

able to assume that our economy is living on borrowed time. That means that a depression, which could wipe out much of what's left of the American middle class, is all too possible.

Pat's proposed polices could be the catalyst for such a depression. How would President Buchanan respond? By radically freeing markets, slashing taxes, cutting the welfare state, and imposing sound money? Or would he take the FDR/Nixon route?

There's a deprecation of economics among some on the right. Just why is it, Hans-Hermann Hoppe has wondered, that so many paleocons feel they can sound off at length on economics without any real background, much less formal study? In economics, unlike history or literature, they presume that no one need read the masters, the "dead Austrians."

Yet the immutable laws of economics are not as accessible as the natural law, which is written

on our hearts; economics must be studied, understood, and applied. This century in particular has shown us the consequences of politicians and intellectuals who think they can use the government to violate and even repeal economic law.

## V. Our Future

The Beltway conservatives who have controlled opinion on the right for forty years have been nowhere in sight throughout the campaign. Their issues have not been central nor have they been able to dictate the terms of debate, let alone the candidates. Their monopoly has been shattered, and their supposed power to make or break elections has been exposed as a hoax.

The floodgates of radical opinion have been opened, and what it

was once forbidden to discuss (outside the pages of the *RRR*) is finally in the open, even among mainline Republican voters. The masses now say what Old Right libertarians have said all along: we are living under tyranny when it is our birthright to live under freedom.

How magnificent that Pat's and Steve's campaigns have helped this along. In Pat's case, it is the right to own guns, the right to inherit some wealth, the tyranny of the judiciary, and the evils of the New World Order. In Steve's, it is the moral and economic urgency of large tax cuts, the evil of "revenue neutrality," the possibility of ridding ourselves of the Social Security incubus, the virtues of hard money,

and the social possibilities offered by a capitalist economy. Woven together, these themes represent a magnificent vision of American freedom.

Our immediate task is to pry loose the wedge that the media are trying to insert between "eco-

nomic conservatives" and "cultural conservatives." In reality, these are two facets of the same cause. By destroying the Beltway's status and returning all power to the states and the people, as the 10th amendment demands, we address the major cultural problem in this country, which is the government-sponsored poisoning of the culture and the government-driven breakup of family and community.

At the same time, the end of the welfare-warfare state will create, *de facto*, a free market, where we can trade with whom we please, keep what we earn, associate with whom we choose, and put our trust in a dollar that cannot be depreciated by the government's central bank.

To restore the peace and prosperity of the Old Republic, there is

no shortcut to keeping the focus on the real enemy, which is always and forever the federal Leviathan.■

# Anatomy of a Hit

by Paul Gottfried

**T**he dismissal of Sam Francis has occasioned much speculation. As an essay by John Cloud in the *Washington City Paper* (1/19/96) makes abundantly clear, Francis has become a hated figure for neocons and liberals. Though an award-winning journalist with a national following, he has not been allowed onto TV programs with mainstream conservative commentators. His former assistants now surpass him in public exposure and in the perks that come from being "moderately opposed" to the left. Sam has a reputation for never pulling punches on social issues, and he has always reserved his hardest love for self-described conservatives who reason with the left but never with those who stray one millimeter to their right.

Not surprisingly, the conservative movement—a.k.a. the kept opposition of the center left—has for the most part, welcomed Sam's firing. Though *National Review* offered the opinion that the *Washington Times* may have gone too far, obligatory mention was made of the "hysterical" tone of Sam's polemics. Meanwhile the president of AEI weighed in with the view that Sam as a "racist" fully deserved his fate. This accusation was intended to deflect attention from Christopher DeMuth's own protege, Dinesh D'Souza, who has drawn fire from liberals for the same indiscretion. Both DeMuth and D'Souza trained their fire on Francis for self-preser-

**Pat's  
proposed polices  
could be the  
catalyst for  
a depression.**

vation, to keep liberal friends from noticing the far more blatant insults against blacks contained in D'Souza's controversial book *The End of Racism*.

At the same time, another, previously unknown champion of respectable conservatism was devoting his life to destroying a leading paleo journalist. A twentyish foundation assistant Greg Forster drafted a letter to the *Wall Street Journal* published there on December 1. Forster expressed outrage at the "racist" statements that he found in the assorted speeches and columns of Sam Francis, and he took comfort from the fact that the task to which he had devoted his still young life was already being fulfilled. He had succeeded in his "one-man crusade to get this guy kicked out of the conservative movement."

Despite his zeal, Forster was wrong on three counts. He had not been alone, even in his own office, in waging a crusade against Sam's career. Others had participated in the same crusade, with even more success. Moreover, Sam had never belonged to the "conservative movement" as Forster understood that term: that is, advocates of global democratic imperialism.

Finally, there is no evidence from the documents that Forster points to that Sam is venting racial hate. Both the accused and Rabbi Mayer Schiller, who attended a conference in Atlanta during the previous spring at which Sam supposedly uttered his most offending comments, provided a point-by-point refutation of Forster's brief printed in the *Wall Street Journal* on December 20. Though Francis had spoken of the possibility of racially-based political communities within a federalized country, he emphatically

opposed the degradation or segregation of one race by another. Indeed his proposal largely replicated the one offered by the U.S. Communist Party for more than half a century.

Like the Communists, Sam spoke up for partial political autonomy for American blacks, while insisting, like the Communists, that the same arrangement also exist for non-black Americans. In this respect, Sam might have noted, his neocon-liberal critics have become even more collectivist than the American Communists. In their integrationist fanaticism, liberals and neocons would force the races together through administrative policy. Such a course has already resulted in in-

creased race hatred.

As judged by Cloud's article, liberals and "moderate" conservatives have even more demanding litmus tests for political sanity. The attacks on Francis in Cloud's report are not simply about imprudent statements of opinion. Francis, we learn, "bashes" blacks, immigrants, gays, and welfare moms because of what he is, a bespectacled, heavy-set, chain-smoking hermit without friends. It is Cloud, one feels, and not only his liberal and neocon interviewees, who hold this opinion of Sam's personality: "To the extent that he was ever discussed, he was dismissed as an extremist," the "intellectual equivalent of a militia nut."

As a close friend of Sam who does not live in Atlanta (where his only possible friend, Lew Rockwell, is supposed to reside), I can testify to the falseness of Cloud's characterization. Sam clearly has many friends, including a lady friend of many years, and possesses one of

the funniest personalities around. But even stranger than the insinuations about his sanity is the kind of evidence adduced for his emotional problems: we are told that Sam advocates "ethnic partition" for South Africa, once called for releasing Mandela from custody on the grounds he was "ailing," opposed the Arthur Ashe memorial now being erected in Richmond, and criticized the motor voter bill.

He also believes that the Confederate flag should continue to fly atop the state capitol in South Carolina if the state's residents want it there; and he thinks the Southern Baptists should not be apologizing for the ownership of slaves by their pre-Civil War coreligionists. Having looked at this brief of indictment, I can find nothing pathological or even particularly rightwing about any of the stands attributed to Francis.

The Cloud-neocon-liberal attack on Sam Francis is aimed at positions, which, though defensible, are no longer politically correct. Ten years ago M.E. Bradford noticed that the neocon occupation of the Right had "closed off" most of the critical distance between what used to be opposite sides of the spectrum. By now there is no distance between the two; and the respectable right now runs around pushing its own variations on leftist themes. Sam's failing was that he did not follow suit here.

Another one of his follies seems to have been the failure to endorse the Arthur Ashe memorial. This caused considerable discomfort. In fact the publisher of the *Times*-funded magazine *The World and I* considered Sam's remarks here to be genuinely "embarrassing." "All the people in my shop were upset. They felt they would get tarred with the same brush." *The World and I* publisher then noted that there are "certain limits beyond which you don't go. If you say that Hitler is the greatest statesman of

**Sam's  
proposal largely  
replicated the one  
offered  
by the U.S.  
Communist  
Party.**

the 20th century, you're going to be fired." Though Sam never made that particular comment, his critic "can imagine him doing it." On the basis of this fevered exercise of imagination, Sam had "crossed the line" and deserved to be fired.

The Ashe incident does prove the rigid limits of liberal-neocon political orthodoxy. There is no compelling moral or aesthetic reason that a bronze likeness of a black tennis star in a sweat suit should be stuck amid monuments to Confederate leaders. The only conceivable reason is the one that Sam gives, to change symbolic associations in a way acceptable to the American political-journalistic elite.

As a victim of AIDS (who really died because of the obstacles initially imposed by gay activists to culling out infected blood donated by homosexuals), and as a black political liberal, Ashe represented quite different values from those associated with the creation of Richmond's Monument Boulevard. Though there should be a place for a statue of a great tennis player as well as one of Robert E. Lee, there is no justification for having both statues on Monument Boulevard,

except to highlight an ideological change. The South will only be allowed to continue to memorialize its past if it can also accommodate the current liberal ascendancy. On this point Sam is entirely correct, and there is nothing "extremist" about his underlining of the obvious.

From Cloud's essay it is obvious that Sam's youthful adversaries keep meticulous records on his activities. Forster has been filing his speeches and remarks and by now has a voluminous dossier on someone he plainly hates. He has performed this labor while on the staff of the neocon Center for Equal Opportunity. An undistinguished think tank run by the neocons' official Hispanic, Linda Chavez, and funded by the usual foundational suspects, the Center would be an appropriate place for digging up dirt. In fact it is hard to see what other purpose it might serve, except as a money funnel for Chavez and her staff. Note that no one is arguing, as far as I know, that the CEO was chiefly responsible for getting Sam fired. In any case there is not enough evidence at present to demonstrate that charge.

What can be safely assumed is that neocon think tanks exist, among other reasons, to ruin the careers of paleo critics. They do not simply ignore authentic conservatives. As part of their *raison d'être*, they set out to destroy perceived opponents on the right. Since the early eighties neocon operatives have accused the Old Right of being jealous of their success. The Old Right, we are led to believe, has stayed out of political dialogues because no one has thrown funds in its direction.

The reality is altogether different. The neocons and their allies

have excluded paleo spokesmen from any public discussion of political issues and taken even stronger measures against those enjoying national followings. What happened to Francis typified this by now familiar course. By disagreeing from the right with the neocon-liberal hive and by subsequently attracting attention, Sam made himself a marked man. He also behaved indiscreetly in granting an extended interview to a homosexual advocate newspaper.

Like M.E. Bradford, who spoke honestly to the *Washington Post* while being considered for the directorship of the NEH, Sam should have known better. But even allowing for this faux pas which came from his overly trusting nature, Sam became a moving target from the time the neocons decided to go after him.

The way they did this illustrates their changed method of execution. Such work is now usually delegated to underlings like Forster and his two CEO colleagues, Jonathan Miller and Linda Chavez. Unlike the campaign against Bradford in the early eighties, neocon hits nowadays come from below. That way the capifamiglia avoid direct

implication and can run their operations without noticeably bloodstained hands.

The expressions of surprise at Sam's fate by David Frum and Bill Kristol show the same sincerity as Lucky Luciano did in testifying before the Senate about the death of the gangland rivals. The remark by young Kristol quoted by Cloud that other people "overestimate neocon influence" could only have come from a grade-B Mafia movie. It is too much of a cliché for the better kind of gangster flic. ■

**Neocon think tanks exist, among other reasons, to ruin the careers of paleo critics.**

**RRR** *The Rothbard-Rockwell Report*. (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Second-Class Postage paid at Burlingame, CA 94010 and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to RRR, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editors*: Murray N. Rothbard (1926-1995) and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors*: Sarah Barton, David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Michael Levin, and Justin Raimondo. *Publisher*: Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor*: Sybil Regan. Subscription: \$49 for 12 issues. Single issue: \$5. Copyright ©1996 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

# A Fifth Column

by Justin Raimondo

**P**olls show that Americans are opposed to the Bosnian intervention more than 2-to-1: yet the president usurped the Constitution and—with the help of Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich—sent 20,000 American troops into the Balkan quagmire. A clue as to why can be found in the power of the Bosnia Lobby.

George Kenney, in *The Nation*, blows the cover off the lobby, writing that “much of the early war was fought not on the battlefield but through high-powered (and high-priced) lobbying firms.” There has also been an effective corps of “journalists, think-tank analysts, Capitol Hill staff and administration hawks” pushing the Bosnian case. “The result is that everywhere that counts in America, it is almost impossible to be too anti-Serb.”

The ink on the Dayton accord was barely dry when the neocons came out with a full-page ad in the *New York Times* hailing the intervention. Their front group is called the American Committee To Serve Bosnia (ACSB), the activist arm of a well-financed lobby that includes the nonprofit “nonpartisan” Balkan Institute, whose letterhead reads like a Who’s Who of CFR types and militant do-gooders: Albert Shanker, Norman Podhoretz, Richard Perle, Jeanne Kirkpatrick, Hodding Carter, Henry Louis Gates, Saul Bellow, Susan Sontag, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Frank Carlucci, Walter Cronkite, and Bianca Jagger.

The ACSB, and something called the “Action Council for Peace in the Balkans” (chaired by Hodding Carter), not content with having achieved their goal of massive U.S.

military intervention in Bosnia, is gearing up to make sure our stay is a long one. In a letter to supporters announcing ACSB’s third annual “Grassroots Conference on Bosnia and the Balkans,” held February 3-4, 1996, in Washington, D.C., director Stephen Walker warned Committee supporters that, “we have entered a new and potentially tragic phase of the Balkan conflict.” He does not mean the tragic inevitability of American lives being lost, but the prospect that the Dayton accord will lead to Bosnia’s “ultimate partition or extinction as a state.”

This is what it means to be the agent of a foreign power: to place the interests of another country, in this case Bosnia, above the interests of one’s native land. Americans have a right to ask these Bosnia-Firsters if they have registered as such, as required by law.

Naturally enough, the ACSB invited the Honorable Sven Alkalaj, ambassador off the fundamentalist Bosnian regime to the U.S., to be the keynote speaker. Also featured was Mira Baratta, described in the program as “Foreign Policy Advisor, Officer of Senator Dole.”

A whole brace of organizations, all of them stuffed with Establishment figures of various sorts, has suddenly sprung into existence: the Balkan Institute (founded in May 1995), the ACSB, the Action Committee for Peace in the Balkans (apparently a special group designed to appeal to the left), and even a student activist organization with the crudely propagandistic name of “Students Against Genocide.”

The ACSB and allied organizations are carrying out a two-pronged assault by bringing pressure to bear on the President and members of

Congress, and by spreading Bosnian government propaganda to make their case to the general public. There is apparently no lack of money for all these activities.

Whether or not the Bosnian government or some of the Arab states are financing the Bosnia lobby, either overtly or covertly, the links between the Izetbegovic regime and its American cheering section are fairly brazen.

One of the signers of the full-page *New York Times* ad, neocon national security maven Richard Perle, a former Reagan Defense official,

served as a “consultant” to the Bosnian Muslim government during the Dayton negotiations. The Bosnian lobby is also pouring campaign contributions into pro-interventionist congressional candidates of both parties. Most of all, these agents of a foreign power are determined to defeat those brave Republican freshmen who stood up for America and defied their own sell-out “leadership” by voting to deny funds to the Bosnia intervention.

Their response should be a congressional investigation of the foreign lobbyists whose job it is to drag us into war. Slick publications, a scholarly institute, high-priced public relations firms, and an army of bought-and-paid-for intellectuals: the first question such an investigation must ask is *who is paying for all this?*

The mere exposure of these foreign agents will do much to lessen their influence. A congressional investigation, should also come up with proposed legislation. Ideally, this would include a ban on all efforts by foreign governments to influence U.S. policy. Let the investigation begin!■

**This is what  
it means to be  
the agent of a  
foreign power:  
to place  
the interests  
of another  
country, above  
one’s native land.**