

served warm coffee?

The New York Times Decries Regulations

Controls on private property have brought a "repressiveness bordering on tyranny" in Richmond, Washington, reports the *New York Times* (6/7/93). The Jones family wanted to paint their house bright purple with teal trim, but were prevented from doing so. "I can't believe this is happening in America," said Mrs. Jones.

What the *Times* hates is not government restrictions, of course, but private ones. The Joneses signed a covenant and other agreements when they bought their house. These contracts bar, for example, outlandish color schemes. And now local courts have upheld what the *Times* condemns as "private government." What a great phrase!

Boycott Benetton

I used to buy some of my daughter's clothing at Benetton, but no more. The advertising campaigns of the Italian firm are designed to ridicule religion, break down traditional lines of demarcation in society, and promote polymorphous perversity.

One Benetton outrage, in the French commie newspaper, *Liberation*, features, says the

Washington Post (6/10/93), "vivid photos of 58 adult and child sex organs." It "shows we are all equal," says company chairman Luciano Benetton. ■

Toward A Paleo Right

by Greg Kaza

The re-emergence of an Old Right was one of the most remarkable, and underreported, developments of the 1992 election.

The Republican Party, long the preserve of country club liberals and religious right conservatives, was suddenly confronted with the emergence of a third force committed to free markets, individual liberty, and a non-interventionist foreign policy. This development offers hope to middle Americans that there are alternatives to

Washington's professional political class and its status quo politics of higher taxes and greater Empire. It also presents Republicans with the possibility of *total victory*; the last time the GOP controlled Congress was during the Old Right's glorious reign between 1946 and 1952. The demise of the Republican Party in Congress in the

20th Century is largely the demise of the Old Right. It was only the premature death of Ohio Senator Robert Taft, Mr. Republican, that created a political opening in the mid-1950's for a "New Right" enamored of a mixed economy, social engineering, and foreign adventurism. Since then, it has been one long, slow descent into neo-con hell.

While offering hope, the Old Right's re-emergence does present several problems. One unresolved semantic question is whether the term "Old Right" is meaningful and relevant to most Americans. Another question is whether Republicans loyal to the Old Right tradition should devote their energies to pursuit of the Presidency or focus on local, state, and congressional races.

A False History

The problem is that the "New Right" of the mid-1950's has been redefined by the neo-con establishment as today's "Old Right." For Beltway Conservatives, William F. Buckley is the movement's grandfather, while Robert Taft has disappeared down an Orwellian memory hole built by neo-conservatives.

Can there be any doubt this is a deliberate provocation, not the result of accident or benign ignorance? Taft's politics, especially his bitter opposition to establishment of the national security state, are anathema to the neo-cons. Rather than confront Taft on the issues, the neo-cons define his policies as illegitimate and rewrite history. Rather than ascribe the GOP's decline in Congress to the Old

**I used to
buy some
of my
daughter's
clothing at
Benetton,
but no
more.**

Right's demise, the neo-cons blame it on the unwillingness of Republicans to become social democrats. The danger of this neo-con history is that calling oneself "Old Right" today is to be identified politically in most circles with *National Review*.

One option is to reclaim the "Old Right" through an *intellectual* fight. But this overlooks the *political* question of whether "Old Right" is a meaningful and relevant term. Intellectually, we should confront the neo-cons whenever possible. Politically, the term "Old Right" makes little sense. A majority of Americans oppose higher taxes and greater Empire (especially when Washington drafts their kids), but do not identify these policies with the "Old Right."

Another option is to redefine ourselves *politically* as "paleo-right." The Old Right's re-emergence in 1992 was marked by increased usage of the terms "paleo-libertarian" and "paleo-conservative." The split between "neo" and "paleo" conservatives is an established fact even in liberal circles; redefining ourselves as "paleo-right" sets us apart within the Republican Party as a *political* group distinct from the neos, country club liberals, and religious or "New" Right.

It may be objected that semantics mean little politically. First-hand experience leads me to reject this. During my successful candidacy for the Michigan State House in 1992, my opponents and the news media attempted to define me politically as a "libertarian," "conservative," "right-wing," "far-right," etc. I added a political caveat to

their definitions: "I am the only candidate who supports tax cuts and term limits, and opposes Lansing's policy of spending millions to give maximum security prisoners a college education."

Candidates who fail to define themselves leaves them open to being defined by opponents. Likewise, our failure to define ourselves allows the neo-cons to define us in their own critical terms. We should define ourselves politically as *paleo-right*.

The White House?

The paleo-right's emergence occurred largely, but not entirely, within the context of Pat Buchanan's candidacy for the Republican nomination for President. Buchanan's failure as a candidate led some observers, primarily neo-cons, to ascribe the paleo-right as an aberration.

The fetish with presidential politics is a recurring phenomenon within the conservative and libertarian movements. Every four years, a new "Savior" emerges on the national scene to guide the movement to the Political Promised Land. Incredible amounts of time, energy, and resources are expended to place "one of our own" in the White House. In 1980, it was Reagan and Clark. In 1988, Kemp and Robertson were the candidates. In 1992, it was Buchanan. Candidates are already jostling for 1996.

It is in the paleo-right's interest to use its limited resources to their full, maximum advantage. Is pursuit of the Presidency the best use of our resources? Or do we have a greater impact by entering races at lower levels?

Robert Taft never lived in the White House, but his influence on the Presidency was tremendous. Taft led the opposition to FDR and Truman, and his advice convinced Eisenhower it would be folly to commit U.S. ground forces to Southeast Asia. Would the Vietnam conflict have occurred if Taft lived? That is an interesting question. The point is that Taft's seat in the U.S. Senate gave him a national platform for his Old Right views.

Today's paleo-right needs similar platforms in Congress and state legislatures across America. The neo-cons will attack us from New York, but our sheer numbers will overwhelm them in the end. There are no elected neo-con legislators, only a handful of "ex"-Trotskyists advising Jack Kemp. The paleo-right should take America back; one state house seat and congressional district at a time. ■

Greg Kaza is a Republican state representative in Michigan.

Warning! On Bret Schundler by M.N.R.

We should properly rejoice at the smashing victories for conservatives in June—the great triumph of Dick Riordan over the leftist Woo in Los Angeles, and the incredible landslide of Kay Bailey Hutchison over incumbent Senator Bob Krueger in the Texas Senate race. We should be especially jubilant about the abject crumbling of