

to crack down on rampant street crime, and with swift justice.

Schmemmann also quotes an eloquent passage from V.Z.'s campaign book: "How do I see Russia? I do not see Russia weeping, I see Russia proud, Russia in which the proud traditions of her army will be again realized, where again talented Russian engineers and businessmen will create the latest technology." How can any friend of nationalism fail to be moved?

Of course, the unfortunate side of nationalism and patriotism is that it sometimes ignores other nationalisms, and shades over into imperialism. During the nineteenth century, the Age of Imperialism, the worst offenders were Great Britain, followed

by imperial Russia. The British Empire, which the Brits were forced to abandon after World War II, has of course, always enjoyed a worshipful reception in the U.S. Establishment press. As a foe of all imperialisms. I was delighted in the wake of the collapse of the imperial Soviet Union, that Russia was forced to disgorge many of its subject nationalities from its old Tsarist imperium. I hope that the former USSR nations: Ukraine, Belarus, the Baltics, etc. will band together and manage to fend off any attempt by Russia to re-

impose its Empire. But the crucial point for Americans is that all this is *none of our blankety-blank business*. Imperial Russia, even if it reestablished its pre-1917 borders, constitutes no conceivable threat to the United States. Our foreign policy should be the traditional one of neutrality in all foreign quarrels, Peace and Friendship with all

nations, and Don't Tread on Me. Period. Our attitude toward the new nationalities, accordingly, should be God Bless You and So Long. And let's keep a sharp eye out for emigre and other special interest groups who wish, for ethnic agendas of their own, to suck us into quarrels that are none of our affair.

But what, you might say, about Zhirinovsky's demand that the

U.S. return Alaska? Well, folks, let's not lose our heads. We bought it fair and square? But for a long time, the purchase of that frozen tundra was known as "Seward's Folly." Let's negotiate with V.Z., if it should come to that. How about this for a compromise: We free Alaska, give it its independence from U.S. imperialism, and maintain it as a peaceful, demilitarized buffer state between the U.S. and Russia, which, across the Bering Straits, is now only about ten miles from home? But, by God, we'll fight to the

last Californian if V.Z. should insist on getting all of northern California down to the southernmost point of Russian settlement, at Fort Ross or the Russian (!) River.

On the other hand, though, I have to admit there is a certain charm in the idea of forcing our ruling elite out of the Bohemian Grove to make way for the Russians, or in subjecting the wealthy New Age leftists of Marin County to a bit of old-fashioned Russian discipline! Hey, V.Z., let's negotiate.... ■

**Let's keep a sharp eye out for special interest groups who wish to suck us into quarrels that are none of our affair.**

## The Virginia Senate Race: North vs. Miller

by M.N.R.

One of the most interesting Senate races coming up in 1994 is in Virginia, where incumbent Senator Chuck Robb (Dem.) has been engaged for years in a mutually destructive death-struggle with his Democrat rival, outgoing Governor Doug Wilder. Wilder, who is out to destroy Robb, is going to run against him in the Democrat primary, and if he loses, promises to run as an independent in November.

All this makes the Republican nomination particularly desirable, all the more because of conservative George Allen's triumphant victory for the governorship in November 1993. Two leading candidates for the Republican slot are none other than the famous Lt. Colonel Oliver North (ret.), and free-market economist and Reaganite

chairman of the FTC and head of OMB, James Miller.

The Left-Libertarian view of the split between North and Miller might go something like this: the two embody different aspects of the Reaganite movement: Ollie North the pro-war, "intolerant" Christian Right; Miller, the free-market, libertarian wing of Reaganism. Since he left the Reagan Administration, Miller has been head of the free-market D.C. thinktank, Citizens for a Sound Economy.

While this would be a superficially plausible view of the North-Miller split, it would be dead wrong. Apart from the fact that Iran-Contra and the Cold war itself are now only antiquarian issues, Miller's "free-market" credentials are questionable. Miller's free-market thinktank is moderate, and Kochtopusian: moreover, on the crucial free-market issue of our time, Jim Miller favored NAFTA, whereas Ollie North opposed it. Furthermore, the following Establishment-conservative Cold Warriors have lined up in favor, not of North but of Jim Miller: former Secretaries of State George Shultz and Alexander Haig; Secretaries of Defense Casper Weinberger and Frank Carlucci; former Attorney-General Ed Meese; Reaganite political director Lyn Nofziger; and last but not least, the sinister neocon foreign policy leader and Podhoretz-son-in-law Elliott Abrams.

In short: Jim Miller is the candidate of the dominant Establishment wing of Reaganism, of the malignant Trilateralist-neocon coalition that dominated the Republican politics of the

1980's. Ollie North is the candidate of the people—of the populist wing of the conservative movement. The battle between North and Miller will be a continuation of the struggle. The battle between the Establishment Dole-Kemp-Gingrich Republicans and the Buchananites-Perotvians over NAFTA.

As became evident in the Iran-Contra hearings, Ollie North is clearly beloved by the people. This support has been reflected in the enormously successful grassroots fundraising that North has accomplished in the last several years. After the hearings in the summer of 1987,

North established the North Legal Defense and Family Safety Trust the following spring to raise legal fees and funds for his personal protection. By the time the defense fund ceased money-raising in late 1992, it had raised the phenomenal sum, mainly through direct-mail, of over thirteen million dollars. In the meanwhile, in the spring of 1990, Ollie took over a dormant charitable organization called the Interamerican partnership, and renamed it the Freedom Alliance, to promote American liberties. In the years since, the Freedom Alliance has raised nearly nine million dollars. North takes only a modest salary as president of

the Freedom alliance; almost all the annual funding (about 93 percent) gets plowed back into promoting North's speeches and other public relations activities. But most of North's income in the last few years has

come from the sales of his book, *Under Fire*, which sold a total of 625,000 copies in hardback and paperback editions, and from lecture fees, which run as high as twenty-five thousand dollars a pop. Perhaps more important, North has been using these formidable resources to speak at very Republican political meetings, high and low, in the state of Virginia

for the past two years.

One of North's effective points in his stump speeches is to quote the advice of a Texas police chaplain, after North has spoken of the importance of prayer; "Son, if you're going to pray for our President, you ought to use a Bible verse... Psalm 109, verse 8... look it up." And then Ollie cites the verse: "May his days be few and may another take his office." Amen! Yes, I think the North vs. Miller battle will be an instructive test of the strength of Establishment centrism vs. right-wing populism in the ranks of the Republican masses. And I have no doubt who is going to win.

[For fascinating facts about

**Jim Miller  
is the  
candidate  
of the  
malignant  
Trilateralist-  
neocon  
coalition.**

North and his campaign, see the article, even though critical, by Jeffrey Toobin, "Ollie's Next Mission," *New Yorker*, Dec. 27.] ■

## Kristol On Buchanan: What Goes On Here?

by M.N.R.

I never said Irving Kristol wasn't smart. Unlike the second generation of neocons, who are mainly dolts jumped up to fame and fortune by the support of their elders, the first generation at the famed City College of NY alcove (Kristol, Bell, Howe, Lipset, et al.) were shrewd political analysts and polemicists trained in Trotskyite cadre tactics. Since the 1992 election, the Kristols, pere et fils (Irving and William) have not been at their most cogent. Trying to be Godfathers, senior and junior, and therefore the overall bosses of the Conservative Movement, the Kristols at least have to pretend to be "cultural conservatives," and are not able to simply take a narrow Kempian line of marginal tax cuts on the upper brackets and the heck with the culture. And clearly the culture front is now a major sore spot and focus of the conservative masses. The objective of the Kristols is to try, gently, to shut the conservatives up on the cultural front. And so they have been pushing two contradictory lines: (1) the culture war has been irretrievably lost, so please stop talking about taking back the culture; and (2) we're des-

tined to win and win big soon, on the culture front, so let's sit back and wait for it to happen, like the crumbling of the Berlin Wall (bringing in a phony anti-Communist point.) Seemingly totally contradictory, the real point is the common conclusion: urging the right to shut up about culture.

All of a sudden, out of this murk, Irving has written a shrewdly perceptive article on the true lessons of the struggle over NAFTA. (*Wall St. Journal*, Nov. 24). He says: "Forget Ross Perot. Think Pat Buchanan." Perot, Kristol goes on, is transient, a washout, because even though his movement is energetic and taps a large body of frustrations, Perot himself is arrogant, muddled, and self-destructive. Perot the man is a loser and will fade away.

Buchanan, on the other hand, writes Kristol, is, in contrast, "a man of considerable intelligence" and capable of "effective demagoguery." Pat can offer the populist constituency he could inherit from Perot "a seductive, sharply defined agenda, and he can articulate this agenda with force and passion." Not only that, but Pat has a "real" political vision, a distinctive vision, neither liberal nor conservative but "powerfully reactionary." Yes! That's it! Conventional wisdom, Kristol adds, says that a reactionary vision is hopelessly utopian and need not be taken seriously. But Kristol retorts that even if Buchanan couldn't get an electoral majority and win the presidency in '96, he could be "strong enough to wreck the GOP and change the nation's

political landscape."

Pat's 'vision,' Kristol sums up as economic protectionism, America First foreign policy, radically restricting immigration, and getting "ruthless-and not just 'tougher'" on crime and welfare. In short, to restore the "old Republic," the republic where "the streets were relatively free of crime and not many 16-year-old girls were having illegitimate babies." The establishment, says Kristol, commonly reacts by saying that Pat "goes too far" and therefore will have no impact. But the old Trotskyite understands populist appeals to the masses: "speak to the taxi driver on your next trip and you will discover that—regardless of race, age or sex—he (or she) thinks there's a lot to be said for going too far." Buchanan's vision, Kristol adds, comes to a lot of Americans "as a breath of fresh air after all the mostly empty and ineffectual chatter we have heard in recent years about 'change' and 'reform.'"

Kristol then puts on his political analyst's cap and shows how Pat could go about changing the face of American politics. If he ran again in the Republican primary, Kristol states he will just get wiped out again. No: a more clever route would be to run as the candidate of a third party, running as many candidates as possible throughout the country. A Buchanan race on a Perotvian populist third party ticket would undoubtedly not win in 1996, but he could easily get 15 to 20 percent of the vote, and the Buchanan party could elect some candidates to a number of offices