

Affirmative action and racism

With affirmative action being beaten against the congressional ropes, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights Deval Patrick popped up at a hearing last week to invent yet another rationale for saving the race-and-gender privilege code.

"If you could sit at my desk for one week," moaned the man who replaced Lani Guinier as the federal government's race czar, "you would be astonished and saddened by incidents of discrimination, unfairness and even violence motivated by race, ethnicity or gender."



Samuel Francis

Why, only three weeks ago, he reported, there was just such a case in Lubbock, Texas.

There, testified Mr. Patrick, three men drove into town "hunting African-Americans." Luring three black men into their car, they shot them with a sawed-off shotgun. "This is simply to say that while some progress has been made, barriers remain."

What this tale has to do with affir-

Samuel Francis, a columnist for The Washington Times, is nationally syndicated. His column appears here Tuesday and Friday.

mative action is not particularly clear, but it does tell us something about what drives characters like Mr. Patrick. For them the purpose of affirmative action, as of the "hate crimes" they are always discovering, is to advance one race (their own) at the expense of another. The purpose of affirmative action in their minds is not to remove discriminatory barriers in employment or college admissions but to fight "racism" itself, "racism" being a phenomenon restricted entirely to whites.

Thus, when blacks commit "hate crimes" against whites, don't look for Mr. Patrick to pay any attention to them, let alone invoke them as rationales for any racial privileges government has been snookered into creating.

The killing of the three black men in Lubbock, of course, is an atrocity, but to this date neither Mr. Patrick nor much of anyone else has had much to say about a similar racially motivated murder in Kentucky back in January. I described it in a column a few weeks after it occurred, but hardly anyone else seems to have noticed.

The Kentucky story concerns a young white man named Michael Westerman, who was driving his pick-up truck down the road with his wife when a carload of young black men began chasing and shooting at them. Mr. Westerman's truck, you see, sported a Confederate battle flag, the symbol of his

high school football team, and the flag seems to have been the main reason for the attack. In the event, the blacks shot Mr. Westerman through the heart and killed him.

Is this a "hate crime"? Yes. One of the defendants in the case has testified that the attack was motivated by the sight of the Rebel flag, a symbol linked in many black minds with white racism. Ideas and passions associated with racial identity thus were the motives for the otherwise pointless slaughter of Mr. Westerman.

But for Mr. Patrick and his ideological tribe, such hate crimes are on the back of the bus. A spokesman for Mr. Patrick told reporter Michael Hedges of The Washington Times that, "This is an open matter within the Justice Department. We are closely monitoring the local prosecution." Are they indeed? How nice.

But in the Lubbock case, which involved two Hispanics and one white man as the alleged perpetrators, Mr. Patrick did just a little bit more than "monitor" the situation. Almost as soon as the Lubbock crime was committed, Mr. Patrick announced that the Justice Department would be filing federal murder charges against the defendants as "hate criminals," even though (as in the Kentucky case) state murder charges had already been filed.

Moreover, even though two of the perpetrators in the Lubbock case were Hispanics, it will be counted as a white-on-black hate crime. The federal government, in its passion for equal justice, counts Hispanics when they're victims of hate crimes but not when they commit them.

The point, of course, is that "hate crimes" aren't for white people. They're for non-whites, and as Mr. Patrick's congressional testimony shows, they're quick and easy ways to claim that white "racism" is the problem, the only problem, and that the federal war against white racism justifies the racial privileges the federal government has concocted for non-whites at the expense of whites.

Nothing more clearly exposes the race war and the drive for racial power that lurks behind such laws and policies as affirmative action and "hate crimes" than the racially self-serving language and policies of Mr. Patrick. When most Americans are able to cut through the liberal and egalitarian mist with which such racial powermongers hide their real goals, we can get on with ridding ourselves of their ambitions once and for all.