

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!

Populism, or hatred of the Establishment, can and has taken many forms; within the last year, we have seen David Duke, Pat Buchanan, Jerry Brown, and now H. Ross Perot, express different aspects of the populist impulse. Buchanan's is right-wing or paleo-populism, Brown's is left-populism, and Perot's is a fascinating hybrid. But the important point is that all of these movements have been expressions of populism, and, as I have been maintaining for some time now, populism, the emphasis on mass action from below, is vitally important, whether right, left, or hybrid, in rising up, attacking, and hopefully overthrowing the malignant left-center-right elites that have been increasingly grinding us down. If the elite, the Establishment is the major enemy, and the masses, for all their flaws, are the only hope, then the paleo-libertarian and paleo-conservative must welcome all of these movements, even the flake Jerry Brown.

And now that it is clear that Pat Buchanan will not receive the Republican nomination in 1992, paleos, while helping to build the Buchanan movement for the future, must make their decisions on how to react to the contest this November. Surely, even the most jaundiced anti-Perotvian must admit that the little Texan has brought an excitement, a verve, a sense of dynamics and of open possibilities, which had threatened to disappear in a dreary race between two dismal, out-and-dried Trilateralist-Establishment figures.

Left-libertarians, as usual, have totally missed the boat on the Perot phenomenon. My old friend Bill Evers wrote an article for the *Christian Science Monitor*, (April 7) demonstrating at some length that Perot is not a libertarian. Well, Bill, no one ever said he was a libertarian; this is straw-man polemics at its most absurd. The great thing about Perot is that he is a populist, both in the content of his views and in the manner of his independent, third-ticket (not "party") candidacy. And what a manner. Never before has this happened in American history: that a simple announcement of a possible presidential race brought forth literally millions of phone calls of support, and millions of grassroots volunteers. And no conspiracy theory about how Perot welcomed or planned for this event can erase the phenomenal response of the American public to Ross Perot. As a billionaire with a proven record of accomplishment; as a folksy, down-home guy with an East Texas twang and a plain, forthright manner who takes no guff from the smarmy media; as a guy who talks sense; Ross Perot connected with the American masses in a remarkable way. And, as the Establishment begins to engage in

"scrutiny" (looking for smear material) and trying to "define" (smear) Perot, they are going to find that the People's Billionaire is willing to spend over \$100 million of his own money to "define" himself. Good. Libertarians should note the contrast of the guts of Perot, of his willingness to spend what it takes to make him President; with the miserly contribution of only a million dollars to his own Vice-Presidential campaign of oil billionaire David Koch in the LP campaign of 1980.

So the best thing about Perot is that he and his movement are throwing a monkey-wrench or a scud missile into the Washington machinery. He is scaring the bejesus out of the inside-

the-Beltway types. Hell, if Perot is able to call upon his head the denunciations of David Broder, Mr. Insider, for not being a professional pol, then the little Texan can't be all bad.

But there are other, highly positive things about Perot. First, his foreign policy, always a prime consideration with this observer. Ross Perot has a superb foreign policy, for: (a) he

bitterly and vociferously opposed the Gulf War, *even after* the fighting began; (b) he wants to end foreign aid, and to end the practice of the U.S. paying for the "defense" of Germany

The great thing about Perot is that he is a populist, both in the content of his views and in the manner of his independent, third-ticket (not "party") candidacy.

and Japan; (c) he opposes the \$10 billion loan guarantee to Israel; (d) he has taken the Sam Francis-Pat Buchanan line in denouncing the activities of foreign agents in American politics; and (e) he stresses private rather than government action, e.g., his heroic personal rescue mission of his own employees from Iran. Also, Perot's nomination of the paleo-con Admiral Stockdale as his interim veep is most interesting; Stockdale was not only a heroic POW of Communists in Asia, he also testified early about the fraudulence of the Gulf of Tonkin incident that enabled LBJ to escalate the war in Vietnam. Which of the other two major candidates are anywhere near this good?

Domestically, Perot has taken a vital step: the only candidate to dare touch the sacred universal entitlements of Social Security and Medicare. Perot has put it neatly and bluntly: "Why should a rich man like me collect Social Security of Medicare?" Why indeed? A Perot victory could point the way to extricate us from the entitlement horror.

Perhaps the most intriguing, and the most sneered at by the pundits, is Perot's concept of an electronic town meeting to decide policies. The standard argument for representative democracy over direct democracy goes as follows: direct democracy, town meetings where everyone could vote directly on policies, were wonderful in the colonial period, but they became technologically obsolete with the growth of population and of a more

complex society: therefore, as a second best measure, we had to substitute legislatures, representatives of the public. But one of the striking features of our modern world is that direct democracy, direct mass voting on policies, has now become, once again, technologically feasible: through television, pay-TV, etc. I have wondered for years now: why have none of the political scientists or the bombastic champions of "democracy," why haven't they talked about this and advocated direct democracy—

say, giving the public a veto power over Congressional laws, or deciding between several alternatives? Where are all the loud-mouthed "democrats" now? I suspect they shrink in horror from this plan, because these "democrats" don't want the public to participate actively in decisions; they want the masses to vote Ja! in plebiscites ratifying the dictates of the elite.

Many pundits have claimed that Perot is vague on specifics, and that if he doesn't present an 85-page plan for every conceivable issue, he will lose public support. Rubbish! They don't understand the genius of the Perot concept: Details? Democracy! Let the masses decide directly through electronic ballots! *And why not?*

No one is saying that the masses will always, or even most of the time, make wise choices. But at least, they will be participating, and they are more to be trusted than the elites that are eating out our substance.

Not just Evers, but even mainstream pundits have raised as an allegedly crushing point against Perot that he made his billions by selling computer services for Medicare and Medicaid to state governments. So what? Are we all supposed to be fiercely opposed to all government contracts? Actu-

ally, Perot was only carrying out the famed libertarian Robert Poole concept of privatizing by contracting-out government! What happened was that the state governments found they couldn't run their computer systems, so they hired Perot, thereby saving taxpayers huge amounts of money. What in the world is wrong with *that*? Is every presidential candidate of whatever party supposed to be so much of an anarchist that he scorns even government contracting out? Get real!

It should be emphasized that, in gauging Perot or any other candidate, we are not stacking them up against Mr. Perfect. Mr. Perfect ain't running this November. Now that the

Perot was only carrying out the famed libertarian Robert Poole's concept of privatizing by contracting-out government.

primaries are winding down, we are weighing Perot, Slick Willie and his Lady Macbeth consort, and the inarticulate preppie from Kennebunkport. Comparing persons and policies, Ross Perot wins hands down. And besides, he's short, and it's about time us shorties won one. ■

PC Watch

by Llewellyn H.
Rockwell, Jr.

Mob Welfare

Black state rep Curtis Tucker, Jr., was appointed to head a California legislative commission on the L.A. riots. His first act, at a rally at the state capitol, was to threaten that "we'll burn this state down" unless blacks get billions more in welfare.

Polly Want a Handout?

I've long known that Polly Williams, the left-wing black state legislator in Wisconsin, was a member of the Black Militia. This paramilitary group has threatened to kill white people unless it gets \$600 million and soon. Now it turns out that she also believes in an "Afrocentric curriculum"—for whites.

Williams, who was Jesse Jackson's state campaign chairman, has been praised to the skies by *Reason* and the *Wall Street Journal*. Why? Because she's for "school choice." That is, she wants the black underclass to get even more welfare, this time to attend private

schools for free.

The private schools, because they will be accepting tax money, will then come under state regulation (and, when Bush's bill goes through, federal regulation) of their admissions, discipline, and curriculum. Williams wants to include the ludicrous anti-white fictions of Afrocentrism. White parents, of course, will have no choice.

Mr. Smith Goes to Guernica

The *New York Times Book Review* is so disappointed. In "It Wasn't Such a Wonderful Life," an *NYTBR* editor, Barry Gewen, mourns the loss of Frank Capra as heroic leftist. A new biography by Joseph McBride shows that "the man who seemed to put the spirit of the New Deal on the screen was, in reality, a closet reactionary and a dogged Roosevelt hater." Capra was a "life-long Republican who never once voted for Roosevelt. He was an admirer of Franco and Mussolini" and even, "during the McCarthy period," a "secret FBI informer."

The Black-Out

No dissent on the matter of Rodney King and the L.A. lootathon is allowed in the national media (with the exception of the best magazine in America, *Chronicles*, where my article on the subject will appear in July).

Anything that didn't fit into the sticky-note directive (cops bad, Rodney good; whites oppressors, blacks victims; rage justified, welfare necessary)

was suppressed. For example, a friend from New York City told me of rioting in which he and his family were almost injured that was never reported by the New York or national media. And the London *Daily Telegraph* reports that "a black Atlanta police official, Calvin Howard" said that "black police officers" will "express their rage" by murdering white cops.

"Beware," said Mr. Howard, "because you are going to see police officers drawing guns" and shooting white "officers now. We are not going to accept the verdict as it came down." Needless to say, Cal was not even reprimanded. Imagine the reaction if the situation were reversed.

P.S. Even though the L.A. killers and thieves were clearly motivated by hatred of whites and Koreans, in addition to high time preference greed, none of their acts will be recorded in the official statistics for hate crimes.

The Multicultural Cacophony

The National Endowment for the Arts is supposed to support a few of the best American folk artists. This year, the NEA's choices include Francisco Aguabella, an "Afro-Cuban drummer"; Fatima Kuinov, a "Bukharan Jewish singer from Central Asia"; Ng Sheung-Chi, a "Chinese *Toissan muk'yu* folk singer"; and T. Viswanathan, a "South Indian flute master."

Can We Call the Devil She?

The radical feminists are increasingly successful in imposing