

which can only be called nationalist.

Garet Garrett predicted it fifty years ago, in his classic essay *The Mortification of History* (Chicago Tribune: 1943). "American nationalism may be for the time being repressed," he wrote, as World War II raged on, but

... All elsewhere in the world, however, nationalism is rising, becoming more and more vocal, powerful, and assertive, even in Russia. If this continues... an astonishing sequel may begin to appear. The proposed great American adventure in world-wide sharing may assume a solitary aspect; internationalism at last may become isolated in America.

As angry Somalians cry "Yankee go home!" and the Europeans actively discourage U.S. military intervention in the Balkans, it looks like Garrett was right.

We know what internationalism is: we hear it often enough, and from every quarter. It is the Yankee equivalent of the White Man's Burden, a global War on Poverty, the End of History, the final dissolution of American sovereignty in a worldwide social democracy. It is a love of everything *but* one's country.

But what of its opposite, the love whose name none dare speak; what is nationalism of the American variety?

Repressed during World War II by wartime censorship and subordinated to the exigencies of the Cold War, American nationalism is on the rise, and the forbidden phrase, *America first*,

is once again heard in the land; raised not only by Pat Buchanan, but also strongly implied by the Perot phenomenon. Anti-government, anti-Beltway, suspicious of foreign adventurism and pro-middle class, this libertarian populism is the biggest obstacle to the Clintonian slide into "multicultural" socialism. As we drain our coffers to force-feed the Somalis, bail out the Russians, and buy the peace of the world, the people are beginning to ask: is it worth it? Ordinary Americans are wondering why their government is keeping order in the streets of Mogadishu while it can't effectively police the streets of Los Angeles.

This is American nationalism speaking—and when it begins to speak in its own name, the uproar of indignation is bound to be deafening. The punditocracy will scream: Isolationism! Nativism! *Selfishness!* We ought to plead guilty to this last charge: yes, it is high time for a little selfishness. After three world wars, two "hot" and one "cold," we have earned it.

Garret put the issue well when he wrote:

It is not yet inevitable that we shall have to buy the peace of the world with our standard of living; nor is it so resolved in the American mind. A terrific struggle for decision is bound to take place. When it comes the characters will be revealed, both to one another and to themselves, and many no doubt will change sides, seeing clearly for the first time

where they were going. The isolationist will be an image cast aside and forgotten. The bitter conflict at last must be one between nationalist and internationalist.

In that contest, libertarians can take but one side. In a world where unelected international agencies decide questions of war and peace, economics and culture, the defense of American sovereignty is a major task of all those who love liberty. This is what unites the various shades of *paleo* into a cohesive movement, what makes us American nationalists: the spirit of 1776. ■

Justin Raimondo is the author of *Reclaiming the American Right: The Lost Legacy of the Conservative Movement in America*.

Phony Libertarians and the War for the Republican Soul

by Murray N. Rothbard

It looks like Lew Rockwell and I got out of the "libertarian movement" and created "paleo-libertarianism" just in the nick of time. I used to think that the one accomplishment of the Libertarian Party was to spread consciousness of the name "libertarian" far and wide throughout the culture. Now I'm not so sure that was a net gain. For the

word "libertarian" in our current political culture means something very different from the original concept. All the radical anti-statism—the abolition of the income tax, of the welfare state, of the Federal Reserve, etc.—has dropped out of the public consciousness, and all that remains is the left-egalitarian cultural baggage that was draped around the original core concept by virtue of the cultural leftists and misfits who constituted the bulk of the movement. Now, in the post-Bush fight for the soul of the Republican Party, "libertarian" means a devotion to "gay rights," that is, to gay privileges and "anti-discrimination" laws, to the gayization of the military, to forcing free condoms and multicultural sensitivity training and compulsory "love" for "diversity" upon public school youth, etc., plus some egalitarian and socialistic vaporings about "empowerment" of the poor and the inner cities. In short, "libertarian" has now become a code word for cultural and political leftism within the Republican Party. The word "libertarian" has become a veritable stench in the nostrils of every paleo-libertarian, of every rightist libertarian.

In the concrete, the word "libertarian" has now become a label for the Kemp-Weld-Pinkerton wing of the Republican Party. In short, of what could be called the "left-wing" of the neocon movement. According to a remarkably revealing article in the *New Republic*, the Kemp-Bennett-Weber Empower America movement,

launched with great fanfare in a January 12 press conference as an implicit Kemp-for-1996 neoconservative coalition, has already begun to unravel, and indeed to fall apart. [Ruth Shalit, "Disempowered", *The New Republic*, March 15.] It is beginning to seem that Kemp, placing all his eggs on tax cuts and accepting all the rest of welfare state spending and of cultural leftism, has gotten *too* leftist for most of the neocons. Bill Ben-

nett has been denouncing Kemp for ignoring rightist moral and cultural issues. Thus, for the cancerous problems of the inner cities, Bennett correctly places the blame on immorality and a violent "culture of poverty," whereas Kemp, almost idiotically, thinks that the whole problem can be solved by "enterprise zones" and capital gains tax cuts. (South Central Los Angeles has been an "enterprise zone" for several years now—and so what?) In a press interview in mid-December, Bennett trenchantly scoffed that "enterprise zones are fine, provided you understand you have to have law and order in that neighborhood, or people won't come in. You have to have the work ethic in people's hearts."

The same rift occurs on the question of gay "rights." Ben-

nett wanted Empower America to weigh in on the side of the heroic parents of Queens in New York City, who successfully battled against leftist social engineer school Chancellor Joseph Fernandez's attempt to cram multi-cultural pro-gaydom down the throats of public school kids, a battle that succeeded in ousting Fernandez, much to the horror of the *New York Times*. William Weld, of course, was opposed to such support of the parents.

Jack Kemp, on the other hand, lashed out at Bennett's emphasis on the culture wars in the Empower America Jan. 12 press conference. Kemp countered with an "Index of Inner City Economic Opportunity, to show what happens when poor people get access to credit and capital." This, of course, is a direct

slap at the free market; what is Kempian "access" supposed to mean except coerced governmental subsidies and invasion of the property rights of capitalists? Does Kemp really think that a few more subsidized hustlers in the inner city will cure its ills?

Kemp, in the meanwhile, refuses to talk about the gays-in-the military issue. Miss Shalit, in an illuminating phrase, calls this attitude "denial" on Kemp's

Kemp refuses to talk about the gays-in-the military issue.

part. In the meanwhile, she reports that Weld hopes to convince Kemp to be "more libertarian," although Weld was distressed to find that Weber, the outfit's operating head, had not told him that his "libertarian soulmate" (!) Jim Pinkerton, had quit the organization to work at a conservative think tank. William Kristol, "Crown Prince" of the neocons, also declined to join Empower America, going off to another conservative think-tank. In the meanwhile, Mona Charen, neocon syndicated columnist, gently but firmly chided Kemp for not supporting the Bennett moral-cultural issues. So, while Empower America itself is firmly in Kempian hands (Weber and bankroller, investment banker Theodore Forstmann are both dedicated Kempians), it looks like this will mean little, for the neocons may be planning to jump ship.

(Miss Shalit's article is written from a Weld-Pinkerton perspective; see her article on the Bush campaign from the point of view of a young Pinkerton aide, "What I Saw at the Devolution," in left-libertarian *Reason* magazine, March 1993).

The Phony Libertarianism of Bill Weld

Bill Weld first came to our

favorable attention when, after beating the neocon John Silber for governor of Massachusetts in 1990, he actually cut the state budget, amounting to about \$15 billion, by \$1.6 billion. He was then facing a Dukakis-inherited state deficit of over \$630 million. But soon other aspects of Weldism came to the fore countering these libertarian leanings: his all-out foreign interventionism, proclaiming he would never bring a single soldier back from overseas; his radical environmentalism; and his ardent support for gay privilege. But while "socially tolerant," in left-libertarian jargon, he at least seemed to be honestly "fiscally conservative."

No more. As Bill Weld increasingly becomes

the darling of the Republican Left, his fiscal leftism, too, has now come out of the closet. Weld's newly proposed budget for next year is a whopping \$900 million increase over the current fiscal year, bringing the total up to \$15.2 billion. Weld's proposed big spending budget includes a \$9 million increase on environmentalism (bringing the total up to

\$149 million), and no less than a \$175 million hike in "human services," including day care, welfare, AIDS funding, and Medicare. In addition, Weld wants an increase of \$123 million

on higher education.

Weld's turnabout was hailed as an "ideological swivel" from his 1991 budget by the *Boston Globe*, the left-liberal Establishment newspaper of the region. The *Globe* stated that the new budget was "designed to help heal the injuries he [Weld] inflicted two years ago," and the paper was happily reminded of Dukakis's budgets of the "high-flying 1980s." [See "Second Thoughts on Weld's Big-Spend Budget," *Human Events*, Feb. 27].

So much for Bill Weld, and the alleged "libertarianism" he is trying to push on Jack Kemp. MiGod, do we have to yearn for the Return of John Silber, so we can put an end to the Weld Threat? ■

Free Speech, 1, Hate Thought Police, 1

by M.N.R.

There's good news and bad news on one of the mighty struggles of our day: Free Speech vs. the Hate Thought Police. Left-libertarians might ponder the fact that in both cases the great cause of free speech is being upheld not just by rightists, but by Irish Catholic rightists, at that.

Bad news first. Following on the heels of the lynching of Marge Schott, Dedham, Massachusetts, Judge B. Joseph Fitzimmons, Jr., is another person to be pilloried and punished, not only for Hate Thoughts, but also for Hate Thoughts expressed in

Weld's newly proposed budget for next year is a whopping \$900 million increase over the current fiscal year.