

for a change. For never let it be said that we at RRR are too petty to admit mistakes. Once in a blue moon, we're wrong. For since his death, the floods have arrived, and Bettelheim Revisionism has arisen to make a powerful and unchallengeable case.

For it turns out that eminent shrink Bettelheim was a vicious sadist and child abuser; many of his abused former patients have testified to that fact ever since his death has released them from a life of fear.

And now comes the final nail in his coffin: folklore expert Alan Dundes, a long-time anthropologist at Berkeley, has demonstrated that the very book I had praised—his splendid defense of fairy-stories against the hordes of Left Puritanism—was a work of wholesale plagiarism of Stanford psychiatrist Julius Heuscher's book, *A Psychiatric Study of Fairy Tales*. [Anne C. Roark, "Bettelheim Plagiarized Book Ideas, Scholar Says," *Los Angeles Times*.] Professor Dundes concludes that if an undergraduate "were to turn in a research paper with this sort of borrowing without any attribution," it would certainly be considered as plagiarism.

Fodder for shrink analysis is some of the curious reactions to this revelation. As in the case of Martin Luther King, the guy being plagiarized was not only not troubled, but seemed to be honored that a great man like Bettelheim would bother to plagiarize him. Not at all curious but nevertheless odious was the response of Bettelheim's longtime literary agent, Theron Raines.

Belligerently, Raines wanted to know why this article is written

now, after Bettelheim is dead and he is no position to answer the charges against him.

OK, Theron, if you really want to know, I'll tell you. Because if the S.O.B. couldn't be brought to justice when he was alive, perhaps he can at least be judged at the bar of history. I know it would have been far more satisfying to drag Bettelheim to the dock in person, but Theron, we can only do the best we can. — M.N.R.

## Scrambling For Funds

by Paul Gottfried

While Bertolt Brecht was right to observe that food is needed to philosophize, in the case of American movement conservatism financial grants have replaced ordinary food. In *Time* magazine (December 3, 1990), a detailed report is given about the comings and goings of Vile Body, a group of self-identified cultural conservatives who meet to exchange ideas in New York. This group, which includes, among others, Roger Kimball, Richard Brookhiser, Bruce Bawer, and (depending on his schedule) John Podhoretz, has published with Poseidon Press an anthology of their thoughts, which condemns the "adversary" culture<sup>1</sup>. What *Time* does not indicate is that all fourteen participants represent magazines and other interests receiving steady, vital subsidies from one or more of four neoconservative foundations. *The New Criterion*, for which most of the contributors write

and which employs several of the contributors, drew a subsidy of \$125,000 from the Sarah Scaife Foundation in 1989 and has received annual grants of \$100,000 from the John M. Olin Foundation and at least \$50,000 from the Bradley Foundation since the mid-eighties<sup>2</sup>. Two other publications with Vile Body contributors, *National Review* and *American Spectator*, are likewise the recipients of regular subsidies from neoconservative foundations. *American Spectator*, a monotonously faithful, neo-conservative magazine, is perhaps the one most often in straitened circumstances, after *The New Criterion*. Bradley and J.M. Olin provide it jointly with about \$450,000 per annum, while Bradley made

a special grant of \$50,000 to the *American Spectator's* editor in 1986 to help relocate offices in Arlington, Virginia<sup>3</sup>.

Without the administrative staffs of Bradley, Olin, Smith-Richardson, and Sarah Scaife, there would be no operative agenda of "cultural conservatism" being implemented in New York and Washington.

Cultural conservatives—that is, critics of modern society, there would undoubtedly be, but not organized activity for positions that foundation heads decide to call "culturally conservative"—e.g., defending Jackson Pollock's modern art against Robert Mapplethorpe's or Martin Luther King's oratory against Jesse Jackson's.

The shaping of cultural conservatism is now bringing economic

**The  
perversion  
of  
conser-  
vative  
founda-  
tions.**

benefits to political activists who have discovered a market for "values." The head of the Free Congress Foundation Paul Weyrich, for example, receives hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly from the Bradley and Olin Foundations.

In return, Weyrich ceases to be a mere congressional lobbyist and becomes instead a spokesman for "Judeo-Christian values". In this role, he calls for governmental programs to promote "cultural conservatism" across the country. An even greater amount of annual funding from Bradley, Olin, and Smith-Richardson goes to the Institute for Educational Affairs. Under the institute's recently departed head, Leslie Lenkowsky, its staff worked to further "democratic values," seen as the neoconservative foreign policy of aiding both the A.F.L.-C.I.O and Reagan State Department in their drive for global democracy<sup>5</sup>. In late 1988 Bradley conferred \$475,000 on the James Madison Center, which was subsequently incorporated into I.E.A.<sup>6</sup>. The center was organized as a forum for William Bennett, who, together with Jack Kemp, has emerged as one of the two preferred presidential candidates of the neoconservatives. Bennett's decision to become drug czar made it no longer necessary to furnish him with a thinktank of likeminded constitutional and educational theorists. (Now he is an Olin-funded fellow of the neoconservative Hudson Institute, which Lenkowsky heads.)

## "Cultural conservatives" champion Pollock vs. Mapplethorpe.

Conservative cultural rhetoric is intended to keep afloat both political candidacies and Washington lobbies, but neoconservative philanthropy does not exist entirely for that end. There is a definite worldview that neoconservative-

controlled foundations subsidize, and it may be inferred from both neoconservative editorials against the Old Right and from recently published essays on conservative wars.

Neoconservatives, who have defined the conservative movement in the New York-Washington corridor since the early 1980s, stand generally for open immigration, the civil rights cause before it turned against Israel and in the direction of quotas, the welfare state without Jimmy Carter's additions to it, "democratic values" in public and private schools, and "American democracy" throughout the world<sup>7</sup>. Its view of recent American social reform is that of a train that became derailed at the time its neoconservative passengers elected to get off. Those on their right are dismissed as fascists and anti-Semites for failing to board the same train; those too far on the left are belabored with the same terms of contempt for staying on too long. Only those who remained on the train of Progress for the proper time span and left with the right people are entitled to the redemptive label "democrat."

Behind these attitudes socio-cultural and philosophical factors

are equally detectable, and it may be debated ad infinitum which is the most critical one for the neoconservative worldview, the Eastern European Jewish-New York backgrounds of most of its representatives, their Wilsonian-Rooseveltian vision of America, or their connection to the anti-Stalinist Left, which lives on in the appeals to global democratic revolution. The piecemeal takeover of the American Right by neoconservatives through foundations, in any case, entails more than the quest for power emphasized by their critics. Unlike most of the mob of "conservative" job-seekers in Washington during the Reagan years, the neoconservatives do stand for something. And the ruthless wars they have fought against competitors on the Right—whether discrediting the front-runner for the N.E.H. directorship, M.E. Bradford, or more recently, trying to defund and destroy the heretical Rockford Institute—has reflected conviction as much as the passion for power.

It may be argued that neoconservatives have seized foundations to influence culture because they believe seriously (as they assert) that politics is culturally derived<sup>8</sup>. And so they have produced official positions on educational, religious, and aesthetic questions and have hired advocates to publicize their stands. Michael Novak's *Crisis* and Richard John Neuhaus' *First Things* have been created to provide the Christian or Judeo-Christian counterparts of *Commentary*. Both magazines are lavishly funded by Olin and Scaife. Olin and Bradley also earmarked \$200,000 to *This World* while Neuhaus, then an employee of the Rockford Institute, had used that

periodical to proclaim the gospel of democratic capitalism. Funds from the same sources have gone to support the one-note Institute on Religion and Democracy, while Scaife in 1989 bestowed \$100,000 on Neuhaus' Institute on Religion and Public Life in New York, together with \$125,000 on the Ethics and Public Policy Center led by George Weigel in Washington<sup>9</sup>. All these groups show differences without distinctions, having interlocking boards, and pushing the same point of view, that Judeo-Christian morality requires democracy and democratic capitalism.

The heavy concentration of funding from neoconservative philanthropies on the same activities and programs has two explanations. One is the attempt by neoconservatives to rivet public attention, particularly in downtown Washington, on salient ideological positions. Thus it is possible, while walking on Connecticut Avenue in Northwest Washington, to encounter a phantasmagoria of neoconservative magazines and advertisements for lectures, all having titles with the word "democracy" or "democratic." The four sister philanthropic foundations have funded, singly or jointly, all the following advocates of world democracy: Institute on Religion and Democracy, Institute for Democracy in Eastern Europe, Bradley Institute of Democracy and Public Values, In-

stitute for Liberty and Democracy, the partly public National Endowment for Democracy, The Friends of the Democratic Center in the Americas, Gregory Fossedal's trib-

ute to global democracy, *The Democratic Imperative*, a center for "democratic" journalism at Boston University, and the magazine *Studies in Democracy*. The pervasive vision of a democratic state with a mixed economy and unlimited immigration radiates through other ob-

jects of neoconservative philanthropy, particularly Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, the (former) Committee for a Free World, Freedom House, and academic chairs set up by the Olin Foundation for the study of democratic civilization.

In the maiden issue of *First Things*, Richard John Neuhaus castigates his Old Right opposition for scorning "democracy"<sup>10</sup>. This charge could not be properly leveled at Neuhaus or at his fellow-Catholic neoconservative Michael Novak, who has invoked democratic capitalism as the "true incarnation"<sup>11</sup>. Even less does this charge apply to the four sister foundations and to the dominant figure who coordinates their combined philanthropic activities and has been executive director of both Olin and Bradley, Michael S. Joyce. Joyce, who has characterized himself as a Martin Luther King liberal, is excited about the goodness of

contemporary America. Out of his presentist enthusiasm, he has cooperated with Leslie Lenkowsky of Smith-Richardson, I.E.A., the Philanthropic Roundtable, and Hudson, to pull grant-making foundations behind "democratic initiatives" both at home and abroad<sup>12</sup>. For Joyce and Lenkowsky, the National Endowment for Democracy has been a critical instrument for "doing something about democracy" in Central America; and despite traditional identification of conservative foundations with free enterprise, both Joyce and Lenkowsky have been happy to throw support to the National Endowment for Democracy, two-thirds of whose budget goes to labor union activities<sup>13</sup>.

Undoubtedly personal relations have also figured into the funding decisions of the four sisters. In 1988 Olin granted \$376,000 for a three-year fellowship to Irving Kristol at American Enterprise Institute<sup>14</sup>. The grant was mere pocket money for someone who has been called the "neoconservative godfather" and who numbers among admiring proteges Joyce at Bradley, James Piereson, director of Olin, and Richard Larry at Scaife. Olin and Bradley have done particularly well by the Straussians. Joyce admires in particular Harry Jaffa and Jaffa's work on equality as the highest American value, but he has given stipends with equal alacrity to other disciples of the late Leo Strauss. Among these are Clifford Orwin and Thomas Pangle at the University of Toronto, Ralph Lerner and Allan Bloom at Chicago, Walter Berns at Georgetown, and Berns's student James H. Nichols at Claremont. Between 1986 and

## The pervasive vision of a democratic state with a mixed economy and unlimited immigration.

1989 Berns also took from Olin \$500,000 for his endowed chair at Georgetown<sup>15</sup>.

The appointment of Berns's son-in-law, Hillel Fradkin, at Bradley as senior program officer, in 1986 (after a stint at Olin) brought to its funding operations a certain balance.

Fradkin's superior, Joyce, was a Western Straussian, a follower of Jaffa and his Claremont circle; Fradkin, by contrast, took his cues from the Eastern Straussians centered around Bloom and Berns. Supporting scholarship has meant for Bradley since 1986 dividing at least a million dollars annually

between two doctrinaire sects, each looking for the roots of Reaganite democracy in Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau. But the Straussians have special value to the neoconservatives and their clients in dressing up Cold War liberalism and the democratic welfare state in a kind of classical garb. While Straussians stress the justness of America's democratic republic founded on principles of material self-interest, they also claim to be pointing back to the ideals of the ancient city, as explicated by Plato. Their interpretation of "the early American republic as a Lockean regime," their presentation of Plato as an epistemological skeptic, and their attempt to make decontextualized ideas stand for regimes and entire civilizations are all highly problematic, but there can

## Personal relations have also figured into the funding decisions of the four sisters.

be no doubt that Straussians have achieved fame and fortune by pushing such notions. They have turned them into a defense of the political status quo and preach a vision of America as an evolving combination of modern materialism and ancient (non-Christian)

ethics. And they praise the Reagan Revolution for embodying such a synthesis and for seeking to export it.

The equally sectarian and personal focus of Olin funding came out in a 1987 *Chronicles of Education* article that describes how James Piereson spends more than \$5 mil-

lion annually: providing "seed money" for *The New Criterion*; and setting up "campus-based centers," most prominently for Allan Bloom<sup>16</sup>. In 1986 Olin set aside close to \$4 million for Bloom and his fellow-Straussian, Nathan Tarcov, at the University of Chicago-based John M. Olin Center for Inquiry into the Theory and Practice of Democracy. Though Jon Wiener of *The Nation* does not distinguish between personal and operating budgets, he does come up with the staggering figure of \$3.6 million as Bloom's total gift from Olin for his center. Delicately put, most of these funds have been available to Bloom and his associate Tarcov to be spent as they choose. Wiener also finds that Samuel Huntington, a neoconservative political sociologist, has received \$1.4 million from the same benefactor for his own

institute at Harvard<sup>17</sup>. The grant, which has been given for lectures and seminars rather than buildings and capital equipment, is clearly a gift package, with few strings attached.

Far more ominously, in 1988 an Olin Fellowship for \$36,856 went to the Catholic University of America historian, Jerry Z. Muller<sup>18</sup>. An outspoken global democrat with *Commentary*-connections, Muller felt compelled to call the university administration and attack the frontrunner for a graduate professorship in political science as an "anti-Zionist." The candidate was Jewish and had even defied the Israeli government, but had also riled Podhoretz by speaking disrespectfully of *Commentary*. It is certainly possible though not demonstrable that the Olin grant was a reward for a hit well-made<sup>19</sup>.

Three circumstances have combined to produce the neoconservative ascendancy over the four sisters and over conservative foundations generally. The first is the gradual withdrawal from foundation leadership of the actual benefactors at Olin, Bradley, Scaife, and Smith-Richardson in favor of neoconservative staffs. This occurred most dramatically at Bradley, which underwent two related revampings. The elevation of the Milwaukee business tycoon, I. Andrew (Tiny) Rader as the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation president in 1985 came during the first of two organizational changes. A local philanthropic arm of the Allen-Bradley Company, the national foundation was formed in 1985 when Rockwell International Corporation acquired the parent organization<sup>20</sup>. The foundation



once placed under Rader departed from precedent by funding "scholarly activities" nationwide, to the annual amount of \$23 million, and by paying high salaries to its board members for attending meetings. Rader received \$77,220 during fiscal year 1987-88 for working part-time as board president<sup>21</sup>. Soon after his arrival, Rader brought Joyce and Fradkin from Olin and thereafter, Amy Crutchfield, a sometime Bloom-student at the University of Chicago, as program assistant to Fradkin. Though the charter for the revamped foundation speaks of its being "dedicated to strengthening American capitalism, its institutions, principles, and values," the appeal to the free market contained therein has little relevance for current funding practices<sup>22</sup>. Almost all the recipients of Bradley as well as Olin Foundation scholarly grants support a mixed economy and a highly aggressive approach to exporting American democracy.

The board of governors of Smith-Richardson (Robert Bork, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and James Q. Wilson) are all neoconservative "reliables," with the proper social and/or political connections. Though Bork is not a grantee of Smith-Richardson, he does take from Olin an annual fellowship of \$162,000<sup>23</sup>. As director of Scaife, Richard Larry has been able to manage his own board.

Neoconservative activists have largely succeeded in centralizing both the collection and distribution of funding from right-of-center philanthropies. By carefully working with Piereson and Larry through the Philanthropic Roundtable and other organizational frameworks, Joyce and Lenkowsky have been gaining control over the form and

content of movement conservatism. Though the Roundtable has not been able to cope with all mavericks, its leaders can isolate some of them, while channeling over \$30 million in annual patronage to their allies. Lenkowsky, who worked briefly for the United States Information Agency (by now heavily staffed by neoconservatives) before moving on to I.E.A., has stressed the need to maximize the public impact of grant makers<sup>24</sup>. Such phrases are interpreted less charitably as a cover for Lenkowsky's democratic globalist fixations and personal ambition. Though it may be hard to isolate personal factors, it does seem that Lenkowsky's career thus far has been dedicated to a single ideal and he has promoted that ideal through a rapid succession of high-paying positions.

James Taylor, director of Young Americans Foundation and a self-described paleoconservative, believes the Philanthropic Roundtable was never intended as a mere "clearing house." It was, from the outset, an "attempt by neocons to search out all conservative funds and direct them toward their own friends<sup>25</sup>." The Old Right Fund for American Studies, the National Humanities Institute, Taylor's own Young Americans Foundation, the Conservative Caucus of Howard Phillips, and even the black conservative Lincoln Institute (whose leader Jay Parker dared to dress down Jack Kemp) have all been deemed unfit for

funding at Roundtable discussions. Faced by mounting insolvency, Richard Viguerie accepted a gift of \$10 million from the World Unification Church to bail out his own corporation<sup>26</sup>. When Taylor's organization recently came into an inheritance of several million dollars, the heads of neoconservative philanthropies and foundations meeting in New York let it be known that the Young Americans Foundation had "squandered money left by a Baltimore bag lady."

Though Taylor's charges have been made by others, neoconservative-controlled philanthropies will operate to take

over responsive conservative foundations as well as to isolate the nonconformists. Joyce and his allies have labored to control a critical mass of the funding of groups that did not start out as neoconservative but do have organizational value. They have understandably kept funds away from the National Humanities Institute. A scholarly organization that

defends the humanism of Irving Babbitt and has been contemptuous of "democratist sentimentality," its founder Claes Ryn has criticized Straussian scholarship in print<sup>27</sup>.

Like the old Communist Party, neoconservative philanthropic foundations have found it necessary to establish front groups in order to gain public credibility. Their proliferating front organizations include the National Legal Center, the Georgetown Center for Strategic and Interna-

## Neo-conism: globalist fixations and personal ambitions.

tional Studies, Institute on Religion and Democracy, Center for International Relations, and Bradley Institute of Democracy and Public Values, all of which are run almost entirely with doctrinaire neoconservatives. The front organizations each operate to publicize a particular aspect of the neoconservative worldview or policy agenda: for example, the National Legal Center to advance the idea of presidential supremacy over Congress and to keep alive the tradition of presidential activism typified by Lincoln, Wilson, and the two Roosevelts; and the Bradley Institute to emphasize "democratic values" properly understood<sup>28</sup>.

In recent years, neoconservatives have made increasingly large grants to libertarian foundations, particularly the Institute for Contemporary Studies, the Manhattan Institute, the Cato Institute, and the Bowling Green Social Philosophy and Policy Center. The four sisters also keep solvent the once Old-Right Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies<sup>29</sup>. The logic of these grants has been to increase aid in return for penetration. Thus neoconservative philanthropic aid has been unstinting to libertarian institutes that have accepted neoconservative tampering with their boards and/or staffs.

The *piece de resistance* of neoconservative infiltration of conservative policy institutions has occurred in Washington, where conservative foundation heads rush to express agreement with already fixed neoconservative stands. In 1989, the sociologist Charles Murray was released as a fellow by the Manhattan Institute, even though the Bradley Foundation was willing to go on financing his research.

Murray, it was discovered, had extended his work on the culture of the underclass too far, by investigating racially-based differences in I.Q. testing. The only foundation that stepped forth to provide office space for the displaced scholar, long a neoconservative darling, was the politically centrist A.E.I.. Ed Crane, president of the Cato Insti-

ing and media accessibility impelled Crane to tack to the left on social and cultural questions in order to win mainstream respectability for his pamphlet crusade for deregulation and privatization. In an interview with the magazine *Liberty* in November 1990, Crane denounced the "gay-baiting" and "racial comments" of one culturally conservative libertarian and judged paleoconservatives to be "neo-fascist in the social arena." He also scolded the journalist Pat Buchanan for trying to "reinforce our Euro-ethnic heritage," by encouraging the integration of Eastern Canada into the U.S.<sup>31</sup>. None of the charges raised by Crane was in any sense documented. And his tributes to the "seamless web of liberty" have been repeatedly belied by his intolerance of "insensitive" scholarship and his enthusiastic support of "big-government conservatives," most notably Jack Kemp. Yet Crane can no longer be considered an intellectually free agent. He and Cato have begun to draw on neoconservative sources, particularly Olin and Bradley, and their chairman and largest contributor, Charles Koch of Wichita, Kansas, is a socially left-of-center free marketeer<sup>32</sup>.

In view of the funding achievement of the four sister philanthropic foundations, it would seem that an imposed peace could hold the current conservative movement together. This has not happened, and John B. Judis' references in an essay in *The American Prospect* to "the conservative crackup" and to the "movement's disunity and disintegration" sum up the contemporary reality well<sup>33</sup>. Judis depicts a conservative movement reduced to clashing armies of

**The needs for both increased funding and media accessibility impelled Crane to tack to the left.**

tute and Murray's old fishing partner, commented on his current project that "sometimes taboos serve a legitimate social function"<sup>30</sup>. Such a remark may seem particularly surprising, coming from a figure and institute that claim to oppose social taboos, especially prohibitions against homosexuality and mind-altering drugs. But Crane made a costly decision when he moved his predominantly academic thinktank from San Francisco to Washington in 1981. Thereafter his institute became identified almost exclusively with public policy; and the needs for both increased fund-

rightwing populists, Wall Street internationalists, and competing Washington-hustlers, looking for money and not being overly scrupulous about where they take it.

Judis has exposed only the tip of the iceberg that is overturning the agitated vessel of American conservatism. The concentration of power and money within its neoconservative wing, together with savage reprisals against suspected heretics, has not brought a conservative peace; and it may soon turn out that policy foundations will engender increasing costs but diminishing returns to philanthropic organizations. The most respected of the once right-of-center foundations, A.E.I., is today centrist with left-wing Fellows like Norman Ornstein.

The problems of credibility and contagious animosity confronting foundations in greater Washington may be inherent in the claim to represent the *only* conservative principles or policies. It is not possible anymore to include the entire conservative spectrum within a single institute without inviting internecine war. The substantive differences between neoconservatives and the Old Right are even more profound now than five years ago, and the policy battles are increasingly overlaid by memories of who took over what turf.

Paradoxically, the Old Right, which has not gained but been dislodged from turf, may have the advantage of being able to fight a war without logistical burdens. The Old Right's younger members do best at muckraking, which is not an expensive operation. Thus Old Right publicists have dug up information

embarrassing to their opponents: about questionable doctorates of foundation leaders and the plagiarized dissertation of Martin Luther King, Jr., the neoconservatives' most celebrated hero after Lincoln<sup>34</sup>. Such revelations have been made to sustain a war which the neoconservatives and their captive foundations cannot end. Perhaps the neoconservatives have pursued a flawed tactic, by humiliating, but neither disarming nor reconciling, their opposition on the right. If so, they may suffer the fate which Machiavelli warned the prince emphatically to avoid, being despised rather than hated or feared.

At the present time maintaining an affluent lifestyle for its commanders and a few privileged beneficiaries looks like the major aim of neoconservative funding. There is a problem of credibility when neoconservative academics being endowed by the four sisters lament their suffering at the hands of left-wing facilities. Professors identified with the intellectual Right but not with the neoconservatives, such as John Lukacs, Murray N. Rothbard, Claes Ryn, and M.E. Bradford have produced in some cases far more scholarship than the neoconservatives who are receiving four or five times their annual incomes. Another relevant datum is that few humanities scholars on the Left hold the financial resources available to the neoconservatives' kept intellectuals. There can be no doubt that the widely published socialist scholar Judith Shklar collected less money in the late eighties than her neoconservative colleagues in the same political science department at Harvard. Though some conservative scholars have been the victims of leftist discrimination, clients of the

four sisters, many of them rich beyond the dreams of avarice, are not among them. In a comment on Midge Decter and her by now disbanded Committee For the Free World, neoconservative journalist Eric Breindel notes what he considers as an unjustified suspicion, that a "collective of enormously wealthy foundations was financing a highly organized ideological struggle led by Midge Decter's Committee and the various little magazines<sup>35</sup>." A survey of the objects of neoconservative philanthropy, particularly in universities, might lead one to wonder about squandered wealth rather than about the intellectual and polemical vigor of a particular school of thought.

*Professor Gottfried, an adjunct scholar of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, is professor of politics at Elizabethtown College. This article is extracted from a much longer chapter to appear in his new book, written with Thomas Fleming of Chronicles. For a copy of the endnotes to this article, subscribers may send a self-addressed stamped envelope to RRR. ●*

## A Heart-Warming Story For A War-Weary World

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

Despite the Gulf War and what President Bush calls "environmental terrorism," a world leader can still show us the real priorities: Pol Pot, former dictator of Cambodia, has a "soft spot for wildlife," reports James Pringle in the *Washington Times* (1/30/91).