

I shall change my plans in order to be here to vote for the splinter Republican candidate Viviam Kellems, in Connecticut. I agree with you, of course, that these movements "won't get very far." (at least not soon)...

But in spite of that the Andrews candidacy was

1) an opportunity for Americans to register a choice, and 2) an experiment to find out what actual support there is in these States for American constitutional Government... That is the opportunity I have been longing for, all these years; and I welcome with the greatest joy this offer of a way to register my own political philosophy—to "stand up and be counted," as one who believes what I believe.

Lane went on to say that a large vote for Andrews would strengthen the hands of the so-called 'right' elements in both parties. In Connecticut it may have the effect of defeating the Republican ticket. It may even be large enough to repeat the pattern of the Republican ticket in 1856—and, after four more years of socialism in Washington—the Republican vote of 1860.

Lane understood that the defeat of the Eastern liberal Establishment's stranglehold over the GOP was and is a prerequisite for the victory of liberty. It was true in 1956, and it is just as true today. The key

question to ask is: what course of events will best serve our chances in 1996? Do we want King George around to put his royal imprimatur on Jim Baker, or would we rather see the Bush wing of the GOP prostrate?

Our movement must take the long view. Four years from now, the country will be more than ready for our message—and the Republican Party will fall into our hands like an over-ripe apple dropping off the tree. I can hardly wait. ■

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

Reply to Raimondo: Whom To Root for in November? by M.N.R.

Justin's eloquent denunciation of George Bush is all very well and I agree with it. The problem: what are we supposed to do about it? What is Justin's positive program for us in November? After all the thunder, his prescription is pretty feeble: vote for Howie Phillips where he's on the ballot, and otherwise, don't vote.

But this advice misses the point. I was not really concerned, in my article, to counsel on who to vote for in November: I was talking about a very different, though related matter:

whom should we cheer for on Election Day? Whom should we *hope* wins the election? Voting is a matter of personal conscience, and can be for one of many minor candidates or for no one at all; *rooting* on who should win, is a different problem: because regardless of who you or I vote for, or whether we vote at all, one of the two *major* candidates is sure to win in November. Whom should we hope wins, or are all the considerations so equally weighted that we should be indifferent? Regardless of our hopes, no minor candidate will win, and the office of President, alas, will not be declared vacant. So we are left with the stark alternative: Bush or Clinton? [The glorious thing about Perot was that *he* had a real chance to win.]

To clarify the difference, let us consider Justin's reference to the glorious Andrews-Werdel ticket, the last Old-Right third-party presidential ticket. I was an ardent supporter of Andrews-Werdel (and of course the great Vivien Kellems for Senate of Connecticut), and would still be today. If the ticket had been on the ballot in New York, or if I had lived in Connecticut, I would have eagerly voted for and supported Andrews-Werdel-Kellems to the hilt. I would have done so for two reasons: first, because I agreed with the entire thrust of their politics; and second, because it was vitally important at the time to preserve and build upon this last gasp of the "isolationist" Old Right.

Before getting to the crucial distinction of voting vs. rooting,

I would add that there was a critical difference between Andrews/Werdel and the Phillips effort this year. Representative Thomas Werdel was a right-wing Congressman from California; T. Coleman Andrews of Virginia had been head of the IRS, and then resigned, to stump the country for the next several years denouncing the IRS and calling for abolition of the income tax. The Andrews-Werdel foreign policy was Old

Right isolationist: against all foreign aid, and in favor of the Bricker Amendment to the Constitution to stop treaties from overriding Constitutional guarantees of strictly limited government power, or protection of the rights of American citizens. The Andrews/Werdel forces were rooted in the Right-wing of the Republican party and were an attempt to form a new Old Right

party, while putting pressure on the Republicans to take back that party from the Wall Street liberals that had conquered it in the Eisenhower Administration. The Phillips effort is not a rooted party faction; it is not even an integral third party, appearing only on ballots of other minor parties (e.g. the American Independent Party in California, and on no party ballot in New York unless it be the Right to Life Party). It is scarcely

comparable to the Andrews-Werdel effort.

To get to the voting/rooting distinction, what I was discussing in my article was not whom to vote for (in 1956 it was easy: Andrews-Werdel), but *whom* we should favor winning on Election Night. In 1956, my own position was simple: I was ardently in favor of the election of Stevenson, not for his own sake, but in order to break and punish the Eastern Liberal/Eisenhower

forces. Indeed, the only hope for the Andrews/Werdel party, or for a Right-wing takeback of the Republican Party was precisely that: to destroy the Eisenhower wing of the party, and to elect Stevenson. Unfortunately, the Republican Right was stubbornly loyal to the Party, and voted for Eisenhower, and by 1960, the Old Right had faded out of existence.

Misbegotten Republican Party loyalty had laid the Right-wing low.

So on the two critical questions, in 1956 I favored *voting* for Andrews, while rooting for Stevenson. In 1992, I am indifferent to whom one votes for, but I'm definitely rooting for Bush over Clinton.

The problem is that Justin has various suggestions about who to *vote* for (Phillips, or nobody), but says nothing about the

more important problem: whom to *root* for. Perhaps he might say that, on the analogy with 1956, we should root for Clinton in the same way I rooted for Stevenson in 1956. Apart from the substantive issues (Stevenson was far to the right of Clinton on all matters and his foreign policy was decidedly better, more pro-peace, than Eisenhower's), as I've said, does not speak for a substantial wing of the Republican Party, and has no organized faction.

Again, as between Bush and Clinton, Clinton is substantially worse on all matters, foreign and domestic; in foreign policy, for example, Clinton has already denounced Bush for not going to war with the Serbs over Bosnia. Even more important is the strategic scenario for the next four years. The important strategic question is: under whose reign will we have a better chance to build up the paleo-movement, specifically the Buchananite Right-wing? Consider the scenario of a Clinton victory. Setting aside the horror of a Clintonian America, with both the Executive and Legislature churning out a united Great Leap Forward onto multicultural socialism, what would happen to the Right? It has been true ever since the 1940's that the conservative masses are energized by a Democratic victory, pouring lots of funds and support into conservative institutions; whereas, befuddled and lulled by Republican victories, the support of the conservative masses for Right-wing institutions has tended to dry up. So: a Clinton

In 1992, I am indifferent to whom one votes for, but I'm definitely rooting for Bush over Clinton.

victory would energize the conservative masses. Isn't that good? *No*: because, the state of the Right being what it now is, this funding and energy would be poured into the wrong hands: into the coffers of neocons, Kempians, Buckleyites: in short, of Mensheviks and hacks, whose funding, influence and power would swell, preparatory to one of these neocon or Official turkeys winning the Republican nomination in 1996. The Buchanan forces, that is the genuine Right-wing forces, would be in grave disadvantage for the 1996 donnybrook.

But let us consider another, far more pleasant scenario: George Herbert Bush limps into office by a whisker in November. The way things look, a Bush victory could only be marginal, and surely would be no landslide. And that's *good*, because Bush surely does not *deserve* an enthusiastic mandate, or a triumphant victory. Bush limps into office, with no support. Quayle is discredited, and Kemp and Bennett are, willy-nilly, tied to a crumbling Bush Presidency in his second term. But the beauty part is that the conservative masses will *still* be lulled by the fact of a Republican presidency, so that support and funding for the hacks, Officials, and neocons, will continue to fade away, to crumble with the Bush presidency. In the meantime, a feisty Buchanite Right arises, getting even feistier, and in an increasingly better position to duke it out for the presidency in 1996. And by 1996, Pat would be in a position, if he doesn't get the Republican

nomination, to threaten to launch an organized third-party effort. In short, all sorts of possibilities will be open to us.

So, the paleo-Rightwing strategy, it seems to me, is to vote for Bush or not, but in particular to root for Bush to pull out a victory, thus (a) holding back the socialistic hordes, plus (b) putting an organized Buchanite Right, which would have officially endorsed the Bush ticket at Houston, into an excellent position to ride to power in '96 on the backs of a disintegrating Bush Administration, dragging down the neocon and other factions tied to its fate. In short, after seeing to it that Bush safely slides back into office on Wednesday after Election Day, the paleo-right goes immediately into Opposition, to act as a burr under the Bushian saddle for Four More Years. ■

Gang-Stabbing the President: What, Who, and Why

by M.N.R.

It should have been the ides of March, instead of late July. For surely it was *Et tu, Brute?* time in the nation's capital. As

George Bush plummeted in the polls, all the nation's Official Conservative leaders, including of course the neocons, took turns, one by one, with great delight, in plunging the knife

into the president. As Sam Francis of the *Washington Times* has pointed out in a brilliant syndicated column, these are the same people who gathered together in Bermuda in May of last year to proclaim, in the words of neocon godfather Irving Kristol, that "President Bush is now the leader of the conservative movement within the Republican Party."

These are the same creeps who, shocked at Pat Buchanan's "disloyalty" to Bush, denounced Pat viciously as a "fascist", "anti-Semite," or a variant thereof. And now, as Sam Francis writes, "with Mr. Bush's rating lower than a snake's belly, it has occurred to movement conservatives that 'principle' demand they jump ship."

One by one they got up, preaching on television, as if in concert, at a time neatly orchestrated to hit the Bush forces when they were at their lowest point, after the big Clinton-Gore bounce at the convention and their bus trip through the heartland, surrounded by the swooning Respectable Media

"With Mr. Bush's rating lower than a snake's belly, it has occurred to movement conservatives that 'principle' demand they jump ship."