

[Chronicles, January, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

In Search of Impulses

Some years ago, there was a series on American television called "In Search Of . . .," a documentary show that every week embarked upon some intrepid quest "in search of" such titillating arcana as the Loch Ness Monster, Bigfoot, Flying Saucers, table-rapping, and people who turn into giant mushrooms in the dark of the moon. William F. Buckley Jr. probably never watched the series, but it is impossible to think of his most recent book, In Search of Anti-Semitism, without being reminded of it, and not only because of the similarity of the titles.

His book, of course, is the hard-cover incarnation of the mammoth article that devoured the entirety of the December 30, 1991 issue of National Review, and since the same magazine devoted yet another entire issue in March to the epochal importance and world-historical significance of Mr. Buckley and his latest ruminations, it would not become me to try to evaluate the book as a whole in this compressed space. Nevertheless, as inconceivable as it may be to its author, some readers may no longer recall the article or its argument, and they will need to be instructed as to its general scope and the controversies that swelled, for a time, about it.

"In Search of Anti-Semitism" (the article) was an examination

of the "cases" of various individuals who had been accused of anti-Semitism in the recent past -- specifically, Joseph Sobran, Mr. Buckley's "close friend" and colleague at National Review; the Dartmouth Review, an undergraduate magazine; columnist and commentator Patrick J. Buchanan; and novelist Gore Vidal. After winding his way through the published remarks that had instigated the accusations, the accusations themselves, and the defenses offered by the accused and their supporters, Mr. Buckley reached various conclusions and offered sundry meditations of his own in each instance. All of this would ordinarily have been no more remarkable than the yachting books and spy novels that have consumed most of Mr. Buckley's literary energies in recent years. His exposition of the "facts" in each "case" seems to have consisted largely of reprinting whole columns and articles that had already been published elsewhere. With the exception of long excerpts from a few letters of Mr. Sobran and others that had not been previously available, Mr. Buckley had little new information to impart, and what he did unbosom was not especially enlightening. Moreover, since the controversies as well as some of the controversialists had generally exhausted themselves already, it was not clear why any of these unpleasantries needed to be resurrected. The dedication of an entire issue of the magazine Mr. Buckley founded, and over which he still presides, to a single gargantuan essay by him might plausibly have been ascribed merely to his equally gargantuan ego, and the whole

matter might have quickly evaporated into memory, which, at the present time, it has done.

By a curious conjuncture of events, however, it so happened that Mr. Buckley's article appeared almost immediately after news of Mr. Buchanan's plans to run for President struck the headlines, and it was this conjuncture that created the controversies that ensued. To many of Mr. Buchanan's supporters, it looked as though Mr. Buckley had deliberately attacked him on the very eve of his campaign, and indeed some sources at National Review have acknowledged that the publication date of Mr. Buckley's article was moved up to coincide with Mr. Buchanan's announcement. Hence, there was, to say the least, a good deal of bitter feeling toward Mr. Buckley on the part of the Buchananites, as well as, among many conservatives, a general nausea instilled by Mr. Buckley's unwillingness to let the supposititious Loch Ness Monster of anti-Semitism rest in its watery lair.

Mr. Buckley's conclusion as to the "case" of Mr. Buchanan was not that the columnist-turned-candidate was or is an anti-Semite, a term Mr. Buckley never defined, but merely that "I [Mr. Buckley] find it impossible to defend Pat Buchanan against the charge that what he did and said during the period under examination amounted to anti-Semitism, whatever it was that drove him to say and do it: most probably, an iconoclastic temperament." Predictably, Mr. Buckley's conclusions supplied ample ammunition for both neo-conservative and Republican as well as left-wing guns aimed at Mr.

Buchanan in the primary campaign, and it soon became evident that, whatever his motivations, Mr. Buckley had struck a blow against a major political effort and a major personality of the American right. Mr. Buckley and National Review then spent a good part of the primary season last year trying to retreat from, explain, and minimize the damage they had done, even to the point of endorsing Mr. Buchanan's presidential efforts. These maneuvers won them only additional criticism, this time from Mr. Buchanan's enemies among neo-conservatives and Jewish liberals. Questions (and more than questions) were raised about Mr. Buckley's own attitudes about Jews, and The New York Times' Abe Rosenthal went so far as to say that National Review itself "now is wan and pockmarked with the disease" of "moral equivalency" toward anti-Semitism. It was clear that Mr. Buckley had blundered, committing perhaps the most serious and harmful mistake of his career.

So much for the background of the original article and the reactions to it, reactions that in retrospect seem inevitable given Mr. Buckley's reckless, poorly defined, and actually evasive invocation of the potentially ruinous offense of anti-Semitism. It is all very well to say, as National Review did say some months later during the magazine's bail-out operation, that "Neither National Review nor its Editor-at-Large has expressed the view that Patrick Buchanan is an anti-Semite"; but to live on the difference between an explicit accusation and Mr. Buckley's ambiguous and somewhat giggly, "I find it impossible to defend,"

etc., is simply disingenuous, if not outright irresponsible. If Mr. Buchanan is an anti-Semite, Mr. Buckley should have said so. If he is not, then he should have said that. If Mr. Buckley couldn't tell, then either he hadn't done enough research and rumination on the question or else maybe the whole question was not worth pursuing in the first place.

One would have thought that Mr. Buckley's blunder might have taught him something, but evidently it has not, which brings me to my present theme. Turning to the footnote on page 170 of In Search of Anti-Semitism (the book), I discover that Mr. Buckley has once again launched a reckless accusation of anti-Semitism. This time his target is me.

Explicitly, Mr. Buckley accuses me of "anti-Semitic impulses" and of exhibiting an "orientation" toward the most banal Judeophobic delusions. The whole footnote, while it does not merit publication at all, needs to be reprinted and considered in some depth:

A classic example of what anti-Semitic impulses do to a working mind is seen in an editorial published in the March issue of Chronicles signed, and presumably written, by Samuel Francis, an erudite journalist associated with the Washington Times. He cannot believe (he tells us) that I had anything serious to say about Messrs. Buchanan and Sobran. Could it have been ... a Jewish plot! "Given the triviality of Mr. Buckley's conclusions, the absence of any compelling evidence to support them, and the staleness of the charges themselves, readers are led ineluctably to an overwhelming question: why did Mr. Buckley choose this particular time to secrete so much mental fluid about this immaterial matter?"

"Some light on this may be shed by a 'backgrounder' published by the American Jewish Committee more than a year ago, in November, 1990, at the height of the controversy about Mr. Buchanan. The backgrounder's author, Kenneth Stern, wonders what 'we' should do about Mr. Buchanan, and his decision was suggestive. 'Unless he says something Mein Kampfish,' wrote Mr. Stern, 'we should refrain from calling him an anti-Semite. That will only draw attention to him, and bring him defenders. Rather, I suggest we approach other people whom Buchanan's adherents see as equally qualified for the title of "defender of the faith" to write a rebuttal. When it comes to Catholic-Jewish tensions, why not a leader in the church? And when it is an anti-communism based issue ... why not a non-Jewish conservative?' If Rasputin and Machiavelli had conspired over cocktails, they could not have concocted a more furtive stratagem. The shoe that fits, of course, is Mr. Buckley, a Catholic conservative. Is it too cynical to ask if the American Jewish Committee or someone associated with it manipulated him into launching his insubstantial Scud against Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Sobran?" From there to the Protocols of Zion is pretty steep climbing, to be sure, but the orientation is dead on.

It is never easy to reconstruct the illogic by which a faulty conclusion is reached, and Mr. Buckley's reasoning is at best elusive. It seems to consist of the following: A staple theme of anti-Semitic folklore is the claim that there exists a "Jewish plot," sponsored by rabbis, "elders of Zion," bankers, etc., which is responsible for a variety of or all evils that have befallen the West, America, Christianity, "Aryans," etc. I (Francis) suggest and discuss the existence of a "plot" by persons associated with the American Jewish Committee against Mr.

Buchanan. Therefore, I am at least encouraging belief in the aforesaid staple of anti-Semitism and may actually credit it myself, and while there is no apparent reason to accuse me of believing in the old hokum of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," I am clearly on the road to doing so and encouraging others to do so.

Now in the first place, if this is an accurate reconstruction of his elliptical argument, Mr. Buckley has committed an elementary logical fallacy in his reasoning, a fallacy so elementary in fact that it has long since been given the name of the "fallacy of the undistributed middle." A classic expression of the fallacy is the syllogism: (a) All leaves are green; (b) My tie is green; (c) Therefore, my tie is a leaf. The specific form that Mr. Buckley has used is (a) Anti-Semites believe in a "Jewish plot"; (b) Francis believes in a "Jewish plot"; (c) Therefore, Francis is an anti-Semite. You don't have to be very erudite to see the flaw, but it seems to have sailed past Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Buckley's error in reasoning is compounded and made more serious, however, by yet another fallacy, namely, that of equivocation -- using a term to mean more than one thing in the same argument, the term in question being "Jewish plot." He is correct that belief in a grand Jewish plot is a staple of anti-Semitic mythology and propaganda, and just for the record I will say that I do not believe in such a plot and did not intend to foster belief in one. What I suggested was indeed a plot, but one

of rather more mundane dimensions than the "Protocols" and similar literature expound upon. Mr. Buckley seems to be reasoning that anyone who suggests that any Jews engage in any plots is conceptually indistinguishable from, or at least on the road to becoming, someone who credits the far more grandiose versions of conspiratorialism favored by anti-Semites. By his logic, anyone who accused Julius and Ethel Rosenberg of plotting to give secrets to the Soviets, anyone who accused the late Meyer Lansky of plotting with Bugsy Siegel to commit crimes, anyone who accused Jonathan Pollard of plotting with his Israeli handlers to commit espionage -- anyone who suggests that such so-called "Jewish plots" exist is an anti-Semite, even though such plots are "Jewish" only in the sense that some Jews engage in them and not in the more expansive and sinister sense that such plots may be attributed to the generality of Jews.

But of course there is just a little bit of difference between the concept of a "Jewish plot" as an ideological device to inculcate all or most Jews, on the one hand, and, on the other, citing specific empirical evidence that a particular plot by particular Jews exists. The one implies that all or most Jews or their representative leaders are involved in conspiracy; the other offers evidence that some Jews are involved in specific plans toward some end. Mr. Buckley has elided the two concepts and condensed their separate meanings with his single phrase, "Jewish plot."

Let it be noted also that I never used the expression "Jewish plot" in the editorial in question; that usage is Mr. Buckley's, and I believe it would have been an inappropriate expression to use, given the false and sinister associations the expression has.

Nevertheless, if, at Mr. Buckley's behest, we are going to call Mr. Stern's proposal a "Jewish plot," then there is little question that it existed, at least in the sense that no one has challenged the authenticity of the American Jewish Committee's backgrounder. The question, then, is not, did a "Jewish plot" (Mr. Buckley's term) exist, but rather, was I correct in suggesting that Mr. Buckley was part of it? I simply don't know; I didn't know when I wrote the editorial, and I still don't know even now that Mr. Buckley has discussed it. The reader of Mr. Buckley's footnote (presumably written by Mr. Buckley) will note that he does not deny it, as I deny believing in or trying to foster the myth of a Jewish conspiracy. I am prepared to assume that Mr. Buckley is an honorable man, and if he does deny it, I have no problem believing him. But he has not done so. Will he deny that he was either consciously part of an American Jewish Committee plan to discredit Pat Buchanan or that he was manipulated into being an unconscious tool of such a plot?

Finally, we come to my supposed "anti-Semitic impulses," which is actually where Mr. Buckley started out. Since I have met Mr. Buckley only briefly and have never discussed with him Jews, anti-Semitism, "Jewish plots," or related matters, and since I

almost never write on such subjects, I do not see how Mr. Buckley could possibly know what "impulses" related to them, if any, bubble through my nervous system, unless he has inferred such "impulses" simply from the editorial in question through the fallacious reasoning discussed above. My impulse, in fact, is to suspect that Mr. Buckley, his monumental and almost pathological vanity wounded by my dismissal of his silly and ill-conceived article, is simply bent on vengeance. My impulse is to believe that the clue to his attempt to smear me with "anti-Semitism" is betrayed in his phrase that "he [i.e., I] cannot believe ... that I [i.e., Mr. Buckley] had anything serious to say" in Mr. Buckley's magnum opus, and only one who harbors "anti-Semitic impulses" would confess his inability to believe that William F. Buckley Jr. "had anything serious to say" or would refuse to admit the deathless genius of every jot and tittle that dribbles from William F. Buckley Jr.'s too-loud mouth on the subject of anti-Semitism. My impulse to think so is invigorated by the fact that this spring, as a guest at an editorial luncheon at The Washington Times, in my absence but in the presence of my editors and colleagues, Mr. Buckley chose to insinuate a similar accusation of anti-Semitism against me, presumably but unsuccessfully intended to harm me professionally. My impulse, in short, is to believe that his reckless accusation of anti-Semitism against me is simply malicious. I guess the editorial got to him a little.

Mr. Buckley's footnote "exposing" my "anti-Semitic impulses"

is all of a piece with the regular smear tactics of the neo-conservatives with whom he now keeps company, just as it is all of a piece with his flawed and sly attack on Mr. Sobran and Mr. Buchanan and, more ominously, with his general desertion of any serious conservatism in the last several years. In that period he has supported the Panama Canal Treaties against the opposition of Ronald Reagan, advocated the legalization of marijuana and of drugs in general, endorsed the legalization of prostitution, written a book in support of national service, promoted federal gun control through the so-called "Brady bill," endorsed "civil rights" for homosexuals, and most recently opposed a proposal in Oregon to forbid the state government from promoting homosexuality. Many on the American right may agree with one or another of Mr. Buckley's positions on these issues, but there is no doubt that the vast majority of American conservatives would disagree with him strongly on all of them.

I do not say this in criticism of Mr. Buckley because the whole concept of "conservatism" in America today is virtually devoid of meaning, in large part because conservatives made the seminal error of allowing dilletantes like Mr. Buckley to define it for them in the first place. I say it simply to point out that Mr. Buckley's posturings about anti-Semitism are entirely consistent with the posturing he affects on so many other matters and to suggest that whatever "impulses" may motivate him, they are not what anyone who still regards himself as a serious

conservative should pay any further attention to. Let him pose and preen in public all he wants in search of an answer to the burning question of whether his "close friends" as well as people he has barely met are or are not anti-Semites in whatever recondite sense he wishes to deduce. Most of the rest of us have better things to do than bother with his persistent and consuming impulse to worship the gargantuan idol he has constructed of his own impulses.■

[Chronicles, February, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

The Survival Issue

Long ago in March, 1989, in the first column I wrote for this space, I noted that President George Bush shared with only one other American chief executive (namely, Martin Van Buren) the distinction of having been elected to the White House from the office of the vice-presidency. I also commented that "the lackluster record of Andrew Jackson's successor perhaps does not inspire confidence about the new administration" of Mr. Bush, a remark that, generously interpreted, might be considered a prediction of Mr. Bush's defeat four years later. But even with all the generosity that Chronicles readers are capable of mustering, it was at best merely a tongue-in-cheek prophecy. Just think what I could prognosticate if I ever got serious.

One serious prediction that wafts up from the tea leaves of the 1992 election is that American conservatism, at least in the form in which it has been known since it first began to materialize in the late 1940s and early 1950s, is now at last defunct, and you don't need to be a swami to understand why it died. The Bush administration and Mr. Bush's defeat delivered the coup de grace to the organized American right, even though the terminal signs had been evident for some time before. In the days after the election, of course, a squadron of professional

conservatives delivered themselves of all the reasons why the Republican loss of the White House was really a tremendous victory, but no one paid much attention to them. Like Glendower, they could call spirits from the vasty deep, but no apparitions manifested themselves in response to their incantations.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that mainstream conservatism is defunct is that the very concept of what conservatism means has evaporated, even for those who regard themselves as its high priests. The day after the election, Washington Post reporter E.J. Dionne quoted a high-ranking official of The Heritage Foundation on the continuing relevance of conservative ideas. "What do you mean that conservative ideas didn't work in the 1992 election?" she protested. "They worked for Clinton." Only a few days later, as Spike Lee's new film Malcolm X was about to debut, an editorial writer in The Wall Street Journal published a column entitled "Malcolm X, Conservative Hero." It ought to be evident that a movement that claims both Bill Clinton and Malcolm X as its icons is simply meaningless, and you don't have to be a political neanderthal to wonder what either one of these champions has to do with anything remotely resembling "conservatism" in any sense.

Of course, the authors of such sentiments were simply trying to paint the pallid countenance of the conservative cadaver with the only cosmetics they possessed. Totally ignorant of what the cadaver looked like when alive, they merely swiped some make-up from the dressing table of the left and applied it in a vain and vulgar attempt to resurrect a zombie for the right. Indeed, for

the last several years the application of cosmetics is what the mainstream right has been reduced to. Ever since Mr. Bush in 1990 violated his pledge not to raise taxes, professional conservatives have kicked and screamed vociferously, but in 1992 they wound up supporting him anyway in a desperate effort to pretend, to themselves as well as to their dwindling number of followers and donors, that they still retained political clout at the highest level of national politics. As the electoral judgment day drew nigh, their efforts reached an almost comic, but definitely pathetic, pinnacle.

The week before the election, a group of about 45 professional conservatives summoned a meeting in Washington that was originally planned as a "wake" for the Bush administration, which was facing a rout because, you see, it had deserted conservative principles. But in the last part of the same week, as the assemblage was about to convene, Mr. Bush began to rally a bit in the polls, and it started to look as though he might win after all. The 45 stalwarts at once changed their tune, and when they emerged from their huddle, they proclaimed their unanimous endorsement of Mr. Bush. Indeed, his recent rise in the polls was due, they announced, to his return to "conservative roots," though when his conservative roots bore no branches in the actual voting a few days later, the pundits and gurus of defuncto-conservatism labored late into the night to explain how Mr. Bush's ideological defection was responsible for the disaster. Had the defuncto-cons

harbored sufficient integrity to separate themselves definitively from Mr. Bush when he first began to go wrong, they could today more convincingly purport that his defeat was indeed due to his abandonment of their "principles," whatever those might be. But, having swaddled themselves in him, his administration, and the increasingly distasteful Republican Party under his tutelage, the organized right is unable to extricate itself from the wreckage of last November.

No small part of the more general reason for the demise of American conservatism has been the importation into the ranks of its leadership in the last decade of the very species of ignoramuses, opportunists, and sloganeers who imagine that Malcolm and Mr. Clinton are men of the right and who snatch at every fluff in the political breeze to prove that they and their "movement" are within grasp of ultimate victory. But the more general reason itself is simply that history has passed conservatism by, and that fact implies a reorientation of American politics such as has not been seen since the New Deal or even before.

The American Right centered around three principles, which may be formulated in an over-simplified way as anti-communism, small government, and cultural traditionalism. Of the three, none remains intact, at least as the first generation of conservative architects constructed them. Anti-communism is simply irrelevant today, and even when the Soviet Union still had breath in its body, the anti-communist cause was subtly redefined in terms of a

crusade for global democracy and a new global regime thinly disguised by the trappings of nationalism as a Pax Americana. "Small government" -- a strict constructionist, laissez-faire, and decentralized state -- was also redefined, sometimes subtly, sometimes brazenly, as the post-Reagan right embraced the civil rights movement, supply-side economics, the "imperial presidency," a "progressive conservative" defense of the welfare state, certain forms of judicial activism that suited the Reaganites' immediate partisan and ideological agendas, and other extensions of the American mega-state constructed by the left in this century. "Cultural traditionalism," of course, remains a catchword of the right today, though conservative airheads have increasingly denuded it of any concrete content. In their version of cultural traditionalism, "family values" mean whatever you say they mean, Americans have "religion" but no particular faith or church, and, if not yet Malcolm X, then at least Martin Luther King, is taken as an exemplar of American ideals on the same level as Washington and Jefferson. Any notion that America is the product of a distinctive and particular people and their institutions and that the nation cannot exist or survive apart from them is alien and repugnant to the mainstream leadership of those who regard themselves as conservatives today, and even the description of America as a "Christian nation," as Mississippi's Gov. Kirk Fordice discovered shortly after the election, is greeted with derision and fear by the national leaders of the Republican Party.

What remains of American conservatism today seems largely to be centered around economic and fiscal issues -- controlling or limiting taxation, cutting the budget, and dealing with the deficit (for those who think that the deficit is even an issue). What no one seems to have noticed, however, is that, absent the "small government" ideals of the Old Right, those issues too become meaningless. If conservatives are now committed to a kind of Tory welfarism and if, even after the end of the Cold War, they continue to support the foreign policy apparatus of the Cold War state in the form of foreign aid, troops abroad, etc., how can they possibly expect to cut the taxes or limit the spending necessary to maintain these structures and functions? It is all very well to smirk about the costs of the franking privilege and various barrels of pork, but almost all of such perennial egregious examples of "waste" together are not significant portions of the federal budget.

Moreover, it has become a commonplace of American politics that so many Americans of all kinds and constituencies now depend on "welfare" and similar benefits dispensed by the federal leviathan that it is politically impossible for any one party or movement to get itself elected and preside over a balanced and fair reduction of federal entitlements. The budget crisis in the United States will be solved when and only when a coalition of constituencies gains power and proceeds to slice out the entitlements of everyone who is not part of the coalition. But no

one imagines that entitlements will ever be reduced in accordance with the small-government, political neutralist principles that animated the Old Right from the days of the New Deal.

The word and concept of "conservatism," then, have been rendered all but meaningless, though it is to be expected that those who make use of the word and concept will prosper under the Clinton administration, and while it might even come to pass that some of them will eventually be elected to one office or another, it is doubtful that any of them will ever be able to govern, unless they further delude themselves that the left is really the right and thereby gain the applause and approval of the nation's dominant political and cultural forces. "Conservatism," to be sure, is able to raise money, increase subscriptions for its journals, attract some followers, and perhaps even win elections, but it is unable to govern because it does not control or even have strong allies within the dominant culture. It is uninterested in culture, except in so far as it serves as a convenient bumper-sticker for electoral purposes, and in the last election it proved that it cannot even make use of its vaguely and vapidly defined cultural issues effectively.

What, then, is to be done? Gaetano Mosca, the Italian political scientist of the late nineteenth century, wrote that the "Social Darwinist" conception of human society was somewhat misplaced, because the competition among and within human societies is usually not a "struggle for existence" or survival,

as Social Darwinism taught, but rather a "struggle for preeminence, which is really a constant phenomenon that arises in all human societies, from the most highly civilized down to such as have barely issued from savagery." The real issue in most social conflicts, from war to elections, is not about physical survival but over which groups will prevail and subdue which other groups. For most of American history since the Civil War, American political conflicts have not been about survival but about preeminence, about which group -- parties, ideologies, factions, regions, coalitions -- become preeminent. That has been true also in the conservative-liberal conflict since World War II, because the conflict was largely over which direction the American mega-state would lurch and who would control it, not whether there would be a mega-state, much less whether there would be an America.

Yet there comes a time in the history of many societies when survival is the issue, although even then the "survival issue" is closely connected with the "preeminence issue." In the election just past, some candidates -- Ross Perot and James Stockdale, for example, and, at least by implication, Pat Buchanan -- began to whisper, ever so softly, that for America that time has now come.

The issues that began to mutter in this past election -- economic digestion by foreign powers, the danger not only of crime but of outright anarchy, cultural disintegration under the impact of massive immigration and militantly anti-white and anti-Western

multiculturalist movements -- have to do with whether the American nation, as a political unity and as a cultural identity, will live or die.

Conservatism, as it came to be defined in the Reagan-Bush era, has nothing to say about such issues because it refuses to admit their relevance, and it refuses to admit their relevance because most of its exponents are preoccupied with proving that they are compatible with and supportive of the same political and cultural forces that have brought the nation and its civilization to the brink of destruction, with proving that Malcolm X and Mr. Clinton are really conservatives and that immigration and unrestricted free trade are really tonics for the nation. Indeed, the defuncto-cons typically regard some of the most dangerous of such forces as signs of health. If, however, the survival issues now arising are not addressed by political forces capable of resolving them, the nation, its culture, and its people are likely to go over the brink and not come back. It won't be conservatism that resolves them.

The passing of conservatism, then, cannot be mourned. Like any species that slips into the evolutionary twilight, it was unable to respond to the challenges it encountered, and good riddance to it. The task for Americans who are intent on the survival of their nation and its civilization now is not to revive anything like the species that has just expired but to evolve a new movement, a new political and ideological category that

transcends left and right, capable of perceiving the challenges and formulating the measures necessary to meet them. With a slate clean of the defuncto-cons, we now may be able to create such a movement. ■

[Chronicles, March, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Race and Reality

About ten years ago, I recall, I had a conversation with a friend of mine, a prominent conservative journalist and editor, who told me he believed the United States had essentially solved its racial problems. The dislocations caused by the civil rights movement, the black nationalism of the 1960s, and the riots of that era were over, he argued, and now all that remained was for blacks to scamper up the ladder of economic and political opportunity. The welfare state and liberal civil rights policies, he thought, were the principal obstacles preventing blacks from making the ascent.

I didn't argue with my friend, except to say that I completely disagreed with him, that I believed the country's racial problems were only just beginning and that they would be exacerbated not only by continuing black disappointments but also by the massive immigration, legal and illegal, that was just then coming to public notice. I haven't talked to him about the subject of race since that time, and nowadays it might be too embarrassing to bring it up at all. Nevertheless, embarrassing or not, race is a subject that needs to be brought up and indeed actually thought about in ways that few conservatives and no liberals at all have yet been willing to do.

Ten years after that conversation, it ought to be obvious that my friend was wrong, and every newspaper and every local news report today offers evidence of his error. Not only has the United States failed to solve its racial problems but race remains the major problem, and the root of other major problems, in the country today, and it shows no signs whatsoever of being solved. The overwhelming statistics on black illiteracy, educational failure, poverty, unemployment, welfare, crime, family and neighborhood collapse, political incompetence and corruption, drug use, AIDS and other chronic diseases, and, not least, the emergence of an embittered and increasingly violent black racial consciousness that preaches explicit hatred of whites, Jews, and Asians all confirm my friend's total misperception of what was occurring even as we talked. But of course it was not his error alone; it was the mistake of an entire generation of Americans who lived through the civil rights movement and desperately grasped at its central premise as the only palatable concept by which the United States could resolve the emerging racial crisis. That concept was the idea of the inherent equality of the races, and if we have learned anything in the last 30 years, it is that racial equality has all the scientific reliability of the theories of the flat earth and the four elements.

In the 1960s, when Jim Crow still fluttered, it was arguable that the races were indeed equal in intelligence and other socially significant mental and behavioral attributes. It was

arguable simply because it was an idea that had never been fully tested, though there was already a substantial body of evidence to show that the idea of racial equality was no less a concoction of pseudo-science than palmistry and the analysis of human character by inspection of bumps on the cranium. Nevertheless, racial egalitarianism and its environmentalist assumptions about human nature were formulas that served the interests of the country's dominant cultural and political forces. Such doctrines afforded a convenient rationale for creating and managing social engineering programs that placed vast amounts of public money and power in their hands for the ostensible goal of social improvement and therapy. Most Americans, well insulated from the immediate consequences of the experiment in equality, were ready to give it a whirl, or at least to oblige white Southerners to give it a whirl. That the myth of equality would soon be swallowing them in a typhoon of social and political delusion from which they would be unable to escape did not seem to occur to anyone except a few bigots and Bourbon politicians.

Today, with the evidence of black social and economic catastrophe all about them, little else does occur to an increasing number of whites, who have long since abandoned the cities, neighborhoods, urban schools, and most other locations where they or their families are likely to run into blacks for any extended period of time. But not only the experience of black failure discredits the myth of equality; an overwhelming amount of

scientific evidence has accumulated in the last generation to explode the myth once and for all.

The general conclusion of this body of evidence is that the average score of blacks on I.Q. tests is about 15 to 18 points less than that of whites, that only about 16 percent of blacks have I.Q.'s above 100 (considered "normal") and only about 3 percent have I.Q.'s above 115 (usually considered the minimum for graduation from an accredited four-year college with grades acceptable for graduate work), that whites are six to eight times more likely to have scores above 135 and that blacks are equally more likely to score around 70 (considered "retarded"), while at the so-called "genius" level of 140 or above, there are hardly any blacks at all. No one denies that this breakdown by race on I.Q. tests actually exists; what environmentalist critics challenge is the meaning of the tests. They argue the tests are "culturally biased" to reflect the learned skills, values, and ideas of a white-dominated society and that blacks do poorly on the tests because they are victims of oppression, poor education, lack of opportunities, or growing up in a subculture that does not socialize its members in the ways of the dominant culture.

The main problem with such arguments is that when the I.Q. tests are corrected for "cultural bias" (for example, by using tests such as Raven's Progressive Matrices, which contain no verbal or cultural content and rely on recognition of various geometrical patterns), blacks score even lower than they do on

tests supposedly steeped in "bias." Moreover, other non-whites from foreign, alien, or exotic subcultures (e.g., Asians) have no problem scoring as well as or better than whites on the tests and certainly better than American blacks. Finally, it is not only I.Q. tests on which blacks score poorly; they also perform badly on almost all the standardized tests by which educational and professional aptitudes are currently measured in the United States -- the Scholastic Aptitude Test, the Law School Aptitude Test, the Medical College Admissions Test, the Graduate Record Examination, etc. -- and if there is one point of agreement among scientists and educators about I.Q. tests in general, it is that their results do offer reliable predictions of how those who take them will perform in school and professional life. Those who make high scores on I.Q. tests can be predicted to make high grades in school and to perform professional jobs well; those who don't do well on I.Q. tests can be predicted not to make good grades and not to do so well in their careers.

The critique of I.Q. testing might be more credible if the actual performance of blacks were at odds with their test scores.

Unfortunately, almost everything blacks as a group do seems to be consistent with what we would expect of people with lower intelligence, namely the economically unproductive, educationally miserable, criminally violent, and socially destructive behavior that greets Americans every morning in the news and which has recently been collected in book form by Jared Taylor in his

shattering Paved with Good Intentions. Nor is black behavior in other countries much better. Ethiopia and Somalia, Uganda and Liberia, Haiti and Jamaica all exhibit recurrent patterns of impoverishment, political chaos, tyranny, corruption, and backwardness that do nothing to challenge the conclusions that intelligence testing and other scientific evidence of inherent racial differences reveal.

Quite separate from the evidence offered by mental testing, other studies of the inheritability of intelligence show all but conclusively that a large part of what we call "intelligence" is genetically based -- 60 to 80 percent, in the estimates of the most authoritative experts -- and psychologist Arthur Jensen, the best known and probably the most respected of the hereditarians, stated in a recent interview in the August, 1992 issue of the newsletter American Renaissance that "there's no question that the preponderance of the variance in intelligence ... is attributable to the genetic variance."

As a layman, I am not in a position to pronounce definitively on this body of evidence, but from what I know of it and of the responses to it by the exponents of environmentalism, I have to conclude that the hereditarian side has much the better of the argument, that there are indeed inherent, genetically based differences between the white and black races in intelligence and perhaps in other socially significant psychological and behavioral traits. If there is still a case to be made for the alternative,

environmentalist thesis, let's hear it; otherwise, let's go with the evidence we have, which is what we normally do in every other scientific controversy, from disputes over the Big Bang theory in astrophysics to the causes of mumps and measles.

The more important question, however, is not whether the available scientific evidence is valid or not but what does "going with" that evidence involve? It is at that point that the controversy gets sticky, though there's really little reason for it.

The conventional implication that is drawn from the evidence of racial differences is that the evidence justifies racial discrimination in one legal or political form or another. Indeed, this implication was in fact drawn by the defenders of segregation, and the fear of it is no doubt the main reason why opponents of segregation and other kinds of racial subordination have so often refused to discuss or take seriously the hereditarian argument and not infrequently have resorted to outright repression and intimidation of those who do discuss it. Yet the fact is that no such implications can be validly drawn from the scientific evidence about race.

Racial segregation in American education and in the South long predated the availability of reliable I.Q. testing, and Jim Crow codes were largely political reactions to the repression and misrule of Reconstruction rather than applications of racial theory and Social Darwinism. Indeed, one of the most outspoken

scientific critics of Darwin's theory of evolution in the nineteenth century, the Swiss naturalist Louis Agassiz, who taught at Harvard even as Northern armies were ending slavery in the South, was also one of the most outspoken Negrophobes and racists in American history. Moreover, racial differences in I.Q. simply do not justify racial segregation in schools; certainly their implication is not the "separate and equal" schools of the 1896 Plessy vs. Ferguson decision that segregationists defended against the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education ruling. If racial differences in intelligence are valid and if they implied any educational segregation by race at all, then they would imply unequal though not necessarily separate educational facilities for the two races.

Yet racial disparities in I.Q. do not necessarily imply any such racial segregation; they might imply separation of students by I.Q., and for all practical purposes that would encompass racial segregation within a school, though there would still be a sufficient number of black students whose I.Q.s are commensurate with those of whites to make complete racial segregation of education impossible. Nor do differences in I.Q. have anything to do with other forms of segregation -- in public accommodations, water fountains, conveyances, etc. People regularly eat or share public space with obviously retarded persons whose I.Q.'s are considerably lower than those of most blacks, and I have yet to hear of anyone who objected to such integration of the subnormal

into the commonplace institutions of social life.

As a matter of fact, if the biological and psychological inequality of human beings has little to do with racial segregation, neither does the principle of equal rights have much to do with the myth of racial equality. The principle of equal rights is a convenient public fiction by which human social and political relationships can be regulated, and its usefulness is entirely independent of the dubious claims for the equality of natural endowments that egalitarians espouse. The Constitution, for example, employs the principle of equal rights for states when it establishes equal representation of states in the U.S. Senate.

New York and Wyoming each have two votes in the Senate. In that juridical and political sense they are equal, and each state enjoys the same rights as every other state (with the exception of Southern states under the Voting Rights Act). But it would occur to no one planning a business venture, buying a home, or trying to raise a family in one state or the other to think that the two states really are equal in fact.

The principle of equal rights for citizens was recognized in the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which simply confirmed that former slaves possessed the legal capacity to carry out those civil functions that are inseparable from being free and independent -- namely, such functions as the ability to make contracts, buy and sell property, sue and be sued, etc. Not until the civil rights revolution of the 1960s did such legislation as the Civil Rights

Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 actually proceed to join and confuse the useful public fiction of equal rights with the outright lie of equal people, and by doing so it converted the legitimate principle of equal rights into the ideological sledgehammer of egalitarianism. Having adopted laws that assume that human beings really are equal, the federal government was then compelled to sally forth on a crusade against those social manifestations of the reality of human inequality.

The resulting war against "discrimination" is thus actually a war against those institutions of civil society such as property, patterns of association, education, and employment that naturally reflect inequality and differentiation, for the purpose of forcing human and social reality into conformity with the fictitious equality of human beings. By importing egalitarianism into the principle of equal rights, civil rights law and policy essentially committed the federal government to perpetual conflict with American society and its members, and the commitment to the illusion of equality in the civil rights acts of the 1960s quickly led to the whole apparatus of affirmative action, quotas, set-asides, enterprise zones, and egalitarian experimentation that afflicts us today. If the races really are equal, then their apparent inequality in employment, education, etc. must be due to discrimination, and if the state is committed to rooting out such artificial and unjust discrimination, then the apparatus of affirmative action is perfectly logical. Those, whether

conservative or liberal, who reject the inheritability of intelligence must accept an environmentalist explanation for racial differences in I.Q. or reject the validity of I.Q. testing.

If they accept environmentalist explanations for racial differences, then the crusade against inequality appears to follow.

Whether the races are or are not equal or naturally different in their endowments, then, has nothing to do with the legal and political recognition of equal rights, which do not depend on natural endowments, and the acceptance of natural racial differences implies no legal or political discrimination of one race against another. But the falsity of racial egalitarianism does carry socially significant implications nonetheless. In the first place, the natural differentiation of the races in intellectual capacities implies that of the two major races in the United States today, only one -- the white -- possesses the inherent capacity to create and sustain the level of civilization that has historically characterized its homelands in Europe and America. There is simply no evidence, from psychology or history or current events, that the black race possesses that capacity apart from a thin layer at its top. The elementary technical functions that enable civilization to flourish, not to speak of the creative genius that is the distinctive mark of civilization, cannot be performed or realized by a population that is largely composed of mentally subnormal elements.

Recognition of the dependence of what whites have historically regarded as civilization on whites themselves ought, then, to lead to a further conclusion -- that white racial consciousness and identity, so far from being a relic of a paleolithic tribalism that should be discarded, is essential to the continuing vitality of civilized life in Europe and America. White civilization cannot flourish without the people who created and sustain it, and they cannot sustain it unless they are conscious of their role in sustaining it and are collectively committed to doing so. Indeed, recognition of the necessity of whites to the survival of their civilization ought to encourage their understanding that the revival and re-legitimization of a civilized white racial identity and consciousness are by far the paramount requirements for the survival of civilization.

And secondly, the recognition of racial realities implies that most of the efforts now deployed to combat racism, fight insensitivity, celebrate diversity, eradicate prejudice, and impose racial equality are misplaced, based on a profound misconception of racial capacities and directed toward goals that are neither just to either race nor attainable without the perpetuation of serious injustice to both. Those policies and laws are the fruit of a discredited egalitarian mythology that animates the federal leviathan's perpetual war against civil society and debilitates white resistance to the gathering storm of racial revolution that the enemies, white and non-white, of the

white race and its civilization now openly preach and prepare. The sooner we recognize the truth about race, bring to an end the war for equality that the big lies about race engender, and learn to live with the real nature blacks and whites possess, the sooner we will overcome the real reasons America has failed to solve its racial problems, and the better off both races will be for doing so. ■

[Chronicles, April, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Paths of Glory

At the time I am writing this column (in mid-January), the United States has 30,000 troops deployed in Somalia, has just launched new bombing strikes against Iraq, has announced a naval blockade of Haiti, and is debating whether it should send combat forces into the Balkans. By the time you are reading this column (in mid-March or early April), there is literally no telling where our military forces will be engaged, though any number of locations are entirely possible: South Africa, where the "transition from apartheid" may or may not proceed at a pace and in a fashion that suits the friends of global egalitarianism; Sudan, which endures famine and chaos no less severe than Somalia; Germany, where riots against immigrants have taken a number of lives in the last few months and suggest the incipient revival of a militant counter-revolutionary nationalism; or any of several other countries and regions where internal disorders, unsavory political conditions, or social and economic problems that Americans find disgusting may sound the bugles for the cavalry to mount and administer mercy at the point of American bayonets. But what droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven these days is less likely to be mercy than the payloads of U.S. bombers.

There is no way to tell where American troops will be sent a

few months from now because, quite simply, virtually no one in the policy-making positions in our government nor in the opinion-making classes of American society any longer considers "national interest" to be the operative principle by which foreign military intervention should be determined. When President-elect Clinton announced just before his inauguration that he would retain President Bush's policy of turning back boatloads of Haitian immigrants, his stated reasons for violating his own campaign promise and not welcoming an armada of unskilled, illiterate, and disease-ridden invaders to our shores had nothing to do with our national interest, nor even with enforcing long-standing and popularly supported laws against illegal immigration. His decision, he proclaimed, was based on the welfare of the Haitians themselves. Reversing the policy, you see, would encourage the pilgrims to embark on the high seas in quest of the happy harbors of Miami, and many of them might drown or expire from exhaustion and exposure before the Coast Guard could save them from the consequences of their ill-conceived expedition. Presumably, if Genghis Khan and the Golden Horde returned to life and headed across the Bering Straits for Seattle, any resistance they met from the U.S. government would be predicated on the need to spare the Mongols the risks of catching pneumonia in their journey through Alaska's arctic wilderness.

The extinction of the concept of "national interest" as the governing guideline of our foreign policy betrays the coming

extinction of the nation-state itself, or what our governing elite would like to be its extinction. Hardly any discussion of "post-Cold War foreign policy," from high-school commencement addresses to highly classified memoranda exchanged among the munchkins of the national security labyrinth, fails to rehearse all the cliches of a "global economy," the "meaninglessness" of national borders, and the evolution of the planet towards political, cultural, economic, and demographic "interdependence." Such platitudes are not simply rhetorical commonplaces that have replaced salutations of the Founding Fathers and biblical allusions as staples of public oratory. They establish and are intended to establish the conceptual framework within which actual policies are designed and by which the choice of actions available to policy-makers is delimited. The general consequence of such language is not merely neglect of the national interest but its obliteration and the removal from the national consciousness of any inkling that there are some things that are important, and others that are unimportant or actually harmful, for the nation to do. The more specific result will be the eventual evaporation of any concept of the nation itself as a distinct political and cultural unit. An institution that has no interests of its own to pursue or perennially fails to pursue them and whose leaders and members are profoundly oblivious to such interests cannot be said to exist in any but the most vacuous and abstruse sense.

The disappearance of the concept of "national interest" is

not, then, an accident, nor the result of sloppy thinking and careless expression. It corresponds to and reflects one of the major social trends of our times, the formation of a genuinely supranational apparatus of global management administered and governed by an emerging supranational elite. Given the global reach of modern organizations and the homogenization that their operations demand, a unified global government able to enforce such homogeneity is consistent with the interests of the groups that manage these organizations, and the building of a global government necessarily involves the erosion of national units as politically sovereign and culturally distinctive organisms. Nor is it an accident that the elaboration of the basic concepts and institutions of this "New World Order" are now more or less explicitly voiced by the hired mouthpieces of the emerging regime.

Last year, at a meeting of the Group of Seven in Paris, the big enchiladas of the "global economy" assigned some homework to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. They instructed him to come up with plans for a standing army of the United Nations able to undertake missions "for preventive diplomacy, for peacemaking and for peacekeeping." By June, the secretary general had completed his work and turned in his paper. What he proposed, and what his instructors wanted, is nothing less than an independent armed force that would empower the United Nations itself as a new global power in its own right.

Mr. Boutros-Ghali's proposal is to "bring into being, through

negotiations, the special agreements ... whereby member states undertake to make armed forces, assistance and facilities available to the Security Council ... not only on an ad hoc basis but on a permanent basis." In the past, you see, U.N. "peacekeeping forces" were limited. They were sent into a region only after a ceasefire among the combatants had been worked out, not into combat situations, and their own combat was confined to self-defense, unless they enjoyed special authorization for large-scale collective enforcement action, as in Korea in 1950 or Kuwait in 1990. Under the new proposal, the U.N. army would be more or less independent of the states whose troops actually compose the force and whose money finances it, and the Security Council itself would decide when and against whom the army under its exclusive control would strike.

The rather alarming implications of this plan for the institution of national sovereignty, though muted in the secretary general's report in June, is explicit in the ruminations of such professional munchkins of the supranational Lollipop Guild as former U.N. apparatchik Sir Brian Urquhart, who intoned in the New York Times in 1991 that "the unraveling of national sovereignty seems to be a feature of the post-Cold war period" and who proposed plans remarkably similar to those later unbosomed by Mr. Boutros-Ghali.

In his report, the secretary general was a bit cagey about sovereignty, professing that, well, of course, he believed in it,

though we wouldn't want to over-do, would we? "Respect for ... fundamental sovereignty and integrity are crucial to any common international progress," he assured us, but, so his very next sentence read, "the time of absolute and exclusive sovereignty has passed." Mr. Boutros-Ghali recapitulated his non sequiturs in a recent article in Foreign Affairs, where he informed us that "while respect for the fundamental sovereignty and integrity of the state remains central, it is undeniable that the centuries-old doctrine of absolute and exclusive sovereignty no longer stands, and was in fact never so absolute as it was conceived to be in theory." Sovereignty, however, is almost by definition a pretty absolute concept. Either you have it or you don't, and being a "little bit sovereign" is no more feasible than being a little bit pregnant. But however weaselish his words, Mr. Boutros-Ghali couldn't disguise his ultimate goals. "The world," he wrote, "is still in some ways in its 'Middle Ages' when it comes to international organizations and cooperation. Centuries were required before the struggle among monarchical and baronial forces was transformed into states capable of carrying out responsibilities in the fields of security, economy, and justice.

There is no doubt that the institutions of the U.N. system must travel such a path if chaos is to be avoided." The analogy he draws is pretty clear: sovereign nations today are analogous to the feudal barons of the Middle Ages, whose autonomy and power were eventually crushed by the emerging dynastic monarchies, which

are analogous to the Pharaonic world government that glitters in Mr. Boutros-Ghali's dark Egyptian eyes. What is a little bit pregnant turns out to be the United Nations itself, from the belly of which will eventually spring a now-embryonic planetary regime.

It may be imagined that, being an Egyptian, Mr. Boutros-Ghali, is peripheral to the mainstream of what is actually thought and done in the West, but such is not the case. Nor is enthusiasm for a One World State under the United Nations confined to the eccentric corners of the political left, where One Worldism has long linked arms with the white-lipped advocates of Esperanto, Peace Toys, the Rehabilitation of Criminals, and the Metric System to mount the soapboxes at Marble Arch and similar locations every Sunday. Last December, popular historian Paul Johnson managed to take time off from his annual publication of a seemingly endless series of obese volumes that would take serious scholars a lifetime to complete and penned an article for National Review that demanded what he called a "New Imperialism." It is of no small interest that while those on the political left, like Mr. Boutros-Ghali, couch the New World Order in humanitarian terms calculated to appeal to the ideological confabulations of their comrades, those on the political right (or have insinuated themselves into the right) like Mr. Johnson frame it in terms that will catch the fancy of the retired colonels who pine for the days of Kipling and King of the Khyber Rifles. Such convergence between right and left in the content of what the brahmins of each

category propose is itself part of the cultural and political homogenization that the new global order demands.

Mr. Johnson, however, doesn't much like Mr. Boutros-Ghali and suggests that he be fired (even after the secretary general had so successfully completed his homework earlier in the year), but he at least appears to agree that "a new global structure of order" needs to be established in which the U.N. Security Council will provide the keystone and the muscle. The creation of this new order will involve transforming "collective security from a reactive and negative force into a true watchdog, engaged in foreseeing and forestalling -- crime prevention and disaster avoidance." "Like the traditional Great Powers and their general staffs," breathes Mr. Johnson, "the Security Council must learn to devise diplomatic, military, and logistical plans for all foreseeable disturbances" and "the Security Council and its agents will become the last, most altruistic and positive of the imperial powers, restoring to the word colonialism the 'good name' it once enjoyed -- in Mediterranean antiquity no less than the nineteenth century." Like many Englishmen, Mr. Johnson appears not to have a clue as to just how despised the British Empire was in the nineteenth century, not only by those peoples whom it tried unsuccessfully and often brutally to civilize but even by those, like many Americans and Europeans, who always saw through the cant, greed, and tyranny that animated so much that lay in its heart. As for the "good name" that Mr. Johnson imagines

colonialism enjoyed in ancient times, the Gauls, Greeks, Jews, and Egyptians whom the Romans slaughtered and enslaved might have had a name for it that was not so benign, though to be sure each of them had done pretty much the same sort of thing in their own day.

To be fair, of course, Mr. Johnson is proposing the "new imperialism" as a means of taking care of Third World peoples and countries that obviously are incapable of taking care of themselves, though nowhere does he establish any good reason why we -- the West, let alone the United States -- should assume that burden. Nor do any of the pioneers of the new empire consider (at least in print) what may be the consequences for the sovereign nations of the West of a world run by the U.N. Security Council. We already begin to perceive one thing it means through the fog of our adventure in Somalia this winter, an adventure begotten somewhere in the bowels of the White House and "authorized" by the United Nations, just as our earlier crusade against Iraq was similarly "authorized" by the same body. Since the United States had no compelling national interest to make war against Iraq or to invade Somalia and since national interest has ceased to determine when, where, and why "we" decide to send troops, why shouldn't the United Nations, composed of delegates for whom no American ever voted, decide such affairs for us? For that matter, since the United Nations as yet has no soldiers under its own command nor any money of its own with which to recruit and arm them, why shouldn't American soldiers enforce whatever it is the court

eunuchs of the new empire decree? And why shouldn't we get used to the idea that providing the military power for the "new imperialism" will be our principal role in the future? Moreover, and this is another consequence of the New World Order and the empowerment of the United Nations in a form independent of the nation-states that created it, why shouldn't the Security Council someday deploy its own troops against us?

Warlords in Somalia may someday look pretty tame compared to the warrior kings who lead the Crips and the Bloods in Los Angeles, and the chaos they may someday cause would provide at least as good a reason for the New World army to show up in South-Central L.A. as we have for sending our own troops to Mogadishu. So, for that matter, would American "racism," mistreatment of women and children, standards of health not up to the snuff of the World Health Organization, environmental problems, or any of the scads of derelictions perennially invented by those of the managerial elite whose business it is to concoct "problems" that they can then "solve."

So far, most Americans seem to be fairly passive about what One Worlders have in mind for them, and perhaps, as long as too many of us don't get killed, taxes don't increase too much, and it doesn't pre-empt the sit-coms too often, most of us will go along with it. But the irony is that in most of the world, even as Mr. Boutros-Ghali, Sir Brian, Mr. Johnson, and their party announce the end of national sovereignty, nationalism is thriving and

aspirations to national independence, political autonomy, and cultural identity flourish. It is the resurrection of just such assertions of nationality and group solidarity that is the real wave of history, and it is the conflict between those who assert them and the emerging global elite that seeks to suppress and supersede them that constitutes the real line of political and social struggle in the coming century. Those assertions and the conflicts they engender may be dormant in the United States today, but sooner or later they will awaken, and when they do, the nightmarish fantasy of a unified and homogeneous planet will scatter like the straw it is.■

[Chronicles, May, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Gangbusters

In The Killer Angels, Michael Saara's novel about the battle of Gettysburg, there is a character named Col. Arthur Fremantle, a British military observer attached to the Confederate forces. In part a comic figure, Fremantle is perpetually perplexed by Americans in general and Southerners in particular, and he painfully worries himself and others with his seldom-very-acute perceptions. One thing he can't understand is why all the Southerners he meets are always so polite, and when he finally figures it out, he explains his discovery to Gen. Lewis Armistead, who later recounts it to his colleagues. "That Fremantle is kind of funny," says Armistead. "He said that we Southerners were the most polite people he'd ever met, but then he noticed we all of us carry guns all the time, wherever we went, and he figured that maybe that was why."

For once, Col. Fremantle may have hit upon an important truth, one that pertains not only to the antebellum South but also to human society in general. Armed societies are courteous societies, and many of history's most heavily armed social orders besides the Old South -- those of the ancient Greeks, medieval European knights, Japanese Samurai, Renaissance courtiers, and barely literate cowboys on the American frontier -- have also been

noted for the elaborate rituals of courtesy and chivalry they practiced. The word "chivalry" itself, now a synonym for the old-fashioned style of deportment at which the emancipated strumpets of President Clinton's cabinet and household snort, derives from the code of the human battle tanks that rode horseback in the Middle Ages. The reason for the relationship between good weapons and common courtesy ought to be clear. With just about everyone you meet clanking a sword or packing a pistol, you'd better mind your manners, and your manners had better be highly formalized in clearly defined, normative patterns of conduct that leave no doubt about the benevolence of your intentions and the innocence of your behavior.

The converse also appears to be true. The society of late-twentieth century America is perhaps the first in human history when most grown men do not routinely bear arms on their persons and boys are not regularly raised from childhood to learn skill in the use of some kind of weapon, either for community or personal defense -- club or spear, broadsword or longbow, rifle or Bowie knife. Ours also happens to be one of the rudest and crudest societies in history, having jubilantly swept most of the etiquette of speech, table, dress, hospitality, regard for fairness, deference to authority, and the relations of male and female and child and elder under the fraying and filthy carpet of politically convenient illusions. With little fear of physical reprisal, Americans can be as loud, gross, disrespectful, pushy, and negligent as they please. Yet if more people carried rapiers at their belts or revolvers on their hips, it's a fair bet you'd

be able to go to a movie and enjoy the dialogue from the screen without having to endure the small talk, family gossip, and assorted bodily noises that many theater audiences these days regularly emit.

The prospect of a society in which you can put a bullet between the eyes of drivers who grab a parking space for which you've been waiting or meet under the oaks at dawn characters who bray sexual and scatological slang in the hearing of your wife and children in restaurants will no doubt strike most Americans today as brutal, but the fact is that that is precisely how most societies in human history have disciplined themselves. For the most part, of course, bloodshed over such slights did not occur, because the slights themselves did not take place and most people knew the price they might have to pay for indulging in the ethic of Me First and What's Yours Is Negotiable. Today, discourtesy is commonplace precisely because there is no price to pay for it. Habitual rudeness is too trivial a disruption of the social bond for even the ubiquitous American megastate to notice or control, and if it becomes too unbearable for the dwindling number of Americans who are repelled by it to stomach, they simply avoid locations where they're likely to encounter it. They move to the suburbs, which they perhaps imagine are the last redoubts of safety and civility, places where they won't have to fight to defend themselves or the way of life they prefer and where they can rely on somebody else to fight for them.

But in the last year or so, there have been indications that even that escape fantasy is being denied to Middle Americans as criminals and their close predecessors on the evolutionary tree of incivility, just plain boors, pursue them beyond the city limits.

Last summer in suburban Maryland, a woman who was driving her pre-school child to a day care center was kidnapped and murdered by two worthies from the District of Columbia. They pushed her out of her car and broke her neck and then pitched the baby out of the moving vehicle. This sort of crime is fairly common in the District itself, but the woman's neighbors in Howard County weren't used to it. "One of the things the real estate agent said," a neighbor told The Washington Times soon after, "was that Howard County has the lowest crime rate and that this area has the lowest rate of all." Virginian suburbanites expressed similar sentiments in the aftermath of the random killings by a wandering lunatic near CIA headquarters during the height of the rush hour earlier this year in upscale McLean, Virginia. "I moved out here to be safe," whimpered a local clergyman to The Washington Post the day after the shootings. "Now I can't even drive in the suburbs."

The emergence of routine rudeness and discourtesy and the eruption of serious crime in suburbs as well as cities are both part of the same pattern of social and civil decomposition that the United States is enduring, and the removal of force as a social control on both of them is perhaps the major underlying

reason for their appearance. "Disguise it how you will," wrote the Victorian conservative theorist and lawyer Fitzjames Stephen, "it is force in one shape or another which determines the relations between human beings." Stephen regarded force as the foundation not only of law and government but also of social relationships, and he would have understood what is happening in the United States today as quickly and clearly as those police officers who have to live -- and die -- with it. Donald Murray, president of the Boston Police Protection Association, told The Times in the wake of the Maryland killing last year that "The criminal justice system has gone soft. Nobody has the guts to pull the lever on the electric chair. Instead, they tolerate increased violence, and every year the murder rate goes up."

Actually, Americans and even their lawmakers increasingly are beginning to rediscover the inverse relationship between the level of force available and social disorder, but unlike Stephen they persist in the delusion that force belongs only to and in the state and particularly in the federal government. Lawmakers understand the use of force at least to the degree that they know it's a good idea to pretend to support more of it as a means of controlling crime.

Thus, for the last couple of years a federal "crime control" bill has been bouncing around Congress that promises to inflict capital punishment for no less than 51 different offenses. By voting for it and bragging about it, the congressmen can boast to

their constituents of how draconian they are on criminals, though when you examine the bill's provisions closely you will find that the crimes for which a convict can be haled to the scaffold include such offenses as treason, espionage, and genocide. Death is a reasonable penalty for those who commit any or all of these, but executing those convicted of them does nothing to control the sorts of crimes most Americans have reason to fear. No one is really afraid of being mugged by Julius Rosenberg or raped in the parking lot by Pol Pot. In fact, most of the rest of the bill's sanguinary language merely protects federal bureaucrats and congressmen, not the ordinary citizen, by inflicting death on the killers of just about every professional political parasite from the visiting dignitaries of foreign countries to egg inspectors in the Department of Agriculture.

Whenever using more force as punishment or deterrent is discussed these days, it is almost always in terms of how to enhance the power of the megastate itself and to strip average Americans of whatever means of force they have left to protect themselves; it never involves the removal of the political and legal restraints on the use of force by social authorities. Gun control and expanding the numbers of policemen, prosecutors, and prisons are among the favorite gimmicks advanced by what preens itself as the "tough on crooks" school, and of course our friends the neo-conservatives are in the forefront of peddling its doctrine. The original plans of "drug czar" Bill Bennett for the

Bush administration's much ballyhooed "war on drugs" were the prototype for a veritably Napoleonic expansion of federal power that would have placed Mr. Bennett at the center of an iron web of national law enforcement, international diplomacy, the coordination of military forces, and the dispensation of billions of dollars to federal, local, and state police, educators, rehabilitators, and therapists. President Bush, perhaps sensing the implicit coup d'etat that the drug czar was trying to pull on him and the nation, wisely gutted most of it, and Mr. Bennett, his fun spoiled, eventually announced a tremendous but fictitious victory in the war on drugs and fled the administration a couple of years later.

But the drug czar's visions of a vastly expanded federal role in law enforcement live on in the neo-conservative mind. Last year, just after the Los Angeles riots, Terry Eastland, Mr. Bennett's one-time boon companion, mouthpiece, and ghostwriter, unbosomed himself of a brainstorm for further enlargement of federal crime control. Complaining that Lyndon Johnson's response to the Watts riots of 1965 hadn't included enough federal law enforcement, Mr. Eastland wrote that Johnson "believed law enforcement should remain a local matter. Conservatives have long believed that too, but Mr. Bush will also make a mistake if he rejects the need for a deeper federal law enforcement presence in the nation's inner cities." While neo-conservatives shudder at the word "nationalism" when it refers to an America First foreign

policy and trade doctrine, they smack their lips with glee when the term can be drafted to bolster federal power and implement Big Government conservatism. "Nationalism must prevail when the most fundamental right of all -- to self-preservation -- can no longer be secured by local authorities," entoned Mr. Eastland.

Yet the lesson of the experience of the last sixty years or so of federal involvement in law enforcement is that there is far too much of it.* Think, for a moment, of the federal agencies already engaged in police work: the FBI is the most obvious, but there is also the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Border Patrol, the U.S. Marshals Service, the Secret Service, the U.S. Customs Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the Bureau of Prisons, and the inspectors for the U.S. Postal Service, in addition to the whole apparatus of the military police and criminal investigation services of the armed forces, not to mention divers and sundry inter-agency task forces, federal prosecutors, judges, court officials of one kind or another, and the quietly enlarging role of the armed forces themselves and the CIA in enforcing the drug laws. Does anyone other than enthusiasts of reruns of The Untouchables imagine for a second that this labyrinth of bureaucracies has made American society any safer than it was before any of them existed?

Moreover, since the "incorporation doctrine" was foisted off on the legal system, the federal courts have presided over what is

nothing less than a revolution in criminal law whereby every unsolicited confession of a street-corner grifter and every poke of a policeman's nightstick in the ribs of a pimp or a pusher yields yet another new revelation of a hitherto latent meaning of the Bill of Rights. By slyly reshaping the Constitution's limitations of federal power into restrictions on state and local authority, the courts have managed to wreck most of what remains of effective local law enforcement in the country and centralize and censor its common sense procedures. What the courts have been unable to reach with their legal fictions has been mopped up by affirmative action programs that mandate the hiring of unqualified minorities and women as policemen and prevent the promotion of qualified officers.

Nor does the strategy of the federalization (more properly, the nationalization) of law enforcement promise to stop in the new age of Mr. Clinton and his policy harem of Hillary, Zoe, Kimba, Donna, and/or Janet. It took the new president nearly the whole of the first month of his administration to locate an attorney general who both supported him and also was sufficiently square with the law to pass the scrutiny of the check-bouncers, secret-leakers, plagiarists, and woman-drowners on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and when he finally discovered the incumbent Ms. Reno, she at once announced that her first priority of business as the nation's top gangbuster would be the welfare of children. Mr. Clinton himself probably knows no more about law enforcement than

any other public responsibility, and he probably cares about it even less than he does for those things he may know something about, but he too went through the charade of "tough on crooks" earlier this year when he vowed to push for the hiring (largely with federal funds) of yet another 100,000 policemen to put on the nation's streets even as he also promised to sign more federal handgun legislation.

That, in a nutshell, is the long-standing liberal-neo-conservative law enforcement strategy: disarm the citizens and swell the power of the federal leviathan. It has nothing to do with protecting Americans from criminals or punishing the criminals themselves, let alone with restoring to the communities and citizenry the force they naturally need and ought to have to protect themselves. It has everything to do with enhancing the power of those who can expect to gain from an enlarged but largely incompetent federal law enforcement apparatus and making certain no one outside the federal megastate and the professional police agencies that profit from it has any power at all. The nationalization of law enforcement, even when it claims to be "tough on crooks," is a fraud that converts local public authorities into vestigial organs of the megastate and robs social institutions of the force that disciplines society.

From at least the days when Franklin Roosevelt's first Attorney General, Homer Cummings, barnstormed about the country stumping for what he variously called a "national police force,"

an "American Scotland Yard," a "super police force," and, on one occasion, a "Federal Army of Justice" to wage his "war on crime," the grand design of the architects of the managerial state has been to replace what they view as the "chaos" and "backwardness" of local and state police departments with the scientifically planned, humanely progressive, and fashionably therapeutic experimentation of law enforcement administered from the purportedly cleaner corridors of Washington. Cops who know their beats and keep the peace on them and sheriffs who can tell the difference between the local ne'er-do-wells and dangerous criminals are supposed to yield to over-educated young ladies with master's degrees in womanology.

But law enforcement, like most of the other social functions Washington claims to be able to perform better than anyone else, is really not a very complicated matter. Most societies in history have never had much of a problem with controlling criminals, and they've never needed science, or therapy, or special training and task forces, or centralized bureaucracies, or indeed very many cops, to deal properly and speedily with killers, thieves, and rapists. What they needed and what they had at hand that we do not have was precisely the force that "in one shape or another ... determines the relations between human beings" and the will to make use of it. If Americans really want to take back their streets, their cities, and their suburbs and teach some manners to the clods and crooks that are pushing them out of the

theaters, parking lots, shopping malls, and restaurants, a little force and the will to use it are all they need to accomplish the task.■

[Chronicles, June, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

A Story of the Days To Come

Early in December of last year, while President-elect Clinton was trying to come up with a Cabinet that would "look more like America," the U.S. Census Bureau published a report that told us what America really looks like and what it will probably look like sixty years from now. Presumably, Mr. Clinton will have departed from the White House long before the prophecies of the bureau's professional beancounters come true, but not even the cabal of questionable millionaires, hatchet-faced fag hags, and trendy minorities selected by the new president to run the country for the next four years bears any resemblance to the rulers of the days to come or the population they will rule. Indeed, the subtext of the Census Bureau report suggests that within the lifetime of Americans now living, the United States as its citizens have known it for the last two centuries will, for all practical purposes, cease to exist.

The report, written by demographer Jennifer Cheeseman Day, concludes that the U.S. population will grow from its present 255 million to 383 million in 2050, but the expansion of total numbers is not the most interesting finding of the report. It also concludes that by 2050, the Hispanic part of the U.S. population will have grown from its present 24 million to 81 million, that

the "Asian and Pacific Islander" portion will have risen from 9 million in 1992 to 41 million, that the black population is "projected to almost double from 32 million in 1992 to 62 million," and that "the non-Hispanic White share of the U.S. population would steadily fall from 75 percent in 1992 ... to 53 percent in 2050." While non-whites and Hispanics will increase by some 120 million between 1992 and 2050, the white population will swell by a mere 11 million in that period, and by the middle of the next century whites would be on the eve of becoming a minority in the United States. The report finds that

Although three-quarters of the population is non-Hispanic White in 1992, this group would contribute only 30 percent of the total population growth between 1992 and 2000, 21 percent from 2000 to 2010, and 13 percent from 2010 to 2030. This group would contribute nothing to population growth after 2030 because the non-Hispanic group would be declining in size.

The report attributes these changes in the ethnic and racial composition of the country to differences in the birth rates of the various groups and also to the immigration rates. "Currently," it states, "about 66 percent of all births are non-Hispanic White. That percentage is expected to fall to 61 in 2000, 56 in 2010, 48 in 2030, and 42 in 2050. All other race and ethnic groups would increase their share of births." As for immigration, "the U.S. population in the year 2000 is projected to be 9 million (3 percent) larger than it would have been if there had been no net immigration after July 1, 1991. The equivalent figures for 2010, 2030, and 2050 are 21 million (7 percent), 49 million (14 percent), and 82 million (21 percent)." By 2050, that

is, the population of the country will, in the words of the New York Times reporting on the Census Bureau publication, "include 82 million people who arrived in this country after 1991 or who were born in the United States of parents who did. This group of immigrants and their children will account for 21 percent of the population."

The Bureau's conclusions differ from earlier reports it has published because this time it makes use of rather different assumptions from those it employed in the past. In earlier reports, the Bureau assumed that the total fertility rate would fall. But, "since the late 1980's, after a relatively stable 15-year trend of low fertility, there has been a dramatic rise in total fertility levels to almost 2.1 births per woman. Secondly, convergence of fertility among race and ethnic groups is no longer assumed. Historical data show that though fertility rates for different groups do experience similar effects, there is little evidence to assume that their fertility rates will eventually converge."

Earlier Census Bureau reports also assumed that immigration would decline due to the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. "The last report," the new report states, "assumed the Immigration and Reform [sic] Act of 1986 (IRCA) would partially reduce undocumented [i.e., illegal] immigration." That, indeed, was a major purpose of the act, as its sponsors repeatedly assured us, but "in fact, there is no evidence of any reduction in the

undocumented movement. In addition, the Immigration Act of 1990 allows more immigration. For these reasons, the future immigration assumptions for undocumented, legal and refugee immigrants were increased."

The meaning of all these numbers, percentages, and quotations should be clear. By 2050, a white person born in the United States in 1990 will be sixty years old and will be part of a minority in the country his or her forefathers founded. The racial and ethnic groups to which he belongs will be dwindling in numbers and in their percentage share of the population. Moreover, since the Census Bureau report uses the Office of Management and Budget definition of "white" as "a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East," its count of whites living in the United States now and in the future does not refer exclusively to European-descended elements of the population but includes also non-European, African, or Arabic strains that most white Americans have not historically considered to be white and with which they share little cultural kinship.

The conclusions of the Census Bureau beancounters are not entirely new. In 1982, demographers Leon Bouvier and Cary B. Davis reached similar results about the future population of the United States in a study distributed by the Center for Immigration Research and Education, but his monograph attracted little notice.

A few years later, Time magazine published a cover story (April

9, 1990), which found that "By 2056, when someone born today will be 66 years old, the 'average' U.S. resident, as defined by Census statistics, will trace his or her descent to Africa, Asia, the Hispanic world, the Pacific Islands, Arabia -- almost anywhere but white Europe." These studies, however, were not the official word of the American mega-state itself, which the new report of the Census Bureau is, but when the report was published last year, even though it made the front pages of the Washington Post and the New York Times, there appeared to be little reaction from anyone, especially whites, to the news that the historic core of the population of the United States was about to experience a revolution.

The absence of shock from whites themselves at their imminent demographic demotion is perhaps not all that surprising. A population, ethnic group, culture, or race that allows itself to be taxed without consent or understanding, runs off to fight wars for causes and against countries for reasons it can't explain, and tolerates the level of criminal lawlessness and political corruption that Americans have come to accept probably just doesn't much care whether it even exists or not, let alone whether it remains the core group of its nation and civilization. Moreover, so permeated are our minds with the fantasy that all cultures, races, and ethnic groups are the same, that a member of one group can as easily doff his culture and put on a new one as he can strip off a T-shirt, that most Americans who were aware of

the impending demographic revolution probably didn't see why it made much difference.

Nevertheless, it does make a difference -- probably more difference than any of the various political, economic, and social changes the United States has ever experienced, and those Americans who do care about their country and its civilization ought to start thinking very seriously about what they can do to stop the revolution from proceeding. As the figures of the Census Report imply, the principal cause of the demographic revolution is immigration and the differential in birth rates between non-white immigrants and white natives of the United States. The main thing Americans must do to preserve their civilization and the ethnic base on which it is founded is to stop immigration, especially from countries that do not share the ethnic and cultural heritage of the the historic core of the nation.

Even Time had the wit to understand that what it called in its 1990 cover story "the browning of America" "will alter everything in society, from politics and education to industry, values and culture." This, from a magazine notorious for its superficiality, betrays a good deal more common sense than the proclamation from xenophile and champion of unrestricted immigration Julian Simon only a week earlier in Forbes (April 2, 1990) that "The claim that our basic values, institutions, habits will be altered by immigrants from a different culture, and permanently altered, is pure hooey. ... At a time when barriers

are falling down everywhere, even trade barriers, the only barrier that hasn't fallen is the barrier to immigration." It really doesn't require much imagination (though more than Mr. Simon can muster) to understand that the importation of massive population fragments from radically different cultures will affect the receiving culture.

Indeed, in the last few years, the role of immigration in determining culture has been the subject of major historical scholarship. The most comprehensive is probably the work of historian David Hackett Fischer in his mammoth 1989 work, Albion's Seed, a thousand-page study of the role of four British subcultures on the formation of American civilization. Professor Fischer identifies some 24 "folkways" or "the normative structure[s] of values, customs and meanings that exist in any culture." In his view, folkways do "not rise from the unconscious even in a symbolic sense -- though most people do many social things without reflecting very much about them. In the modern world a folkway is apt to be a cultural artifact -- the conscious instrument of human will and purpose. Often (and increasingly today) it is also the deliberate contrivance of a cultural elite."

The folkways Fischer enumerates include normative patterns that govern such settled ways of doing and thinking as habits of speech, building, sex, food, dress, sport, time, wealth, work, rank, order, power, and freedom, and no doubt he could have added others. The Puritans of East Anglia who settled New England

brought with them from that region cultural habits and beliefs that were significantly different from those imported from the south and west of England to Virginia or from North Britain and its Celtic fringe to the Appalachian hills, and those patterns of beliefs that immigrated to North America in the 17th and 18th centuries have persisted, often unconsciously, ever since. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, Grady McWhiney, and Forrest McDonald, among other recent major historians, have also pointed to the role of the original British immigrants to North America as the source of enduring American cultural habits.

In The Rise of Selfishness in America, a little-noticed but major book published in 1991, jazz historian James Lincoln Collier discusses the equally important contributions to an evolving American culture made by the European immigrants of the 19th century. Unlike the British immigrants of the previous era, he argues, the Irish, German, Jewish, and Southern and East European immigrants who came to this country in the 1800s had little attraction to the prevailing Victorian ethic that the prevalent Anglo-Saxon stock had imparted. "The immigrants, then," he writes,

were bringing to the United States an array of habits, attitudes, and folkways that conflicted, at times dramatically, with the prevailing American patterns of thought and behavior. They were, in sum, resolutely anti-Victorian in almost every respect. They did not believe in discipline, punctuality, sobriety -- the order and decency of the Victorian ethic. They wanted instead to live as expressively as they could. In what spare time they could snatch from their jobs and

family obligations they wanted to drink, to dance, to gamble, to have fun. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the people of the old stock were appalled by their behavior. It seemed to them that the newcomers were intent upon destroying the decent and orderly society that they of the old stock were trying so hard to build and maintain.

The result, in Collier's view, was that the new immigrants of the 19th century imparted to America their own cultural habits centered around "expressiveness" through their predominance in the new industries of popular culture -- sports, movies, music, theater, journalism, mass entertainment, and the mass vices offered by organized crime under the control of new immigrant godfathers.

The conclusions of such scholarship as that of Fischer, Wyatt-Brown, McWhiney, McDonald, and Collier are perfectly consistent with common sense -- that people carry their cultures in their heads and their hearts and do not leave it behind when they move. Immigration, therefore, affects culture, importing new habits and patterns of thought and behavior that often conflict with the old habits of the culture that receives immigrants, and the history of the political and social conflicts of European and American history can be told in terms of such struggles between clusters of customs and those who bear them. Moreover, cultural habits are not randomly distributed; they tend to follow ethnic and even racial lines, since most people acquire their cultural habits from their natural parents and families, if not from even more fundamental biological forces.

The demographic revolution that the Census Bureau predicts can therefore be expected to exert profound changes on American culture as it has flourished in our national history and as it exists now. The loss of political power by what the Census Bureau calls "non-Hispanic Whites" as they dwindle from a majority to a minority is only the most apparent such change, and it is hardly unreasonable to expect that what will follow from the transfer of power will be the outright dispossession and political and legal persecution of the white minority by a non-white and non-Western majority that has little experience of constitutional government, little respect for the rights of minorities and oppositional groups, and little love for whites or the West. Indeed, we already see the beginnings of that dispossession in affirmative action programs, hate crime laws, multiculturalist curricula, calculated insults to and vituperation of whites, and the proliferation of racially motivated atrocities against them. The demotion of "non-Hispanic Whites" as the demographic majority will almost certainly be accompanied by their demotion as the ethnic pool from which the American governing elite in political and economic life is drawn, and again we already see the beginnings of this form of dispossession too. Earlier this year the Knight-Ridder newspaper chain conducted a computer study of changes in the American workforce based on data drawn from the 1990 Census. It found, as The Economist (Jan. 9, 1993) reported, that "white men may soon be a minority of America's bosses. They are already

a minority of the workforce. As recently as 1960, they held two-thirds of all jobs. Now they hold 45%." While the percentages of white males in American managerial positions have declined in the last decade, those of women, blacks, and Hispanics have risen in the same period. In March, the Wall Street Journal reported that U.S. corporations, ever indifferent to the health and survival of the culture, country, and people that enable them to function, are intent on hiring foreign professionals over their American counterparts. "Foreign professionals are becoming more attractive just as demand for some U.S. professionals, notably scientists and engineers, is at its lowest in at least a decade," the Journal reported. "The number of electrical engineers employed in the U.S. ... has fallen by one-fifth since its peak three years ago."

Nearly every white male I know who has sought a professional position in the last few years has tales of blatant racial or sexual discrimination against him; in one case, a black employment official simply laughed at the applicant.

Yet while the demotion and dispossession of the groups that created, ruled, and sustained American civilization may effectively decapitate the civilization, the importation of non-Western habits of thought and behavior will very likely simply kill it outright. Not only the absence of a "folkway" of constitutional government but also the lack of a scientific and empirical tradition in non-Western societies, different concepts of work and time use, and different religious and ethical systems

may well perpetuate within U.S. borders the political repression, violence, superstitions, filth, and apparent laziness of non-Western cultures. Parts of Florida, Texas, and southern California have already ceased to belong to the West in any but the administrative sense that they continue to pay taxes to Washington, and the same cultural meiosis is apparent in many major cities in other parts of the nation. Indeed, the very term "nation," derived from the Latin word for being born, will become meaningless when as much as 21 percent of the population is not born within the country's own borders.

Even as the Census Bureau published what may be the first lines of the epitaph of the American nation and its civilization last December, President Bush was plotting one last war in Somalia before he slipped into the twilight of history. The U.S. government, as George F. Kennan notes in his recent memoir, "while not loath to putting half a million armed troops into the Middle East to expel the armed Iraqis from Kuwait, confesses itself unable to defend its own southwestern border from illegal immigration by large numbers of people armed with nothing more formidable than a strong desire to get across it." Mr. Bush's last war and Mr. Kennan's latest reflections point to the central irony of the American imperium's last days, that the willingness of the American mega-state to kill some 250,000 Iraqis who had never harmed or threatened the United States in any way is regarded as the ultimate confirmation of the omnipotence of a

superpower that has ended history and can now do whatever it wants, while the same power cannot imagine any good reason to protect its own borders from invasion. The mega-state and its masters can play with bombs in Baghdad and Bosnia all they want, save as many Somalis as can be rounded up, and count as many beans as they can find, but those enterprises will not preserve a civilization or a nation whose founding demographic core is facing a slow extinction and whose leaders have forgotten what civilization means and have come to regard their own nation as a barrier to be broken down and discarded.■

[Chronicles, July, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

'A Perpetual Censor'

When Supreme Court Justice Byron White announced his retirement from public life in March of this year, a shudder rippled down the spines of Washington conservatives. Previously, when one or another of the Court's Nameless Nine had declared his intention to quit the pleasures of wrecking the laws and customs of local communities he had never heard of and spend his remaining years improving his golf game, the Beltway Right had rubbed its hands in glee. Every new vacancy on the court meant an opportunity to plug one of its own eruditi into the empty socket of American jurisprudence, and even if the Senate Judiciary Committee thwarted its plans and succeeded in ruining the conservative nominee's reputation by exposing him as a rake, a reactionary, or a scholar who had had too many ideas, there still remained a bottomless pit of money to be raised and volumes of articles to be scribbled on the subject of the unfairness and hypocrisy of it all.

Yet, with the exception of Robert Bork, all of the Republican nominees to the Court in the 1980s were confirmed, and by the end of the decade one would have expected that a genuine legal counter-revolution would have been triumphant or well under way. The last major decision of the Court in the Reagan-Bush era,

however, was a signal failure to overturn the 1973 Roe vs. Wade ruling by which a right to abortion had suddenly been discovered glimmering in the shadowy bottoms of the constitutional text, and since no small part of the conservative reaction against "judicial activism" was generated by outrage over the Roe decision, the inability of conservative legal hounds to bring it to bay must be chalked up as one more blind alley down which the Reagan Revolution blundered. Indeed, the reason why conservative spines should tingle when incumbent justices contemplate retirement nowadays is that the Republican ascendancy of the 1980s did virtually nothing to diminish the swollen power that the Court has grabbed for itself throughout this century. Hence, when King Bill and his consort replace retiring justices with the obscurities, misfits, and malcontents whom we must expect them to choose, the new Solomons will receive intact almost all of the power that their predecessors accumulated and which the Republicans and their appointees did nothing to dismantle. Of course, the Court did sway a bit to the right under the influence of the Republican appointments, but at no time did the Reagan-Bush justices seriously seek to reverse and reduce the grandiose pretensions of the Court's power or undo the damage inflicted on the republic by Earl Warren and his colleagues.

The premise of the Warren revolution and the ruin it made of the republic is the dogma handed down from the 1920s through the 1940s known as the "Incorporation Doctrine," according to which the Bill of Rights is "incorporated" within the meaning of the 14th Amendment. Originally intended as a series of limitations on

the federal government, the Bill of Rights, as illuminated by the Incorporation Doctrine, has evolved into a constraint on state and local powers and an anvil on which legal and judicial elites can sledgehammer local and state laws and procedures that stand in the way of their political preferences. Legal scholar Paul Murphy, a champion of Warren and his works, actually acknowledges the transparently political baggage that the former chief justice successfully snuck under the constitutional tent. Warren, writes Murphy, "utilized the judiciary as a constructive policy-making instrument in a wide range of areas. Intent more upon social ends than upon legal subtleties and refinements, and candidly prepared to say so, he had pushed the nation, through his Court's legal rulings, to take public actions that Congress was unprepared to recommend and the executive was incapable, unilaterally, of effectively securing."

In other words, since voters and their elected representatives persisted in the nasty habit of repulsing the legalistic hurricanes that continuously erupt from the nervous systems of the ACLU, the NAACP, labor unions, and Communist front groups, it was left up to the valor and ingenuity of such decrepit apostles of progress as Warren himself, Harry Blackmun, the late Thurgood Marshall, William O. Douglas, and William Brennan to fob off on states and cities the "true meaning" of the Constitution as discerned by these sages, and the Incorporation Doctrine was the principal tool by which they did so. As conservative legal

scholar Douglas Bradford expresses it in an article in the journal This World last year, "upon this rock [of the Incorporation Doctrine] rests the authority of the federal judiciary to oversee busing, quotas, school district boundaries, abortion, Miranda warnings, probable cause for arrest, prison and asylum standards, libel, pornography, subversive speech, and the separation of church and state." In the absence of the Incorporation Doctrine, that is, there would in fact be virtually no enduring liberalism in the United States, and the grotesque failure of the "Reagan Revolution" is nowhere more glaringly exhibited than in the inability and perhaps the unwillingness of its court appointees to challenge the doctrine. Indeed, there now flourishes a school of neo-conservative jurisprudence that is actually committed to endorsing and keeping the Incorporation Doctrine in one form or another.

The ostensible reason certain conservatives are drawn to the Incorporation Doctrine is that it seems to offer them an opportunity to encode in the Constitution what they take to be fundamental rights of property and economic enterprise and the constitutional protection of a free market economy. Their views are largely drawn from late nineteenth century jurisprudence, when the 14th Amendment was conscripted by the conservative jurists of the Gilded Age to buttress "substantive due process." Under this interpretation, the Amendment's prohibition of a state depriving "any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of

law" is extended to the substance of what legislatures do, not merely to the procedures by which the laws operate. As legal historian Melvin Urofsky explains the distinction, "Procedural due process ... regulates the courts and constitutes the rules of the game; substantive due process regulates the legislature and is the game." By claiming that the 14th Amendment dictates what legislatures may do, the concept of substantive due process essentially brings state legislatures (as well as city and county governments) under the control of the federal courts.

The value of the substantive due process as understood through an expansive view of the 14th Amendment to defenders of free enterprise comes mainly from its application to local and state licensing laws. The leading Court rulings in this field remain the 1873 "Slaughterhouse Cases," in which the court narrowly upheld (thereby rejecting the substantive due process claims) a Louisiana statute that limited the location of slaughterhouses to certain areas of New Orleans. Butchers outside the area challenged the law on the ground that it violated their rights to exercise their trade as guaranteed in the 13th and 14th Amendments and the 1866 Civil Rights Act. Justice Samuel Miller, speaking for the five-vote majority on the Court, rejected their argument, stating that to use the 14th Amendment to authorize federal protection of individual rights within and against the states would "fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress" and would "constitute

this court a perpetual censor upon all legislation of the States."

Miller's view prevailed, but not for long. By the 1890s, the idea of using substantive due process to resist efforts of Progressivist reformers to regulate business at the local level had proved too useful for the judicial defenders of laissez faire to resist, even at the expense of sacrificing federalism. Up through the 1930s, when conservative justices used it to resist Wilsonian and Rooseveltian attempts to regulate the economy, the substantive due process view prevailed, until Roosevelt's own political manipulation of the Court allowed it to be replaced, at least for economic purposes.

Although the legal reasoning by which substantive due process is applied to economic cases differs from that by which the Incorporation Doctrine was developed, the effects are essentially the same. In both, a branch of the federal government -- the Supreme Court -- dictates what state legislatures may and may not do, and in both the 14th Amendment is invoked as a basis for this expansion of federal power and the corresponding diminution of state and local authority.

Today the principal exponent of reviving substantive due process reasoning in economic liberty cases is Professor Richard Epstein of the University of Chicago, but while Professor Epstein is involved largely in the theoretical elaboration of the argument, the main pioneer of this school on a practical level has been Clint Bolick of the Landmark Legal Foundation and more

recently of the Washington-based Institute for Justice. Mr. Bolick and his attorneys have mainly sought to use substantive due process arguments to oppose local licensing laws that they claim violate citizens' rights to engage in private enterprise. Thus, they have supported litigation aimed at overturning Washington, D.C. licensing laws banning bootblacks from city sidewalks and a Houston, Texas, law that banned jitneys because of their competition with local street car companies. In these and similar cases, Bolick argues that such laws are also racially discriminatory, since they usually have the effect of pushing out black competitors in favor of white businesses and since they were often passed in the first place for precisely that purpose.

The specific results of Mr. Bolick's efforts -- overturning obsolete or irrational licensing laws that restrict competition -- are no doubt commendable, but, like the original substantive due process cases, their effects on conservative legal strategy in the longer term are likely to be pernicious. Reliance on the Incorporation Doctrine and substantive due process theory by conservatives contradicts and weakens whatever efforts the right might make against the use of these same principles by the left, and if the legal history of this century proves anything, it is that the left will be the ultimate beneficiary of any centralized legal system and the principles that support it. There is no way decisions such as Roe vs. Wade or similar rulings on prayer in schools, burning the flag, obscenity, civil rights, and entire

casebooks of other victories for legal liberalism can flourish without the kind of interpretation that the left has imposed on the 14th Amendment and which Professor Epstein, Mr. Bolick and his colleagues, and their adherents also espouse.

Local licensing laws, moreover, may have few economic merits, though in the original Slaughterhouse Cases, the purpose of the laws was to protect public health against the disease that accompanies the professional slaughter of cattle. The fact is that states and local communities may have any number of perfectly valid and legitimate reasons for enacting legislation limiting local enterprises, and certainly the approval or disapproval of nine men in Washington (or of political ideologues in universities and foundations) should have nothing to do with how communities govern themselves.

The whole point of the U.S. Constitution as it was originally written and adopted was to enable the people of what was then one of the world's largest and most diverse countries to govern themselves without coming under the centralized dominance of a particular interest, faction, or region. Throughout American history, it has been that very feature of the Constitution that has so profoundly offended and alarmed the legions of those armed with a Better Idea -- High Federalists, abolitionists, Social Darwinists of the Gilded Era, Wilsonian apostles of the New Freedom, Rooseveltian peddlers of the New Deal, New Frontiersmen, Great Society social engineers, lunch counter liberators, civil

liberties Stalinists, abortionists, common criminals, and overeducated freethinkers who feel oppressed because someone could read the Ten Commandments on the school bulletin board. Each and every one of them has sought to gut the dispersion of political power promised in the old Constitution and tried to get the federales on his or her side, usually by wheedling the branch of the federal government least responsive to the voters into forcing everybody else to conform to his or her hobbies and obsessions.

What has stood between these platoons of crackpots and crusaders and the ordered way of life most Americans prefer to follow has not been the presidency, the Supreme Court, the Congress, the news media, the churches, or big business, and certainly not any "conservative movement" headquartered on K Street or Capitol Hill. What has resisted them has been the American people themselves, organized and represented in the decentralized local institutions of government at the levels of county, town, and state, and their resistance has been overcome only when their enemies have captured the Supreme Court and turned the Court into a political weapon to advance their pet causes. If Americans are going to recapture their country, they'll have to do so by stripping the Court of the powers it has seized under such fictions as the Incorporation Doctrine and substantive due process, dismantling the Court's appointment of itself as the "perpetual censor upon all legislation of the States" that Justice Miller warned against, and preventing the exploitation of Court

and Constitution as the "constructive policy-making instruments" into which Earl Warren transmuted them. So far, the Reagan Revolutionaries and their tax-exempt allies in the Beltway Right have shown little capacity to accomplish that counter-revolution and precious little interest in even trying.■

[Chronicles, August, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Crossing the Line

On April 29, 1993, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs held a confirmation hearing for Roberta Achtenberg, President Clinton's nominee for the position of Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. Like most nominees, Miss Achtenberg brought along members of her family to lend her support during her hour of ordeal and fondly introduced them to the committee. But, because Miss Achtenberg is an admitted lesbian, the first "family member" she introduced was "my beloved partner, Judge Mary Morgan," as well as her rabbi. The hearing room must have looked a bit like Maya Angelou's inaugural poem come to life.

Even though neither the beloved partner nor the rabbi opened her or his mouth throughout the proceeding, Miss Achtenberg's subtle exploitation of religious authority to legitimize her open sexual perversion could not have been missed, but dragging them along turned out to be unnecessary after all. One would have thought that the appropriate reaction from the assembled senators would have been to tell Miss Achtenberg -- and the President who nominated her -- that the open practice of sexual abnormality inherently disqualifies a person from serving the people of the United States in a position of public trust and that it was an

insult to the Congress as well as to the citizens it represents for an acknowledged lesbian even to show up at the hearing, let alone to thrust the fleshly evidence of her repellent habit before the committee's and the public's eyes. Yet, though four members of the committee voted against her nomination, not a one of them uttered a word of disapproval of her perversion, her immorality, or her grotesque tastelessness.

As the debate on the Achtenberg nomination developed, it soon became clear how the lines were being drawn. The committee chairman, liberal Democrat Sen. Riegle of Michigan, openly praised the nominee for trampling down yet one more vineyard where the grapes of public morals are stored. "In a sense," he spouted, "you're crossing one of those invisible lines that we have in our society in terms of this issue that is there, raised by some with respect to sexual orientation. I think it has no part in the suitability of you to serve in this job." Mr. Riegle's thoughts appeared to be at one with those of his colleagues who also supported her. One of the main purposes, and perhaps the whole purpose, of the nomination was precisely to cross, if not to erase, the "line" of which Mr. Riegle spoke -- to discard once and for all the notion that the sexual life and sexual orientation of a nominee is relevant to the nominee's capacity to serve in public office.

Moreover, liberal Democrats were not the only ones to take this position. In the course of the confirmation hearings, Miss Achtenberg received some tough questions from conservative Republican Sen. Lauch Faircloth of North Carolina about her

blatant political bludgeoning of the Boy Scouts while she was a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Miss Achtenberg repeatedly used her position to stop the Scouts from using public school buildings in San Francisco because they refused to hire homosexuals as scout masters, and she also pressured the United Way of the Bay area to withdraw its six-figure financial donations to the Scouts for the same reason. In the course of wrestling with Mr. Faircloth's questions, Miss Achtenberg was evasive if not actually perjurious, and similar themes were taken up by other Republicans opponents during the floor debate.

But neither Mr. Faircloth nor conservative Mississippi Republican Sen. Trent Lott, the main critic of Miss Achtenberg during debate on the Senate floor, ever challenged her "crossing of the line" or the propriety of her sexual habits. Mr. Lott indeed went so far as to assure everyone that "I want to re-emphasize that the issue before us today is not one of sexual preference or orientation. It is whether the nominee is qualified and temperamentally fit for the position to which he or she may be nominated." During the whole debate, which ended with her overwhelming confirmation, only one senator -- Jesse Helms -- ever questioned whether the line should be crossed. "We are crossing the threshold," Mr. Helms declared clearly, "into the first time in the history of America that a homosexual, a lesbian, has been nominated by a president of the United States for a top job in the U.S. government. That is what the issue is."

For his pains, Mr. Helms was, of course, at once subjected to the vilification of his colleagues -- hardly a new experience for him, since that is the treatment regularly administered these days to those who resist crossing cultural and moral lines, and Mr. Helms has long made a distinguished career of standing athwart lines that no one else dares defend -- with Sen. Carol Mosely Braun of Illinois gurgling that "I am frightened to hear the politics of fear and divisiveness and of hatred rear its ugly head on this floor" and Sen. Riegle himself proclaiming that Mr. Helms' remarks "reflected poorly on the United States Senate."

This, then, is the position in which the nation now stands: a senator who objects to the nomination of an open homosexual to a high public position is condemned by his colleagues as a fearmonger, a bigot, and an exponent of hatred and is told he is a disgrace to the Senate, while the pervert herself is held up as a moral paragon. That is what it means to cross the line of which Mr. Riegle and Mr. Helms spoke, since the line marks not only what is considered suitable conduct for public office but also what a fortiori is suitable in private life and personal judgments. If moral impropriety does not bar a person from holding public office, why should it color our private judgment about the person?

The acceptance of Miss Achtenberg's nomination, then, crosses more than one line, and that too was a large part of its purpose.

By nominating an open homosexual for a sub-cabinet level position, Mr. Clinton took a giant step -- the biggest ever taken

by any president -- to declare homosexuality a normal and legitimate form of sexual conduct and to rescind the traditional moral and social sanctions against it.

Yet what emerges even more clearly than the sly normalization of perversion that the liberal left has pulled off is the total unfitness of the Republican Party to resist this moral and cultural revolution. Indeed, if one fact has become apparent about the Republican Party this year, it is that as a whole it not only does not want to bear any banners in the nation's continuing cultural war but also doesn't even understand how to do so. The fighting of that war consists precisely in the ability and the willingness to discern the "lines" and "thresholds" across which new norms are smuggled and old ones abandoned, and the Republicans have shown themselves to be chronically myopic when it comes to perceiving such boundaries.

It was not, after all, the Republican right that initially resisted Mr. Clinton's proposed lifting of the ban against homosexuals in the armed forces but Democrat Sam Nunn with the support of Colin Powell and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was not the Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee who refused to confirm lawbreaker Zoe Baird as Attorney General but moderate Democrats like Arizona's Dennis DeConcini, bolstered by the spontaneous popular revulsion registered against her by thousands of phone calls to Senate offices. Nor did most Republicans raise serious objections to any of the other bizarre characters whom the

new administration called to office: Donna Shalala at Health and Human Services, Janet Reno at the Justice Department, Ron Brown at the Commerce Department, etc.

But the Republican performance during the Achtenberg debate is the clearest instance so far of the party's own unsuitability to serve as the representative of Americans committed to the conservation of their moral and social norms in their public manifestations. What seems to drive the party, however, is not, as with liberal Democrats, the open embrace of cultural revolution so much as it is a profound ignorance of cultural norms themselves, how they might be defended, and how they are being discarded by their professed enemies. What Republicans fear is being called bigots, and they fear that label because many of them really are bigots -- that is, persons who harbor prejudices against those who violate cultural norms but are so ignorant of the valid reasons for their prejudices that they are unable to defend them and are ashamed to admit to them. The Republican opponents of Miss Achtenberg instinctively knew something is wrong with her appointment, but they were totally unable to express, either to themselves or to the nation, what it was, with the result that they were unable to offer any compelling reasons for opposing her.

In the case of "sexual orientation," as the current cant for perversion is known, the reasons for regarding it as relevant to public office-holding are really not difficult. Any society must

regulate and discipline sexual impulses and must do so in terms of what is morally permissible as well as what is socially tolerable.

In the absence of social and moral norms governing such sexual relationships as those of husband and wife, parent and child, elder and youth, and male and female generally, the human condition would indeed come to resemble Hobbes' anarchic state of nature, since there would be no ready means to prevent the spontaneous sexual exploitation of the weak by the strong, and each act of exploitation would at once lead to the violence of jealousy and the extraction of revenge for transgression of sexual rights and relationships. Indeed, American sexual life already resembles just such a jungle, as the brutalization of women and children and the violence of homosexuals explodes, in large part because the abandonment of norms governing sexual conduct encourages opportunities for exploitation, revenge, and jealousy.

One such norm has always been that those whose own lives are not governed by norms should not govern others.

Unlike the neurotically repressive sexual codes of Victorian times, healthy individuals and societies recognize the power of sexuality and allow for its satisfaction, but movements like that of the queer militants today demand far more than that. What they demand -- and Miss Achtenberg has been in the forefront of it -- is that men and women be defined through their sexuality, that sexuality become the most important measure of ourselves. The power of sexual impulses in most human beings is such that when

the norms that govern them are weakened, sexuality escalates into such a consuming preoccupation that it becomes the defining dimension of the personality, with other dimensions being suppressed or ignored. It would not occur to a sexually normal male heterosexual nominated to Miss Achtenberg's position to bring along his girl friend or his mistress to his confirmation hearing and introduce her to the senators -- indeed, were Ted Kennedy on the committee, it might even be dangerous to the young lady to do so -- because no normal heterosexual man defines himself as mainly or exclusively a sexual being, and all such men leave their sex lives in compartments separate from that of their business. The only people who do so define themselves, who do demand that their private sexual lives be stripped of all regulating norms and decorum and splashed about in public for all to goggle at, are those who have become so preoccupied by sex that they can think of themselves in no other dimension -- in a word, those who are perverts. The understanding of the proper place of sexuality (and other matters as well) in the normative codes of American society ought not to be too tough for all grown men and women to grasp, but they seem to be well over the heads of the Republican Party today.

It is not for nothing that John Stuart Mill called the conservatives of the 19th century "the Stupid Party." In one sense, this was a compliment, since a certain stupidity is at all times necessary for the continuation of civilized life. Human

beings cannot re-invent the wheel every week, so they have to keep making wheels the way they were raised to make them, and the repetition of inherited ways of doing and thinking often resembles the behavior of stupid men. Conservatives are those who insist at all times on continuing the stupid but essential routines of civilized life, and usually that is sufficient to keep the wheels of civilization turning.

But sometimes it is not enough, and the failure of Republicans today to perceive that the major issue of American politics is whether we should try to make the machinery of human society turn by inventing new kinds of wheels for it shows that this is one of those times. The ideal response to Miss Achtenberg would have been to hoot her and her supporters out of public life entirely and to leave her, Mrs. Mosely Braun, Mr. Riegle, and the whole repulsive pack of them in a public pillory for a few days where the mobs could work their will on them with rotten eggs, dead cats, and decaying fruit. If the Republican Party were doing its job, if it even knew what its job is, at least the political and rhetorical equivalent of such public mockery of perverts and their minions could take place, and the norms of public and private life would be protected. As it is, the Republicans are the ones who are pilloried for even daring to suggest that there are any good reasons why a Sapphic sister shouldn't hold public office, and so weak, vapid, cowardly, and trivial has the resistance of the Stupid Party been to the cultural revolution

that there is no good reason to say that the pillory is not where most of its members belong.■

[Chronicles, September, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Stupid and Proud

When the editors of The New Republic told writer Stephen Rodrick to get his cute little fanny down to Washington's Omni Shoreham Hotel and cover the first conference of Pat Buchanan's American Cause Foundation last May, Mr. Rodrick must have felt something like a character in Sartre's "No Exit." The prospect of idling for an entire week-end among the sworn enemies of Robert Mapplethorpe and Hillary Clinton is about as enticing an assignment for a budding New Republican as reporting on the recent water-tasting contest in Berkeley Springs, West Virginia. Nevertheless, even the Buchanan Brigades might be good for a snort, he probably figured, and who knows, he might get to meet a real, live anti-Semite of the kind he's read so much about.

So Mr. Rodrick came, saw, and reported, and his magazine duly carried his reportage in its issue of June 7. He never met any anti-Semites, but he seems to have had himself a grand old time anyhow.

"Mothers in floral-print dresses, rednecks selling 'Keep Our Privates Straight' stickers, clergy adorned in pro-life fetus buttons and respected conservative thinkers in navy blue suits grab croissants and pour themselves coffee in Delft cups," he snickered. Mr. Rodrick didn't seem to get much out of the speeches

at the conference except a few madcap quotes that New Republic readers would think just rip the lid off what the Buchananites are really up to, but he sure enjoyed himself making fun of the people. The subject of the conference was "Winning the Culture War," and there were citizens on hand who picket abortion centers, organize grassroots efforts against homosexual rights, and think the public schools ought to be closed down by the local vice squad. There was a black woman -- Ezola Foster of Los Angeles -- who praised the Los Angeles Police Department. Then there was the lunch of what Mr. Rodrick distastefully and not entirely accurately described as "ham sandwiches and Nilla Wafer pie," which was probably not at all like what they put into their mouths over at the New Republic. And there was even a man from Altoona, Pennsylvania.

That, however, is about as close to anti-Semitism as the impenetrable Mr. Rodrick could get. He had to content himself with a longish account of Mrs. Foster, who "discusses the difficulty in expressing alternative viewpoints in the African-American community, but soon veers into a forty-five minute filibuster detailing exactly how alternative her views really are." It seems Mrs. Foster not only likes the LAPD but also believes Jesse Jackson and certain other black leaders should be in jail and that public schools have become socialist training centers. Well, now, we at the New Republic are all for "alternatives," of course, but that wasn't precisely what we had in mind, especially for "African-Americans." Regrettably, Mr. Rodrick never asked Mrs. Foster what she thought of his magazine.

Had she told him, he might have lost his Nilla Wafer pie even before the conference was over.

You can't expect more from the New Republic and its lesser lights than the sophomoric snobbery dressed up as enlightenment that Mr. Rodrick burped out in his story. Nor, as it develops, can you expect much more from the magazine generally thought of, in what passes for a free country these days, as the New Republic's counterpart on the right, National Review. The other NR also sent a reporter to cover the proceedings, one Matt Scully, a former speechwriter for Dan Quayle, and Mr. Scully also spent the first paragraph of his article putting a bit of distance between the inhabitants of the conference and the Uptown Right as represented by his own journal. Among the funnyfaces Mr. Scully spied out were "young staffers who look as if they have just left Salt Lake City on their first mission abroad" and "a woman in satin gloves and a sun hat with crepe veil, recalling Barbara Stanwyck or Claire Trevor in a 1940s thriller." These, he fretted, were "the sort of political eccentrics who make for 'they're-not-like-us' caricatures in the Washington Post Style section."

But Mr. Scully went on to say that such "eccentrics" were indeed "principled and articulate, and prefer winning elections to winning good ink in the Style section." That's nice, but for some reason (which I shall elucidate anon), he, like Mr. Rodrick, felt compelled to crack wise about the good folks who attended.

The fact is that there just weren't very many oddwads at the Buchanan conference. I have been attending gatherings of the right for some 24 years, and I have seldom seen a more normal looking crowd than showed up for this one. These were, almost to a man and woman, Middle Americans, principled and articulate to be sure, but also the kind of people you'd be glad to see walking toward you in a parking lot after dark. If it's funnyfaces you want, go to any one of the various conclaves sponsored by the mainstream "conservative movement." At these geekfests, you will indeed run into young men who look like fugitives from the Nerd Room in Animal House, as well as the usual gaggle of "populists" who rally the masses by direct mail from Northern Virginia, mothers who make good livings defending family values and haven't seen their own husbands and children since Jimmy Carter was President, and the usual set of petty functionaries in the federal government who earn handsome fees lecturing on behalf of anarcho-capitalism. As for the New Republic and its tribe, if conservative gatherings look like the bar scene in Star Wars, those of the left usually resemble the basement of the mental hospital in Silence of the Lambs.

Moreover, National Review as well as the other unofficial organ of the Stupid Party, Human Events, both contrived to miss the larger meaning of the American Cause conference. Mr. Scully used a good part of his article to scratch the back of his old boss, Bill Kristol, a speaker at the conference and former chief

of staff to Vice President Quayle, and what both NR and HE found most compelling were Mr. Kristol's comments on a recent Atlantic Monthly cover story entitled "Dan Quayle Was Right." This, in the words of HE proves to Mr. Kristol and presumably to Human Events too, that "reasoned argument can eventually gain ground even with hidebound liberals." Yep, we've got 'em on the run all right. A few more reasoned arguments from Dan and Bill like the ones they came up with last year and we'll have Jeffrey Dahmer in charge of the Food and Drug Administration.

Dan Quayle was right about what, exactly? Was Dan Quayle right when he criticized "Murphy Brown" for glamorizing illegitimacy, or was he right a few weeks later when he tried to make nice by sending a letter and a toy stuffed elephant to Murphy's fictional bastard? Was Dan Quayle right when he blasted the country's cultural elite for eroding "family values," or was he right later in the summer when he boasted of the Bush administration's "very good policy of non-discrimination" against homosexuals? It's hard to tell what Dan Quayle was right about because no sooner did he enunciate one cultural position than he renounced it or diluted it shortly afterwards, and by waffling on the rhetoric as well as the substance of cultural conservatism, Mr. Quayle merely made a fool of himself and succeeded in fumbling the chance to frame the cultural issues of the campaign in meaningful terms.

I don't mean to pick on either Mr. Quayle or the two Stupid

Party journals for saluting Mr. Kristol's generally commendable talk, but their cuddly reception of his speech and some similar ones shows that the really interesting aspects of the American Cause conference sailed right past their horn-rims. What was most interesting about the conference was the presence, for the first time on something like a national stage, of a more or less authentic counter-revolutionary (as opposed to a merely conservative) force. And those who gave voice to that force were not the luminaries whom NR and HE found so fascinating but rather a band of obscurities and ne'er-do-wells who were not even mentioned by either magazine but who happen to be associated with a small journal called Chronicles.

The counter-revolutionary tactic was implicit in Chronicles editor Tom Fleming's remark that the cultural war is "New York, essentially, against Nebraska," which Mr. Scully quotes but manages to miss the point of. Taking Dr. Fleming's largely metaphorical antithesis literally, Mr. Scully thought it was contradicted by the success of Mary Cummins' recent rebellion against New York City schools. So not everybody in New York is a liberal, Fleming. So there.

I will forebear recounting my own speech to the conference, which dealt with the theory and practice of Antonio Gramsci's concept of "cultural hegemony" and how it might be applied to the causes of the right. I proceeded from the premise that the main mission of "cultural conservatives" today is not to conserve but

to overthrow -- namely, the cultural elite and its apparatus of political and cultural power. My remarks happened to receive a standing ovation from the audience of "eccentrics," but neither National Review nor Human Events bothered to mention it. Nor did the similar counter-revolutionary thrust of the speeches of Mrs. Foster and Rabbi Yehuda Levin excite much thought from the deadly duo from the conservative press. National Review did not even mention them either. Human Events did mention them but only to make the utterly jejeune and somewhat insulting point that having a black and a Jew at the conference refutes the smear that Mr. Buchanan is a racist. Only the Stupid Party really believes that having a couple of blacks and Jews around will save them from being accused of racism. Pat Buchanan, of course, is not a racist, but inviting Mrs. Foster and the several Jewish speakers who were on hand doesn't prove he isn't, nor was that why they were invited anyway. Human Events' point is so banal that it ought to apologize to the two speakers as well as Mr. Buchanan.

Paul Gottfried, author of the recently published monograph, The Conservative Movement and a frequent Chronicles contributor, spoke on the subject of how "political correctness" and "multi-culturalism" are not merely superstitions of the academy but have now permeated the institutions and minds of the country at large. The implication of Mr. Gottfried's remarks also was that not "conserving" but revolt is the appropriate mission of the serious American right today. Finally, classicist E. Christian Kopff, a

Chronicles contributing editor, delivered perhaps the most forceful address of the whole conference, arguing for an educational system grounded in mathematics and the classical languages as the only means of preserving the main traditions of Western culture in science, thought, language, and religion. As with Dr. Fleming's remarks, Mr. Gottfried's speech, and my own, the implications of Professor Kopff's remarks involve a mission of challenging and overthrowing the incumbent elites of education and culture, not conserving them or fighting them with "reasoned arguments" drawn from the Stupid Party's repertoire.

Though neither Dr. Fleming's speech nor Professor Kopff's nor mine seemed to register with Human Events, Mr. Scully did refer to Mr. Gottfried as what he called a "pockets-of-virtue man" -- i.e., one who thinks it's impossible to recapture the culture or the country and merely advocates retreat to backwaters like Altoona. As it happens, that is the direct opposite of what Mr. Gottfried advocated. The line Mr. Scully drew between "conservatives who aim to 'recapture the culture' and those resigned to finding little 'pockets of virtue' within it" actually excluded, concealed, and missed the point of the most significant parts of the conference. In Mr. Scully's view, the real hero of the weekend was -- guess who -- Bill Kristol, whose reasoned argument that Dan Quayle was right all along was invigorated by his sense, "as with the Soviets in the early Eighties, of a hollowness at the center." In Mr. Kristol's view, you see, the dominance of the

cultural left in the United States is about to collapse like the Kremlin state. Once again, we've got 'em on the run.

The true line of division at the American Cause conference had nothing to do with "pockets of virtue" or "recapturing the culture." Everyone, including Mr. Kristol, wanted to accomplish the latter; what they differed on was the tactic by which that can be accomplished and what exactly it is that ought to be recaptured. To the conservative mind, as represented by the reports of National Review and Human Events, the cultural, social, and political structure of the United States is essentially healthy and needs to be conserved. Hence, there's no need for radicalism; we just have to sit back and wait for Bill and Hillary to catch up on what the Atlantic's been publishing, for Murphy Brown to get married and the lavender lobby to abandon politics and open a florist's shop. In the meantime, we should meet the repression, exploitation, lies, smears, and calculated cultural destruction of the left with "reasoned arguments" about family values, global democracy, enterprise zones, and Martin Luther King as a conservative icon. Conservatism thus becomes a counsel of inaction, passivity, an infantilistic optimism, and banality.

To the warped minds of Chronicles editors and writers, however, the future is not so bright. "Reasoned argument" won't work with the enemies of Middle America because those enemies don't care about reason. They care about power and using power to advance themselves by subverting American beliefs and

institutions. The only way to counter them and their power is through countervailing power, which is why Gramsci has more to teach us than Dan Quayle. And the only way to mobilize that countervailing power is to organize the normal people of the nation who come from places like Altoona and Salt Lake City and who gobble down entire buckets of Nilla Wafer pie every day, to engender in them a common consciousness of how they are losing their country, their culture, their wealth, and their political power, and to design and popularize a strategy by which they can do something about it.

And that, of course, is the reason why Mr. Scully and his editors felt it necessary to put a few cultural miles between themselves and the Middle Americans who attended the conference. If everything is as OK as National Review and Human Events think, there's no reason to have Middle Americans around at all, and there is in fact some danger in letting them loose in Washington.

The folks over at the Style section and the New Republic might see them and try to make out that we of the Stupid Party are just like them, and then they'd be caricaturing National Review as well. How can we at National Review, Human Events, and other strategic centers of the Stupid Party enjoy reasoned argument with the cultural elite if the cultural elite thinks we too eat Nilla Wafer pie and wear funny hats?

The real significance of the American Cause conference was that it showed that there exists at least a nucleus for a Middle

American counter-revolutionary force, outside the Republican Party and outside the whole incestuous, complacent, and outright crooked ranks of the mainstream conservative movement. If Mr. Buchanan is smart (which he is), he'll build this nucleus into a broad-based, independent social and political movement, and he'll leave the Uptown Right and the Stupid Party to hold all the reasoned arguments they want with the enemies of American culture.■

[Chronicles, November, 1993]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

People of a Different Stripe

Precisely when it first occurred to Illinois' Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun to lay her traps for the United Daughters of the Confederacy and its iniquitous insignia containing the Confederate "Stars and Bars" we are not given to know, but certainly it was well before the senator, invariably described in the press as the "Senate's first black female member," splashed into American living-rooms with her now-famous tantrum on the Senate floor last summer. As early as April, Mrs. Moseley-Braun, who had arrived in the Senate only a few months before, announced her intention to oppose renewal of the congressionally approved patent for the UDC insignia when the matter came before the Judiciary Committee. This announcement, like most of what issues from Mrs. Moseley-Braun's lips, generally passed unnoticed, though some Southerners and not a few Northerners who care about their country's history tried to sound the alarm that mischief was afoot.

By late July, the mischief was up and galloping. Sometime in the spring, the Committee yielded to Mrs. Moseley-Braun's unique blend of threat, whine, and smear and voted overwhelmingly not to renew the patent for the insignia that had received unanimous and non-controversial assent in every Congress that had considered it since 1898. That would have been the end of the matter, had not

Sens. Strom Thurmond and Jesse Helms contrived in July to offer an amendment to slip the patent through. As in the days of yore, their amendment passed, but then someone alerted the First Black Female Member of the Senate, who perched herself in the path of the legislation and once again began to emit her characteristic noise. In what The Washington Post the next day described as "a speech bristling with outrage," Mrs. Moseley-Braun, whose "voice was eloquent and angry," denounced or insulted the flag, the Confederacy, the UDC, the senators who proposed the amendment, the senators who supported the amendment, the senators who opposed the amendment, and the Senate itself. Finally, after consuming an inordinate amount of time that could have been used for raising taxes, declaring war on harmless countries, or swelling the belly of the state, the Senate, like the Committee earlier, yielded to her imprecations and by a vote of 75 to 25 undid what it had just done by defeating the Thurmond-Helms amendment.

Whatever "anger," "outrage," or "eloquence" the First Black Female Member of the Senate evinced, it cannot be said that she exhibited much command of elementary logic, nor was the conduct of her senatorial colleagues much better. It was her argument that for the Senate to grant a patent to a seal that contained a depiction of the Confederate flag was to give what she called an "imprimatur" to racism. Since the Confederacy was itself racist, therefore its flag was and is a symbol of racism, and therefore anyone who displays the flag or uses it as a symbol at all is also a racist, as is anyone who votes for a patent for a seal that uses the flag. This line of reasoning set off a predictable chain

reaction of senators professing their own abhorrence of racism, the most ridiculous and repellent link in the chain being the ponderous Howell Heflin of Alabama, who waddled forward to bleat about his own Confederate ancestors and how they would certainly today join him in voting against the UDC patent. Not to be outdone, Sen. Patrick Moynihan managed to remain sober long enough during the debate to lisp that "for the Senate to endorse it [the Confederate flag] is something I do not think we had any idea we were capable of." That, of course, was a bald-faced lie, since Mr. Moynihan knew very well that the UDC patent comes up for renewal every 14 years and has been unanimously "endorsed" by the Senate, including him, each and every time.

There seems to have been little or no challenge to the premise of Mrs. Moseley-Braun's argument that the Confederacy was indeed racist. It might have been interesting, did we possess senators capable of debating that or any other postulate, to hear some back-and-forth on this. Not only might it have illuminated our contemporary understanding of what the Civil War means but also it might even have yielded some definition of the now-vacuous term "racism." But, barring that, the senators who voted for the flag amendment might also have explored other aspects of the issue. Mrs. Moseley-Braun herself, for example, represents a state that in 1848 adopted, by a popular vote of two-to-one, an amendment to its constitution to forbid any free blacks from entering its territory, and for all I know the Illinois state flag

today is the same one that graced the Land of Lincoln at that time as well as a decade later, when the state's foremost political figures sallied up and down its length professing their commitment to white supremacy. It would be of no small interest to know what Mrs. Moseley-Braun has done or plans to do to rid Illinois of its racist heritage and its continuing imprimatur of such explicit symbols of racism as Mr. Lincoln and his cult.

Then there is the small matter of the American flag, which, no less than the Stars and Bars, flapped over a nation that not only tolerated slavery but extended the protection of federal laws to the slave trade and slave owners. Mrs. Moseley-Braun, were she calm enough, might respond that the American flag stood and stands for other things besides the protection of slavery, but so, for that matter, did the Confederate flag, a concept she does not appear to be able to entertain with equanimity. By her own logic, she ought to burst into hysterics every time she spies Old Glory waving over the Capitol, and indeed, perhaps she does.

The Senate's patent for the UDC insignia, however, was never intended to be an endorsement of the Confederacy or even of its flag. It was an endorsement of the UDC. Opponents of the patent pointed out, correctly, that the UDC could protect its insignia by instruments other than the rather unusual means of a congressional resolution. So it can, but the special senatorial "endorsement" of the UDC has historically been intended to express the gratitude of the federal government to a private organization that has

donated to the American people millions of dollars in Civil War memorials and monuments, land for public parks, scholarships, work in veterans hospitals, and charitable services generally. As some defenders of the UDC and its patent suggest, maybe the Daughters should start asking for their contributions back, or maybe they should stop offering them. There is no reason why they should continue to bear the burden of their charities when all they receive for their labor are insults from the human refuse of the Senate.

Yet despite the ignorance, hypocrisy, ingratitude, mendacity, and cowardice exhibited by most of the Senators and despite the fanaticism and self-obsession revealed by the First Black Female Member of the Senate, Mrs. Moseley-Braun has one point in her favor. Unlike most of her colleagues, she understands the value and meaning of symbolism to the identity of a nation -- that is why she chose to make such a fuss about a "mere" symbol in the first place -- and it is precisely because she does understand it while many of her colleagues do not that the fuss she made represents something important. What it represents is the first wave of assault on the national identity as most Americans have historically understood it, and unless the kind of attack she mounted is repulsed and the social forces behind it reversed, the Confederate flag will be only the first casualty in the cultural war she and her allies are waging.

One who perceives the real meaning of Mrs. Moseley-Braun's

assault is Jonathan Yardley, book review editor and columnist of The Washington Post, who expatiated on the meaning of it all a few days after the First Black Female Member of the Senate's outburst.

Mr. Yardley is himself a Southerner of the tribe that advances itself by making certain the enemies of the South know he's on their side. There was a name for this tribe in the days of Reconstruction and even a means of dealing with it properly, but sadly those times are done. Mr. Yardley seized the occasion of the flap over the flag to make sure his bosses at the Post and his readers within the Beltway knew what he thought of the UDC, the flag, and those who came to their defense.

"The day has long since passed," he wrote, "when the UDC had the power to inject its genteel poison into the communal bloodstream. It now limps toward the end of the millennium a mere shade of its former self, the object of little except ridicule and neglect in all save those outposts of small-town Southern insularity in which it has always found a gentle welcome. ... the UDC is little more than a foolish relic of a past by now so distant as to seem prehistoric." So visible is Mr. Yardley's personal resentment at the symbols of the old Southern class system that it's fairly easy to guess in which corner of the barnyard his own forebears dissported themselves. The ladies of the UDC, he sneers, "for far too long have enjoyed the favor of the U.S. government," and they "must now look for a new image with which to adorn their scented letterheads and lace doilies; in

their present mood, a violated maiden recumbent upon a bed of straw, with Atlanta afire in the background, might be appropriate." Actually, burning cities and raped women would be more appropriate symbols of the present-day United States than Mr. Yardley prefers than they are of the Old South, which, for all its flaws of romanticism, generally understood how to prevent such things.

Mr. Yardley writes about the UDC like a blackballed freshman would write about the fraternities who declined the pleasure of his company. Yet whatever it is in his psyche or personal background that leads him to spit his own poison about a charitable organization that is at worst harmless and at best a generous source of historical, educational, and philanthropic service, Mr. Yardley correctly grasped the historic meaning of the First Black Female Member of the Senate's onslaught.

"The election of 1992," he writes, "changed the Senate -- and, by extension, American politics -- in ways we can only now begin to understand The old boys' club is breaking up, not merely the boys' club of the Senate but the boys' club of leadership and power. What is most significant about the election of Carol Moseley-Braun, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Patty Murray and others in the Class of '92 isn't that they are politicians of a different stripe but that they are people of a different stripe. They speak for backgrounds and experiences that until now have been quite unknown -- and thus unrepresented -- in the halls of

power; inevitably, this will change the way business is done in those halls."

Precisely. What we are seeing in the UDC episode is the first evidence at the level of the national government of the demographic changes and their cultural consequences that American society is experiencing and will continue to experience. Those changes, the direct result of a rising non-white birth rate reinforced by massive immigration from non-Western societies, will, as Mr. Yardley perceives, "inevitably" change the way business is done in this country, and not just in the Senate. The change is inevitable because it is inconceivable that people who are not and whose ancestors were not part of the historic defining core of the American nation will adopt the same norms, values, and beliefs and adhere to and respect the same political and social institutions that that core supported, and neither will they embrace the same symbols. As the historic nucleus of American civilization finds itself overwhelmed numerically -- indeed, well before it is overwhelmed numerically -- it will find that it can no longer elect political leadership willing and able to offer the protection and sanctions of the state to the norms and symbols that define its civilization. It will find that new leaders, more representative of the new demographic composition of the nation, will seek to redefine the norms and institutions of American life and that they will not hesitate to use political power to do so, and the only response that the new leadership will offer the older

norms and institutions is exactly the one offered by Mrs. Moseley-Braun to the Confederate flag. In short, when the country is composed of Mr. Yardley's "people of a different stripe," it will be a country of a different stripe, and the Confederate flag is merely the first symbol of the "racist" and "repressive" old civilization to be struck from the mast.

As the Census Bureau has shown in a recent report I discussed in a previous column in this space, the majority of the American population within 60 years will no longer be white. By that time, the change will certainly have been completed so far as the old American civilization is concerned, but we probably will not have to wait that long to witness it. One reason we won't is that the revolution will enjoy the active assistance of renegades like Senators Heflin and Moynihan and Mr. Yardley. They will not only welcome the revolution but will eagerly seek to clamber onto its back, and, as Mr. Yardley's own column about the UDC suggests, they will be among the first to help the enemies of the old civilization round up and hunt down the dwindling number of Americans who defend it.

Of course, they may not succeed in this tactic. If the demise of American civilization through racial and cultural revolution is already apparent on our horizon, in South Africa it has nearly arrived. Last summer, just about the time Mrs. Moseley-Braun was blubbering about the Confederate flag, some 12 white churchgoers in an affluent suburb of Capetown were butchered

by a gang of black terrorists. The church was Anglican, which has been one of the most adamant foes of apartheid, and its congregation was racially mixed, a rarity in that country. Not for the first time in history the apostles of progress were among the first of its victims, and the same pattern can be expected to occur in this country as our own apostles of "inevitable" change see their prophecies come to life.

Yet the revolution Mr. Yardley perceives and welcomes is "inevitable" only if its demographic and ideological premises are granted. I happen to subscribe to the quaint belief that it remains possible for Americans who do not welcome the revolution to challenge and reverse those premises. But to do so would require more than congressional resolutions and more than the monuments and memorials the Confederate Daughters so generously bequeath. As to whether the historic core of American civilization understands what would be required and whether it can still muster the strength to undertake it I make no prediction.■