

success rate; the GAO says it was closer to 40. Given this record, it doesn't make sense to waste \$2 billion each on more Stealth bombers, which, despite the hoopla, have never flown in combat.

Yet the Defense Department (which ought to be called by its old name, the War Department) plans to spend another \$58 billion on smart weaponry. How much is that? In 1966, when the Pentagon claimed to be fighting a global communist menace, it was the entire military budget. Fifteen years earlier, it was the entire federal budget.

In the military, as with the rest of government, words mean the opposite of what's in the dictionary. When the government says "investment," think waste; when it says "financial aid," think ripoff; when it says "smart," think stupid.

Before the Second World War, conservatives understood this. They were second to none in their skepticism of military bureaucracies. Since then, they have suspended critical judgment. Sure, welfare agencies are self-serving and wasteful, but military agencies defend us and never have enough money.

In truth, all government programs work badly. Employees are not paid according to their productivity, but by a pre-set pay scale. They have no incentive to keep costs down. Quite the opposite: spending the maximum amount ensures an equal or higher budget next year.

Unlike the private sector, there are no real consumers of what the bureaucracy produces. That means there is neither accountability nor a reliable method for maintaining quality. The private sector is always searching for better technologies, while public agencies are stuck in

the same old rut. Change, much less useful innovation, is against the very nature of bureaucracy.

All of this is as true of the Pentagon as it is of the Post Office (excuse me, the Postal Service). For these agencies, public relations is more important than what they are supposed to be doing, whether delivering the mail or defending the country.

The communist menace is gone, but today the military budget is four and a half times what it was 30 years ago. That's what we'd expect from a

government bureaucracy. Whether taxing us or handing out welfare, bribing foreign peoples or blowing them up, bureaucracies are always and everywhere the enemies of a free people.■

**In the military, as with the rest of government, words mean the opposite of what's in the dictionary.**

## Toss the TV

by L.H.R., Jr.

If you're like me, you have no idea what's on prime time. I long ago decided to wage my own private culture war by unplugging the television. If I had a left-wing dinner guest who also cursed and made incessant sexual cracks in mixed company, he'd be out the door. So it is with tv. Decent fathers struggle to make their homes a safe refuge from the rot outside; they don't invite network moguls to bring it back in.

But as bad as tv was the last time I saw it, it's apparently getting worse. Consider this roundup of the season's fare from the *Washington Post* (June 5, 1995):

"On the NBC sitcom 'Wings', a couple having sex are interrupted

by a fire ignited by the bra that the female character has carelessly tossed near a fireplace. On CBS's 'Bless This House,' the lead actress talks about an acquaintance who wants her children to leave the house 'so she can do it on the coffee table.' Meanwhile, on 'Friends,' NBC's top-rated sitcom, a character watches Ross, one of the show's protagonists, skipping happily down the street and observes, 'Somebody got some last night.' To which Ross responds, 'Twice'.... [T]he cast of 'The Nanny' crack wise about oral sex while the single women on 'Cybill' trade quips about yeast infections well before it's dark outside." Then there's "'Third Rock from the Sun,' about a group of sex-crazed aliens."

This is what the *Post* admits to, so I assume the actual situation is a hundred times worse. What are conservatives doing about it? The Media Research Center looked at last year's fare and complained that in 72 half hour programs, there were 40 instances of sex involving unmarried partners, while only five showed sex between "married partners."

But this makes the dubious assumption that it's somehow more wholesome to observe married people having sex than unmarried people having sex. It makes the even more dubious assumption that the actors having sex are actually married! Is this what conservatives have been reduced to: moaning about the lack of marital sex on tv?

Conservatives are also pleased that the power of the networks has been reduced by the presence of competitors. The bad news is that 70 percent of homes have two or more tv sets, and 28 percent have three or more. This allows each family member to gawk at will. Again, there's only one solution: cut off the cable, take down the antenna, and hook your tv only to a vcr. Or do as the harder-core Russell Kirk once did, and literally toss the television out the window.■

# Flight 800: The Price of Empire

by Justin Raimondo

**T**he incineration of 230 passengers and crew aboard the Paris-bound 747 coincides with a foreign policy crisis fast developing in the volatile Middle East. As an orange fireball convulsed in a double death-agony in the sky over Long Island, and the same Islamic group that took credit for the Dharan bombing in Saudi Arabia almost immediately owned up to the downing of flight 800, a complicated diplomatic game was reaching a dramatic climax.

The half-mad and entirely senile King Fahd is at the center of a power struggle among several possible heirs; chief among them Crown Prince Abdullah, whose antipathy to the U.S. government is well known. Three times the King

has packed his bags and gone to the airport with his retinue, bound for his palace in Spain. Three times he was called back by those who did not want him gone without some guarantee of their own power and privilege.

At the very moment of imminent crisis, the House of Saud is leaderless, as helpless as its monarch as it goes the way of the Pahlavis, the imperial house of Iran.

What is more than likely to rise in its place is an Iranian-style fundamentalist regime, but one with far more oil wealth, weaponry, and moral and religious authority than the mullahs of Teheran.

## Tilting Toward Turkey

The developing crisis in the Middle East has illuminated one mystery. It has answered the question as to why Bill Clinton staked his presidency on the U.S. military intervention on behalf of Bosnia's Muslim government.

Against the fundamentalist upsurge, the great hope of the New World Order crowd—whose main goal is to keep those oil wells pumping for the Rockefeller world empire—is not the Saudis but Turkey, the model of Westernization.

Their alternative to Islamic fundamentalism is the brutal and genocidal regime of Kemal Ataturk, which stamped out religion and set up a military dictatorship very much like the one imposed by the Russians on the Afghans.

This tilt toward Turkey as a bulwark against the fundamentalist onslaught was given a major jolt when the Islamic Welfare Party gained a plurality in the July 1996 elections and succeeded in forming a government after much maneuvering. This set off alarm bells in the State Department and the White House, signaling the possible col-

lapse of their Middle East policy. For the Islamic Welfare Party victory endangered a key element of that policy: the Turkish-Israeli military alliance, concluded by the previous center-right government of the Motherland Party.

The announcement of this new level of cooperation coincided with a series of mysterious explosions in the vicinity of Damascus, the seat of the Syrian regime. Shortly afterward, a great amount of money seemed to be missing from the Turkish budget, a fact that eventually led to the downfall of the regime, new elections, and the triumph of the Islamic Welfare Party. Under the watchful eye of the militantly secular Turkish army, the Turkish Islamicists have been taken into a coalition with the former ruling party. The price of power, however, was to agree not to pursue the matter of the missing money.

While the Iranian connection is always assumed, and the blame has been put on Saudi dissidents, it could be that this latest act of terror is in retaliation for the Damascus bombings. Naturally, we know very little about those bombings; perhaps children were killed, innocents slaughtered, an entire high-school French club assassinated. If so, then the Syrians are the logical suspects, for Turkey is (rightly) seen by them as a cat's-paw for the United States.

Clinton's Bosnian crusade is meant to carve out a Turkish sphere of influence in the Balkans as a reward for taking on Syria. The key fact here is that Syrian dictator Hafez Al-Assad is Israel's main antagonist, and the chief obstacle to the dream of a Greater Israel championed by the newly-installed nationalist government of Prime Minister Netanyahu.

The Clinton Administration at-

**Keep those  
oil wells  
pumping for the  
Rockefeller  
world empire.**

**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. Periodicals 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*: David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Hans-Hermann Hoppe, 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.