

EDITOR
Thomas Fleming

MANAGING EDITOR
Theodore Pappas

SENIOR EDITOR, BOOKS
Chilton Williamson, Jr.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Christine Haynes

ART DIRECTOR
Anna Mycek-Wodecki

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
John W. Aldridge, Harold O.J. Brown, Katherine Dalton, Samuel Francis, George Garrett, E. Christian Kopff, Clyde Wilson

CORRESPONDING EDITORS
Janet Scott Barlow, Bill Kauffman, John Shelton Reed, David R. Slavitt

EDITORIAL SECRETARY
Leann Dobbs

PUBLISHER
Allan C. Carlson

PUBLICATION DIRECTOR
Guy C. Reffett

COMPOSITION MANAGER
Anita Fedora

CIRCULATION MANAGER
Rochelle Frank

A publication of The Rockford Institute.
Editorial and Advertising Offices:
934 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103.
Editorial Phone: (815) 964-5054.
Advertising Phone: (815) 964-5811.
Subscription Department: P. O. Box 800,
Mount Morris, IL 61054. Call 1-800-877-5459.
For information on advertising in *Chronicles*,
please call Rochelle Frank at (815) 964-5811.

U. S. A. Newsstand Distribution by Eastern News
Distributors, Inc., 1130 Cleveland Road,
Sandusky, OH 44870.

Copyright © 1993 by The Rockford Institute.
All rights reserved.

Chronicles (ISSN 0887-5731) is published
monthly for \$24 per year by The Rockford
Institute, 934 North Main Street, Rockford,
IL 61103-7061. Second-class postage paid
at Rockford, IL and additional mailing offices.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to
Chronicles, P. O. Box 800, Mount Morris,
IL 61054.

The views expressed in *Chronicles* are the
authors' alone and do not necessarily reflect
the views of The Rockford Institute or of its
directors. Unsolicited manuscripts cannot be
returned unless accompanied by a self-addressed
stamped envelope.

Chronicles
A MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN CULTURE

Vol. 17, No. 4 April 1993

POLEMICS & EXCHANGES

On 'Clerical Celibacy'

Professor Jenkins bears false witness against me in "Priests and Pedophiles" (December 1992) when he implies that somehow I am an opponent of clerical celibacy. The only thing I've ever written on the subject has been in support of celibacy. I have consistently argued that most pedophiles are married men and that the pedophilia syndrome is acquired early in life, usually by being a victim of sexual abuse oneself, and does not result from celibacy.

—Father Andrew Greeley

Professor Jenkins Replies:

Father Greeley accuses me of misrepresenting his views and says that he has never linked the problem of priestly

pedophilia to the issue of clerical celibacy. I am interested to hear this statement from a writer whose opinions on Catholic matters rightly receive widespread respect and attention. However, not once does my article attribute to him the view described. My references to his work state, quite correctly, that he has gone on record as emphasizing the scale and seriousness of the "abuse" problem and as criticizing the handling of that issue by the Church. I was particularly quoting his op-ed piece entitled "Priestly Silence on Pedophilia," from the *New York Times*. I did not refer to his position on celibacy and do not think I can fairly be described as "bearing false witness" against anybody in this matter. On the other hand, it can be amply documented that other writers on "priestly pedophilia" do indeed draw the connection with celibacy.

CULTURAL REVOLUTIONS

AS THIS ARTICLE and this issue of *Chronicles* go to press, the United States Senate Judiciary Committee will be considering whether Dade County State Attorney Janet Reno is, by her character, fit to serve this nation as Attorney General.

My own opinion is, *no*. In the 1988 Dade County, Florida, general election, I was Attorney General-Designate Janet Reno's Republican opponent. I ran against her and lost by a two to one margin—the most respectable margin any of her opponents has ever garnered—knowing I could not win in a town whose sole newspaper, the *Miami Herald*, has turned her over the past 15 years into an icon of political correctness.

I ran against Reno because of our wildly divergent views on the aims of the criminal justice system. That is why the Fraternal Order of Police endorsed me, even knowing full well I could not win. The rank-and-file officers whom the FOP represents had grown to hate Reno because of her long-held animus toward police and legitimate law enforcement efforts, and they were desperate to express that hatred. Here's an

example of the hard lesson Dade police officers had already learned in the streets and in Reno's courtrooms. In the only debate of our campaigns against one another, televised from the studio of WL-RN-TV in Miami, each of us was asked our highest priority as Dade State Attorney. I said: "To put away as many criminals for as long as possible." Reno said: "My highest priority has always been not to convict criminals but rather to protect their rights." Straight out of the ACLU policy manual, as is her penchant to prosecute law officers for "excessive use of force" when no credible evidence of same exists.

The demoralizing effect Attorney General Reno will have upon the federal law enforcement community will be devastating; just ask any South Florida law officer. But it is Reno's character and not her policies that will be the focus of debate during her nomination hearings. The "advise and consent" clause conferring confirmation power for Cabinet and other offices upon the Senate has, for better or worse, devolved to make "character" the only *ostensible*

legitimate area of inquiry. The "Borking" of Clarence Thomas was done for policy reasons, but it had to proceed under the guise of "character" inquiry.

What, then, are my and others' concerns about Reno's character? First, there is the question of her "sexual orientation." In our campaign, Reno categorically denied, without refuting the evidence, that she is a "closeted lesbian." NOW President and outed-but-formerly-closeted-lesbian Patricia Ireland is one who pushed Clinton to nominate Reno and said, "We need this *kind* of woman at Justice." Reno, when asked *after* her post-nomination triumphal return to Miami by the assembled media at the Miami Airport what her sexual orientation was, said: "Mr. Thompson is preoccupied with my sexual orientation. I am an old maid who has a strong affection for men." Not exactly a categorical denial anymore. The *Miami Herald* transmogrified that weak-kneed rebuff into a stronger statement: "... who has a strong attraction to men." Even the *Herald* knew the "affection for" phrase constituted a winking admission, so it misreported what Reno said to the cameras into the "attraction" quotation, which is what ran in nearly every American newspaper the next day.

Days later Queer Nation weighed in with an "outing" outside the Justice Department in which their spokesperson stated that "many homosexuals in Miami have contacted us and told us that Reno's lesbianism is common knowledge among the gay community." NOW's Patricia Ireland interestingly weighed in, after the "outing," with an interesting statement: "Ms. Reno should not be judged on the basis of her sexual orientation."

Are Reno's sexual proclivities, *per se*, the core issue? Not these days, at least not to me. The issue has always been Reno's *blackmailability* because of her *closeted* proclivities. Blackmail occurs between the ears of the blackmail target. Reno cannot now come out of the closet if she wanted to, because it would end her public career. She would have to admit she lied for 20 years.

The liberals have very recently made the point exquisitely in the wake of Anthony Summers' book, *Official and Confidential: The Secret Life of J. Edgar Hoover*, about J. Edgar Hoover's closeted homosexuality and the blackmail danger it posed to this law enforcement officer's judgment and integrity. No such

even-handed analysis has been brought to bear upon Reno's sexual proclivities by anyone in the confirmation process or the media, even though I and others have conveyed evidence to the attorney hired by Clinton, liberal Maryland attorney Lanny Davis, to check out Reno's background *prior* to her nomination. Indeed, Communications Director George Stephanopolous responded to an inquiry in the White House briefing room days before Reno was nominated about whether the "sexual orientation" of the Attorney General was relevant. He said that it was not.

If you don't buy my analysis of what may be a problem here, how about Reno's immediate predecessor and boss, Dade County State Attorney Richard Gerstein, a life-long Democrat, who died in 1992 and whose front-page obituary in the *Miami Herald* contained the following admonition of Gerstein: "No [closeted] homosexual can be a prosecutor because it gives every defendant the blackmail option." Gerstein did not know of the Trojan Horse within his office.

Upon Reno's nomination, I and others gave the Senate Judiciary Committee and the FBI evidence not only of Reno's closeted lesbianism, but also of her alleged: a) use of "escort service" girls for sex. One such call girl, whose name is "Crystal," has reputedly told the publisher of a certain "escort" magazine that she has received money for sex from Reno at Reno's home; b) apprehension by a Broward County police officer in a shopping-mall parking lot in the backseat of a car with a disrobed girl, as related by a homosexual Ft. Lauderdale talk-show host; c) long-standing relationship with a South Florida television news anchorwoman.

Could Reno really be blackmailed? In 1987, I persuaded her to open an investigation of some local pornographers. She acknowledged in the September 24, 1987, edition of the *Ft. Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel* that she opened the investigation per my request. The pornographer then announced publicly that if Reno pursued him, he would make the case that she is a lesbian. The investigation was dropped, no explanations given. I was successful thereafter in the federal venue in determining that these pornographers were indeed engaged in criminal activity, as I had alleged to Reno.

Reno is more than willing to punish those who threaten to open one of her

closet doors. For example, shortly after I went public with my assertions and evidence of Reno's lesbianism, the Florida Bar, on whose Board of Governors sit Reno's campaign contributors, retained a Dr. Barry Crown to render an opinion that I was "mentally incapacitated" even though Dr. Crown had never met me. Dr. Crown is reported to receive massive expert witness fees from Reno's office. That ploy by Reno's supporters backfired, as a neutral psychiatrist and psychologist ultimately agreed to by the Bar certified me sane after a full battery of tests. I am now one of the few certified sane lawyers in Florida.

Reno and her friends tried to use the Bar again when I blew the whistle (in the pages of *Chronicles*) on the illegal distribution of pro-homosexual audio tapes to the children of the Dade County School System. I beat that scam also, and thanks to Reno's unsuccessful Bar gambits, the Florida Bar's insurance carrier just paid me \$20,000 in damages for this frontal assault upon my First Amendment rights.

Another example of protective retribution by Reno is the case of Jim Collier, who brought evidence on massive Dade County electronic vote fraud to Janet Reno, which evidence included bogus computer cards being pre-punched and fed into the vote-counting machines. Collier took these fraudulently pre-punched ballots directly to Reno, but Reno, rather than investigating the fraud which would inconvenience a number of her political allies, had the public-spirited Mr. Collier arrested for grand theft of ballots even though Collier took the "stolen" ballots to Reno. Mr. Collier has told his tale to an interested investigator reporting to Judiciary Chairman Joe Biden and may indeed testify at the confirmation hearings.

Alex Cockburn wrote in the March 8, 1993, issue of the *Nation* that Reno is not beyond using unsavory methods to accomplish her goals. Mr. Cockburn doesn't know the half of it when it comes to Reno's desperate methods to protect herself and her carefully crafted closet of many doors. If she heads Justice, she will turn the Justice Department into the latest oxymoron.

At press time, homosexuality, even closeted homosexuality, appears to be a qualification rather than a detriment to Reno's nomination, but there is one door yet opening in the Reno closet.

John Bliss, a Republican investigator on the Senate Judiciary Committee who reports to Colorado Senator Hank Brown, told me and another person on a conference call at six o'clock p.m. on February 18 that the Committee had preliminary evidence unexpectedly fall into its lap that Reno has been pulled over five times while "driving under the influence" in Dade County. The contact with the Republican investigators on the Judiciary Committee had been David Gibbons, Director of Federal Affairs at the National Rifle Association. Gibbons, according to Bliss, had been approached by a former Dade Assistant State Attorney, under Janet Reno, who had been told by five police officers about five separate drunk-driving incidents. Reno had not, the officers stated, been arrested, because of fear of reprisals by her, but electronic logging tapes memorializing the pull-overs might prove the apprehensions.

United States Senator Trent Lott's office has memoranda relating to the drunk-driving information, as well as to the willingness of the five officers to come forward if Reno is asked in the confirmation hearings if she has ever been pulled over after drinking. One memo has been circulated to Republican senators and representatives, all of whom have remained silent. It states that the officers will come forward to prove a) she has been pulled over and b) she has committed perjury in swearing she was not. When are the Republicans going to come forward? Will the questions ever be asked?

Given the timidity among the Republican senators on the Judiciary Committee, the question is more likely to come from the other side of the aisle. The Republican senators, according to sources on the committee staff, are loathe to tangle in the wake of Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas with another female, this time a nominee, backed by the radical feminist lobby.

The Republican senators, according to John Bliss, would not even ask Democratic Chairman Joseph Biden for a subpoena to compel the NRA's Dave Gibbons and now two other persons who know the former Reno assistant's name to cough up that name, under threat of a contempt of Congress citation if they refused, which would compel the former Reno assistant to come forward. The former assistant has indicated that what she knows may cost her her job,

and she is reluctant to come forward fully. A congressional subpoena upon those who have her name would *force* her to come forward. [Ed. note: Bliss denies possession of such information, but political activist Priscilla Gray says she discussed the D. U. I.'s in a conference call with Bliss.] The Republicans, however, are not pushing for the name. Why? The fear of being "Arlen Specter-ized" runs deep among the nervous GOP senators. As one former U. S. senator told me this week: "That cowardice is why we're the minority party."

No such cowardice is evident among the Democrats. Senator Joe Biden's investigative staffers—Mark Schwartz and Mary DeOreo—interviewed me for more than an hour on February 23 much more professionally and thoroughly—and sympathetically—than did the Republicans. It may be that Senator Biden takes more seriously his "advise and consent" duties than do the Republicans, or maybe this confirmation battle is a trial contest with the White House as to who will really pick the next Supreme Court Justice: Hillary or Joe. Whatever the reason, the clear conclusion from talking to Biden's people is that they wanted to know and do something appropriate with evidence of Reno's character problems, especially the D. U. I. problems and cover-up thereof. The Republicans have only responded with fear.

Therefore, as this article goes to press, the Senate Judiciary Committee has compelling evidence that Reno has a potential closet full of personal problems from lesbianism to chronic alcohol abuse. Blackmail, the Judiciary Committee has been told, can be visited both upon her and by her. It is problematic as to whether the committee, on either side of the aisle, will use its considerable investigative powers, including the subpoena power, to ferret out the truth. America deserves to know what kind of Attorney General it is getting. The reader of this article will have the benefit of knowing if anything came of any of this—if Janet Reno's confused personal life sullied and sank her nomination, and with it the dwindling perception that Bill Clinton knows how to govern. The perception of the Republicans, at least, is not dwindling. They are not even on the radar screen, so total has been their failure to discharge their "advise and consent" du-

ties during the now extended confirmation process.

When Reno was nominated, CNN's Bernard Shaw intoned: "Many Capitol Hill insiders say this nominee, after two false starts by Clinton, must be the Caesar's wife of Attorney General nominees." Reno is nobody's wife. There may be reasons for that.

—John B. Thompson

THE JAPANESE have been zealous in buying up American symbols: golf courses, movie studios, Rockefeller Center, the Mariners. Recently, however, they are beginning to learn that cosmopolitanism can be a two-way street. In January, American sumo wrestler Chad Rowan became the first foreigner to be awarded the rank of "Exalted Grand Champion." Six feet five inches and 455 pounds, Rowan is able to dominate the smaller Japanese wrestlers, and a century-old cultural tradition, deeply embedded in Shintoism, may soon be as American as Coca Cola, jeans, and Cheap Trick.

The internationalist press in the United States is absolutely thrilled, not only because this proves the sincerity of the Japanese promise to open their markets to foreign competition, but, more importantly, because American sumo wrestlers strike a blow for bland uniformity in the New World of women clergymen, homosexual marines, girl boy scouts, white bluesmen, and Korean cellists. If the pygmies had wrestling events, they would probably have to open them up to the bloated behemoths of the WFL.

The entire United States sometimes seems like a million-mile-long strip mall studded with Chi Chi's, Olive Gardens, Pizza Huts, and TGI Friday's serving the same microwaved compost with a light ethnic accent. Processed white cheese and tomato paste make it Italian, chili powder makes it Mexican. The great American melting pot turns out to contain Hamburger Helper, and if a cook serves ribs on Martin Luther King's birthday, he is engaging in "negative stereotyping." We have lost the right to be different, because being really different means the ability to discriminate and to exclude. Orthodox Jews cannot remain orthodox if they allow women to become rabbis, and a Christian fraternity may not admit Jews without ceasing to be Christian. When black

scholars claim that only they can interpret the "black experience," they may be forfeiting their academic status, but they are staking a claim on the more solid ground of authenticity. Of course, we are all human beings, and we can all make educated guesses as to what it is like to be black or Chinese or Southern Protestant, but the native knows things from experience that no gifted outsider can ever figure out. If Americans were not so poorly educated, they would know this, but our journalists and politicians manage to graduate from college unscathed by the histories, languages, and literatures of any people, including their own. If they were to read this screed, they would take to outputting their files on human rights and the global village. "You, you're laughing," says Horace, "but the joke's on you."

To insist upon openness and equality is to deny others the right to be themselves. "I am what I am and that's all that I am," was the creed of Popeye the sailorman, but in today's world Olive and Bluto and Swee'pea would all be lodging suits alleging victimization, discrimination against bullies, and spinach deprivation. Besides, Popeye's conduct after Pearl Harbor constitutes Japan-bashing and race-baiting.

America has come a long way since the 1940's, and the NBA recently inducted Ulyona Semyonova, a 7'2" Russian female, into its Hall of Fame. What nation, exactly, does the NBA represent?

If the Japanese are smart, they will do more than impose the weight limit they are contemplating. They will find some apparently innocent way to declare, in their charmingly xenophobic way, that sumo wrestling is a Japanese folk art that is not open to foreigners. Men wanted, no foreign devils need apply. The Japanese, as we have known them for the past hundred years, are an enemy worth our admiration and, occasionally, deserving of our animosity. If they are foolish enough to open themselves up to an American takeover, they will deserve the contempt we ordinarily reserve for ourselves, who have practically nothing left to sell out.

—Thomas Fleming

OBITER DICTA will be an occasional, "by the way" column in *Chronicles*. Appearing at the end of Cultural Revolutions, it will report on past and future

events of interest and on the comings, goings, and doings of friends of *Chronicles*.

This month, for example, we would like to note that Bill Kauffman and David R. Slavitt are now listed as corresponding editors on our masthead. Author of the novel *Every Man a King*, Mr. Kauffman will contribute a series of articles to *Chronicles* on the old Middle American culture. Having already written for the magazine on such subjects as Sinclair Lewis, Henry W. Clune, and the struggles between Upstate and Downstate New York, Mr. Kauffman is a welcome addition to our force. As is Mr. Slavitt, who has written bimonthly movie reviews for *Chronicles* for several years now.

We are also pleased to see that the National Humanities Institute's *Humanitas* has taken on some extra pages and is now a thin journal. The additional space will, as its editors reason in a statement entitled "HUMANITAS: Rethinking It All" for their Fall 1992/Winter 1993 issue, allow for more "scholarship that challenges uncritical assumptions and can set the humanities on a more promising course." *Humanitas* aims to "oppose the facile classification of ideas in political terms and . . . encourage articles that go beyond an obsolescent left-right distinction"—good news for anyone interested in the future of the humanities.

Finally, we would like to report on two conferences organized in part by *Chronicles*: the third annual John Randolph Club meeting, which was held in Chicago last December 11 and 12, and a smaller gathering to discuss European (and American) politics, which will take place in Chicago from March 26 to 28.

"Bosnia, USA: Ethnic Conflict at Home and Abroad" was the fiery topic of this year's John Randolph Club conspiracy (somehow "conference" does not seem the appropriate word), during which club members demonstrated their intellectual and oratorical strength by delivering engaging and (more or less) relevant talks, often at literally a moment's notice. Not even blustering blizzards on the East Coast (which prevented several of the scheduled participants, including the keynote speaker, from attending) could stop the club from engaging in its (sometimes heated) debate. With scholars like Ralph Raico of the SUNY at Buffalo, Antony Sullivan of the Earhart Foundation, and

Leonard Liggio of the Institute for Humane Studies filling in for snowed-in members, panels on subjects like "IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE: The Threat to Liberty" and "BLADDERUNNER: L. A. and the Aftermath" provided ample food for thought. As did Wayne Lutton, associate editor of the *Social Contract*, and Samuel Francis, a columnist for the *Washington Times* and a contributing editor of *Chronicles*, with their discussions of the consequences of massive immigration and the possibilities of white reaction to ethnic violence, respectively. Their panel, entitled "INVASION USA: Ethnic Conflict in America," left the audience crying for more discussion time as the meeting broke for lunch. Jared Taylor, who graciously filled in for the stranded keynote speaker the second night of the conference, gave attendees a preview of his recently published book *Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America*. The John Randolph Club, which was founded by the Rockford Institute and the Ludwig Von Mises Institute to encourage exchange between traditionalists and libertarians, plans its next meeting for this fall. For more information about the club, please write to: Burton Blumert, 875 Mahler Rd., #150, Burlingame, CA 94010.

The upcoming "New Politics" conference, while probably somewhat tamer than the JRC escapade, proves to be equally engaging. Bringing together a small number of writers and scholars to talk about the nationalist, regionalist, and populist movements of Europe and the United States, the conference aims to initiate a continuing dialectic among intellectuals on both sides of the Atlantic. Conference participants will include (among others): Alain de Benoist, head of GRECE (Grouping of Research and Studies for European Civilization) and editor of the journals *Krisis* and *Nouvelle école*; Robert D'Amico, professor of philosophy at the University of Florida; Thomas Molnar, author of the recent *Philosophical Grounds*; Paul Piccone, editor of *Telos: A Journal of Critical Social Thought*; Carlo Ruzza, a visiting professor of sociology at the University of Surrey in England whose home is Como, Italy; and Tomislav Sunic, professor of European politics at Juniata College in Pennsylvania. c

by Samuel Francis

Paths of Glory

As I write this column (in late January), the United States has deployed 30,000 troops in Somalia, has just launched new bombing strikes against Iraq, has announced a naval blockade of Haiti, and is debating whether it should send combat forces into the Balkans. By the time you read this column (in late March), there is literally no telling where our military forces will be engaged, though any number of locations are entirely possible: South Africa, where the “transition from apartheid” may or may not proceed at a pace and in a fashion that suits the friends of global egalitarianism; Sudan, which endures famine and chaos no less severe than Somalia; Germany, where riots against immigrants have taken a number of lives in the last few months and suggest the incipient revival of a militant counterrevolutionary nationalism; or any of several other countries and regions where internal disorders, unsavory political conditions, or social and economic problems that Americans find disgusting may sound the bugles for the cavalry to mount and administer mercy at the point of American bayonets. But what droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven these days is less likely to be mercy than the payloads of American bombers.

There is no way to tell where American troops will be sent a few months from now because, quite simply, virtually no one in the policymaking positions in our government nor in the opinion-making classes of American society any longer considers “national interest” to be the operative principle by which foreign military intervention should be determined. When President-elect Clinton announced just before his inauguration that he would retain President Bush’s policy of turning back boatloads of Haitian immigrants, his stated reason for violating his own campaign promise and not welcoming an armada of unskilled, illiterate, and disease-ridden invaders to our shores had nothing to do with our national interest, nor even with enforcing long-standing and popularly supported laws against illegal immigration. His decision, he proclaimed, was

based on the welfare of the Haitians themselves. Reversing the policy, you see, would encourage the pilgrims to embark on the high seas in quest of the happy harbors of Miami, and many of them might drown or expire from exhaustion and exposure before the Coast Guard could save them from the consequences of their ill-conceived expedition. Presumably, if Genghis Khan and the Golden Horde returned to life and headed across the Bering Straits for Seattle, any resistance they met from the United States government would be predicated on the need to spare the Mongols the risk of catching pneumonia in their journey through Alaska’s arctic wilderness.

The extinction of the concept of “national interest” as the governing guideline of our foreign policy betrays the coming extinction of the nation-state itself, or what our governing elite would like to be its extinction. Hardly any discussion of “post-Cold War foreign policy,” from high-school commencement addresses to highly classified memoranda exchanged among the munchkins of the national security labyrinth, fails to rehearse all the clichés of a “global economy,” the “meaninglessness” of national borders, and the evolution of the planet toward political, cultural, economic, and demographic “interdependence.” Such platitudes are not simply rhetorical commonplaces replacing salutations of the Founding Fathers and biblical allusions as staples of public oratory. They establish and are intended to establish the conceptual framework within which actual policies are designed and by which the choice of actions available to policymakers is delimited. The general consequence of such language is not merely neglect of the national interest but its obliteration and the removal from the national consciousness of any inkling that there are some things that are important, and others that are unimportant or actually harmful, for the nation to do. The more specific result will be the eventual evaporation of any concept of the nation itself as a distinct political and cultural unit. An institution that has no interests of its own to pursue or that perennially fails to pursue them and whose leaders and members are pro-

foundly oblivious to such interests cannot be said to exist in any but the most vacuous and abstruse sense.

The disappearance of the concept of “national interest” is not, then, an accident, nor the result of sloppy thinking and careless expression. It corresponds to and reflects one of the major social trends of our times, the formation of a genuinely supranational apparatus of global management administered and governed by an emerging supranational elite. Given the global reach of modern organizations and the homogenization that their operations demand, a unified global government able to enforce such homogeneity is consistent with the interests of the groups that manage these organizations, and the building of a global government necessarily involves the erosion of national units as politically sovereign and culturally distinctive organisms. Nor is it an accident that the elaboration of the basic concepts and institutions of this “New World Order” is now more or less explicitly voiced by the hired mouthpieces of the emerging regime.

Last year, at a meeting of the Group of Seven in Paris, the big enchiladas of the “global economy” assigned some homework to U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. They instructed him to design plans for a standing army of the United Nations able to undertake missions “for preventive diplomacy, for peacemaking and for peacekeeping.” By June, the secretary-general had completed his work and turned in his paper. What he proposed, and what his instructors wanted, is nothing less than an independent armed force that would empower the United Nations itself as a new global power in its own right.

Mr. Boutros-Ghali’s proposal is to “bring into being, through negotiations, the special agreements . . . whereby member states undertake to make armed forces, assistance and facilities available to the Security Council . . . not only on an ad hoc basis but on a permanent basis.” In the past, you see, U.N. “peacekeeping forces” were limited. They were sent into a region only after a ceasefire among the combatants had been worked out, not into combat situations, and their own combat was con-