

each other, and of growing together, or fusing into one paleo movement as swiftly and easily as by osmosis.

When we first formed the paleo alliance, we had the idea of writing a book, presenting "two sides," the libertarian and conservative, of each of a number of key issues, and then trying to arrive at a synthesis at the end of the book. But we all realized after only a few months of interchange, that the idea was obsolete. While of course there are inevitably nuanced differences among individuals, we suddenly realized that we were all on one side, all paleos together. It was a pleasure to find at last, that the old idea of a "community of scholars" who learn from each other and agree on truths is not just a dead cliché of universities but can actually be a living reality.

Recently, a veteran LP leader wrote to a friend, remembering that I had persuaded his generation, in my "Listen, YAF" article in 1969, to leave the conservative movement and to form a self-conscious libertarian movement. He notes wistfully that now I have apparently changed my mind.

I'll try one more time. The last few years have seen one of the most momentous events of the 20th century: the sudden collapse of the Soviet Union and therefore of the Cold War. My Old Right opposition to "perpetual war for perpetual peace" was always my prime reason for separation, a reason I never tried to conceal. The problem is that, with a few exceptions, modern libertarians have never cared tuppence about

foreign policy, about war and peace. Hence, the general confusion among libertarians about my seeming change of heart.

A change in fundamental conditions often calls for a change in basic strategy. There's a new world out there, fellas, and it would be very odd if a radical transformation would *not* cause libertarians, as they should lead Americans, to rethink their foreign policy as well as their place in the ideological universe. The Right is no longer the pro-war monolith it had been since the late 1950s; there are many elements, especially the paleos, who are seeking to return to the spirit of

the Old, pre-Buckley Right. That's what it's all about, Alfie; there's a new world out there. It's time to put aside your *Atlas Shrugged*s and come out and explore it. ■

The New York Times, Communism, and South Africa

by M. N. R.

It would of course, be absurd to call the *New York Times* in any sense pro-Communist. Absurd. Ridiculous. Daft. Surely not the



*Murray N. Rothbard and Phyllis Schlafly
at the Republican National Convention in Houston.*

Field Marshal of Establishment Left-Liberalism. And yet, and yet...

Take the recent thinkpiece in the Sunday *New York Times* (the day for thinkpieces) by top *Times*man Bill Keller, "South Africa's Communists Navigate a New Politics" (Sept. 20). The entire article is devoted to praising the merits, the intelligence, the downright *lovability*, of the Communist Party of South Africa, a possibly guiding powerhouse within the leftist African National Congress that is poised to take over the Republic of South Africa.

The article features the greatness of one Chris Hani, General Secretary of the South African CP, who, unlike most Communist leaders in our "post-Soviet world" is "not geriatric, irrelevant or former." Hani, whose picture is featured in the article—looking suitably young and thoughtful—has won an "enthusiastic young following" among blacks. Keller admits that the Communist Party exerts disproportionate influence within the ANC. Even though the CP has a membership of only 35,000 out of a million members in the ANC, somehow it has managed to acquire "at least" 10 of the 26 seats on ANC's national working committee, its main policy body. But Keller tries hard to trivialize this disproportion, attributing it to the nobility, the heroism of the CP leaders as individuals. The *Times*man quotes a South African political scientist that "the reason so many (Communists) have risen to leadership positions, is that they've done the fighting and dying.

It's not necessarily their credentials as socialists." Well, whew! *That's* a relief!

Besides, reports Keller, the CP has really been a *good* influence within the black movement in South Africa. "The Communists," Keller notes, "are generally credited with persuading the African National Congress to adopt a nonracial policy in the 1950's." Keller then quotes "Mr. Hani": "We contributed to the elimination of narrow nationalism, of South Africa for the blacks only," adding that "we also brought into the ANC the culture of militancy, of sacrifice."

Well, gee, those Commies are really wonderful, harmonious, noble, multiracial idealists, aren't they? What a lovable bunch! It's also remarkable how, under the *Times* gentle aegis, seventy-five years of butchery, of despotism, of enslavement, of mass murder of scores of millions on an unprecedented scale, all this monstrous record of world Communism, just simply washes away. History and memory disappear, and we are back in the most naive fantasies of the Western fellow travelers of the 1930's, those fools and liars who whitewashed the Communists' black record. More than a half-century after the lies of *New York Times* Soviet "expert" Walter Duranty about the Soviet Union, lies for which the *Times* has never deigned to apologize, all this guff that we had thought was gone is back—at least when the Commies possess a color that is politically correct.

Another piece of Keller naivete is his excited discovery

that the CP of South Africa admits its past error, one of its top ideologists admitting that the Party had been too reflexive in supporting the Soviet invasions of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. "We are living down a sort of ignoble recent past," said this theoretician. Darn nice of him to rethink his "sort of ignoble" past, isn't it? Keller also notes that there are many factions within this small but highly influential CP, ranging from "neo-Stalinists" to "moderates" akin to the British Labor Party. Keller doesn't seem to realize that CP's almost always have many factions within them, *especially* when they are not in power.

And yet, despite this manifest moderation and lovability of the CP, the *Times*man laments that President de Klerk, from whom so much has been expected in his drive to divest the white regime of power, has, in recent weeks, gone back on this policy and has "hammered with rising fury at the theme of Communist influence." Why has de Klerk suddenly started worrying about Commies? This harks back to the September march of the ANC upon the autonomous black republic of Ciskei. The ANC, angry at the rule over Ciskei by the conservative black Brigadier Gqozo, has vowed to overthrow Gqozo, and organized the march on Ciskei's borders to step up the pressure and to threaten an invasion. President de Klerk is exercised by the fact that the march, which led Gqozo's troops to shoot and kill two dozen marchers in defense of their country, was led by the

notorious militant Ronnie Kasrils, member of the governing committees of both the ANC and the Communist Party.

One would think that de Klerk had a point in worrying about Kasrils and the Communist influence. But not to Mr. Keller, who regards de Klerk's warnings as merely a cynical way to "sow division in the black alliance and frighten voters" away from supporting the ANC. And, of course, we wouldn't want any of *that*, would we?

The culmination of Keller's nonsensical position is to warn that de Klerk's strategy is "risky," for de Klerk, by "raising the Communist specter," will frighten off foreign investment and polarize the country. As if the specter of a leftist government with powerful Communists within it is not enough to scare foreign investors!

Keller concludes by discussing the relationship of ANC President Nelson Mandela, than whom there is no one more beloved in the Left-liberal press, with the Communist Party. Mandela, Keller assures us, is not a Communist; in fact, the ANC is getting ever more respectful of private property (Yeah, sure. Tell us another one, Bill.) But we have to realize that Mandela is "wedded

to the Communists by personal and political loyalties" of half a century. Well sure, of course, good old loyal Nelson. And, in a particularly neat touch by Keller, Mandela's partnership with the Commies "helps protect (him) against charges... that he is drifting comfortably into compromise, forsaking his roots." Well, sure, we wouldn't want Mandela to forsake his militant Commie roots, now would we?

Besides, Keller ends wistfully, an ultimate split between the ANC and CP is inevitable. Communists seem more comfortable as "outsiders" than running the country (wanna bet, Bill?). and besides, the CP's "ultimate goal" is "an economy dominated by public ownership and large-scale redistribution of wealth."

An interesting portrayal of Communism's "ultimate goal." No mention, of course, of murdering dissenters, totalitarianism, slave labor camps, and all the rest. No: just a little more socialism and redistributionism than Mandela or Keller would want. In short, Communists are wonderful, heroic, self-sacrificing idealists who want a bit more socialism than Mandela or Social Democrats, the Mensheviks on the *New York Times*.

There are several morals to this little tale. One is that, just because Communism disintegrated in the USSR and Eastern Europe does not mean that we should abandon our insights into the evils of Communism. There are still Commies around. In fact, the end of the Cold War makes "red-baiting" less dangerous because it can no longer be used as a cover for a warmongering, interventionist foreign policy, for a foreign policy designed to spread Social Democracy throughout the globe.

And secondly, Mr. Keller's piece is testimony to the fact that the illusions about Commies as heroic idealists, which we thought had died along with Duranty and the myth of the Chinese Communists as "agrarian reformers," are still all too prevalent.

And finally, if we needed yet another demonstration, that there is, down deep, not very much difference, after all, between Communism and Social Democracy, between Bolshevism and Menshevism. ■

Fear and Loathing in D.C.

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

The horror! The horror! President Bush wants a 5% cut in the pay of bureaucrats making more than \$75,000 a year.

It's a "major blow" to the "civil service," said Bruce Moyers, head of the Federal Managers Association, which

No mention, of course, of murdering dissenters, totalitarianism, slave labor camps.