

New World Orgy? Just this: massive overkill firepower for the Bad, food and endless social programs for the Good! This is not a completely new package. After terminating with extreme prejudice 200,000-plus rowdy Filipinos at the beginning of this century, the U.S. sent Yankee schoolmarms and sanitation experts to succor the survivors. The comments of the dead went unrecorded. As to who they are who constitute the Good and the Bad, why, the U.S. rulers will decide—sharply dressed in their safari jackets, pith helmets, and United Nations figleaves.

Am I making light of disaster and starvation in Somalia? I hope not—but Somalis were starving long before the U.S. leadership suddenly discovered their utility to the emerging New World Ordnung. It is intervention and empire that should be our concern. The “new role” of the U.S. military is the old role with better P.R.—i.e., to project power worldwide in pursuit of the power-political, ideological, and economic goals and whims of the U.S. governing elite and their friends (e.g., Aircraft Carrier One, the former U.K.).

As columnist Charley Reese noted (11 Dec.), the U.N. can now fulfill its true purpose as the arrogant enforcer and frontman for the interests of the great powers. The Cold War temporarily foreclosed this happy form of imperialist cooperation. The Soviet collapse leaves the U.S. free to do pretty much to the world (and those of us at home) whatever it can get away with. The One Remaining Super-

power (the phrase Charles Krauthammer keeps under his pillow for instant use) is going to be a major problem for some time to come.

If there aren’t enough bombing targets left for the U.S. forces after a few more “coalition” exercises like the Gulf War (a problem “we” had in Korea where bombing actually had to cease for a while), we’ll probably see more international New Dealism to take up the slack. Soon, Tom Brokaw and the other usual suspects will be filing glowing, goggle-eyed reports about the heroic exploits of the Ninth Motorized Drywall Hangers and the Fifth Airborne Soup Kitchen Rangers.

One could almost miss the Soviet Union just for the limits which that ghastly “social formation” placed on the boundless ambitions of the American rulers. The American state was supposed to be subject to internal limits. This quaint notion—constitutionalism—has been out of fashion for a while. We were meant to “bind them down with the chains of the constitution.” This depended, according to the classic formulation of the America idea, on the persistence of republican virtue and libertarian instincts among the people. Absent these, it will be a long *fin de siècle* indeed. ■

Mr. Stromberg is an historian.

¹Francis Butler Simkins on Father Abraham—now in another starring role on public tv—and Fort Sumter.

Response to Raimondo on Liebman

by Paul Gottfried

Justin Raimondo’s review of Marvin Liebman’s autobiography (RRR, February 1993) provides a masterful summing-up of the major problems of the postwar conservative movement. Justin got it all right, from the centrality of an anti-Communist foreign policy in that movement to its lack of fixed principles on domestic issues. The conservative movement constructed by Bill Buckley was never serious about dismantling the welfare—or what later became the therapeutic-welfare—state. That movement was in fact more than willing to compromise on what it did profess to believe about domestic policy, and it did so to build anti-Communist alliances with Cold War liberals and others. From the early seventies on, moreover, Buckley became an appendage of New York Jewish celebrities and worked earnestly to make his movement congenial to his new friends. These efforts were made all the more easy by the eagerness of the media to treat Buckley and his new circle of friends as “respectable” conservatives—and everyone else on the Right—a.k.a. the real Right—as anti-Semitic extremists. John Judis, in his biography of Buckley, deals at length with the impact of Buckley’s friendships on political changes that were imposed on a conservative movement that looked to him as its “patron saint.”

My one disagreement with Justin centers on his labeling of Buckley's factotum Marvin Liebman as a "neoconservative." Despite Liebman's Brooklyn Jewish Marxist background, and recent invectives against Pat Buchanan, the neo-conservative label does not, in my opinion, seem to apply to him. Liebman is a fairly typical conservative activist, who has easily adapted himself to his "maturing" movement and to the political odysseys of his idol William Buckley. Even if he were not gay, he would likely be expressing sympathy for "oppressed" homosexuals; and even if he were not Jewish,

he would speak as "sensitively" about anti-Semitism as Bill Buckley has in his most recent incarnation and the Podhoretzes everywhere and always. Liebman was a screaming anti-Communist and convert to Catholicism, when these were the in-things for conservatives to be twenty or thirty years ago. He has since come to express new relevant concerns, which Justin considers to be neoconservative. Though I would not dispute this assessment of his most recent views, it seems to me that Liebman has not embraced neoconservative agendas because of any persistent social democratic

belief. I doubt he was a social democrat thirty years ago—or that he would remain one any longer if the improbable occurred and Mr. Buckley altered his social alliances.

If anything, Justin is too kind to Marvin Liebman and other movement conservative zombies to whom he attributes a consistent *weltanschauung*. Like Sam Francis I have never met a self-described neoconservative activist who did not remind me intellectually of a sea scallop. The alterations in party-line these people have had to swallow each time Buckley or Heritage makes new friends, looks for a new donor base, or

tries to make it with David Broder and A.M. Rosenthal would be too much for even self-respecting members of the American Communist Party to put up with. Justin and I can both remember how these conservative activists went from honoring Pat Buchanan to condemning him as a neo-Nazi, within the space of a few days. And there was nothing that

Buchanan said in the intervening time that could be cited to justify this about-face. Surely such types cannot be described as principled theorists of any kind, and Marv Liebman, who displays the same flexible convictions, should be viewed the

same way. Why is it that Liebman joined the Catholic Church when its magisterium spoke out against homosexuality much more emphatically and unanimously than it does now? Why wasn't Liebman more concerned about anti-Semitism on the Right in the fifties and sixties, when *N.R.* published anti-Semites, than he is now, when anti-anti-Semitism has become Mr. Buckley's widely publicized and highly praised obsession?

The answers to my rhetorical questions are obvious and explain why I consider Liebman to be far less significant than a neocon. Liebman illustrates the gullibility and lack of a moral center that allowed the conservative movement to be taken over, almost without resistance, by a handful of neocon power-brokers. What made that takeover possible was the combination of knee-jerk anti-Communism, intellectual vulgarity, and social opportunism that has characterized all too many postwar conservatives. Such activists were not predisposed to neoconservatism; though they were certainly not Taft Republicans, they were also not social democrats either. It was the eagerness to take orders from above in what was perceived as a global struggle against Communism, not any commitment to Roosevelt's or Humphrey's welfare state, that became the defining mark of the rank-and-file conservative activist. Needless to say, the leadership, personified by Buckley, could not plead stupidity when they handed over their movement to the *Commentary*-set. But those who were followers thought and

Justin is too kind to Marvin Liebman and other movement conservative zombies.

did as they were told. There was no temporal salvation for them, or so they thought, outside the movement; and both financial and social punishments were inflicted on those who disobeyed. Justin might consider this situation in trying to understand Liebman. His Communist background, which Justin emphasizes, does shed light here. ■

Dr. Gottfried is author of *The Conservative Movement* (Twayne, 1993).

Economy and Enterprise in the Age of Clinton

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

If we need any proof that Bill Clinton intends to vastly increase government intervention in the economy, we need look no further than his choice to head the Council of Economic Advisers, Laura D'Andrea Tyson. Though the press has taken no notice, the bulk of the academic work of this professor of economics at the University of California, Berkeley, consists of apologies for East European socialism.

The reader searches in vain for criticisms of those failed systems or for sympathy toward the free enterprise system. She demonstrates a special affection for Rumania's economic policy under the monstrous Nicolai Ceausescu. In *Economic Adjustment in Eastern Europe*, a manu-

script prepared for the United States Air Force, and published by Rand Corporation (1984), she gushes: "Rumania embarked upon a major 'remobilization' effort" in the 1970's. As a result, Rumania achieved, "dazzling growth rates in the 1970's." "Investment grew more rapidly in Rumania than in the other bloc countries throughout most of the postwar period, and by 1974, Rumania's investment effort, expressed as a share of net material product, was the highest in the bloc and perhaps in the world."

Yugoslavia's "market socialism" was the subject of her doctoral dissertation, later published as *The Yugoslav Economic System in the 1970's* (University of California, Berkeley, 1980). She is not nearly as enthralled with Tito's regime as she was with Ceausescu's. Tito was too market-oriented for her. "The market failed to live up to expectations," she writes, and the answer was a recentralization of economic planning. Tito did that, and "by 1977 Tito could justifiably claim that 'the unity of our working people has never been greater than today'."

Tyson, like many other economists before the collapse of socialism in 1989, was ideologically blinded to the reality in Communist countries. With her present advocacy of industrial planning and protectionism, she continues to be similarly blinded by the failures of those policies in Western countries.

In the new administration, she is not alone. Clinton has staffed his cabinet and regulatory agencies with people who

have an undying faith in the ability of the state to manage our economic lives. Though it is the last thing we need after the surge of statism under Bush, the consequence of Clintonism will be a bigger government, a poorer people, and an economy closer to the Swedish model of democratic socialism than the capitalism that made America rich.

What To Expect

In the Age of Clinton, there are many overt ways in which the market will come under attack. For example, we can expect higher taxes. We will get gasoline and across-the-board energy taxes. These are seen as both revenue raising measures and as penalties to discourage consumption in the name of environmentalism. In other words, the intention is to make the state richer and the public poorer.

We can expect other kinds of consumption taxes (which are misnamed, since they ultimately punish production). These include higher taxes on wine, beer, liquor, cigarettes, and any other products deemed politically incorrect. Higher income taxes are promised, and we will also get a value-added tax. Clinton's advisers favor this, despite the horrible results in Western Europe, where such taxes have harmed business and empowered the tax police to invade any business without a warrant and demand all records. No appeal is possible until the full tax and penalties are paid.

Also dangerous is the effort to increase taxes on inheritances.