their institutions, and their country to people unlike themselves. Only whites must always act as individuals and never as members of a group that promotes shared interests.

Racial identity comes naturally to all non-white groups. It comes naturally because it is good, normal, and healthy to feel kinship for people like oneself. Despite the fashionable view that race is a socially created illusion, race is a biological reality. All people of the same race are more closely related genetically than they are to anyone of a different race, and this helps explain racial solidarity.

Families are close for the same reason. Parents love their children, not because they are the smartest, best-looking, most talented children on earth. They love them because they are genetically close to them. They love them because they are a family.

Most people have similar feelings about race. Their race is the largest extended family to which they feel an instinctive kinship. Like members of a family, members of a race do not need objective reasons to prefer their own group; they prefer it because it is theirs (though they may well imagine themselves as having many fine, partly imaginary qualities).

These mystic preferences need not imply hostility towards others. Parents may have great affection for the children of others, but their own children come first. Likewise, affection often crosses racial lines, but the deeper loyalties of most people are to their own group—their extended family.

Non-whites understand this. Blacks call each other “brother” and “sister.” Hispanics call their people *la raza*. Whites used to understand this. In fact, at some level they still do—their actions betray them. As we saw in Chapter 2, whites prefer white institutions, neighborhoods, culture, and texture of life. Whites leave long-established neighborhoods and institutions when their numbers drop below a certain level of comfort. People who grew up in what they took to be America do not want to live in outposts of Mexico or Haiti. They move to parts of the country that are still largely white. This is nearly universal, and even whites who criticize “white flight” do not generally fill their own lives with “diversity.”

If white Americans are asked to name a neighborhood in which they would like to live, almost all will name one with a large white majority; most cannot name a single desirable majority non-white neighborhood. Continued non-white immigration therefore makes whites refugees in their own country, no longer comfortable or welcome where they were once the majority. Yet they refuse to recognize that continued demographic change will turn ever-larger parts of the country into those places in which they refuse to live.

One writer about urban affairs noted that the cities the media, academics, and city planners invariably call the most desirable places to live—such as Portland, Seattle, Austin, Minneapolis, and Denver—have something in common: they are overwhelmingly white. He called Portland, which is often heralded as one of America’s most successful, progressive communities, “America’s ultimate White City.” “The contrast with other, supposedly less advanced cities is stark,” he added.

The writer could not bring himself to take the next step: These places are desirable because they are white, and they will cease to be desirable if they cease to be white. No “ultimate White City” can stay that way, moreover, because it will appeal to everyone, not just whites. No “whitopia” or “white Mecca” can survive in a country that encourages immigration from non-European sources and officially celebrates diversity.

Under the current rules of American society, whites have no moral grounds to preserve racial
majorities in any context, whether in a club, neighborhood, school, region, the nation as a whole, or even in their own families. Somewhere, deep in their bones, whites yearn for the comfort, the ease, the joy of living among their own people in societies that reflect the values of their ancestors. They answer this yearning whenever they move from Southern California to the North, from the city to the suburbs, from diversity to homogeneity. But according to today’s racial dogma, this yearning is evil.

There will always be “white Meccas,” enclaves for wealthy whites who can afford them, but with no moral, legal, or practical way to preserve majorities, most whites will eventually come to the end of the road. They will find that the America for which they yearn has disappeared.

At what point would it be legitimate for whites to act in their own group interests? When they become a minority? When they are no more than 30 percent of the population? Ten percent? Or must they never be allowed to take any action to ensure that the land in which they live reflects their values, their culture, their manners, their traditions, and honors the achievements of their ancestors? If whites do not cherish and defend these things, no one else will do it for them. If whites do not rekindle some sense of their collective interests they will be pushed aside by people who have a very clear sense of their interests. Eventually, whites will come to understand that to dismantle and even demonize white racial consciousness while other races cultivate racial consciousness is a fatal form of unilateral disarmament.

For their very survival as a distinct people with a distinct culture, whites must recognize something all others take for granted: that race is a fundamental part of individual and group identity. Any society based on the assumption that race can be wished or legislated away ensures for itself an endless agony of pretense, conflict, and failure. For 60 years, we have wished and legislated in vain. In so doing, by opening the United States to peoples from every corner of the world, we have created agonizing problems for future generations. As surely as the Communists were mistaken in their hopes of remaking human nature, so have been the proponents of diversity and multi-culturalism.

What goals might whites pursue if they had a racial identity like that of other groups? Clearly, they would end immigration; it is not in the interests of whites to be displaced by others. They would also recognize that when whites prefer to live, work, and go to school with people of their own race, that is no different from anyone else wanting to do these things. Whites—and others—should have legal means to preserve local majorities if that is their preference. That preference should not be imposed on anyone who wishes to live in a more Bohemian manner, but it is wrong to condemn whites—and only whites—for instincts science suggests are part of human nature.

Another goal of whites would be to end the current propaganda about the advantages of diversity, for it only justifies their dispossession. Whites should also be free—again, like all other groups—to express pride in the accomplishments of their people.

It is impossible to predict every detail of an America in which whites recognized the reality of race and defended their legitimate interests, but we have a good idea of what America will be like if this does not happen. The future has already arrived in those parts of the country where whites refuse to live. Nor is it possible to predict every detail of how non-whites would exercise power once demographic change put it irrevocably in their hands. It is possible to guess, however.

A multi-racial society would be difficult enough to manage even if all groups shared wealth equally. One with such stark differences as ours is poisoned by envy and resentment, and blacks and Hispanics have profound reasons for resentment entirely aside from differences in wealth and power. Whites built the modern world. They named the elements and the continents, and discovered the laws
of science. During the past several centuries, they invented and discovered and conquered at a furious pace. They built so much in their own image that scarcely anyone on earth is free from the technology and culture of the white man. It is easy for groups that contributed little to building the modern world to resent whites.

Many whites have absorbed that resentment and turned it upon themselves. While they still had the power and numbers to set the cultural and intellectual tone of the country, they established assumptions of white guilt and blamed themselves for the failures of non-whites. They confessed their racism, and apologized for the sins of their ancestors. Perhaps they thought non-whites would admire them for these confessions, would forgive them and love them.

As we saw in Chapters 5, 6, and 7, however, whatever non-whites feel for whites, it is not love and forgiveness. Other groups have interpreted confessions and apologies as proof that whites are uniquely guilty and deserving more of animus than forgiveness.

While whites were still the majority, they established preferences for blacks and Hispanics that took such deep root that Congress and state legislatures have been powerless to abolish them. These programs would provoke outrage if they were practiced in favor of whites, but they have been partially curbed only by state ballot initiatives and equivocal Supreme Court decisions.

Demography would change this. In 2006, the state of Michigan voted to abolish racial preferences in college admissions and state contracting, but the measure passed only because whites were still a majority. Eighty-five percent of blacks and 69 percent of Hispanics voted to maintain racial preferences for themselves. When they have a voting majority nothing will prevent non-whites from reestablishing and extending preferences.

Are there portents in the actions of Eric Holder, the first black attorney general, appointed by the first black president? J. Christian Adams, a white Justice Department lawyer resigned in protest when the department dropped a case of voter intimidation the previous administration had already won by default against the New Black Panther Party. In this 2008 case, fatigue-clad blacks waved billy clubs at white voters and yelled such things as “You are about to be ruled by the black man, cracker!” Mr. Adams called it “the simplest and most obvious violation of federal law I saw in my Justice Department career.” He believed the decision to dismiss the case reflected hostility to the rights of whites. He said some of his colleagues called selective prosecution “payback time,” adding that “citizens would be shocked to learn about the open and pervasive hostility within the Justice Department to bringing civil rights cases against nonwhite defendants on behalf of white victims.”

Christopher Coates, who was the head of the voting section of the Civil Rights Division, agreed with this assessment. In sworn testimony before Congress, he called the dismissal of the Black Panthers case a “travesty of justice” and described a “hostile atmosphere” against “race-neutral enforcement” of the Voting Rights Act. He said the department had a “deep-seated opposition to the equal enforcement of the Voting Rights Act against racial minorities and for the protection of white voters who have been discriminated against.”

How will the department behave when whites become a minority?

Whites have gone to extraordinary lengths to advance the interests of minorities, to respect their cultures, to protect their sensibilities—and to what effect? How many minorities have ever shown gratitude for racial preferences, for public celebrations of their histories and cultures, for immigration and refugee policies that lifted them from misery? Instead, they resent America, and complain that whites never do enough. There is no sign that when the weight of numbers puts power in their hands
They will treat whites with anything but contempt. They have certainly noticed the implications of demographic change. Retired CNN anchorman Bernard Shaw received a lifetime achievement award from the National Association of Black Journalists in 2007. In his acceptance speech he said: “Beyond this ballroom tonight, white males wake up. Globally, you are an island speck in an ocean of color. The reins of power will weaken and so will your grip—if you do not faithfully support our nation’s greatest strength: diversity.” Is it a gross misinterpretation to rephrase his remarks as: “Go quietly before you are pushed”?

Black lawyer Mark Lloyd, who was to serve later as chief diversity officer at the Federal Communications Commission under President Obama, noted at a conference in 2005 that in government there are a limited number of positions of power. “[U]nless we are conscious of the need to have more people of color, gays, other people in those positions we will not change the problem,” he added. “We’re in a position where you have to say who is going to step down so someone else can have power.”

Roberto Suro, who has worked for Newsweek and the Washington Post, and was a founding director of the Pew Hispanic Center, offers us a choice. He lists the indices of social failure among Hispanics and warns that whites had better improve conditions for them. “The outcome,” he writes, “will determine whether the nation’s cities work or whether they burn.”

Alvaro Huerta, a PhD candidate at Berkeley, has a warning for congressmen who voted down the 2010 DREAM Act, which was a package of benefits for children of illegal immigrants. He says their vote will “haunt them,” adding that “the browning of America is a reality that an aging white population needs to come to terms with.” In other words, “we are the future majority, so you had better do as we say.”

Kent Wong teaches Asian-American studies at UCLA and is the director of the Center for Labor Research and Education. In 2010, he gave a speech calling for in-state tuition at public universities for illegal immigrants. “You will go on to become lawyers, teachers, doctors and members of the U.S. Congress to replace those old white men,” he shouted, as his largely Hispanic audience clapped and cheered.

These people are not speaking the language of universal brotherhood. Although the groups they represent are still minorities, they are speaking the language of dispossession.

E. Raymond Hall, professor of biology at the University of Kansas, wrote the authoritative work on American wildlife, Mammals of North America. He stated as a biological law that, “two subspecies of the same species do not occur in the same geographic area.” Prof. Hall explains that human races are biological subspecies, and that the law applied to them, too: “To imagine one subspecies of man living together on equal terms for long with another subspecies is but wishful thinking and leads only to disaster and oblivion for one or the other.”

In recent decades we have seen what Prof. Hall was writing about in the Balkans, Sudan, Rwanda, Burundi, and the Eastern Congo. We call it “ethnic cleansing.” In Zimbabwe there is a systematic effort to rid the country of whites, and some observers do not rule out similar efforts in South Africa and Namibia. Is it utterly unrealistic to imagine ethnic cleansing in the United States? Prof. Hall’s forebodings do not appear outlandish in some of our schools, prisons, and neighborhoods.

The demographic forces we have set in motion have created conditions that are inherently unstable and potentially violent. All other groups are growing in numbers and have a vivid racial identity. Only whites have no racial identity, are constantly on the defensive, and constantly in retreat. They
have a choice: regain a sense of identity and the resolve to maintain their numbers, their traditions, and their way of life—or face oblivion.
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