

ciple or cover up the truth about Andre Marrou?"

The answer, of course, was coverup. Dumb as well as immoral, because there's no way the truth wouldn't get out. This article is RRR's own answer to Emerling's question. But there's much more. The *Manchester* (N.H.) *Union-Leader*, which gave a lot of coverage to Marrou's campaign in that state, has already broken the news. An article will appear in *Human Events*. And Andre already found, when he happily appeared on the national Tom Snyder radio talk show, that Snyder was primed, and, to Andre's horror, kept peppering away at the Marrou Scandal. Suddenly, Andre found a very hostile interviewer, a reviewer who had read the Emerling Report. And this is only the beginning.

The latest news:

The long-suffering Norma Segal has apparently kicked Andre out, throwing his clothes on the porch. Apparently, she began to question his motives as being more financial than romantic. How can anyone, knowing Andre's record, question

his financial motives? So this means that Andre Marrou, presidential candidate of the nation's Third Largest Party, may now be homeless. Where will Andre stay? In his new

Andre Marrou, presidential candidate of the nation's Third Largest Party, may now be homeless.

campaign office, in the midst of the Washington, D.C., ghetto? How will he be treated by his fellow denizens?

We now know the official LP response. Various NatCom members and LP biggies, instead of calling for the ouster of Marrou, have launched a T-shirt sale charity campaign to pay the bum's debts. How does that grab you, or the average LP donor: buy a T-shirt to give a home and some soup, and pay the debts, of their bum-candidate? Has the LP, at long last, no sense of shame at all?

And, spekaing of LP biggies, where are the NatCom auditors? The Marrou campaign early signed a contract with the LP

allowing for audits by the NatCom. Where is the NatCom and its beloved Auditor, former LP Chairman Dave Walter? Why didn't he audit Marrou before, and why doesn't he audit Marrou now?

This whole sorry affair is the logical and inevitable unfolding of the much-vaunted Walter-Gingell-Marrou "performance team" that gained control of the national Libertarian Party in

1989 and has run it ever since. Some team! Some performance!

At the very least, there should be a hue and cry rising in the LP for an outside, independent auditor, to scrutinize

and clean up the Marrou mess. But knowing the LP, fat chance. And fat chance, too, that any state LP will exercise its legal right to kick the Marrou name off their state ballot.

And so here is proof positive: the Libertarian Party has become an irredeemable cesspool. The only honorable course is to close it down, to stay away, to give it no credence, no votes, and above all no dough. Not a penny. Not a farthing. The entire LP water must be cut off, not just the water in the old Fuhrerbunker. The name "libertarian" surely does not deserve such poltroons as these. ■

Ex-Yugoslavia

by M.N.R.

We at RRR were among the first to herald the crackup of that misbegotten spawn of World War 1, that misnamed entity called "Yugoslavia", named for the absurd chimera of a unified "South Slav" nation that cloaked the ugly reality of a Greater Serbia tyrannizing over a myriad of other ethnic nationalities. The breakup has been stalled by the existence of a so-called Yugoslav Army, one of the best equipped in Eastern Europe, armed to the teeth with weapons financed by a United States that once saw it as a bulwark against Moscow. For that army, which is simply a Greater Serb force, remains as a bizarre army without a nation, a Serb force looking for trouble, and only checked by the great expense its continuing wars are costing the Serbian people.

Americans like to think of Yugoslavia, since the breakup of Communism, as a cauldron of numerous ethnic groups each of whom hate the other. Not so. Look at the lineup. Slovenia, thank goodness, won its freedom after a brief but bitter fight with the Serb ("Yugoslav") Army. Croatia, asserting *its* independence, is still being thwarted, during a restless, much-broken cease-fire, by Serb guerrillas and the Serbian "Yugoslav" army. The Albanians, who constitute over 90 percent of the former autonomous province of Kosovo, is still being suppressed by the arrogant Serbs, who run Kosovo and claim it as a mere section of Serbia. The Hungarians, strong in the northern part of the once-autonomous province of the Vojvodina, now groan under the tyranny of the Serbs in a region of a supposedly unitary Serbia. The Macedonians were opposed, in their thrust for independence, only by the Serbs. And, as we shall see below, the Muslim Slavs and the Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who themselves live in perfect harmony in that republic, are only fiercely opposed by Serb guerrillas backed by the Serbian Yugoslav Army. It is not every group's hand against everyone else; in every instance, it is the Serbs who are at the bottom of the problem: Serbs vs. each and every one of the other ethnic groups in that region.

Everywhere you go in the Balkans, it is the Serbs who are the problem. The Serbs were responsible for triggering the crucial calamity of the twentieth century: World War I,

which was the source of all the following disasters for Europe and the world. The Serbian secret police, backed by the pan-Slavic ambitions of Imperial Russia, assassinated Archduke Ferdinand of Austria at Sarajevo in 1914, and thereby precipitated the war. The Serbs are the butcher-birds of the Balkans, and that region will never be at genuine peace, will never achieve ethnic justice, until the Serbs have been treated to a sound thrashing. Even the United States, enamored of "the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia" and therefore long an opponent of ethnic justice in that torn land, is beginning to come around to the true dimensions of the Serbian Problem. Perhaps it is not quite true that the only good Serb is a dead Serb, but it is certainly tempting to leap to that conclusion.

Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Serbs

Bosnia-Herzegovina (B-H), a "republic" of the old Yugoslavia strategically located between Croatia and Serbia, has a diverse ethnic composition. A large plurality, 42 percent, is enjoyed by Muslim Slavs, Slavs who converted to Islam centuries ago while under Turkish rule. The third largest ethnic group, the Croats, constitute 17 percent of B-H's 4.5 million people. In a referendum this year, Muslim Slavs and Croats overwhelmingly opted for independence, and both groups have agreed to live amongst each other in this ethnically mixed land. Not so, of course, the Serbs, the second largest ethnic group with 31 percent of

the B-H population. The Serbs only want to live in a Greater Serbia, now that the hollow shell, Yugoslavia, is gone. Perhaps the other groups might have agreed to some reasonable proposition of partition, as difficult as that is to achieve in B-H. But no: the Serbs insist on a partition that will give them 70 percent of B-H territory, presumably every part of the country where some Serb or other shows his face. It's ridiculous: the old Balkan folk wisdom is correct: you simply can't negotiate with a Serb.

Macedonia

But let us turn from the eternal Serb problem to Macedonia, the southernmost republic of the old Yugoslavia, which has also proclaimed its independence, a condition Macedonians have yearned for in vain for many centuries. But even though the Serbs are now willing to let the Macedonians go, another huge stumbling-block has appeared, which has delayed the U.S. and the European Community's recognizing this eager new country. Greece, to the south and south-east of Macedonia, is adamantly opposed to any recognition of any area including the name "Macedonia", a name Greece presumes to monopolize for itself, the name of its northern region. What! Greece arrogate a monopoly of the name! What in blazes is that?

But there is some method in the Greek madness. The point is this: again defying America's absurd Wilsonian sensibilities, "Macedonia" is not a region whose borders are carved in

stone. Macedonia was a Slav region in the southern Balkans, all of which, until the twentieth century, were subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Out of the breakup of that empire in the first two decades of this century, and out of its attendant wars, the Macedonian region was arbitrarily split into three parts: of which western Bulgaria got 10 percent, Serbia was granted 38 percent, and 52 percent went to Greece, to become its northern territory. But all these Macedonians were one Slavic people; they were *not* ethnically Greek (i.e. they

were not Hellenes), and they spoke not Greek but a language close to Bulgarian, a language that Bulgarians claim is a dialect of their own.

The Greeks are taking this superficially idiotic stand because they are petrified, petrified because once there is, at long last, an independent Macedonia separate from the old Serbia, the pull might become irresistible to draw in their brothers from northern Greece into a new, mighty Greater Macedonia, a united Macedonian entity that hasn't existed since the fourth century B.C. And that doesn't mean, of course, that anyone is worried about little Macedonia successfully aggressing against

mighty Greece. It means that Greece is worried about the Greek Macedonians themselves recognizing their community of culture and language, and rising up to split off from Greece to form a Greater Macedonia.

In the past few months, Greeks have been frantically trying to rewrite their Macedonian past, and to keep emphasizing the Greek-ness of ancient Macedonia. Thus the Greek historian, Eugenia Koukoura, insisted on taking a *New York Times* reporter (April 17) to a 2,500 year-old Macedonia tombstone to show her that

it bears Greek inscriptions.

Well sure, no one denies that, way way back, Macedonia was linguistically Greek and ethnically Hellene. The problem is that, in the seventh century A.D., Macedonia was overrun and settled by Slavic tribes. Macedonia is Slavic, and therefore the Greeks are right to be apprehensive, although terribly wrong to resist the great truth: that Macedonia is Slavic and therefore should be reunited with their Macedonian brothers in formerly southern Yugoslavia. Greeks: let the Macedonians go!

The funny thing is that the Greeks could have an impressive counter to this argument, but it is the last one they are

ever likely to use. For there is good reason to believe that not only Macedonia, but also *Greece* itself was overrun by Slavic tribes during the same era. So that even the "Greeks" in Greece are not really Hellenes. They may speak the Greek language, but they are not Hellenes but Slavs. Let's put it this way: look around at your average Greek worker or manager in a coffee shop; does he bear any resemblance whatever to the Greek statues in the old ruins? ■

Perot and the Populist Upsurge

by M.N.R.

As everyone knows, 1992, wondrously and inexorably, has been the year where everyone hates Washington. And everyone is enraged at government and at politicians. Hatred of the entire system has swept Americans of many groups and classes; it is a great sight, one we haven't seen since the late 1970's, when a libertarian and populist upsurge among Americans resulted in Prop 13, the tax revolt, hatred of Carter, and the landslide for Ronald Reagan—which the Reagan Administration coopted and deflected into restoring the people's love for the President and for politicians. No longer; hatred of the State is back, more powerful than before. In short, 1992 is the year, perhaps the ushering in of the Decade and even the next century, of Populism.

Macedonia is Slavic and therefore should be reunited with their Macedonian brothers in formerly southern Yugoslavia. Greeks: let the Macedonians go!