

commissions that led Canadian Prime Minister Kim Campbell to withhold her consent from Nafta. In a last minute deal, the U.S. then agreed to let Canada off the hook and keep its sovereignty, while the rest will be ruled by the Commissions. Canada can decide these disputes for itself, while the U.S. and Mexico have agreed to abide by Commission rulings.

Why aren't Americans allowed the same powers of self-government as Canadians?

The second rebuttal is Guilt-by-Association. No, we are not buying the absurd protectionist argument that "high-wage Americans" should not have to compete with "low-wage Mexicans (Taiwanese, or...)." This argument from economic ignorance puts the cart before the horse: and it doesn't treat the deeper question: why *are* U.S. wages so high, while Taiwanese or Mexican wages are much lower? The reason is that American employers can *afford* to pay such high wages while Mexican employers cannot. The reason for that is the superior capital investment of the American economy, which has made the productivity of U.S. workers far higher than in Mexico. This means that the *labor cost* per unit of product in the

U.S. tends to be much lower than in Mexico, even though the *wage rate* is higher. For high labor productivity means low labor cost.

Moreover, the very fact that the U.S. exports a lot of goods to Mexico, Taiwan, etc. demonstrates that there is something

very wrong with this protectionist "low-wage" argument.

But the problem, as we indicated above, is the reverse of the standard protectionist line. The problem with Nafta is not that it will allow U.S. businesses to move to "low-wage" Mexico (they can do that now!) The problem is not that Mexico might be able to escape U.S. union, wage,

and environmental regulations. The problem is that the United States is going to suffer *even more* of these regulations as imposed by the supra-sovereign North American Commissions.

Besides, people in glass houses, etc. If *we* are "associating" with the AFL-CIO, you guys have to look in the mirror every morning after associating with President Clinton and Mickey Kantor (Yucch!).

It is important that freedom-lovers in the American public not get fooled by the "free-market" think-tank monolith. Nafta, like the European Monetary System now virtually dismantled,

is bad news. It's worse than open socialism; for it's internationalist socialism camouflaged in the fair clothing of freedom and free markets. Populists, even protectionist populists, are right to view it with deep suspicion.

Kill Nafta—and strike a blow directly in the gut of the Clinton Administration. A good rule of thumb: other things being equal, if the Clinton Administration is for it, whatever *it* is, it should be opposed on general principles. The more the Clinton Administration fails, the more it withers and dies, the more American freedom and prosperity, the more the Old Republic, shall live. ■

Anti-Anti-Semitism Gone Bananas

by M.N.R.

For many years, Stormin' Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary*, has managed to instill deeply into the public consciousness the notion that the definition of an "anti-Semite" is anyone who disagrees with Podhoretz on any public issue. In this task, he has been aided by a lushly-financed cadre of neoconservative media pundits. For years, Podhoretz laid down the law that anyone who publicly disagrees with the State of Israel on any matter whatever is an "anti-Semite," be he Jew or Gentile (the former coming under the rubric as a "self-hating" Jew). And there was no storing up of brownie points in

**Kill Nafta—
and strike
a blow
directly in
the gut of
the Clinton
Admini-
stration.**

Heaven, no gratitude for past agreement. The attitude was always: "What have you done for me lately?" Thus, when Pat Buchanan, after years of strongly pro-Israel sentiment, began to be critical of some of its actions, the Podhoretzniks descended upon their former friend like a ton of bricks, tarring him eternally with the "anti-Semitic," "neo-Nazi" label.

But now the whole thing is falling apart. The first slip in Podhoretznik control came when Stormin' Norman's beloved Likud government in Israel fell, to be replaced by the Rabin Labor government. Suddenly, Norman and the gang, after loudly banning any criticisms of Israel from public discourse as "anti-Semitic," began to denounce Israel themselves! The Rabin government is being attacked bitterly for presuming to talk to the PLO, or even contemplating any sort of renunciation of Israel's occupation of the Arab Palestinians on the West Bank, or any self-government by Arabs under military rule for almost thirty years. On what grounds do Podhoretz and Company reverse their own stern decree? Why, because Rabin and the Israel government have themselves become "self-hating Jews" and are therefore "anti-Semitic." Why else?

And they used to talk about Communists changing their line on a dime! None of the Communist Grand Reversals was quite as outrageous as Norman's. It is difficult to believe that he can get away with it.

Sure enough, it looks as if the neo-con legions are now spin-

ning out of control, gone loco. Best evidence is a fascinating, if nutty, article in the left-neocon *New Republic* (August 23-30), written by Michael Lind, executive editor of right-neocon Irving Kristol's periodical *The National Interest*. It was none other than Lind who, writing in the *New York Times* the day after Pat Buchanan's great Houston speech at the Republican Convention, set the media tone in flaying Pat for his speech as an alleged Hate Crime.

Lind, in his article, ("Aliens

Among Us"), is talking about the attitude of conservatives toward the increasingly thorny immigration problem. Without stating his own position on immigration, he correctly notes that neocons have always been strongly pro-immigration, even unto "open borders." What he is objecting to, however, is what he considers a dangerous new trend among some neocons, specifically Rev. Richard John Neuhaus and Francis ("End of History") Fukuyama, to be in favor of immigration for the wrong

Quotes That Need No Comment

Nafta's environmental provisions are a model for new international cooperation. Under them, no country in the agreement can lower its environmental standards—ever. And if a country doesn't go after its polluters, we will.

Similarly, Nafta's labor provisions ensure that no country denies its citizens basic labor rights: child labor restrictions, minimum wage requirements, health and safety rules, and industrial relations guidelines, to name a few . . .

With all these provisions, Nafta sets a historic standard for other trade agreements. This is the first trade agreement specifically to protect workers' rights and the environment. Every trade agreement from here on out will have to address these concerns.—Mickey Kantor, *Wall Street Journal*

So what was I, neither leftist nor gay, doing there [at the Gay March on Washington in April]? And why did I find it both ennobling and liberating? . . . I don't see why I should stop behaving the way I wish in public simply because someone is pointing a camera at me. I don't think that any busybody's desire not to see me kiss a loved one in public should dictate whether I can do so . . .

And, hetero though I am, I was accepted and welcomed all weekend long by both friends and strangers, an experience I found both uplifting and symbolic of what freedom is all about. Yes, liberty is more than just buying and selling your justly owned property . . . The aura of spontaneous and self-chosen community elicited awe in this libertarian: I felt privileged to be part of this community . . . And that's why, [statist] political message be damned, this even was worth celebrating. Because before politics there is self-chosen community, nudity, public displays of affection, and joy . . . The preservation of civilization depends far more on suppressing hate, violence, and prejudice than on suppressing those people who choose to make love with members of their own sex.—Brian Doherty, editor, *Liberty* magazine

I don't need to work while there are fools out there who will give me money.—Charles Logan, panhandler, phony Vietnam veteran, and convicted thief, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

reasons. (Among neocons, you not only have to take the right position, but on the right grounds.) For Neuhaus and Fukuyama specifically welcome Catholic immigration, from Latin America and Asia, as a conservative cultural force to offset native Americans who have culturally gone left, led by upper class elites whom Neuhaus identifies as "aliens among us," aliens in spirit who are far more alienated from the true America than Third World Catholic immigrants.

Neuhaus identifies these "aliens among us" as (a) the intellectual elite, including "journalists, writers, academics" and mainstream religious leaders; (b) the urban black underclass and the "civil rights overclass"; and (c) homosexuals. And Fukuyama writes of immigrants from Asia and Latin America as culturally conservative, in contrast to the sexual revolution, feminism, the "celebration of alternative lifestyles," and ruthless secularization, all of which Fukuyama identifies as having "originated right in the heart of America's well-established, white Anglo-Saxon community." Fukuyama caps his crimes in Lind's eyes by even concluding "with a call to arms deliberately echoing Pat Buchanan's Houston speech: 'In the upcoming block-by-block cultural war, the enemy will not speak Spanish or have a brown skin.'"

In other words, Lind is horrified that these neocons are adopting a strategy of right-wing populism, of mass counter-revolution against the left elite. He tries to assign this to a Cath-

olic plot (George Weigel being apparently another in this Pro-Third World-populist group), but he is forced to admit that these sinister Catholics are allying themselves ("merely tactically, of course") with Protestant evangelicals in this dangerous populist coalition.

Where does "anti-Semitism" come in? Because, you see, such phraseology as "aliens among us" is "chillingly reminiscent" of anti-Semitic terminology and denunciations of "cosmopolitan" elements. Lind ritualistically concedes that "Neuhaus is no anti-Semite," but the thrust of his article is that Jews are being deliberately included by these New Populists as part of the "Protestant elite" category. It is nice to see that Jews are now, at least for Lind's purposes, honorary WASPs. Here Lind echoes the predominant neocon attitude of the 1950s, that "McCarthyism," or indeed any right-wing populism, is *ipso facto* "anti-Semitic" (Hey, aren't Jews a minority?). Lind also adds the old 1950s gambit that populism is not "genuinely conservative," but really radical. Well, tough!

So if the new pro-Catholic, pro-evangelical Protestant, neocon populism is implicitly anti-Semitic, which periodicals are the source of this new anti-

Semitic threat? The Reverend Neuhaus wrote his screed in his own journal *First Things*. But Francis Fukuyama, the latest Deep Thinker in neocon ranks,

wrote *his* evil article in none other than Norman Podhoretz's *Commentary*!

So there we have it. The center has been lost, all eternal verities are gone; Stormin' Norman himself, who in his own living person embodies anti-anti-Semitism, has now been attacked by a Kristolean neocon as a source of a new anti-Semitic threat. Podhoretz an anti-Semite!

Anti-anti-Semitism has exploded, turned on itself, shattered into a thousand pieces. Look, the time has come to stipulate that every single person in the world, nay in the entire universe, Jew or Gentile, is an anti-Semite. And then let's forget the whole thing. ■

Anti-anti-Semitism has exploded, turned on itself, shattered into a thousand pieces.

What Do Gays Want?

by Joe Melton

What do gays want? The answer is still unclear, but it is becoming all too clear what "libertarian gays" want: the "freedom" to engage in *public* sex. So says Paul Varnell, vet-