

Spring 5-2013

The Council of Conservative Citizens: Extolling Nativism and Perpetuating Stereotypes

Jordan M. Tinnon
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tinnon, Jordan M., "The Council of Conservative Citizens: Extolling Nativism and Perpetuating Stereotypes" (2013). *Honors Theses*. 141.
https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses/141

This Honors College Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

The Council of Conservative Citizens: Extolling Nativism and Perpetuating Stereotypes

by

Jordan Tinnon

A Thesis
Submitted to the Honors College of
The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology

May 2013

Approved by

James Flanagan

Professor of Anthropology

Amy Miller, Chair

Department of Anthropology and Sociology

David R. Davies, Dean

Honors College

Key Terms: Hispanics, Hispanic Immigration, Council of Conservative Citizens, nativism, stereotype, racism, Irish, Irish Immigration

Abstract

The Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC), an overtly pro-white, anti-immigrant political organization, uses biased news articles laden with racial stereotypes to promote and propagate their dogma of white superiority and nativism. In these articles particular attention is paid to the supposed threats of Hispanic immigration, attempting to make the case that Hispanics put white Americans' health and safety, along with the white American way of life, at risk. Six recent articles from the CofCC website are shown to capitalize on the fear of the public to further advance and support a doctrine of nativism. Nativism has serious ramifications both to the perpetrators and the victims.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methodology	1
Research Perspectives.....	1
Research Design.....	2
Sample.....	3
Unit of Analysis.....	3
Research Variables.....	3
Research Instrument.....	4
Setting or Environment.....	4
Data Collection.....	4
Analysis.....	5
Validity.....	5
Summary.....	5
Historical Background	6
19 th Cent. Irish Immigration.....	6
Problems/Stereotypes the Irish Faced.....	12
Nativism in the U.S.....	14
Literature Review	17
Irish and Hispanic Immigrants.....	17
Problems/Stereotypes Hispanics Face.....	18
Overview of Hispanic Immigration.....	21
In Their Own Words.....	27
Outside Opinions.....	29
Findings and Analysis	32
Conclusion	42
References	46
Appendix A	47
Appendix B	48
Appendix C	49
Appendix D	50
Appendix E	51
Appendix F	52

Introduction

The Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC) is a right-wing political organization that is designed to promote the rights of white American citizens. This being the case, I will be exploring how the CofCC embraces a doctrine of white nativism against Hispanic immigrants, considering the growing number of Hispanics in the U.S. and the heated political debate that this has generated. The concept of political organizations, groups, or individuals adopting a policy of nativism against a particular immigrant group is not a new concept in American history. The Irish immigrants of the 19th century perfectly illustrate this phenomena. By examining the challenges and stereotypes the Irish faced, paying special mind to similarities and differences to the Hispanic experience, I can demonstrate a parallel between the nativism that antagonized a predominantly all-white group historically and is now in full force against a non-white immigrant group. I will explore what factors influence the creation of a rampant sense of nativism: economic, cultural, political, or geographic. To examine the CofCC's extent and extremism of white nativism I will be evaluating news articles from their website, cofcc.org. Phrasing, impact, and implication of these documents will be my primary emphasis.

Methodology

I. Research Perspectives

I will be examining the doctrine of white nativism that the right-wing extremist group, the Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC), propagates through news articles displayed on their website. I will specifically look at the CofCC's dogma of white nativism in regards to Hispanic immigrants in light of the recent influx of Latinos in the

United States. Antagonism of immigrants is a historic situation as much as a modern one, so to put my investigations into a historical perspective I will explore the stereotypes and rampant nativism to which 19th century Irish immigrants fell victim. I will compare and contrast the immigrant experiences of 1800s Irish and 2000s Hispanics. This will prove to be extremely interesting, since the Irish were a predominately white group, yet despite this, they still faced discrimination. However, Hispanics are a non-white group, yet they are undergoing similar trials. I will critically assess the racist, derogatory doctrine that the CofCC propagates, seeking to understand what, if any, validation is given for their assertions.

II. Research Design

I will be examining the CofCC's website articles pertaining to Hispanic immigration. I will be using examples from within the last six months and will examine six different articles. I will be looking to see how the CofCC carries out a policy of white nativism in their online publications. To illustrate the history of nativism in the U.S., I will discuss the challenges of 19th century Irish immigrants whose experiences upon arriving in the states have many parallels to those of current Hispanics. Similarities and/or differences between the Irish immigrant and Hispanic immigrant experience will be outlined. I will take into account what factors have motivated both current and historic nativism---economic, cultural, and/or political? By synthesizing this material I will be able to evaluate the white nativist stance that the CofCC takes against Hispanic immigrants.

III. Sample

The six articles dating within the last six months from the CofCC's website will be my primary samples. My criterion for selecting these articles will be that there is a central focus on Hispanic immigrants/immigration. Articles will be selected at random, since a large number posted on the website do deal with Hispanics and/or Hispanic immigration. I will attempt to provide a range of topics in the articles that I select. These articles will be readily available to me, as they are posted on the CofCC website. The CofCC's articles will be the extent of my sample. Articles used for this study can be found in the Appendixes.

IV. Unit of Analysis

I will be exploring full articles as posted on the CofCC website. In some cases one single sentence might be evaluated for its wording and impact. In other incidences, I might put emphasis on the choice of one particular word in these documents.

V. Research Variables

I predict that cultural, political, and economic pressures will influence the acceptance or criticism passed upon Hispanic immigrants. I think this could be especially apparent upon evaluating the experiences of Irish immigrants. Many aspects of political, cultural, and economic life are vastly different today as compared to the 19th century. Hispanic immigration, like Irish immigration before, has a greater presence and influence in certain areas of the country. This could affect the way people from certain regions in the U.S. view immigration.

VI. Research Instrument

To conduct my research I will be using selected articles, which I will evaluate in terms of whether or not they support a nativist stance, what motivates their leanings, how they justify their conclusions, and how they attempt to sway others. These articles will be selected based on the criteria that they have specific emphasis on Latino immigration and are from within the last six months. In totality these selections will be from the CofCC website. My evaluations of these articles will focus mainly on their use of language. I will pay particular attention to their justifications, if any are offered.

VII. Setting or Environment

The data that I will be evaluating will be easily accessible using the CofCC website. Filtering through a proliferation of articles will be a simple task, since only those dealing with Hispanics and Hispanic immigration will be relative to my study. I will need to read through a wide array of articles to ensure that I choose those that most vividly capture the sentiments of the CofCC. Since I will be immersing myself in the doctrine of a political group that I am not presently intimately familiar with, I will need to take particular care in choosing articles.

VIII. Data Collection

I will begin by assembling articles posted by the CofCC that vividly represent their position on Hispanic immigration. Next I will perform a critical, in-depth analysis of each of my selections from their website. I will evaluate the factors motivating the opinions of the CofCC, illustrating how they propagate a white nativist stance. My interpretations will be supplemented with direct quotes from the CofCC's literature and website.

IX. Analysis

I will be taking a systemic approach, looking at the policy of white nativism that the CofCC supports against Hispanic immigrants and the mechanisms that the CofCC has used to establish their position. I would like to see how the CofCC maintains this stance and what validation, if any that they offer.

X. Validity

My personal bias will likely be the largest source of potential bias. I am researching a topic that I have very strong opinions about. I anticipate that I will encounter data that I find unsavory, creating a possibility for me to be unnecessarily harsh. Hispanic immigration, legal or not, is a hot topic that generates strong opinions. I can expect that the articles that I filter through will have firm positions---positions that I may personally find to be neither valid nor moral. Not only will I have to check my own bias, but I will have to deal with overarching ethnic biases that are pervasive throughout our society both historically and presently.

XI. Summary

I will be employing a critical perspective in my case study of white nativism found in literature and posts generated by the CofCC. I will be examining current and historical examples of nativism, documenting differences and similarities between the Irish and Hispanic immigrant experiences, and evaluating methods that the CofCC employs to further their views.

Historical Background

I. Overview of 19th Century Irish Immigration:

Although Irish immigration and immigration to America in general reached its zenith in the 19th century, Irish had been immigrating to North America since the colonial period. Irish were “generally unwelcome in the North American colonies;” a sentiment that would prevail throughout the centuries. Yet, the only Roman Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence, Charles Carroll, was of Irish descent. The Revolutionary Era was relatively kind to Irish immigrants, since ideology took precedence over ethnicity during this time. But, prejudice against the Irish did not disappear, resurfacing with a vengeance when in the 19th century there was a huge increase in arrivals of Irish, particularly those who were impoverished and sickly (Daniels 1991: 85-87).

The 19th century, or the “Century of Immigration,” was a time of extreme growth and change in the United States: “Between 1820-1860 the US grew from 30 million to 105 million, changed from a predominately agricultural nation to a basically industrial one, from a rural to an urban nation, from a relatively isolated nation . . . to a world power. . .” (Daniels 1991: 125). From the end of the War of 1812 to the National Origins Act of 1924, countless changes and advancements in American society took place, but “the incidence of foreign born, citizen and alien, in our population remained a constant one in seven” (Daniels 1991: 125). Immigration was facilitated by technological advancements, like the steam engine, that made travel more rapid, as well as other innovations like the pre-paid ticket and inexpensive, yet dependable, ways to transfer

funds across the Atlantic (Daniels 1991: 126). During this period, many immigrant groups made the journey to America, and among these were the Irish.

Between 1820 and 1930, 4.5 million Irish immigrated, and only one in twelve returning home. The impact of this massive immigration cannot be overestimated (Daniels 1991: 127). Irish immigration can be examined in three phases: pre-famine (up to 1844), during the famine (1845-1855), and post-famine (1855- the beginning of the Great Depression) (Daniels 1991: 128). Immigration started as primarily male, then largely family, and finally predominantly female. All settled in mainly urban areas (Daniels 1991: 121). Immigrants “were not distributed evenly; they went where the jobs or other economic opportunities were” (Daniels 1991: 126).

In the years before the famine after the Napoleonic Wars, Ireland experienced “relative prosperity” and “rapid and dangerous population growth,” making Ireland the “most densely populated ‘country’ in Europe.” Ireland lacked an industrial sector, and so immigration was the only “source of relief.” Most Irish immigrants were Catholic males, and many came in association with the lumber trade between Canada and the British Isles. The British Passenger Act was an attempt to direct immigration traffic from the British Isles to Canada, not America (Daniels 1991: 128). Fare to Canada was markedly less expensive, and immigrants soon discovered that they could cheaply sail to Canada then walk or purchase passage to the Northeastern United States. Thanks to the labor necessitated by the timber trade, New England, previously the “most homogeneous of American regions,” became strongly Irish by the 1840s (Daniels 1991: 129). Boston, particularly, was greatly affected: 74% of the city’s foreign born population was Irish by 1850 (Daniels 1991: 130).

The majority of Irish immigrants who came during the years between the War of 1812 and the famine made the journey independent of their families. Men dominated Irish immigration, and it was their muscle that “created much of the American infrastructure: canals, railways, and urban amenities.” Many of these working men sent remittances home, and the pre-paid ticket paved the way for relatives to join those already established, making the Irish probably the first to practice “chain or serial migration on a large scale” (Daniels 1991: 130). Most Irish immigrants settled and were employed in urban areas. Although America was still predominately agrarian--- only 9% urban in 1830 and 15% urban in 1850--- Irish settled predominantly in urban areas. These Irish Catholics were ill-prepared for success in urban centers because few had viable trade skills or worthwhile education (Daniels 1991: 132). Struggle greeted these new immigrants when they disembarked.

The great potato famine of the late 1840s and early 1850s was a major factor in influencing immigration. In the census of 1841, Ireland had a population of 8.2 million, but by 1891 it had dropped to 4.7 million (Daniels 1991: 126). Leading up to the famine, the growing population had “inevitably” reduced the size of Irish farmers’ land holdings. As the size of farms shrank and the price of rent rose, small farmers began to grow the potato instead of grain products. The potato was an “immigrant” from the New World and part of the Columbian Exchange. It required minimal labor and equipment, yet it had the capacity to produce a high yield in a small space. The potato, however, was easily susceptible to disease, particularly *Phytophthora infestans* (Daniels 1991: 133). By the time the potato blight struck, the crop had become an absolute staple in the Irish diet.

An outbreak struck in 1845, but no great alarm was given since Ireland had already experienced 20 blights in the last 125 years. But in 1846 another blight almost destroyed the entire crop. Farmers had to resort to eating what they would normally have held back for seed, so that in 1847 when the blight was lessening, “only about a sixth of the normal potato crop was even planted.” Disease, “the inevitable partner of famine,” began to creep in, “chiefly those borne by ticks and lice, such as typhus and relapsing fever” (Daniels 1991: 133). The reaction of the British government was pathetic due to the fact that neither the Tory, Robert Peel, nor the Liberal, John Russell, took adequate measure; neither fed the hungry. The Great Famine that followed the blight was “largely the result of Ireland’s colonial status and grossly inequitable social system.” The common prevailing view was that the Irish needed to be “more enterprising” so that they could buy imported food. Charles Trevelyan, the treasury official over Irish relief, believed that “too much relief would damage the character of the Irish people, demoralize them, and make them dependent.” His view was that it “was not famine but deficient moral fiber: the selfish, perverse and turbulent character of the people” that was wreaking havoc in Ireland (Daniel 1991: 134).

The census of 1851 provided a gruesome account of the effects of both natural disaster and “human mismanagement:” one-sixth of the population died as a result of disease or hunger while another 1-1.5 million people emigrated. Emigration was “viewed as an escape,” but in reality it had its own perils. The timber ships that many traveled on were small and not designed to transport humans as cargo. These ships were hard-pressed to endure the rigors of travel across the storm-prone Atlantic. In 1834, 17 immigrant ships sank, taking 731 lives. In 1848 the *Ocean Monarch* caught fire, killing

176, and another fire on the *Austria* in 1858 took the lives of 500 immigrants (Daniels 1991: 134). There were inherent dangers in the passage itself, but disease was “the great killer of immigrants:” typhus, cholera, dysentery, and “ship fever.” The immigrants, poor and weakened by the famine, were extremely susceptible, and the “crowded and unsanitary ships were ideal for the propagation of disease” (Daniels 1991: 135).

During the famine years 2 million people left Ireland, and the most eventually settled in America. “More people left Ireland in the eleven years between 1845-1855 than in its previous recorded history” (Daniels 1991: 135). The experience of the Irish was “highly urban” and concentrated in New England, and the Irish were “at the bottom of the economic structure.” Where there were high concentrations of both blacks and Irish, competition typically developed between the two groups (Daniels 1991: 136). In the South the common philosophy was that the Irish “should be employed in dangerous, high mortality jobs rather than risking the loss of valuable slaves” (Daniels 1991: 137). Irish ranked low on the totem pole, and they worked in risky jobs that most Americans rejected. This wave of immigration had a transformative effect on the Roman Catholic Church. In 1729 there were roughly 25,000 Catholics, but by 1860 that number had increased to 3.5 million, making Catholicism the single largest denomination in the U.S. The leadership of the Catholic Church was greatly French or French-trained and shared the anti-Irish sentiments of many natives and Protestants. “The Roman Catholic Church had become an immigrant’s church” (Daniels 1991: 138-139).

In the years following 1860 over 2.6 million Irish came to the US, making up the majority of all Irish immigration and establishing a “new pattern of Irish immigration.” Waves of other immigrant groups masked these larger numbers of Irish, and the fact that

they settled in urban centers that already had an established Irish presence contributed to their relative “invisibility” (Daniels 1991: 140). Immigration had been largely male, then family oriented during the famine years, but later “more females came from Ireland than males,” especially after 1880. In the years following the famine, the position of women in Irish society diminished. The cottage industry declined, minimizing the economic contributions of women and their independence, while arranged marriages and the dowry system made marriage more difficult (Daniels 1991:141). This new, majority female immigration continued to be relegated to urban areas in the Northeast and was comprised predominantly of younger immigrants. Persons aged 15-24 made up 45% of immigrants during the period between 1850 and 1870 (Daniels 1991: 142).

“The occupational structure of the Irish American population was also changing, slowly but subtly.” As cities began to develop infrastructure, jobs were created, and the Irish were able “to get in on the ground floor” in professions such as policemen and firemen. Second generation immigrants increasingly worked skilled trade jobs, while women continued to work primarily in domestic labor trades. Occupational mobility was now a reality for most Irish, but this mobility varied from city to city (Daniels 1991: 142). “Irish Americans soon developed networks of kith and kin that helped to smooth the way for later immigrants” (Daniels 1991:b143). The Irish essentially invented urban ethnic politics, adapting to and changing the structure of American politics, and they strongly identified with the Democratic Party. The Irish played a huge role in American labor movements (Daniels 1991: 144). Political machines and Irish urban politics go hand in hand. The Irish political boss was a forerunner of the welfare state in the 19th century. “That the Irish played ethnic politics so successfully and for so long, often dominating

local politics long after the numerical preponderance on which that dominance had originally based had disappeared, has been attributed to the Irish genius for politics” This success can be attributed to “numbers, ethnic concentration . . . and organization” (Daniels 1991: 145).

II. Problems/Stereotypes the Irish Faced:

A great obstacle that Irish immigrants faced was the spirit of anti-Catholicism that thrived within U.S. natives throughout the 19th century. After the victory of Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812, America was characterized by an Era of Good Feeling. Migration to the West and immigration from Europe were promoted, and naturalization was a fairly simple process. Some states even allowed immigrants to vote and run for office before they were even citizens. Naturalization, however, was fraud-ridden, especially in New York where William Marcy Tweed’s Tammany Hall ran naturalization “ceremonies” in the weeks leading up to election days (Daniels 1991: 266).

However, this Era of Good Feeling did not last, and anti-Catholicism, which had been present since America’s founding, grew. Catholicism was associated with the Pope and the monarchy, and therefore it was viewed as a hazard to democracy. The ever-increasing number of Irish and German Catholics made Catholicism an internal threat. Catholicism became to be seen “as subversive of not only the republican party, but of the republic itself.” As crowds of Catholic immigrants poured in, what had once been only rhetoric turned into practice---a practice that at times took a violent direction. Boston, in particular, was the site of much violence, including the burning of the Ursuline Convent in 1834. Destruction of Catholic institutions was so rampant that it was almost impossible for them to secure insurance (Daniels 1991: 267). “Confessional” books

written by “former” nuns gained popularity in literature, especially Maria Monk’s *Awful Disclosures of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal*. Maria describes salacious priests who impregnate sisters whose infants are eventually strangled by the Mother Superior. After time, it was disclosed that Maria had never been a nun, but her best-seller had already made its impact, diffusing a morally motivated anti-Catholicism (Daniels 1991: 268).

This anti-Catholic, anti-Irish sentiment expressed itself in many forms. Thomas Nast, the famous political cartoonist, popularized “one of the great ethnic slurs of American journalism: the depiction of the Irishman as a stupid brute with simian characteristics” (Daniels 1991: 144). Nast’s ape-like representation of the Irish would endure for centuries and proliferate in newspapers and magazines. Anti-Irish sentiments had been present in want ads since the 1830s. One printed in the *New York Evening Post* in September of 1830 ran as such: “Wanted. A Cook or Chambermaid . . . must be American, Scotch, Swiss or African---no Irish” (Daniels 1991: 131). Americans held the view (which to some extent was correct) that the standards of cleanliness and hygiene in Ireland fell short of American expectations, and, this being the case, that Irish women would not be able to keep a house in order. (Daniels 1991: 131). As can be seen by Nast’s illustrations and the prevailing thought processes of the day, the Irish were considered by many to be of a lower order. Though there were clearly many who would have desired to limit immigration, legal action against European immigrant groups like the Irish was lacking.

A ruling made by the Supreme Court in the *Passenger Cases* of 1849 declared that states could not tax immigration in any form. This decision was not well-accepted,

considering that so many immigrants were poor or practically destitute and the costs of maintaining the poor fell solely on the states. Political organizations formed in protest of the growing number of immigrants, especially Catholic immigrants, with the pinnacle of these organizations being the Know-Nothing party that promoted a change in naturalization laws. The most popular proposal was to establish a twenty-one year period for naturalization and to place a barrier on foreign born individuals holding office with the exception of minor local offices (Daniels 1991: 269). Congress did amend the Constitution after the Civil War, but it was not in a way that pleased the Know-Nothings. The 14th Amendment stated that: “all persons born or naturalized in the United States . . . are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside” (Daniels 1991: 270). Tensions between the Irish and natives did ease with time, and the explosion of Chinese immigrant arrivals became the new scapegoat for anti-immigrants sentiments (Daniels 1991: 271).

III. General Overview of Nativism in the U.S.:

“With the exception of the Native American, every American is an immigrant--- though not all migrated voluntarily,” notes Pedraza in “Beyond Black and White: Latinos and Social Science Research on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America” (Pedraza 2000: 700). Yet, despite this fact, immigration has not always been looked on favorably, and immigrants’ integration into American society has been impeded by extreme obstacles which Daniels details in his work, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. White nativist sentiments have always existed in American society from the colonial period to today (Daniels 1991: 265). Martinot notes that in Oscar Handlin’s account of European immigrants, *The Uprooted*,

he suggests an implicit border besides the obvious geographic one. Martinot expounds upon this idea in “Immigration and the Boundary of Whiteness,” describing the social barrier that immigrants are thrown against: job discrimination, industrial jobs not suited to their agricultural background, crowded accommodations and the stereotype that they “were too lazy and too parasitic . . . They were accused of competing in the market unfairly and taking jobs away from ‘American’ workers.” This phenomenon appears again, contemporaneously, in regards to Latino immigration (Martinot 2007: 18).

Throughout the 19th century many immigrants poured into the U.S. with limited hindrance of government regulations. Many native citizens welcomed immigration and viewed it as a necessary part of the growing of the country, but there were others who did not share this sentiment. Throughout American history “three discreet phases of anti-immigration activity, or nativism, can be ascertained.” These developed in response to particular aspects of immigration. The first phase was anti-Catholic and focused primarily on the Irish and to some extent German immigrants from the 1830s to the 1850s. Next, there was the anti-Asian movement that thrived until the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which limited Chinese immigration, relieving the worries of white Americans. Finally, there was an “anti-all immigrants” movement that was initiated in the 1880s, when the idea of immigration restriction again gained popularity and culminated with the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924. “Successful nativist movements have almost always been linked to more general fears or uneasiness in American society” (Daniels 1991: 265). I argue that nativist fears and initiatives are building again in the U.S. in response to ongoing Latino immigration. “When most Americans are generally united and feel confident about their future, they seem to be

more willing to share that future with foreigners; conversely, when they are divided and lack confidence in the future, nativism is more likely to triumph” (Daniels 1991: 266).

This new mass immigration of Latinos and the current economic status of the United States have brought immigration back into the limelight. Latinos are the second largest minority, and they are projected to become the largest by the mid 21st century (Pedraza 2000: 699). These Latinos will be encountering a structure, or border, of whiteness that has been maintained for centuries. But, what is “white identity?” And, what is being preserved by “nativism?” To create a white identity, “one erects boundaries in order to define one’s self through them” (Martinot 2007: 27). Immigrants’ success in American society is “a function of three types of factors: (1) the initial social resources of class, culture, education, and values that they bring with them; (2) the nature of their migration . . . and (3) the social context that greeted them” (Pedraza 2000: 699). The social context that greets Latino immigrants is one in which white people are racialized as white, and Latinos are racialized as a minority (Martinot 2007: 22, 30). This racial boundary serves to protect and “generate” a “socio-culture for a white racialized identity” (Martinot 2007: 27). A cultural structure delineates the “proper and ethical” and accepted social practices. By examining how cultural structures operate, an understanding of how that culture “chooses to characterize itself” can be gained. The forms in which the “police, the judiciary, and other formal organizations” operate represent cultural institutions. “White identity and the coherence of white culture depend on certain institutions” that enact racialization. These structures of racialization “have been the social means by which white society has produced itself as white against others that it has denied as non-white --- for its self-racializing purposes” (Martinot 2007: 28).

“Panic over the possibility of a ‘non-white majority’ in certain areas across the country” has brought the white boundary to the forefront of society and culture (Martinot 2007: 29). “The concern of people of color becoming a majority . . . is an anxiety that expresses concern about the sanctity and coherence of white society and the hegemony of its white racialized identity.” The “sanctity” of the U.S. national and racial borders is only maintained if whites remain in the majority. This worry over Latino immigration is in essence expressing a viewpoint that “democracy is a white political structure, and that it can continue to be a democratic structure only with a white majority” (Martinot 2007: 29). The current misconception is that the “sanctity” of the U.S. is at stake, since the U.S. defines itself and its politics as white. The fears that Latinos have generated are evocative of the “fragility” of white racialized identity (Martinot 2007: 30). “While the peoples racialized differ over time, bearing different histories and locations, all exist as Other to the white nation that depends on them both economically and culturally” (Martinot 2007: 32).

Literature Review

I. Irish and Hispanic Immigrants

Immigration to the United States can be categorized into four general periods. The first being the immigration of Northwestern Europeans, which included the Irish, that began in colonial periods and persisted until the dawn of the 19th century. Southern and Eastern Europeans composed the majority of immigrants from the second period of immigration. Thirdly, our nation underwent an “internal movement from the South to the North and Midwest” by minority groups like African Americans and Native Americans. And, the last of these periods, which is occurring currently, is immigration from Latin

America, which began in full force in 1965 and has continued relatively unabated since then (Pedraza 2000: 700-701). Although there are distinct differences, Latinos face obstacles similar to what their Irish predecessors endured. “The conceptual thread of immigrant conditions that runs through these different immigrant landscapes spans the gap between historical and contemporary forms” (Martinot 2007: 26).

Though a century and obvious phenotypic differences separate Irish from Latino immigrants, both groups risked dangerous journeys to arrive in the States, participated in grueling work in selected fields, employed a system of chain or serial migration, and developed ethnic communities in the areas in which they settled in. “Forced labor and an ethos of imprisonment” epitomize both the Irish and Latino immigrant experience. “Forced labor does not refer to slavery, but rather to the economic status of both immigrant groups that forces them to take lowly, underpaid jobs that are shunned by most white Americans. The “ethos of imprisonment” that characterizes both groups refers to the limited social and economic mobility that these groups (Martinot 2007: 26).

Besides the obvious ethnic differences between Latinos and Irish, their patterns of migration are also vastly different. Typically, Latinos during the last two decades have immigrated with the intent to earn money to send back home to families, rather than with the intent to permanently settle in the U.S. Many plan on returning home after sufficient funds have been saved, and, on average, most Mexican migrants return home after three years (Martinot 2007: 24). The return rate of the Irish, in contrast, was only one in twelve (Daniels 1991: 127). This is one of the major differences between current Latino migration and historic European immigration (Martinot 2007: 25). Europeans came with the intention of integrating themselves into American society, but Latinos find

“integration barred in many ways” (Martinot 2007: 25). Irish, though not native to America, were white and also spoke English; whereas, Latinos are typically darker and speak a foreign language. Also, the Irish arrived before major immigration regulations had been enacted. Incorporation into American society took several generations for the Irish, but it did occur. Will these aforementioned key differences between these two immigrant groups prevent full incorporation for Latinos?

II. Problems/Stereotypes Hispanics Face:

Tapia relates the challenges that Hispanics face in his piece, “Viva Los Evangelicos.” Hispanics are confronted with allegations that they steal jobs from hard-working Americans, are a strain to America’s educational and social welfare system, and increase violence and unrest in the communities in which they settle. “Numbers bring power,” and Latinos certainly have a numerous population established within U.S. borders. But, “numbers also bring fear” (Tapia 1991: 18). One of the most serious allegations held against Hispanics is that they are “disuniting America” (Eller 1997: 249). Yet, as Eller points out in “Anti-Anti-Multiculturalism,” to assume that our country will be divided as this recent wave of Latinos continues to expand, is to assume that America is currently united. Many scholars have begun to abandon the idea of America as a “melting pot,” in favor of America as a “chunky pot” (Eller 1997: 253). Differences in cultures in American society are a fact (Eller 1997: 250). New Latinos will change America, but it will not be a “general collapse” or the “end of American civilization” as doomsday-ers herald (Eller 1997: 254, 249).

In regards to the belief that Hispanics steal jobs from hard-working Americans, it is true that there are several fields in which Hispanics are relied upon heavily, notes

Cabrera and Casas in “Latino/a Immigration: Actions and Outcomes Based on Perceptions and Emotions of Facts?,” but these are areas in which little to no training is necessary: brick masons, drywall installers, dishwashers, housekeepers, parking lot attendants, and farm laborers. Most Latinos work in fields in which they do not garner high wages. It is important to keep in mind, however, that Latinos are highly underrepresented in fields that require advanced education and training---fields in which higher wages are earned (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 290). The unemployment rate is higher for undocumented Hispanics than it is for native born Americans and legal immigrants (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 291). As many have lost their jobs due to the recessive period that the U.S. economy is experiencing, Latinos are an obvious scapegoat; but, as the economy sank, so did the number of illegals (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 290). Hispanics do find employment in the States, but it is important to remember that they do contribute to our economy through their services and by purchasing products.

In the article, “Racism, Nativism, and Exclusion: Public Policy, Immigration, and the Latino Experience in the United States,” de Haymes and Kilty speak in regards to Latino immigrants and social welfare programs, concluding that there are costs, but there are also several key misunderstandings: (1) that the vast majority of immigrants are here illegally (2) that “public benefit programs are generally available to and utilized by immigrants” and (3) that immigrants are drawn to the U.S. because of the “generous” social welfare programs. Yet, more immigrants/refugees come legally as opposed to illegally, and most, especially those recently arrived, “are restricted from receiving most forms of welfare or public assistance.” Legal immigrants are denied benefits for the first five years after their arrival, and illegals are denied permanently except for cases of

medical emergency. Proportion wise, immigrants from Cambodia, Laos, and the former Soviet Union receive the most welfare benefits: 28%, 27%, and 20%, respectively. Immigrants from Latin America do not make this list (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 14). Many Latino immigrants underutilize social programs, namely mental health services. Many states have proposed legislation aimed at limiting educational opportunities for school-age Hispanic children (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 291). The Latino population is a “youthful” one; 34.4% are under the age of eighteen. The majority of these children are born in the U.S., making them citizens who are entitled to public education (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 288). These Latino children will grow up to be part of the future of America. There are huge social and economic dangers in having a significant portion of the future work force uneducated or undereducated (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 291).

Hispanics face a prevailing stigma that they bring increased violence and crime into the U.S., yet this stigma does not have a factual basis. “Unauthorized immigrants are less likely to commit serious crime and be incarcerated than the native born population.” Latino immigrants are “more law abiding than the rest of the population” (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 293). Cities with higher populations of undocumented immigrants are safer and have less crime (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 294). It is actually the militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border that has led to an increase in violence (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 1). This, like the aforementioned stereotypes, is a negative representation that has been undeservedly bestowed upon Latinos.

III. Overview Hispanic Immigration:

People of Spanish/Hispanic origin have been a part of and shaped the United States since the nation’s birth and even before (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 1). Historic

roots intertwine the U.S. and Hispanics; St. Augustine, Florida, America's oldest city, was founded by the Spanish in 1565. The Hispanic experience truly began in the U.S. with the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and was propelled by the Mexican-American and Spanish-American Wars (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 3). The "imperialist expansion" of the U.S. has led to the absorption of Hispanics, and it has also set the pace for anti-Hispanic sentiments and deportation practices that continue today (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 8). Mexico lost nearly half of its land in the Mexican-American War, leaving many of her residents within the new borders of the U.S. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo which ended the war also included a provision stating that the rights of current inhabitants would be protected and that these inhabitants would be given citizenship. But, it was ruled that these federal provisions could be overturned by local law, leading to many individuals being deported from what had once been their homeland (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 9).

The dawn of the 20th century saw the transformation of the U.S. border from "relatively open to relatively closed." The Great Depression was the impetus for the first intensive repatriation programs. Many of those who were deported were actually U.S. citizens by birth, yet the color of their skin was the determinant of whether or not they were welcome in America. The U.S. Mexican population dropped by nearly 300,000 between 1930 and 1940. During World War II the Braceros Program brought in Mexican farm laborers to fill the necessary jobs of maintaining crop production in the States since so many working-aged men were deployed (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 9). The U.S. recruited 4 million workers during and shortly after the war years (Cabrera & Casas

2011: 286). During the 1950s, however, “Operation Wetback” was developed to return these workers to Mexico (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 10).

As is explained in Guzmán and McConnel’s “The Hispanic Population: 1990-2000 Growth and Change,” despite repatriation efforts, the Hispanic population in the U.S., both documented and undocumented, persisted. The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 conferred legal status to many individuals, giving them the capability of sponsoring family members who desired to enter the States. And, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act of 1996 possibly encouraged undocumented Latinos to stay in the U.S. because they feared that in the future more restrictive laws would be passed and that they would be apprehended while traveling back to their home country. New immigration policies and the fear of being detected worked during the 1990s to push Latinos to migrate to new areas like the Midwest and South where state legislation had been less harsh against Latinos. Also, at that time, there was a drastically diminished INS presence outside of the Southwest and West Coast (Guzmán & McConnel 2002: 115-116).

Today deportation and border security practices are commonalities in regards to immigration. The 1,600 mile border between the U.S. and Mexico has become the focus of much attention. Slowly but surely the U.S. military has expanded its presence, and politicians and the media have portrayed the border and the surrounding communities as areas that run amok with “drug runners, welfare cheats, and foreigners looking for a free ride” (de Haymes & Kilty 2000: 12). Latino immigrants literally risk life and limb to cross the dangerous U.S. border, seeking employment in low-paying, benefit-less jobs that the majority of white Americans essentially refuse to accept, yet Latinos are

considered to be lazy and unwilling to work (Martinot 2007: 18). The journey across the border that immigrants (who do not enter the U.S. legally) must make is a perilous endeavor, since in the last decade hundreds have been shot or have died because of hunger or thirst (Martinot 2007: 24). Once across the border, the danger is far from over; Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) is an ever-looming threat to Latinos. While in custody of INS, immigrants have “no access to basic civil rights, such as courts, trial procedures, or due process. “Detention is often arbitrary and indefinite” (Martinot 2007: 26).

This current wave of immigration is characterized by being more heterogeneous than ever before (Pedraza 2000: 709). Latinos exhibit diverse backgrounds, and those who differ most from “White physiognomy,” particularly immigrants from Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Bolivia, and Peru, are those who potentially struggle the most with incorporating into American society (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 284). Latinos represent all types of immigration: labor migrants from Mexico and Puerto Rico; even brain drain from Colombia, Chile, and Argentina; and refugees from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Cuba (Pedraza 2000; 709). The exodus from Cuba has been ongoing for the last forty years, and the U.S. now hosts 12% of Cuba’s population. For Cubans, immigration, to some degree, is not a choice but rather a necessity---more push than pull (Pedraza 2000: 710). Cubans have become a presence in Miami (Martinot 2007: 26).

Latino presence in the United States has a long history, and Texas is a prime example of this. After Mexico lost her land that is now Texas to the U.S., the Mexicans who remained were a highly stratified society, but as more and more white Americans

came in, Mexicans increasingly became an unstratified, poor society. Texas became “part of the commercial ranch society, ruled by a merchant class that ‘grew’ cattle, especially longhorns, as a cash crop for profit” (Pedraza 2000: 701). Cotton developed as a mainstay, and a system of sharecropping became the norm. Mexicans were increasingly the tenant of choice because of the “growing demand for a cheap and docile labor force” (Pedraza 2000: 702).

In many instances, Latinos are still laborers of choice. “Immigrants and ethnics are overwhelmingly concentrated in only some industrial sectors: agriculture, organized labor, the garment industry, domestic service, and ethnic enterprise” (Pedraza 2000: 713). There are several industries that do rely heavily upon Latino labor, both documented and undocumented. “40% of brick masons, 37% dry wall installers, 28% dishwashers, 27% housekeepers, 25% farm workers, and 21% of parking lot attendants are Latino. But, Latinos are severely lacking in fields that require advanced education or training (Cabrera & Casas 2011: 290). Immigrant labor in developed countries has “structural causes” and plays a vital role for the recipient society (Pedraza 2000: 707). The U.S. economy relies upon “Latino agricultural labor for both international trade and credits and for domestic fruit and vegetable production.” In recent years raids on Latino agricultural workers have upset various local economies. In 2006 cherry growers in California sued agents who intercepted their workers. Because of the lack of workers, the cherries rotted on the trees, destroying the crop and potential profit. When twenty-one workers were arrested in Vidalia, Georgia, thousands of others abandoned their jobs in fear of being imprisoned. And, in 2004 when twenty-four undocumented laborers were arrested in a North Carolina

town, following the same pattern, workers in large numbers abandoned the fields, forcing production to stop and leaving the town in a depression (Martinot 2007: 25).

While there are several specific fields that immigrants generally find work in, women immigrants have a much more limited selection of enterprises that are open to them, namely the garment industry and domestic service (Pedraza 2000: 714). Mexican women work in the garment industry because it is imperative that they have some way to support themselves, since they are mainly unskilled or semi-skilled. While Cuban women work to help regain their family's middle class standing, since many Cuban immigrants are political refugees. Immigration can be "far more positive for women than for men." Women working in the domestic service can often earn and save enough to move themselves upward (Pedraza 2000: 715). The situation of female Latino immigrants is unique and different than that of males.

Latino workers "are forced to labor under extreme duress" and fear (Martinot 2007: 26). They are paid subsistence wages, and some even live in labor camps; these are primarily seen on the East Coast. "Attempts to escape, to form unions, demand human rights, or to receive the social services to which their labor and taxes as workers entitle them, carry the risk of arrest and arbitrary detention by immigrant authorities (Martinot 2007: 25-26). Yet, "labor migration provides developed countries with a dependable source of cheap labor; it also provides underdeveloped countries with a 'safety valve;' for emigration has become the solution to their incapacity to satisfy the needs of their poor and lower-middle classes." (Pedraza 2000: 708).

As Latino immigrants have come and will continue to come to the U.S., they will continue to incorporate into American society while also transforming it (Pedraza 2000:

708). Different immigrant groups incorporate in different ways, and “they have made and remade America and are fashioning her still” (Pedraza 2000: 706, 709). Immigrants are now embracing dual identities, retaining their old ethnic identity and not completely assimilating. “Instead they develop new bicultural identities, living their lives and being quite involved in more than one nation, more than one world--- in effect making the home and adopted countries both one lived social world” (Pedraza 2000: 710). This is a framework of “biculturalism” and “bilingualism,” in which American culture and English are second to that of their native culture and language theorize Lamber, Moghaddam, J. Sorin, and S. Sorin “Assimilation vs. Multiculturalism: Views from a Community in France.” Through this “juggling act,” Latinos adopt two cultural identities rather than exchanging their old in favor of a new, fully-American identity. The already strongly established and continuously growing Latino population in the United States encourages the development of this dual identity (Lamber, Moghaddam, J. Sorin, and S. Sorin 1990:88-389, 409). Technological advancements in ways of communication and travel enable immigrants to stay much more connected with the life and family that they leave behind in their home country, so that they can “participate both actually and vicariously in its life” (Pedraza 2000: 711). This continued involvement with and sometimes return to their home country is so prevalent because of their “lack of acceptance in America” (Pedraza 2000: 712). Immigration, while it might not be favorable to all in the United States, has come to play an integral role, and as immigrants continue to pour into the U.S., immigration will remain a key issue.

IV. About the Council of Conservative Citizens---In Their Own Words:

The Council of Conservative Citizens, according to their website, is “a group with real members, real chapters, and real activism.” Their self-adulating information pages extoll the underlying principles of the group, stating that: “The CofCC is the only serious nationwide activist group that sticks up for white rights!” The group even goes so far as to claim that they are “the country’s most effective conservative activist group,” quoting Dr. Sam Francis, a former Washington Times writer, editor of the Council’s publication, the Citizens Informer, and author of the CofCC Statement of Principles. Founded in Atlanta, Georgia by conservative leaders from across the nation, the goal of the formation of the Council of Conservative Citizens was to create a modern political association in which the “silent majority” could actively take part in all levels of government. The CofCC purports that their founders and current staff are “men and women whose political experience comes from every responsible social movement, conservative organization, and effective political party in America.” For this reason, unity was a primary objective of the founders. The CofCC asserts that the “collectivist-minded Left” has made organizing into an “art form,” whereas the more “individualistic-minded” Right has had less success in unification efforts, decreasing their appeal to politicians who will indulge associations wielding sufficient power to help or hamper their career. The CofCC set out to change the tides of political organization prowess, and throughout the years the Council has generated a nationwide complex of chapters and supporters that effectively and actively “advocate for the no-longer silent conservative majority.” The CofCC has created an organization that has both strong national and local influence. The Council values their supporters as their greatest political influencers, because they “work at the local level on local issues and cooperate nationally to bring their power to bear on

important national issues.” Instead of relying on lobbyists and political parties, the CofCC places enthusiastic emphasis on local devotees. The CofCC counts their victories at a local level, and they feel that they are quickly gaining ground and becoming the face of conservatism in America. The CofCC operates by this principle: “To win we must build locally, and unify and focus our resources and efforts” (Council of Conservative Citizens 2012).

The CofCC’s Statement of Principles, written by Dr. Samuel Francis, defines in fourteen bullets the CofCC’s beliefs about America, both culturally and politically. According to the CofCC, America is a Christian nation with a European heritage; America was derived from European heritage and should remain European in her character and composition as far as government is concerned. By token of this belief, the CofCC is against all non-European and non-Western immigration. All non-Western immigrants should be severely restricted by means of laws and policies, and the organization’s opinion is that all illegal immigration should be immediately halted, including the return of all illegals to their home countries (Francis 2005).

The CofCC is a proponent of racial segregation and does not support the mixing of races. The CofCC is against affirmative action and other similar programs designed to help primarily non-Whites. In their opinion, as enumerated in the Statement of Principles, this is the degeneration of America’s European heritage and the heritage of Southern people specifically. Any form of forced integration of races is opposed by the CofCC, and they uphold that racial admixture in family units subverts the sanctity of the family unit as well as the national and cultural heritage of the U.S. The CofCC allows only for the celebration of “legitimate subculture and ethnic and regional identities of our

people.” No definition for what is “legitimate” is provided, but assuredly European-derived heritage and culture is the standard. The Statement of Principles calls for America to stand up against fictitious representations of the U.S. (Francis 2005).

V. About the Council of Conservative Citizens---Outside Opinions:

The Southern Poverty Law Center, an acclaimed “nonprofit civil rights organization,” provides “Intelligence Files,” which profile extremism in the United States. In its files it includes the Council of Conservative Citizens. The CofCC was founded in 1985, using the mailing list of the old Citizens Councils of America, commonly referred to as the White Citizens Councils, which was a hate group formed during the 50s and 60s to protest the desegregation of schools in the South. Though the current CofCC tries to promote a “mainstream” image, their propaganda is extreme white supremacy, depicting blacks a subhuman, illegal immigration as immoral, and bemoaning the deprecation of “white, European civilization.” The Citizens Councils of America (CCA) thrived during the 50s and 60s, eliciting over one million members. Although the doctrine of the CCA is much in accord with the Ku Klux Klan, the CCA maintained a sheen of public decency, making Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall refer to it as the “uptown Klan.” Members of the CCA were “bankers, merchants, judges, newspaper editors and politicians --- folks given more to wearing suits and ties than hoods and robes,” although there were “bare-knuckle racists” among their ranks, including Byron De La Beckwith, murderer of civil rights activist Medgars Evers. Predominately though, the CCA used political and financial pull as a means to their ends, as opposed to brute force.

After losing the battle against desegregation, the CCA began to wither exponentially in the 1970s and 1980s, spurring the Midwest field director, George Baum, to meet with thirty other white men concerning the future of their hate organization. The brainchild of this meeting was the Council of Conservative Citizens. Like its predecessor, the CofCC is composed of local chapters that operate on both a local and national level, promoting an ideology of white nativism veiled as neoconservatism. “Race-mixing” has been a continuous theme of the CofCC, stemming from its days as the White Citizens Council. The CofCC goes as far as to assert that racism is a divine institution: “God is the author of racism. God is the One who divided mankind into different types...” The CofCC joined the anti-immigration bandwagon in 1998. Their first rally in Cullman, Alabama featured Barbara Coe and Glen Spencer, both well-known white nativists who worked on passing California’s stringent Proposition 187 (“Save our State”). Since then the CofCC has held rallies yearly that battle non-white immigration and feature eminent racists.

Also in 1998 the CofCC made a splash nationally when a scandal emerged concerning former Republican Georgia Congressman, Bob Barr, and then Senate Majority Leader, a Republican from Mississippi, Trent Lott. Both had spoken at prominent CofCC events, yet both politicians denied knowledge of the existence of and their involvement in the group. The incident forced the then Republican National Committee Chairman, Jim Nicholson, to play his hand, asking all Republican party members to resign from the group. Congress attempted to pass a resolution “condemning the racism and bigotry espoused by the Council of Conservative Citizens,” but the

resolution failed to pass. It was probably squelched by prominent members of the party, trying to save face after the embarrassment.

Despite the scandal, a slew of Southern politicians still catered to the CofCC in the following years. A 2004 Intelligence Report claimed that “no fewer than 38 federal, state, and local elected officials” were still attending CofCC events, as well as speaking publicly at their events. These politicians were supporting an organization that the investigation by the Intelligence Report clearly illustrated was a “hate group,” which, among other denigrations, claimed that Hispanic immigrants were transforming the U.S. into “a slimy brown mass of glop” (Intelligence Files 2012). The loss of standing after their discredit produced a mighty increase of “extremist views on their website and their newspaper.” This “joke” was posted in the CofCC home page in 2003: “What do you call ... four blacks, three Hispanics, three Russian Jews, and one white guy? The FBI’s Most Wanted List!” This clearly illustrates the supremacist doctrine that the CofCC embraces, while attempting to masquerade as a legitimate conservative political group (Intelligence Files 2012).

Findings and Analysis

Hispanics are currently the second largest minority group in the United States, and their continued growth is expected. The U.S. has a rich immigration heritage, being a nation founded and built by immigrants. However, both historically and modernly, immigration has not always been viewed favorably. Immigration is not universally accepted by Americans, leading to the development of political action groups, the generation of stereotypes, and the enactment of nativism. The Council of Conservative Citizens is a current political action group that promotes the rights of white American

citizens. In fact, the CofCC claims to be the only such group that stands up for the rights of whites. The CofCC is involved in promoting white nationalism and white separatism. In its essence, the CofCC is a racist organization that operates under a facade of assumed dignity and legitimacy. The news articles presented on the CofCC website illuminate the true intent and focus of this nativist, far-right organization. The Council of Conservative Citizens' website, cofcc.org, provides information about the political organization, recruits new members, and also highlights news articles which they feel exemplify the principles of white supremacy. The majority of articles appearing on the CofCC website feature crimes committed against whites in which Hispanics or African Americans are the perpetrators. In the last six months that I have been regularly reading articles posted on the website, I have seen no articles in which a white individual has been awry of the law. The bias of the contributing journalists and editors is absolutely apparent when assessing the types of articles the CofCC chooses to include. Their two main criteria seem to be that an article must either illustrate that minority groups threaten the health and safety of white Americans' lives or that minority groups threaten the traditional way of white American life.

The Council of Conservative Citizens attempts to establish that Hispanics pose a threat to the health and safety of white Americans and that diversity is harmful by using sensationalism and appealing to the fears of their readers. Individuals greatly value their own safety and health, and the CofCC uses this characteristic of the Western human condition to advance their nativist, racist sentiments. Playing upon the fear of their readers, the CofCC uses their articles to establish that Hispanics are a threat to health and safety and that diversity is not something to strive for. Three of the six articles that I am

evaluating clearly appeal to the fears of their readership, presenting partial, incomplete, or biased supposition as fact: Article 1, “Latino immigration brings deadly new virus to the U.S.,” Article 2, “It’s official! Diversity is bad for your health;” and Article 3 “Drunk illegal alien with 4 DUIs kills infant.” All three articles, though their topics vary, have the same message: continuing Hispanic immigration and Democratic politics place the lives of white Americans at risk. This is a weighty allegation that the authors of these articles jump to with little help of concrete facts, relying instead upon scare tactics and the power of biased, one-sided journalism and playing upon the fear and emotionalism of the reader. These three articles, which are discussed in the following, present information that is intended to produce fear and ignite anger, but simply because something creates fear or anger does not mean that it can be substantiated as truth.

Article 1, “Latino immigration brings deadly new virus to the US,” (Appendix A) discusses the appearance of the Chagas disease in the United States, comparing this malady to AIDS throughout the article. Chagas is spread by Triatome bugs, through blood transfusions, and less frequently from mother to child. In Latin America and the U.S. all blood banks screen for traces of Chagas. Worldwide, 10 million are affected with 10,000 of these cases being reported in the States, predominately among Central and Latin American immigrants. If caught early, Chagas can be treated with an intensive, three-month long drug regimen. The title of this article immediately strikes fear and provokes a sense of imminent danger, yet, in reality, Chagas does not pose an immediate threat to individuals who maintain a healthy lifestyle in the U.S. The vivid and dramatic description of the effects of Chagas--- symptoms that can lead to the infected individual’s heart exploding if left untreated--- is used to outweigh and distract from the fact that

according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention there are only a limited number of new or vector-borne cases in the States. The continued comparison of Chagas to AIDS increases the drama of the article and augments fear of the disease. There are many negative connotations associated with AIDS in the U.S., and this article uses these fears to its advantage. This comparison, however, is not fitting. AIDS can be passed along with much greater facility, and, unlike the Chagas disease, it is incurable. This article is based firmly upon instigating fear rather than accurately presenting facts, appealing to emotionalism as opposed to rationale. Hispanics are portrayed as disease carriers who are likely to infect innocent Americans. Political policies in favor of immigration are portrayed as responsible for putting everyday Americans at risk. Article 1 uses the power of fear to establish a stereotype of Latin Americans as disease ridden and to strengthen the pro-nativist stance of the CofCC.

“It’s official! Diversity is bad for your health,” article 2 (Appendix B), relies upon a study that appeared in the *America Journal of Public Health*, using this material as proof that diversity is detrimental to health. Kimberly Alvarez, a co-author of this report, describes the benefits to older African Americans and Hispanics of living in an ethnically dense neighborhood, which is defined as a community in which 50% of the population is of the same ethnicity. Alvarez’s findings are presented to indicate that residents of ethnically dense neighborhoods suffer less heart disease and cancer because of the lack of diversity. Other factors that could potentially influence these findings are not accounted for; their exclusion implies non-existence, but that is likely not the case. Income levels of the study’s participants are not given, nor are any evidence provided to directly substantiate that increased diversity is actually to blame for cancer and heart

disease in African Americans and Hispanics. The article offers no information concerning whites who live in either ethnically dense or ethnically sparse neighborhoods. The information presented in this article does not explicitly show that increased diversity actually causes increased cancer and heart disease. Doubt is clearly indicated in the opening sentence: "Diversity may be killing..." but this doubt is neglected to be explored throughout the rest of the article. The pro-white, nativist stance of the CofCC is clearly in line with any findings that might indicate that increased diversity may have negative repercussions, and the article is quick to vilify progressive groups which are fundamentally against their white supremacist position. Progressive groups, in this case left-wingers and Democrats, who support government initiatives to increase diversity in housing, education, health care, and other areas are cast in a doubtful light as being in favor of risking the lives of the minorities who vote for them. This article attempts to give scientific rationale to a doctrine of racism, trying to show that diversity is harmful by pointing fingers and relying on ill-explained potentialities as facts.

Article 3, "Drunk illegal alien with 4 DUIs kills infant," (Appendix C) tugs at the reader's heartstrings with the tragic story of an intoxicated illegal immigrant involved in an automobile accident that resulted in the loss of life of an infant. 43 year old Ramon Hernandez, an alien with previous DUI convictions, who was driving under a revoked license, drove into the vehicle of Zach and Aileen Smith. Aileen, 7 months pregnant, suffered from medical conditions that required an emergency c-section to be performed. The Smiths' child died shortly after delivery. This article graphically details what truly is a tragedy, blaming the "radical left" policies of the government rather than the guilty intoxicated individual. This is a tragedy produced by alcohol not illegal immigration, yet

the article confuses the two. Illegal immigration is not responsible for DUIs and wrecks that take lives. The government is not at fault as the article attempts to assert by shifting blame from an individual to a political group or ideology. The individual is left out of the equation in this article. Hispanics in general are portrayed as regular law-breakers who are a danger to all American motorists. An entire ethnicity, however, cannot be judged based on the one man's actions. The article claims that "illegal aliens slaughter hundreds of innocent American citizens every month," however, no supporting statistics are provided. It should be noted that the use of the word "slaughter," which is evocative of butchering, conjures thoughts of bloody ruthless killing, implying that Hispanics immigrants and government policies in favor of Hispanic immigration are responsible for killing innocent American drivers and, in this case in particular, a defenseless child. The article neglects the fact that, according to the Center for Advancing Health, young white males are 50% more likely than their black or Hispanic peers to drive under the influence. Instead of calling for more strict DUI policies, the article appeals for more stringent immigration policies, forgetting the root of the problem. This article monopolizes the emotional factor of the death of a child to portray Hispanics as thoughtless killers who are a threat to all American drivers and to indict the government's immigration policies as harbingers of death to innocent citizens. This article attacks all Hispanics and any government initiative that supports continued Hispanic immigration, using a tragedy to further the nativist sentiments of the CofCC.

The Council of Conservative Citizens, through articles found on their website, casts Hispanics and the government policies that promote immigration not only as threats to the life, health, and safety of white United States residents but also as a threat to the

white American way of life. The remaining three articles under my evaluation claim that current and future Hispanic immigrants are a risk to the stability of the lives of the majority of Americans. These articles: article 4, “Demography is Destiny;” article 5, “Two-thirds of new jobs going to immigrants;” and article 6, “Imagine if cities put up billboards calling for Anglos to ‘rise up,’” attempt to show that Hispanics will bring political, economic, social, and cultural insecurity to white Americans. As seen in the previously examined articles, these claims that Hispanics are causing the degradation and downfall of the white way of life are presented with an obvious bias, lack of substantiated facts, and strike fear with the grandiosity of their claims. The CofCC implies that the security of their readership’s way of life is currently being attacked and expedites this fear with poorly derived arguments that serve only to promote the racist, nativist ideology upon which the CofCC is founded.

“Demography is Destiny,” article 4(Appendix D), written by prominent political commentator, Ann Coulter, attacks Hispanic immigration and the Democratic Party--- both of which Coulter believes to be detrimental to the fate of conservative America. According to Coulter most immigrants arrive within U.S. borders lacking skills and are therefore in urgent need of government assistance. It is this “desperation” that Coulter feels has been a “boon” to the Democratic Party. Coulter notes the growth in the California Hispanic population; in the last forty years the California non-Hispanic white population has dropped from 80% to 40%. Coulter connects this changing demographic with the changes that the political landscape of California has undergone, transforming from a state that “produced anti-tax initiatives, Richard Nixon, and Ronald Reagan to a state that is absolutely untouchable by Republicans.” Coulter feels that Colorado, New

Mexico, Illinois, and New York are in the midst of the same changes, and she predicts that if Texas ever “flips,” Republicans stand no chance of ever winning another presidential election. Coulter does not attribute the growth of the Democratic Party to more favorable political, social, or economic policies, but rather to the supposed pressure that blacks and Hispanics feel to “vote with their race.” Coulter cites that 57% of immigrant households receive government assistance of some sort; this fact Coulter believes automatically makes these immigrants undesirable as future citizens, “except as voters for the Democratic Party.” Coulter conjectures that these economically unstable immigrants will vote Democrat. She supports this with the claim that the number one issue that Obama had in his favor during the recent election year was that voters felt that he “cares for people like me,” which, according to Coulter, is the same platform on which former Venezuelan president, Hugo Chavez, was elected. This article makes the conjecture that the Democratic Party welcomes immigration only because immigrants are likely Democratic voters, overlooking the lengthy delay between legal arrival in the country and attaining citizenship along with the right to vote. The recent uptake of the Democratic Party is not attributed to the ideology that it supports, but rather to the ignorance and simplicity of its voters, perpetuating stereotypes against both blacks and Hispanics. In Coulter’s portrayal black and Hispanic voters have no mind of their own and are depicted as mindless sheep simply being herded along by the dogma of the Democrats and a sense of racial solidarity. This assumption that poor black and Hispanic voters have no mind of their own clearly shows the bias of both Coulter and the CofCC; it is obvious of the esteem in which both hold blacks and Hispanics. The article clearly implies that, if you are not white, you have limited reasoning capabilities,

intimating that only whites are capable of making educated choices and that blacks and Hispanics will be and are responsible for the “downfall” of the U.S. by the Democratic party. The Democratic Party is portrayed as nothing more than a vote garnering machine that is trying to totally dominate politics by preying upon the economically disadvantaged. Coulter uses stereotypes and unflattering generalizations to both victimize and vilify Hispanics. The Democrats take advantage of the Hispanic vote, and therefore both Hispanics and Democrats are responsible for what Coulter and the CofCC see as the decline of America. Coulter and the CofCC’s claims are built upon unflattering generalizations that perpetuate stereotypes and support white solidarity and nativism.

Article 5, “Two-thirds of new jobs going to immigrants,” (Appendix E) reports that two-thirds of those who have found employment during President Obama’s first term have been immigrants, both legal and illegal. This article implies that immigrants, status legal and illegal, have taken jobs away from native citizens, and it expresses frustration about the supposed limited focus this issue has been given during the recent presidential campaign. Steven A. Camarota, research director at the Center for Immigration Studies, reports that since the first quarter of 2009, the number of employed, working age immigrants has risen by 2 million, from 21.2 million to 23.2 million. He counters that during this same period of time, native-born employment has only increased by 1 million, making the total of employed native-born 119.9 million. This article contrasts the numbers of immigrant and native-born workers, but it does not provide additional data that would provide perspective and show the true impact of the Center for Immigrations Studies’ findings. The article presents its information with the implication that

immigrants have and are taking jobs away from native-born citizens, further implying that native-born citizens are first entitled to employment. There is a veiled sentiment of white superiority, suggesting that native-born citizens, particularly whites, should have more job growth and opportunities as opposed to Hispanics. The lack of clarity and necessary additional data that characterizes this article creates a scenario in which Hispanics are taking jobs away from deserving whites. By presenting limited information in this manner, the CofCC's pro-white, anti-immigration stance is fortified.

“Imagine if cities put up billboards calling for Anglos to ‘rise up,’” Article 6, (Appendix F) discusses an inflammatory billboard that was erected by the Austin Visual Arts Association and Reagan Outdoor Advertising as part of a city-funded art initiative in Austin, Texas. The billboard in question, designed by Nancy Guevarra, depicts block figures with upraised arms holding flags. The image also contains a heart with an image from the Mexican flag imprinted upon it. Underlying these images are the words, “ARRIBA MI GENTE,” which translates to “rise up my people.” The billboard caused immediate objection with protesters citing a “revolutionary message clearly divided along racial lines.” Opposition to the billboard holds that it suggests a “political identity based on nothing more than racial inclusion, not principled positions or rights.” The billboard and its interpreted message are seen by the opposition as being just as distasteful as if the KKK were to erect a billboard with taxpayer monies encouraging whites to unite and revolt. By comparing the billboard to the KKK, the article has intoned that the point of the billboard is a revolutionary message based on the premise of racial unity and group hate. The assumed intent of the billboard is to inspire a social, political, and even physical revolution. The article, however, does not interview the designer nor speak

about the true intent. The intended message of the billboard is left in question, but the intent of the article is clear; the article strives to induce panic and depict Hispanic immigrants, particularly Mexicans, as being itching to incite a radical, rebellious movement. This article is built upon a hypothetical basis that is only meant to cause fear and panic by intimating that Hispanics, especially Mexicans are eager and ready to revolt.

Articles displayed on the Council of Conservative Citizens' website clearly function to augment the purpose of the organization: perpetuating negative stereotypes in regards to Hispanic immigrants and extolling the proclaimed virtues and merits of nativism. For an article to be highlighted on the CofCC website it must either illustrate a supposed threat to health, safety, or life that Hispanics impose upon white native citizens or show that Hispanics are a supposed potential threat to the white, native-born citizens' way of life. All six of the above examined articles, though the scope of their content is vastly different, work together to enforce and further the anti-immigrant, pro-white stance of the CofCC. All articles have the common thread of belittling Hispanics and implying that whites should be in fear. These articles are replete with logical fallacies, poorly represented information, and an obvious bias. These articles capitalize on sensationalism, monopolize emotions, and confuse cause and effect in an attempt to advance the dogma of the CofCC.

Conclusion

The articles highlighted on the Council of Conservative Citizens' website seek to support and propagate the pro-white, anti-immigrant ideology of the CofCC by stereotyping Hispanics and encouraging a nativist outlook. The CofCC is a self-proclaimed white rights activist group that stemmed from the former White Citizens

Council, an anti-integrationist organization prominent in the 1960s and 1970s. Several leading current and past political figures, both local and national, have been open members of the CofCC. The CofCC, on their website, claims to be the “most effective conservative action group,” working both at the local and the national level to protect and promote the rights of white, native citizens. This goal is carried out at the expense of minority groups, particularly Hispanics and blacks. The CofCC website selects and displays what they consider to be crucial news articles in an effort to substantiate and propagate their biased, racist, nativist views.

CofCC articles must be useful in strengthening the CofCC message, having underlying or obvious tones of racist sentiments and white superiority. News articles found on the CofCC website are generally not found on leading mainstream news sites such as MSN, CNN, or FOX News. Articles to be displayed on the CofCC website must qualify in that they augment the ideology of the group. The articles are universally derogatory towards minority groups. In regards to Hispanics and Hispanic immigration, articles appearing on the CofCC website attempt to portray both as a threat to either the health, safety, and life or the way of life of white, native-born citizens. On their website the CofCC masquerades their organization’s dogma as actual news. This biased portrayal is built upon negative stereotypes of Hispanics as disease-ridden, dangerous, and potentially revolutionary job-stealers, who are actively destroying the economy and social structure of the United States. The articles encourage white citizens to unite in order to protect their rights; rights that the CofCC believe to be in dire danger. The articles are all based on a premise of white superiority and Hispanic degradation. The

CofCC preaches a doctrine of hate and racial inequality that has historically proven to have disastrous consequences and has no legitimate basis.

The CofCC accepts stereotypes as fact and supports a nativist outlook as necessary and just. The propaganda of the CofCC and similar organizations is detrimental to Hispanic immigrants, many of whom are marginalized and monopolized. Hispanics are the second largest minority group in the U.S., and it is likely, if immigration trends continue in the same scale of the previous half decade, that Hispanic immigration will continue, growing the Hispanic population in the States even more. Assimilating and adapting to a new environment is a crucial part in every immigrant's arrival in a new home country. A failure to do so produces extreme consequences in the realms of both physical and emotional well-being. With such a large and growing percentage of those residing in the U.S. being Hispanic or of Hispanic descent, their incorporation and success in America should be of concern to all citizens. For the United States to thrive economically, politically, and socially all of her residents must be in a condition to achieve success or at a minimum, security. When racist, anti-Hispanic dogma is actively being promoted, this is not likely to happen. Both stereotypes and nativism have far-reaching ramifications that have historically proven to be detrimental to the welfare of the country in which these policies are enacted. Stereotypes and nativism only impede the adaptation and assimilation of immigrants, which is necessary for their success in their host country.

Almost universally immigrants have come to the shores of the United States seeking better opportunities and a place in which they can live in freedom away from persecution. America, however, has not always been the welcoming safe haven of

immigrants' dreams. Historically, in periods of heavy immigration, native Americans have marginalized, monopolized, and stereotyped the immigrants who have made the often arduous venture to the land of opportunity. After disembarking, Irish immigrants of the 19th century faced the rigorous obstacle of assimilating into a culture and a country that was generally disdainful of them. Roughly one hundred and fifty years later, Hispanic immigrants are facing a similar challenge. Yet, there are several key differences between modern Hispanic immigrants and the historic example of the Irish. Physically the Irish resembled the majority of Americans in that the tone of their skin was light; Hispanics typically have a darker skin tone that automatically distinguishes them from the majority. The Irish spoke English, albeit with an accent; English, however, is not the first language of many Hispanic immigrants. The language barrier makes assimilation and adaption more difficult and is yet another distinguishing factor. Hispanics stand out from the majority of Americans in a way that Irish immigrants of the 19th century did not. Currently many Hispanics are struggling to cope with life in the States. Their integration is essential for both their personal well-being and the well-being of our nation. Propaganda like that of the CofCC is only impeding a necessary process of assimilation and adaption. By perpetuating stereotypes and extolling nativism the Council of Conservative Citizens is only breeding discontent, injustice, and hate; all of which are detrimental to America and her residents.

References

- Cabrera, Ana P. and J. Manuel Casas. "Latino/a Immigration: Actions and Outcomes Based on Perceptions and Emotions of Facts?" *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 33, No. 3. pp. 283-303. 2011.
- Council of Conservative Citizens. cofcc.org. 2012. Web 12 September 2012.
- Daniels, Roger. *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. Harper Perennial 1991.
- Eller, Jack David. "Anti-Anti-Multiculturalism." *American Anthropologist*. New Series, Vol. 99, No. 2. pp. 249-256. 1997.
- Francis, Samuel. "Statement of Principles." Council of Conservative Citizens. Spring 2005. Web 23 November 2012.
- Guzmán, Betsy and Eileen Diaz McConnel. "The Hispanic Population: 1990-200 Growth and Change." *Population Research and Policy Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1/2. pp. 109-128. 2002.
- de Haymes, Maria Vidal and Keith M. Kilty. "Racism, Nativism, and Exclusion: Public

Policy, Immigration, and the Latino Experience in the United States.” *Journal of Poverty*. Vol. 4, No. 1/2. pp. 1-25. 2000.

“Intelligence Files: Council of Conservative Citizens.” Southern Poverty Law Center. 2012. Web November 23 2012.

Lamber, Wallace E., Fathali M. Moghaddam, Jean Sorin, and Simone Sorin.
“Assimilation vs. Multiculturalism: Views from a Community in France.”
Sociological Forum. Vol. 5, No. 3. pp. 387-411. 1990.

Martinot, Steve. “Immigration and the Boundary of Whiteness.” *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Transnational Migration, Race, and Citizenship. Autumn 2007. pp. 17-36.

Pedraza, Silvia. “Beyond Black and White: Latinos and Social Science Research on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America.” *Social Science History* 24:4. Winter 2000

Tapia, Andrés. “Viva Los Evangelicos.” *Christianity Today*. October, 1991. 16-22.

Appendix A

Latino immigration brings deadly new virus to the US

Chagas Disease was once contained to South America. It is spread by a beetle. It causes AIDS-like symptoms that can result in the infected person’s heart exploding. It was once absent in the US. Because of mass immigration, there is now 30,000 cases in the US.

A little-known life-threatening illness caused by blood sucking insects has been labelled the ‘new AIDS of the Americas’ by experts.

The parasitic illness called Chagas Disease has similarities to the early spread of HIV, according to a new study.

Similar to AIDS, Chagas is difficult to detect and it can take years for symptoms to emerge, according to experts writing in the journal *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*.

An estimated 10 million people worldwide are infected with most sufferers in Bolivia, Mexico, Columbia and Central America, as well as approximately 30,000 people in the U.S., reported the *New York Times*.

The disease – once largely contained to Latin America – has spread into the U.S due to increases in travel and immigration.

Due to the severity of the illness, the amount of people infected and the ability of prevention, Chagas is considered one of the Neglected Parasitic Infections, a group of five parasitic diseases that have been targeted by CDC for public health action.

Chagas commonly affects people in poverty-stricken areas and most U.S. cases are found in immigrants.

If caught early enough, the disease can be prevented with an intense 3-month drug treatment.

However, because of the lengthy incubation period and costly medication, Chagas is often left untreated.

Also known as the American trypanosomiasis, the disease spreads easily either through blood transfusions or, less commonly, from mother to child.

All blood banks in the U.S. and Latin America screen for traces of the disease.

Most blood banks in the U.S began screening for it in 2007.

Chagas is usually transmitted from the bite of blood-sucking insect species called Triatome bugs which release a parasite called *Trypanosoma cruzi* into the victim's bloodstream.

The species includes Triatomids – black wingless beetles about 20mm in length commonly known as 'kissing bugs'. Their closest relative is the Tsetse fly, found in Africa, which spread Sleeping Sickness (where the victim's brain swells).

Chagas disease comes in two phases – acute and severe.

<http://cofcc.org/2012/05/latino-immigration-brings-deadly-new-virus-to-the-us/>

Appendix B

It's official! Diversity is bad for your health

Diversity may be killing older African-Americans and Hispanics, according to a new peer-reviewed study published in the *American Journal of Public Health*, which shows that people suffer less cancer and heart disease when they live among their racial or ethnic peers.

“Living in an ethnically dense neighborhood is beneficial when it comes to heart disease and cancer,” said Kimberly Alvarez, a co-author of the new study, which was funded by the National Institutes of Health.

Alvarez’s phrase, “ethnically dense,” describes a community in which at least 50 percent of people are from the same ethnic group.

Many progressive groups advocate the use of government to increase diversity in housing, education, health care and other sectors.

Alvarez’s study reviewed the health records of 2,367 Mexican-Americans and 2,790 African-Americans older than 65, and concluded they lived longer if they inhabited a community mostly populated by their group.

African-Americans “living in a county with an ethnic density of 50% or more ... were 46% less likely to report doctor-diagnosed heart disease and 77% less likely to report cancer than those who lived in an ethnic density of less than 25%,” said a summary of the report, authored by Columbia University’s Mailman School of Public Health.

<http://topconservativenews.com/2012/10/its-official-diversity-is-bad-for-your-health/>

Appendix C

Drunk illegal alien with 4 DUIs kills infant

The politics of the radical left has claimed another innocent life. Illegal aliens slaughter hundreds of innocent American citizens every month.

The illegal aliens had been charged with four DUIs in the past. This means has probably been caught drinking and drinking many more times. However, we know that he was in custody and should have been deported as a threat to public safety at least four times.

A drunk illegal alien with 4 prior DUIs has been charged with vehicular homicide after he veered into the vehicle of a couple from Colorado Springs who were driving to San Diego for their baby shower.

On June 10, Zach and Aileen Smith were traveling south on I-25 when an intoxicated, 43-year-old, illegal named Ramon Hernandez slammed into their vehicle. As a result of the collision, Aileen—who was 7 months pregnant—suffered sever injuries that required her to get an emergency c-section at a nearby medical center in Santa Fe.

Unfortunately for the Smiths, their first child would not make it. Just minutes after being delivered, their son died of massive head injuries and a bleeding brain.

“There was nothing they could do,” Aileen said. “I woke up from surgery and was reaching out asking for my son, and the nurse leaned over and told me that he had passed.”

The Smiths named their son Demetri, after Aileen’s grandfather. They were able to hold him and take a few pictures with him before the hospital staff took him away.

According to the New Mexico authorities, Hernandez was convicted of DUI twice in 2000, once in 2003 and once again in 2004. He was also driving on a revoked license at the time of the crash due to multiple unpaid traffic tickets.

In other words, the government had every opportunity to remove this foreign criminal from the community, but they declined. And because they have decided they will only enforce laws they agree with, citizens like Zach and Aileen Smith are left to pick up the pieces of their shattered lives and somehow try to turn them back into a pursuit of happiness.

<http://cofcc.org/2012/08/drunk-illegal-alien-with-4-duis-kills-infant/>

Appedix D

Demography is Destiny

By Ann Coulter...

Because recent immigrants have no skills, they arrive in dire need of government assistance. Their desperation has been an enormous boon to the Democratic Party.

Thirty-nine percent of native households receive some form of government assistance. By contrast, 57 percent of immigrant households — legal immigrants — get government assistance. We can’t do anything about the native population, but why on Earth is America taking in immigrants who require taxpayer support?

If you come to America and immediately go on welfare, by definition, you are not a desirable immigrant. Except as a voter for the Democratic Party.

In the last 40 years, California’s non-Hispanic white population has been cut in half, from 80 percent to 40 percent. Meanwhile, the Hispanic population has exploded from less than 10 percent to nearly 40 percent — mostly poor Mexicans.

And with that change, California went from being the state that produced anti-tax initiatives, Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan to a state that is absolutely untouchable by Republicans (see Meg Whitman and Carly Fiorina) and just enacted the highest tax rate in any state.

The same has happened, or is happening, to other states, such as Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois and New York. If Texas ever flips, Republicans will never win another presidential election. The two major political parties will be the Nancy Pelosi Democratic Party and the Chuck Schumer Democratic Party.

...

A white person can vote for a Republican or a Democrat without anyone saying to him, “HOW CAN YOU VOTE AGAINST YOUR RACE?” But that is exactly how poor Hispanics and blacks are pressured into voting Democratic.

Noticeably, the No. 1 issue Obama had in his favor this year was not his policies. It was that a majority of voters agreed with the statement: Obama “cares for people like me.” That’s how Hugo Chavez got elected.

Running Hispanics won’t help Republicans. Ask Gary Franks, Lynn Swann or Michael Steele if being black won them the black vote.

Promoting amnesty won’t help — ask John McCain, who won about the same percentage of the Hispanic vote as Romney did.

Or ask California’s Hispanics, only 4 percent of whom oppose Republican immigration policies. Their main beef with the GOP is that they think Republicans are “the rich.”

<http://topconservativenews.com/2012/11/demography-is-destiny/>

Appendix E

Two thirds of new jobs going to immigrants

Two-thirds of those who have found employment under President Obama are immigrants, both legal and illegal, according to an analysis that suggests immigration has soaked up a large portion of what little job growth there has been over the past three years.

The Center for Immigration Studies is releasing the study Thursday morning, a day ahead of the final Labor Department unemployment report of the campaign season, which is expected to show a sluggish job market more than three years into the economic recovery.

That slow market, combined with the immigration numbers, could explain why Mr. Obama and Republican nominee Mitt Romney have struggled to find a winning jobs message in some of the country’s hardest-hit postindustrial regions.

“It’s extraordinary that most of the employment growth in the last four years has gone to the foreign-born, but what’s even more extraordinary is the issue has not even come up

during a presidential election that is so focused on jobs,” said Steven A. Camarota, the center’s research director, who wrote the report along with demographer Karen Zeigler.

His numbers are stark: Since the first quarter of 2009, the number of immigrants of working age (16 to 65) who are employed has risen 2 million, from 21.2 million to 23.2 million. During the same time, native-born employment has risen just 1 million, to reach 119.9 million.

<http://topconservativenews.com/2012/11/two-thirds-of-new-jobs-going-to-immigrants/>

Appendix F

City Billboard Urges Hispanics to Revolt: Update

Imagine if cities put up billboards calling for Anglos to ‘rise up’

It is considered billboard art, but it comes off more as a revolutionary slogan.

Rise Up, My People: Is “Arriba Mi Gente” art, or an inflammatory call for uprising?

“Arriba Mi Gente” by Nancy Guevara depicts a hoard of people with clenched fists and flags raised, over an image of the U.S.-Mexico border and a heart emblazoned with the Mexican flag logo. The slogan, in Spanish, plastered prominently over the artwork translates “Rise up, my people,” with the idea of uprising clearly suggested.

The Austin Visual Arts Association has teamed up with Reagan Outdoor Advertising to put up 10 pieces of art on billboards on major highways across the city of Austin, where it will be seen by hundreds of thousands in the city and millions more driving through.

One can understand why border issues would inspire art, but why did AustinArtBoards.org, which is city funded, decide to project a such a loaded racial message over major highways that English-speaking drivers can’t even understand and which drivers speeding by who could read Spanish would interpret as a call for uprising?

According to BigPicture.net, “*Arriba Mi Gente*” was selected from more than 100 entries, yet “Arriba Mi Gente” is the only piece with words at all, much less a revolutionary message clearly divided along racial lines.

Is it art, or an inflammatory call to revolt?

The artwork suggests a political identity based on nothing more than racial inclusion, not principled positions or rights.

What would be the response if a mural of a KKK rally were put up on any billboard, much less a city-funded one? What kind of message are taxpayers fronting the bill for, and who does it benefit?

Children in schools across the U.S have been disciplined for wearing “offensive” shirts with American flags or refusing to recite the Mexican anthem in class while other officials have been caught flaunting Mexican flags and other regalia as groups like La Raza openly use race as a political rallying point.

<http://topconservativenews.com/2013/03/austin-billboard-urges-latino-revolt/>