

that therefore he quickly became aligned with the "paleo-conservatives" led by Russell Kirk and *Chronicles*, in a call for a return to Old Right isolationism.

Judis also notes the affinity of Pat Buchanan with Dr. Samuel Francis, the brilliant *Washington Times* columnist who is constantly pushing the envelope of paleo strategic thinking. Just before launching his campaign, Buchanan and Francis had decided to found a new America

First Committee (AFC) to promote right-wing nationalism; after November, and assuming Pat does not win the Republican nomination, the new AFC stands ready to serve, as did the original, as a bipartisan nucleus for a continuing and permanent Buchananite paleo movement. Judis concludes that Buchanan has the potential of seriously wounding George Bush, and, if he concentrates on the recession and right-wing nationalism, to play the same role in 1992 for the Republican Party that George Wallace did for the Democrats in 1968. That is: to shoot the elephant so that, in the long run, it crushes the donkey, and paves the way for paleo power and a return to the Old Republic.

**Pat Buchanan, bless him, is gloriously resurrecting the Old Right.**

Finally, Andrew Kopkind in *The Nation* (January 6 & 13). The most leftwing of the three writers, Kopkind's article brims with the usual references to Father Coughlin, David Duke, "nativist paranoia," "seething violence," and the Germany and Italy of the 1930s. But Kopkind at least writes with humor, he captures some of the spirit and importance of the Buchananite movement, and he appreciates some of Pat's virtues. "As an

ideologue," Kopkind writes, Buchanan "is able to lift the campaign from an exercise in poll reading and force the Democrats as well as Bush to think real thoughts and perhaps even say what they mean. That can't be all bad." And how.

Kopkind sees, too, that Buchanan has great potential to take charge permanently of the old conservative movement that is now "leaderless and incoherent," "wandering in the wilderness waiting for a new messiah." Just by announcing, adds Kopkind, Buchanan "becomes the Movement's spokesman," and sets the stage to be its movement leader and a key politico in 1996.

Kopkind also grasps the importance and the power of

the right-wing populist rhetoric that Pat Buchanan is calling into being. In particular: the crucial theme of the people "taking the country back," back from the malignant elites that have been ruling over us. As Kopkind quotes Buchanan's repeated motif: "Take back our streets from the criminals"; "take back our party": "take back our country." Way to go, Pat! Let's take them back! ●

## Pat Buchanan and the Old Right

by M.N.R.

Some libertarians are still confused: How can I be such an enthusiastic backer of Pat Buchanan for President? Isn't he soft on such issues as free trade and immigration? Isn't Pat in favor of military spending? Doesn't he still say kind words for Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon? And what about Pat's views on social issues?

I have already written that, in a real world party, one does not look for 100 percent libertarian agreement from a candidate. But that does not put the point strongly enough. The major point is that Pat, bless him, is in the process of gloriously resurrecting a movement that I have mourned and hoped to see revived for over three decades: he is resurrecting the Old Right. I entered the libertarian movement in 1946, when libertarians were an "extreme" but harmonious and

welcome part of what I have dubbed the Old, or the Original, Right, the Right-Wing as it developed as a fervent and angry reaction against the New Deal and all it stood for. The Old Right was a wonderful, passionate, deep, and strong movement in the American heartland, for the Old Republic and against the welfare state at home and globaloney and war-mongering abroad. It was in a sense a movement of Taft Republicanism, except that Senator Taft himself, even though its premier political leader from 1939 on, was its most leftist, most compromising, and least satisfactory member.

Harder-core members were Senators Wherry (R., Neb.), Jenner (R, Ind.), Bricker (R., Oh.), and Representatives Gross (R., Ia.), Frederick C. Smith (R., Oh.), and my friend the principled libertarian Rep. Howard H. Buffett (R., Neb.), who was Senator Taft's midwest campaign manager in 1952. Also highly important was Colonel Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the *Chicago Tribune*, and the *Tribune's* entire editorial and reportorial staff.

The Old Right had a firm set of guiding principles. It was opposed root and branch to the New Deal; it favored free markets, and the private property rights of every

American. It opposed the welfare state, and all government regulation of business and industry. It favored low and minimal taxation, low and minimal government spending, balanced budgets, and firm adherence to the gold standard. It opposed any and all attempts to invade property rights on behalf of group victimology, and it opposed the Imperial Presidency, or any invasion of state or personal rights by the federal government. In foreign affairs, it favored America First, and the putting of loyalty to the American nation or American in-

terests far over and above any loyalty to any other nation, such as England, or to any abstract ideology of global meddling, "wars to end war," or wars to achieve "global democracy." In other words, the Old Right strongly opposed any foreign alliances or entanglements, putting treaties over American rights, or waging wars in behalf of such entanglements. Hence, its foreign policy was gloriously nationalist or "isolationist."

The Old Right had no special cultural views, but only because it was firmly rooted in an old, pre-1960s culture that none of us ever thought to question or challenge. Nowadays, an Old Rightist

would call stridently for a return to such an Old Culture: that is, to the values, the ethics, and esthetics—in our home, family, schools, art and literature—of individual responsibility, of thrift, of family values, and of a culture that is wholesomely optimistic about ourselves and about our world. It would call for a rejection of the morbid, the nihilistic, the avant-garde.

That indeed is the very Old Right that Pat Buchanan is sounding a trumpet call to resurrect, to revive in America. That is what Pat calls the Old Republic, an Old Republic that is free of all domination and taint by Empire, by nihilism, by the destructiveness of left-liberalism. Pat's call is a veritable call to arms, a call to take back America, a call that comes none too soon and almost too late, a call to take back America from the corrupt elites and victimological groups that are rapidly sending us down the pit to join the late, unlamented Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the rubble of history.

But what about Pat's alleged "deviations"? It is fascinating that these were precisely the areas where the Old Right had disagreements within itself. In the Old Right there were free traders and there were protectionists; and while immigration was not then a lively political issue, there were undoubtedly disagreements on the extent or type of immigration that should be permitted. And on foreign policy, *within* the framework of

**Pat is reviving the Old Republic, free of all domination and taint by Empire, by nihilism, by the destructiveness of left-liberalism.**

America First nationalism there were disagreements, between degrees of pacifists versus those who urged strong national defense and various degrees of emphasis within such strength; there were disagreements on the degree of "isolationism," from purists like myself who wanted to limit American defense strictly to our shores, to those who wanted to include parts or all of the Western Hemisphere in the U.S. defense perimeter. But these were friendly disagreements, variations within a shared ideology and a shared culture. They were what the Marxists would call "nonantagonistic contradictions." As for Pat's social values, they are what all of our social and cultural values should be. Pat made clear in his New Hampshire announcement that a political official could only encourage such values within the strict framework of a severely "limited government." And as for Pat's religious values, if I were a Catholic I would take precisely the same stand that he has against errant heresy and irreligion within the Church.

And even on trade and immigration, Pat's "protectionism" is more akin to genuine freedom of trade than the views of any other candidate on the horizon. Certainly far more than George Bush. What we have to realize is that "free trade" as mouthed by the Bushies, the neocons, or other wings of the Establishment is far *less* free than the trade policy advocated by Pat

Buchanan. For the phony "free trade" advocated by Bush and the neocons encompasses: (a) massive foreign aid subsidies to foreign governments and to American export industries; and (b) currency and banking agreements moving towards global Keynesian inflation and economic and political world government. These latter schemes, firmly and courageously opposed by Buchanan, are the real, living dangers to free trade, far more so than whatever tariffs Pat might come to espouse. It is Establishment "freedom" that poses a clear and present danger to any true concept of free trade. And to all those who still worry about Pat's views on trade: Note carefully that Pat chose to name as the Chairman of his Economic Policy Board, none other than Ron Paul, whose devotion to free trade, and indeed to libertarianism in general, cannot be questioned. Has anyone seen George Bush, or Jack Kemp, or Ed Crane's favorite candidate Pierre duPont, go as far in naming a 100 percent libertarian as head of his economic policy team?

As to immigration, this too is a phony charge, part of the Establishment smear campaign to wrap Pat in the robes of some kind of dark "nativism." Which political candidate, be it Bush, Kemp, duPont, et al., has called for a policy of absolutely open borders? The answer is no one, and no one is likely to either. So it's a phony issue. Every

candidate is going to have *some* kind of immigration policy. Pat's basic objection to open borders is not so much economic or Malthusian as cultural. And here he makes a strong point: Do we really want tens of millions of Indian, or Zulu, or Chinese boat people suddenly arriving in the U.S.? In our real political world, these problems call for hard thinking and not easy slogans. To the standard critique that *all* of us, including Pat Buchanan, are descendants of immigrants, and also that the United States was traditionally the unique country of open borders, the answer is that that is very true and that America should be honored as the land of open borders and free immigration until World War I. But we also have to realize that America the land of open borders and free immigration was also at one and the same time, a land where there was no welfare state, no compulsory public school system, and an immigration overwhelmingly from Europe as well as by people who all made a commitment to learn and use the English language as quickly as possible. While America was not a "melting pot," it was a gorgeous mosaic *within* a shared framework of European culture and of commitment to the English language, and within a land of freedom and of the rights of private property. Realistically, we cannot advocate open borders *until* such a world and such a commitment is restored in America.

Can it be restored? After Pat's smash appearance on the McNeil-Lehrer show, a worried Judy Woodruff asked a commentator whether Pat could possibly succeed in going "back" to the Old Republic and its values. The answer is a resounding "Yes!" When I was growing up as a young rebel against the socialism and communism that infested our politics and our political culture, the standard socialist answer to free-market views was that "you can't turn back the clock." Well, the peoples of Russia and the now dead Soviet Union have already given a resounding lie to that phony claim. The clock of communism is smashed forever, broken beyond repair, destroyed, as the Marxists would put it, by "its own contradictions." All we need to restore the Old Republic is the will, and a brave and articulate leader to raise the banner and sound the trumpet call. We now have that leader in Pat Buchanan. We can do it; now that the Cold War is over, we can revive the Old Right and the Old Republic, we can reinvigorate the heartland to throw off the world-governmentalists, as well as the Right-Wing Mensheviks who call themselves "neo-conservatives," the Left-Libertarians, and all the other misleaders of conservatism or classical liberalism. From this point on, Pat Buchanan, by the very existence of his candidacy and his continuing leadership, has redefined the Right, has realigned and re-

defined the ideological and political spectrum in this country. From now on, Pat Buchanan will be the magnet that realigns politics and through whom everything will be defined. From now on, we are either Buchananites, of whatever nuance, members of a Buchanite movement, or we are anti-Buchananite, or we are confused folk in the middle. These are the three choices and the only three choices, for every American. It is time to choose. •

## New World Order, Haiti Department

by M.N.R.

Did you ever feel that you were plunged into the middle of an old Bob Newhart routine? Consider this example of Bush's foreign policy, which is supposed to be his *strength*. After decades, Haiti finally has an election, which brings to power an extreme-left-wing priest, Father Jean-Bertrand Aristide, an advocate of torture and "necklacing." Alarmed by Aristide's revival of the brutal, paramilitary *Ton-Ton Macoutes*, a dread legacy of the old Duvalier dictatorship, the Haitian military ousted Aristide in a coup, unwisely allowing him to flee

abroad.

The United States government, angered at this repudiation of "democracy," then maneuvered to get the Organization of American States (OAS) to slap a tight embargo on Haiti, causing mass starvation in an already destitute country. Conducting three-way negotiations, the U.S./OAS finally works out an agreement with the Haitian military, bringing back Aristide, with a "moderate," "compromise" figure as Prime Minister, none other than Rene Theodore, long-time head of the Communist Party of Haiti. During the half-century of the Cold War, the U.S. government spent a lot of energy looking for "Third Force moderates" in the Third World, and could never find any. Now they have finally found one, and it's the head of the *Communist Party*??!

**Did you ever feel that you were plunged into the middle of an old Bob Newhart routine?**

The *New York Times* reports that the Haitian workers and soldiers are "confused" by this development ("Selection of Communist Stirs Confusion in Haiti," January 11). A Haitian industrialist reported that "even my workers were shaking their heads in confusion . . .

They just kept asking: a Communist?" Similarly for the "poorly educated" soldiers, who now had to be informed