

[Chronicles, January, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Globo-Cop

No small irony attended the announcement by FBI Director Louis Freeh on July 4 of last year that his Bureau was establishing a "legal attache" office in Moscow, and not only because the agency of the U.S. government historically responsible for counter-espionage had finally penetrated the capital city of its old adversary. July 4, as antiquarians may perhaps remember, is Independence Day, and what was being announced on this particular occasion was yet another quiet step away from the very concepts of national independence, autonomy, and sovereignty -- not, to be sure, quite as large a step as NAFTA, GATT, or the transference to the United Nations of command over American troops and the power to order the United States to go to war, which came later in the summer with the invasion of Haiti, but a definite step nonetheless and an important one. Unlike the traditional observation of July 4, however, there were no fireworks, save in the pyrotechnic oratory with which the new chief globo-cop sought to edify his audience.

"We have no time to waste," Judge Freeh breathlessly puffed.

"The enemy has already broken through the gates," and the creation of the Russian branch of the "legal attache" office -- known as "LEGATS" in the Global Newspeak that is now replacing

real languages -- was by no means the first of its kind. Unveiled near the conclusion of a 10-day tour of the capitals of Eastern Europe, the LEGATS on the Volga was in fact the 22nd FBI office to be established abroad for the ostensible purposes of keeping tabs on drug smugglers, terrorists, white collar criminals, ethnic cleansers, octogenarian janitors from Dachau, white racialists who refuse to spy for the BATF, indoor smokers, unlicensed religious crackpots, gunowners who buy more than one gun a month, businessmen who clean up swamps on their own property, and other dangerous and unsavory folk whose worldwide wickedness purportedly transcends the capacities of poor little old sovereign mega-states to bring them to heel. With his fellow bureaucrat Thomas Constantine of the Drug Enforcement Administration and some 20 other law enforcement potentates from the Justice and Treasury Departments, Judge Freeh oozed about the "beginnings of a global strategy against organized crime" and sternly intoned that "organized crime groups are working to supplant governments, and any government that ignores the fact does so at its own peril." All that was lacking from the well-orchestrated performance was a picture of the Insidious Dr. Fu Manchu to lend concrete detail to Judge Freeh's adumbrations of a vast, sinister, and all but invincible criminal conspiracy against Civilization Itself.

It has long been recognized that ever since the collapse of the Soviet Union the architects of the transnational regime labeled the "New World Order" have been searching for a new enemy.

Saddam Hussein was and periodically continues to be useful for mobilizing troops when the incumbent president needs a quick war

to see him through an election or take the proletarians' minds off a celebrity homicide trial grown tiresome, but Hussein and similar Hitleroids are never sufficiently convincing to justify the long-term structural planning the global leviathan needs. Nor, by themselves, are the various drug cartels, terrorist gangs, secret societies of Nazi war criminals plotting to clone each other and take over the planet next Thursday, or any of the other pathetic stock villains with which the masses are manipulated into believing we still have serious enemies and therefore still need a mega-state to protect us against them.

But, if you lump all these odd characters together, call it "organized crime," and claim that only new heights of governmental power on a global scale can control or contain or otherwise save us from the organized criminals, then you're in business. That, of course, is what Judge Freeh and his platoon of mega-crats were up to in their junket to Eastern Europe last summer. When you think about what the emerging global law enforcement apparatus might be capable of doing, it makes the atrocities of Waco and the U.S. government's murderous assault on Randy Weaver and his family look innocent and the supposed "organized criminals" against whom the new globo-cops are being deployed look like freedom fighters.

The depiction of global organized crime as a "threat" against which the United States and other nations must pool their joint resources is in part driven by the self-interest of aging professional Cold Warriors and an elite of national security

managers who in the absence of threats to national security would be forced to sell real estate and insurance. Thus, Roy Godson and William Olson of the National Strategy Information Center (NSIC), a stable of Reaganite Cold Warhorses in the 1970s and '80s, have now turned their energies from crafting apologies for the intelligence services to thinking up plausible rationales for pretending that we really need to fear pimps and drug peddlers in Burma and Thailand. "Global networks" of criminal gangs, they argue, "provide mobility, an effective communications infrastructure and international connections for criminal enterprise," and according to a cover story by Leslie Alan Horvitz in Insight magazine last summer, these "networks" deal in illicit goods and services in the same way as multinational corporations. "Godson and Olson estimate that international crime rings outperform most Fortune 500 companies," writes Insight.

Well, no doubt they do, but the existence of transnational crime is hardly new -- it was known in the modern world at least as long ago as the Caribbean pirates of the 17th and 18th centuries -- and hardly constitutes a valid reason for centralizing law enforcement powers in new transnational structures. Pirates like Blackbeard and his comrades were dealt with summarily by the fleets and citizens of sovereign nations, and it never occurred to anyone in those days to pretend that it was necessary to set up new transnational bureaucracies to perform functions that existing national governments were perfectly

capable of performing and did in fact perform. But of course a legitimate concern over transnational crime is not the only, and maybe not even a real, rationale for creating global police. The Insight article also quoted liberal Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts, not exactly an old Cold Warrior, who held hearings on international crime last year and, when he talks about the subject, sounds like a National Review editor of the 1950s contemplating communism. "The overall international organized crime threat to our interests is more serious than we had assumed," Sen. Kerry trembles. "Organized crime is the new communism, the new monolithic threat."

But of course, organized crime, even at its worst, is in no sense a "monolithic threat." It is a loose conglomerate of not-very-bright gangsters looking for a quick buck who are more often at each other's throats than those of law-abiding Americans or even congressmen and senators. Yet it is convenient to present international organized crime as a "monolithic threat" because only if it is such could an equally monolithic global bureaucracy be created to handle it. It is just such a transnational monolith that people like Sen. Kerry want to create as part of the governing apparatus of the New World Order.

It makes lots of sense for the embryonic global government to have its own police force, and already the legal foundations of global law enforcement have been established through the U.N. Genocide Convention and similar "international crimes," including

war crimes. The United Nations has already set up tribunals for the trial of war crimes in the Balkans and Rwanda, though the debate over the former was somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the proponents of trying and punishing war criminals in Serbia had not yet agreed on what exactly the punishment was to be. That ought to suggest one of the main problems, from the standpoint of procedural justice, with the whole concept of "war crimes" and international crimes in general, since deciding to punish defendants for crimes before deciding on what the punishment -- or indeed what exactly the crime -- is probably has not been done since the days of Caligula or King John, if not of the Red Queen in Alice in Wonderland. Of course, what the architects of the global police are seeking is neither real justice nor real security, but a precedent, a clear case in which the horrors of the crimes committed inflame public imagination to the point that extra-legal intervention by the "international community" is seen as justified and can then serve as a model for future regularization of such intervention as a routine. In both the Rwandan and Haitian interventions last year, the Clinton administration came close to establishing a basis for just such action in the future in far less notorious cases.

The globalization of law enforcement, however, is merely an extension of the nationalization of law enforcement that the managerial left has pursued since at least the 1930s in this country. One of the long-standing complaints against J. Edgar

Hoover among liberals has always been that he "ignored" or "denied the existence of" organized crime in the United States, and probably today most Americans, even conservatives, share that criticism of the man who built the FBI up from a seedy, incompetent, highly politicized, and outright crooked reservoir of Republican veterans of Teapot Dome in the the 1920s into the world's foremost law enforcement agency at the time of his death.

Hoover may well have been too quick to reject the existence of organized crime, but behind his refusal to admit its existence there was a principled opposition to the centralizing trend of the

national state. As his biographer Richard Gid Powers writes,

When the FBI killed a Dillinger, it was because local authorities had been unable to deal with the criminal before he finally did something that came under federal jurisdiction, and not because the overall situation was a federal responsibility. The national crime problem, according to Hoover's formulation, was a local one; the FBI could help by giving the local police technical assistance and by furnishing them with a model of professionalism.

It was in fact Hoover's lifelong battle to prevent the total usurpation of law enforcement by the national government, and as early as 1933, he wrote in a memorandum to Franklin Roosevelt's first Attorney General, Homer Cummings, a zealous pusher of nationalization, that "it is perhaps not overlooked, but it is certainly under-emphasized, that the [crime] problem is a State one."

Indeed, it might be noted that the foremost crusaders against

organized crime since the 1930s have consistently been on the political left -- Estes Kefauver and Robert Kennedy -- and that their crusade has generally exploited the sensationalism of organized crime to enhance federal police powers. In Hoover's early days, most organized crime, aside from Prohibition Era bootlegging, for the apprehension of which there was a separate federal agency, was by its very nature local, in the form of the vice traffic -- gambling, prostitution, and narcotics -- and extortion. Neither the FBI nor most of the rest of the federal government had any more jurisdiction or business intervening in the cities and states to enforce the laws of those localities than the United States has in intervening in Russia and Rwanda to enforce their laws. The demand for the Bureau to "get involved" in the "fight against organized crime" thus reduced to a simple demand that local and state authority be pushed aside as corrupt and inefficient and that the power of the federal mega-state replace it with the integrity and competence characteristic of swollen bureaucracy. As it turns out, this was precisely the argument mounted by Judge Freeh himself in Senate testimony last spring, when he remarked, in the breathless tones characteristic of him, that "More must be done, because we cannot allow the same kinds of mistakes to be made today ... that were made in responding to the threat of gangsterism that swept through the United States in the twenties and thirties." There is, then, a precise parallel between the efforts to nationalize law

enforcement in the earlier period, efforts successfully thwarted by Hoover, and the efforts today to globalize the same functions of government.

Thus, neither the "war" against organized crime waged by the federal government since the 1920s nor the incipient "war" against international crime today is really concerned with crime. What they are both concerned with, and what they both represent, is merely the continuing quest for centralized power -- first on the national level against states and localities, second on a global, transnational level against the nation-state itself -- by bureaucratic elites that have now acquired the skills and the technologies that enable them to disengage from their own nations and cultures and to grasp for autonomous power on a worldwide scale. The incessant refrain of both phases of centralization is the lie that the smaller, local and national governments of the Old American Republic are not competent to fight the really tough, smart, big, well-heeled, and vicious criminals that plague us today and that only the really tough, smart, big, well-heeled, and vicious mega-state can go toe-to-toe with the global Napoleons of Crime that haunt the imaginations of Hollywood screenwriters and the ghostwritten testimony of congressional hearings.

Yet there is virtually no evidence that greater centralization of law enforcement is any more efficient at stopping crime than the United Nations has been in preventing and punishing genocide. After 60 years of increasing federal

intrusion into law enforcement, we have cities through which it is not safe to walk in broad daylight, and all the congressional crime bills and federal gun control laws have done and will do nothing to make them safer. Now we are told that even the nation-state itself is as obsolete as local and state autonomy and that only by setting up a super-national power, over which neither local and state nor even American authorities will exercise control, can the new "enemy," the ubiquitous and immortal "monolithic threat," of global crime be expelled from our gates. We have heard it all before, and those of us who remember what Independence Day is supposed to represent will be no more eager to sign up in the global war on crime than in any of the other and no less fraudulent wars the mega-state has declared against the enemies it invents for its own purposes.■

[Chronicles, February, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Racialpolitik

Whatever it is that the emerged Republican majority does with the immense congressional power it seized in last November's elections, it will probably be unimportant compared to the force that has just started emerging in the same elections and which the national leadership of the Republican Party, and even more the Democratic Party, sedulously tried to ignore, deny, denounce, and destroy. The emergence of the Republican majority, of course, is important in terms of the conventional politics of the nation. Not only has it converted the remaining tenure of the Clinton administration into a two-year-long sequel to "Night of the Living Dead," this time with the zombies lurching around murderously in the Oval Office, but also it represents the effective end of the New Deal electoral coalition and a great leap forward in the political consciousness of the Middle American Revolution.

By themselves those two developments are enough to make the elections of 1994 a major event in American history. But the end of the coalition that formed the electoral foundation of 20th century liberalism does not necessarily mean that a genuinely anti-liberal coalition has permanently crystallized, nor does the Republican victory mean the Republicans are authentic or adequate leaders of the revolution from which they have gained at least

temporary congressional dominance.

Since its inception in the 19th century, the Republican Party has been wedded to the myth of Economic Man, the myth that holds that the desire for material gain is the principal if not the only muscle that throbs in the human breast and that therefore all historical events can be adequately explained in terms of economic motivation. Most Republicans are probably not aware that they share this myth with unemployed Russian Marxists and too-long-employed American college professors, but the persistence of the myth in what passes for the Republican mind is evident in last year's "Contract with America," with all its budget-balancing, tax-cutting, welfare-reforming, economic incentive proposals. It remains to be seen how many of the "Contract"'s actual promises the Republican leadership was serious about, how much the leadership and the party will be able or willing to enact, and how much is even possible to implement, given what seem to be some of its glaring contradictions. But even if all of the Contract sails through Congress, escapes the ignominious fate of a veto from the nation's First Zomby, and latches itself onto the American way of life as firmly as sit-coms and Social Security, it will do little to fill the tank of what is now rapidly becoming the principal motor of the Middle American Revolution.

That motor, the force that the established leadership of both parties sought to smother, is, in a word, race, and it is evident in the controversy over the most controversial issue in the November elections, California's Proposition 187. That proposition was far more controversial than Ollie North or the

role of the religious right, and unlike them, it will remain with us, shaping the practical politics and the impractical political conversation of the nation, for decades to come.

Ostensibly, of course, 187 was not at all about race but merely a proposal to prohibit illegal aliens from obtaining public services, mainly welfare, public education, and non-emergency public health care, but as is often the case with political issues, what the ballot measure ostensibly was about is not what it really was about. The racial meaning of the measure became clear as the day for the vote approached, with mass rallies of thousands of Hispanics waving Mexican flags occupying public buildings, screaming at policemen and anyone else who attracted their attention, and vocally threatening to burn the cities and the state to cinders if Americans dared vote contrary to the passions of the mobs. On at least one occasion, they beat up an elderly American who had the courage to sport the American flag in expressing his support of 187. The man was luckier than the flag he bore, which the mob promptly burned. These were clear expressions of a militant non-white and anti-American racial consciousness, which the press invariably described as "peaceful."

Just to show how peaceful they were, the National Guard and the Los Angeles Police Department was placed on full alert in the event that Prop 187 actually passed.

In the event, of course, 187 passed overwhelmingly by 59 percent to 41 percent, but it is in the ethnic and racial

breakdown of the vote that the meaning of the proposition for the emergence of racial consciousness is most evident. From exit polls conducted by the Los Angeles Times during the voting, it appears that 63 percent of white Californians supported 187, while 53 percent of blacks, 53 percent of Asians, and a whopping 77 percent of Hispanics opposed it. The racial division is obvious: Non-whites voted together in opposing a measure that was portrayed, almost entirely by its foes, as racially driven, while whites, who still make up 81 percent of the California electorate, supported it by what is usually regarded as a landslide margin. The racial division is evident also in the breakdown of the national vote, in which 63 percent of white men supported the Republicans. As Thomas Edsall wrote in The Washington Post shortly after the election, the mass defection of white males to the GOP "violates a core concept at the heart of the Democratic Party as the party of working people. White men are those experiencing the largest wage declines, the brunt of defense cutbacks and the dramatic attenuation of corporate loyalty."

The racial meaning of the vote for 187 is hardly surprising with respect to non-whites. For years now, politically organized non-white minorities in the United States have openly boasted of their racial consciousness, developed nationally powerful lobby groups to represent their interests, and have effectively legitimized the belief that it is their right to think, feel, vote, and behave as members of their own racial identity while

delegitimizing the same belief for whites. Many, indeed perhaps most, whites have permitted this development and even encouraged or supported it, though some more aggressively than others. But what the vote for 187 tells us about whites is that they are now starting to vote for their own interests as a racial group, in opposition to the interests of other races. If that trend continues, and there is every reason to believe it will, what it logically implies is the emergence of an overtly racial politics in the United States of the kind that we have not seen before.

Of course, not all whites supported 187, and most prominent among those who actually attacked it were presidential perennial Jack Kemp and Bill "Mr. Virtue" Bennett himself. The two neo-conservatives hastened to California to harangue the masses with their insight that "the American national identity is not based on ethnicity, or race, or national origin, or religion. The American national identity is based on a creed, on a set of principles and ideas." Of course, that is a common view of the American identity, one that has been repeatedly expressed throughout our history, though there are at least two problems with it. In the first place it happens to be untrue. In the second place it happens to be a dangerous and even suicidal claim.

It is untrue because the major fact about American national identity is that it is an identity created by British settlers and later European immigrants and therefore is almost exclusively the achievement of whites. Whatever wise pleasantries of universalism

may turn up in the patriotic oratory and public documents of American history, no one can claim that the American identity is really the kind of watery abstraction the Kemp-Bennett statement purports it to be. Behind and beneath those pleasantries lie the concrete identity, experience, and aspirations of a homogeneous people "of a common blood," as Jefferson put it in his draft of the Declaration of Independence, and to reduce that essentially racial as well as cultural heritage to the bloodless "principles and ideals" that Mr. Kemp and Mr. Bennett busy themselves tooting is not only a confession of the most dismal ignorance but also a trumpeting of the most brazen betrayal.

Moreover, the Kemp-Bennett claim is dangerous because it fundamentally misunderstands the nature of a nation or of any collective political identity other than a debating society. If indeed being an American were "based on a creed, on a set of principles and ideas," then any person in the world who adhered to that creed would be an American. That might be fine with the open borders crowd whom the Kemp-Bennett statement was designed to please, but it also means that any person who does not adhere to the creed is not an American, and in asserting the credal identity of the United States, the Kemp-Bennett statement comes close to formulating the grounds of a new totalitarianism. The Soviet Union was "based on a creed," and Russians who dissented from the creed were punished severely. How else indeed could a state defining itself through a creed cohere? So far from opening the

national gates to anyone who wants to come here, defining American national identity in terms of a creed actually guarantees a closed and perhaps brutally repressive regime and implies nothing whatsoever about what kind of welcome we might give to immigrants.

In the first place, if you believe in the Creed, you can be a perfectly good American in the slums of Buenos Aires or the jungles of Rwanda, just as you can be a perfectly good Christian or a perfectly good libertarian or a perfectly good communist, and there's no reason at all for you to come here or go anywhere. In the second place, if adhering to the Creed is what makes you an American, then why not give creed tests to all immigrants, or indeed to native Americans, and if they don't subscribe to the Gospel according to Jack and Bill, round 'em up and send 'em back.

No one knows what any of the immigrants to this country, legal or illegal, past or present, believe or have believed, and there is no reason for anyone to be examined or tested as to what they believe before being admitted. The credal basis of national identity that Mr. Kemp and Mr. Bennett blather about may sound both high-minded and broad-minded, but upon any but the most superficial examination, it (like so much else of what they have to say) turns out to be transparently false and, if it were taken any more seriously than most of the slogans and bumper-stickers that pass for high political theory among neo-conservatives, could serve as the basis of a far more restrictive regime than any nativist has ever conceived.

Despite the defection of white neo-conservatives and the left, the emergence of an overtly racial politics among whites in the vote for 187 suggests that in the future, race will become a significant element in what it means to be an American at all, and that is hardly unprecedented. As the late M.E. Bradford pointed out in an essay on immigration, the very first congressional naturalization statute in 1790 restricted American citizenship to "any alien, being a free white person," and Bradford commented that "all of the Framers clearly expected that it would be Europeans who presented themselves for 'membership' here." Stephen Douglas, in his opening shot in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, could say to the cheers of his Illinois audience that "I believe this government was made on the white basis. I believe it was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and I am in favor of confining the citizenship to white men -- men of European birth and European descent, instead of conferring it upon Negroes and Indians, and other inferior races." Douglas, of course, won the election, though his opponent did all he could to persuade the voters that he didn't disagree on such points. As late as 1965, the federal immigration code restricted immigration on the basis of "national origin" (largely a circumlocution for race), and as Lawrence Auster has shown, the repeal of the law was possible only because supporters of repeal denied it would alter the ethnic and racial composition of the nation.

The vote for Proposition 187 goes far to relegitimize the racial aspect of the American national identity, and the overwhelming white support for the measure suggests that an overt racial identity is now emerging as part of Middle American political and cultural consciousness. If other races and ethnic groups can identify themselves and act in terms of their own racial identities, it should hardly surprise them and their white allies that whites themselves sooner or later will also begin to do so. But the larger meaning of the emergence of racial politics in America is that it directly challenges the myth of Economic Man in which both the left and the right cloak themselves. Their own allegiance to that myth is the real reason why Mr. Kemp and Mr. Bennett denounced 187 so bitterly and why the Republican Party as a whole finds immigration such a difficult issue. The emergence of racialpolitik means that there is something besides material gain that drives human beings, and those who adhere to the mythology of Economic Man have no room for that something in their world-view. As racial consciousness begins to mature among white Americans as it has among non-whites, therefore, Economic Man and those elites that work for him are likely to find themselves in the ranks of the permanently unemployed.■

[Chronicles, April, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Gnostic Newt

The hallmark of the sophomoric mind is that it knows what adult minds do but has not yet figured out how to do it. Bright undergraduates who solemnly inform their professors that they plan to write term papers applying what they've read about the latest fads of pop psychology to the enduring problems of literature and history are fairly typical specimens of the breed. They know that mature scholars spend their lives trying to apply new ideas to old problems, but in their own immaturity they have not yet learned how to tell which new ideas might offer useful approaches to such problems, which ideas are worthwhile but irrelevant, and which ideas are merely foolish. Hence, the papers they eventually submit to their teachers are usually minor disasters of ingenious but misapplied erudition.

Sophomoric minds are common enough in colleges, but sometimes they never grow up. Sometimes indeed they manage to gain Ph.D.'s and teach college, and occasionally they get themselves elected to Congress. But only once in a century or so does a perpetual sophomore become Speaker of the House of Representatives, with a majority of his own party behind him. Such an event is now upon us, and the consequences of a sophomoric mind unleashed and equipped with real political power may turn out to be a good deal

more disastrous than those of silly college term papers.

Most Americans and even most Republicans who knew who Newt Gingrich was before last November's Republican sweep of House and Senate probably had no idea of what for years he has thought and believed, and when in January he began to unbosom his wisdom in nationally noticed speeches, those who listened to him must have been astonished. It is a fair and reasonable interpretation of last year's elections that the citizens who voted for the Republicans did so because they generally wanted such mundane desiderata as lower taxes, safer cities and neighborhoods, smaller government, more controls on immigration, and less meddling abroad. Probably not a single voter in the United States cast his ballot for a Republican (or indeed a Democrat) because he thought it would accelerate a world-historical transformation comparable to the transition to agriculture in prehistoric times or the industrial revolution of the 18th century. It is just such a transformation, however, to which Mr. Gingrich is personally dedicated and to which he now seems determined to deliver the country, if not the planet.

The transformation is what Mr. Gingrich and his personal gurus like to call the "Third Wave," a term they take from the best-selling tract of pop futurism by Alvin Toffler, and no sooner had the 104th Congress convened than Mr. Gingrich himself showed up at a day-long conference with Mr. Toffler and the latter's ubiquitous wife Heidi to proclaim the arrival of the New Age. The conference, on the topic of "Virtual America," was sponsored by

the Progress and Freedom Foundation, run by former Gingrich staff aide Jeff Eisenach, and in addition to the new Speaker it sported former Congressman Vin Weber and the lovely if largely brainless Ariana Huffington, who, while everyone else was palavering about the Third Wave, had some thoroughly unremarkable revelations to impart about what she calls the Fourth Instinct.

But never mind the Fourth Instinct for now. Keep your eye on the Third Wave, which, it turns out, is the epochal social, economic, and political change supposedly induced by the arrival of computers and similar post-industrial technologies. As Toffler himself described it in his 1980 book, "The Third Wave brings with it a genuinely new way of life based on diversified, renewable energy sources; on methods of production that make most factory assembly lines obsolete; on new, non-nuclear families; on a novel institution that might be called the 'electronic cottage'; and on radically changed schools and corporations of the future." Mr. Toffler always characterizes the coming age in the most breathless and dramatically utopian (not to say apocalyptic) terms -- "The emergent civilization writes a new code of behavior for us. ... The new civilization ... will topple bureaucracies, reduce the role of the nation-state ... [and] could ... turn out to be the first truly humane civilization on earth."

The "First Wave," you see, was the agricultural revolution of Neolithic times, and it took thousands of years for its implications to unfold. The Second Wave was the industrial

revolution, and it took only a couple of centuries to waft us to the crest of the third one. Now, armed with laptops and lasers, we can surf into the final high-tech happyland under the mellow guidance of Mr. Gingrich himself.

Mr. Gingrich himself, it turns out, believes almost all of it, just as a college sophomore believes everything he reads in the New York Times, and he's believed it for years. In his book Window of Opportunity, which bears a somewhat qualified endorsement from Toffler (they disagree on the issues of abortion and school prayer) and somewhat less guarded ones from Ronald Reagan and Jack Kemp, Mr. Gingrich expatiated on just a few of the wonders of the coming era. The first wonder he mentioned was "a home video-computer system which would film your golf swing" and tell you how to improve it. Then there was the "personalized health chair," which would record what and how much you should eat and "allow a lot more people to stay out of nursing homes" (he said nothing in this book about orphanages). There will be "an interactive computerized income tax package," a "retirement rules and regulations package," a computer directory for federal parks and monuments, new techniques for helping the handicapped, and (perhaps Mr. Gingrich's favorite, at least next to spiffing up his golf swing), new techniques for learning and "information accessing." "We continue to behave as though we lived in the age of books or even in the age of orally imparted knowledge," Mr. Gingrich complained in his book.

Speaking at the "Virtual America" conference on Jan. 10, he made clear that his views haven't changed much since the above passages were published (in 1984 -- no comment), except perhaps that he now sees his own role in leading the nation and perhaps the world into the Third Wave as rather larger than he did then. Taking from Toffler the idea that the world situation today is comparable to that of the 1770s and 1780s, a period Mr. Gingrich described as "the transition from the end of the medieval agrarian society to the rise of the commercial and ultimately manufacturing society," he noted the role of Adam Smith as the prophet of the industrial age with British Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger, "surrounded by the disciples of Smith," actually implementing the political changes appropriate to the Second Wave.

The analogy is pretty clear. Just as Smith was the ideological prophet of the Second Wave and Pitt its political spearhead, so today Toffler is the prophet of the Third Wave and Mr. Gingrich is its Pitt. Mr. Gingrich, himself a Ph.D. in history from Tulane, is reported to read omnivorously the lives and careers of such titanic leaders of the past as the Duke of Wellington, Bismarck, and Franklin Roosevelt, and certainly his speeches are larded with allusions to such figures, especially Roosevelt, whom he seems to see as a model for contemporary statecraft.

Indeed, what is transparent about the whole Third Wave paradigm, for those familiar with the thought of the late Eric

Voegelin, who was perhaps the very antithesis of a sophomoric mind, is that Toffler's view of the contemporary world situation and Mr. Gingrich's own elaboration of that view are almost literal manifestations of what Voegelin called "gnosticism," the ancient religious and philosophical movement that for a time was a significant rival to Christianity and which Voegelin saw as the intellectual and spiritual ancestor of modern totalitarianism. Voegelin identified four main "symbols" as characterizing gnostic movements, whether the religious ones of antiquity or their messianic political descendants of modern times.

The first symbol, he wrote, "is the conception of history as a sequence of three ages, of which the third age is intelligibly the final Third Realm," the last stage of history in which the perfection of the world, society, and man is achieved through "gnosis," knowledge that usually is imparted through a kind of mystical illumination rather than rational communication. Voegelin identified the Marxist "third age" of proletarian communism and the national socialist "Third Reich" as the symbols of those specific gnostic movements. "The second symbol," Voegelin wrote, "is that of the leader," while the third symbol is that of the prophet, the one carrying out the heavy lifting for practical utopianism while the other works out and proclaims the theory. The fourth symbol is that of the "brotherhood of autonomous persons," which in modern gnostic movements consists of the party, the race, the proletariat, or other collectivities that

are supposed to be the historic agents of secular salvation.

The Toffler-Gingrich Third Wave paradigm incorporates most of the symbols of gnosticism. The "Third Wave" itself is the Third Realm, while Toffler is the Prophet and Mr. Gingrich the Leader of the Realm. The "brotherhood of autonomous persons" is less apparent, but no doubt it will emerge in time as those who adhere to the paradigm and to Mr. Gingrich's unquestioned leadership of it crystallize. But, as the prophet and the leader explain the Third Wave, the new realm they aim to construct appears to be the antithesis of totalitarianism. Thus, Mr Gingrich at the "Virtual America" conference insisted that "everywhere on the planet, we are saying that the information age means more decentralization, more market orientation, more freedom for individuals, more opportunity for choice, more capacity to be productive without controls by the state."

Of course, he's not the only one to believe so, and it is now a commonplac to think that the new technologies of computers and high-tech communications will lead to decentralization. Jude Wanniski, George Gilder, Vin Weber, and Jack Kemp, among others, are those on the "right" who are most vociferous in proclaiming this new gospel -- even as transnational trade pacts and organizations gobble and centralize old nations and regions and even as new communications conglomerates absorb smaller competitors. The truth is that what Mr. Gingrich and his fellow Third Wavers think is decentralization is in fact the very

opposite. The "personalized health chair" that he predicted in his book is a fairly clear example. By connecting your body and its signals to a centralized hospital or health center, you are hardly governing your own diet, health, and physical regimen. You are merely turning it over to (a) the centralized bureaucracy from which comes the information on what your weight, blood pressure, diet, temperature, exercise regimen, etc., "should" be and (b) to the computer itself. What you do when you sit down in Mr. Gingrich's health chair is surrender your own body to its computerized therapies and standards and at the same time surrender your own mind to the decisions it tells you to make.

Much the same is true of all the rest of the new technology. Its whole point is to "hook you in" to networks, information bases, services, etc., that you neither control nor construct and which remain far more centralized than the books for which Mr. Gingrich seems to show so much contempt. All these gadgets and services no doubt have their value, from curing the handicapped to improving your golf game, but have no illusion that they will make you free. Computers and the rest of the new post-industrial technology offer opportunities for human enslavement undreamt of by the gnostic prophets and leaders of the past.

In claiming -- quite seriously, as far as anyone can tell -- that technology rather than human ideas, moral values, and social institutions will make us free, Mr. Gingrich is recapitulating an idea profoundly characteristic of gnosticism. Technology itself

is the "gnosis" of this particular movement, and once we are illuminated (and thus liberated) by its glow, not only will we no longer need such Second Wave contraptions as books but also we'll have done with the whole musty structure of traditional civilization that Mr. Toffler so happily chirps into oblivion. The dehumanized vision of the future that he and Leader Gingrich share may yield a certain amount of decentralization and "opportunity" in the short run, but the more the machines of the Third Wave replace social institutions and moral disciplines, make no mistake about how much freedom from the First and Second Waves will remain on the beach. ■

[CHRONICLES, May, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Voices in the Air

By the middle of the second month of the Republican Revolution, acute observers were beginning to see that the revolution might actually go somewhere if only the Republicans weren't in charge of it. Aside from such irritating contretemps as the discussions of Speaker Newt Gingrich's book deal, his instantaneous dumping of historian Christina Jeffries when her criticisms of a curriculum on the Nazi persecution of European Jews came to light, and his irrepressible habit of unbosoming his every thought and neurological reflex to a bewildered press and citizenry, the prospects of the revolution dimmed considerably when Mr. Gingrich and his counterpart in the Senate, Bob Dole, eagerly signed on to the bailout of a bankrupt Mexico and began to back away from some of their own revolution's commitments.

Mr. Gingrich had second thoughts about ending welfare for immigrants, despite the obvious popular support for doing so, and second thoughts again about repealing the notorious "assault weapons" ban enacted with Republican help in the last months of the previous Congress, despite the obvious debt of the new Republican majority to the votes of outraged gunowners. On all these issues -- the bailout, the immigrants, and guns -- he was obliged by pressures from within his own party, especially

freshmen Republicans considerably to the right of him and Mr. Dole, to reverse himself yet again and exude third thoughts. But since exuding thoughts is never difficult for the Speaker, his political ping-pong was not the main problem.

On the more substantive commitments of the party to its "Contract with America" there was definite progress, though many rank and file Republicans and conservatives asked themselves exactly why the Contract's sometimes arcane pledges were important at all. Several items in the Contract involving rather radical constitutional changes threatened to turn what remains of the U.S. Constitution into the kind of voluminous and indecipherable document more familiar to such governments as those of Bolivia and Botswana, and even with a Republican majority in the House, some parts of the Contract could not pass without suffering amputation of their more radical and meaningful provisions. Nor was there any language in the Contract that committed its signatories to the wholesome task of eliminating whole departments and agencies of the federal leviathan, abolishing affirmative action, or reversing the ruin inflicted on the Republic by generations of judicial insanity, though individual Republican members or Senators did mutter about engaging these issues on their own.

Revolutions, however, exhaust themselves rather quickly, even when fed by passions and ideological fixations considerably fiercer than those known to drive the souls of Republicans, and by locking the House and Senate on the immediate goal of enacting the Contract's promises, the Republican leadership may have ensured that any further and more substantial radical proclivities in

Republican breasts would be smothered before they had a chance to squeak. Indeed, even as the 104th Congress convened to begin implementing the revolution, it was advised by its self-appointed egghead, Bill Kristol, to eschew serious reforms from the right until the Republicans had also captured the presidency. The Republicans, it seems, were about as ready for their own revolution as a college freshman is to start studying for his final exams.

Yet the main problem with the Republican Revolution comes not from the questionable conduct or judgment of its leaders or from any lack of legislative skills. The main problem is simply that the Republican Party finds it almost impossible to conceive of public policies and legislation in anything but economic terms, that it remains wedded to the world-view associated with the myth of Economic Man. No matter how often Republicans dip their knees to "family values," the religious right, and "cultural issues," and no matter how much they exploit patriotic sentiment by contriving to nominate such military titans as Ulysses S. Grant or Colin Powell for president, it is only when dollars and cents are being talked about that the Republican eye begins to gleam and the Republican lip trembles with lachrymose enthusiasm.

The myth of Economic Man, like myths in general, is today less a consciously embraced theory of human nature and history than an intellectual archaism from the bourgeois order of the 19th century, when the Republicans led the nation in crushing a region

that did not embrace the myth and proceeded to construct around it what was essentially the "Second Republic" of American history between the Civil War and the New Deal. Perhaps the only wise sentence that John Maynard Keynes ever uttered was his well-known insight, at the end of his General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money, that "Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas." Leaving aside his skepticism about the power of vested interests (a skepticism rather implausible when the Mexican bailout is considered), Lord Keynes could have been describing (and may have been describing) the Republican Party of the 20th century.

The myth of Economic Man, in so far as it can be accurately expressed, holds that human beings are driven mainly or even exclusively by considerations of material gain and loss, and therefore that the key to understanding history is the calculation of which economic interests prevail and what those interests are.

From that dubious generalization, its adherents elicit a moral imperative, that economic calculations should prevail, and that therefore the value of any course of action, especially public policies, should be judged in terms of whether and how much they

enhance material gain. This myth and its derivatives are the foundation stones of both socialism (especially its Marxist version) and capitalism, and it is no accident that Karl Marx was as indebted to the classical economists who helped unleash the myth on the modern mind as he was enchanted by the American Civil War and the Second Republic it initiated as progressive forward steps of world-historical significance. The main practical difference between the socialist and capitalist versions of the myth is simply that each perceives different roads toward their shared goals of the full dinner pail. It tells us something about both communists and Republicans that they think utopia consists of eating out of a bucket.

In the case of Republicans, almost all of the principal contents of the Contract with America have to do with explicitly economic issues -- the balanced budget amendment, the line item veto, unfunded mandates, welfare reform, tax reform, and even the proposal to alter the accounting method by which U.S. participation in U.N. peacekeeping missions is calculated. Popular discontent with immigration is conveniently dismissed as mere racial scapegoating provoked by economic dislocations, and immigration itself is seen as entirely the result of economic dysfunctions in Mexico and Latin America. Change the economy, and both immigration and opposition to it will go away. The whole debate over immigration is conventionally conducted only in terms of whether it is good or bad for the American economy, not whether

it will alter the basic shape of the national culture. The conventional explanations of urban crime and welfare dependency also are that they are the results of economic incentives foolishly created by urban policies that ignore the universal economic motors of human nature. Create the right incentives through enterprise zones and Project HOPE and we'll end crime, welfare, and poverty. The debates over NAFTA and GATT also were largely confined to their effects on the economy rather than their impact on national sovereignty, and indeed the myth of Economic Man implies that nations themselves are insignificant compared to the appetites for accumulation that drive human individuals.

Hence, it is not surprising that the prophecies of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in The Communist Manifesto about the disappearance of the nation-state closely resemble what Mr. Gingrich's main guru, Alvin Toffler, predicts in his pop futurist best-seller, The Third Wave. "The workingmen have no country," preached the fathers of communism. "National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto." Mr. Toffler essentially agrees, writing "it is questionable how effectively national borders can be sealed off -- or for how long.

For the shift toward a Third Wave industrial base requires the development of a highly ramified, sensitive, wide open 'neural

network' or information system, and attempts by individual nations to dam up data flows may interfere with, rather than accelerate, their own economic development. ... All such developments -- the new economic problems, the new environmental problems, and the new communications technologies -- are converging to undermine the position of the nation-state in the global scheme of things."

Of course, in the global scheme of things, just the opposite has come true. Marx's workingmen enthusiastically supported the belligerent nationalisms of World War I, and the collapse of communism and the end of the Cold War have witnessed a nationalist renaissance on every continent. What is interesting about the false predictions, however, is that they were based on economic calculations, and the persistence of nationalist sentiments and energies simply didn't fit into the equations of either prophet.

Whether consciously or not, the friends of Economic Man simply ignore and omit from their calculations, analyses, projections, prophecies, and policies whatever doesn't fit the mythological assumptions from which their schemes evolve, and therefore they are always shocked to witness mass movements that ignore economic interests and center around charismatic leaders, traditional but practically useless symbols and images, and imperatives that demand exertions that make no economic sense, the postponement of immediate gratification, the denial of sensual satisfactions, and the sacrifice of life itself. Nor can public policies based on this mythology encompass very many of the social

realities around which human existence revolves.

Obviously, economic interests and economic issues are important, and they are important grounds for evaluating the success of a society or its government; but the coronation of Economic Man as the absolute monarch of modern political thought not only ignores and distorts human reality but also serves to destroy and erase human social and cultural realities the monarch doesn't much care for anyway. Relying on "the market" as the universal answer to every question of public discussion, the adherents of Economic Man merely accelerate the institutional destruction out of which the power of the mass state emerges as an alternative answer to the questions Economic Men skip over. While Republicans worship at the temple of Economic Man, two prominent social critics from the left have recently noted the social destructiveness the cult promotes.

Thus, historian Eugene Genovese in a sympathetic critique of The Southern Tradition remarks that "southern conservatives understand the contradictions that neither Ronald Reagan nor George Bush nor even [!] William Buckley has faced squarely. Capitalism has historically been the greatest solvent of traditional social relations. ... Ronald Reagan has had every right to celebrate capitalism as the greatest revolutionary force in world history...." Similarly, the late Christopher Lasch writes in his posthumous The Revolt of the Elites that "The market notoriously tends to universalize itself. It does not easily

coexist with institutions that operate according to principles antithetical to itself: schools and universities, newspapers and magazines, charities, families. Sooner or later the market tends to absorb them all. It puts an almost irresistible pressure on every activity to justify itself in the only terms it recognizes: to become a business proposition, to pay its own way, to show black ink on the bottom line. It turns news into entertainment, scholarship into professional careerism, social work into scientific management of poverty. Inexorably it remodels every institution in its own image."

Having enthroned policies informed by the mythologies of the market and Economic Man, Republicans are always amazed to discover that the results are not at all what they predicted and that those who contributed their support to what was advertised as a revolution wanted something other than business as usual. Not only does the myth in which Republican minds are swaddled not even acknowledge the non-economic forces that really drive the popular base of their revolution but also the myth serves to create new dislocations and destructions that the champions of the mass state will exploit to their own advantage. It should not therefore be surprising that the revolution the Republicans have promised us will stall before it leaves its garage and that it will turn out to be no revolution at all. Whoever the academic scribblers from whom the Republican Revolutionaries have distilled their frenzy might be, what they are really enthroning is not at all different

from the forces to which we have been enslaved since the days of Karl Marx and the revolutionary destruction of the Old Republic he celebrated.■

[CHRONICLES, June, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Poker on the Titanic

If any single act showed the essential fraudulence of the ballyhooed "Republican Revolution" we were supposed to be enjoying this year, it was the last official vote of the previous Congress, less than a month after the 1994 elections, to pass the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade by a bipartisan majority. Of course, the GATT vote took place before the arrival of the new congressmen and senators and so cannot fairly be charged against them, but it can be charged against the Republican leaders of the last as well as the current Congress, Newt Gingrich and Robert Dole, both of whom did all they could to ensure the creation of the global trade leviathan and to smother opposition to it from the right. Just in case anyone doubted the message the Stupid Party's princelings were sending, both gentlemen also hustled to endorse President Clinton's bizarre bailout of Mexico only a few weeks into the new Congress, again in the face of a somewhat more militant opposition from within the Republican right, in Congress and out. In the event, however, not even the support of the new majority leadership could salvage the original \$40 billion in loan guarantees Mr. Clinton was so eager to offer the giant basket case across the Rio Grande, and the president and his millionaire advisers were finally forced to rely on executive powers over

which Congress had little control to pull the Mexicans and their Wall Street dependents back from the lip of disaster.

Revolution, if it means nothing else, involves a transfer of power, political as well as economic and cultural, from one set of rulers to another, and, aside from the specific flaws of GATT and the bailout, the significance of the support for them the GOP leadership provided was that it showed the falsity of the "revolutionary" pretensions they mouth. Both measures transparently reflected the interests of the American managerial elite and its global cousins in Mexico and the transnational bureaucracies that the "global economy" entrenches, and both measures threaten ruin to the peoples, American and other, over whose fates these elites preside. The "Republican Revolution," in so far as it possesses any reality at all, seems to be directed only against the Democratic Party and the incumbent administration, though by trying to bail Mr. Clinton out of one of the most unpopular decisions of his two years in office, even the impulse toward partisan political rebellion seemed to wither when the interests of the dominant global elites were at stake.

Opposition to GATT and the Mexican deal was mobilized by an unlikely coalition consisting of hard right nationalist and populist forces led by Pat Buchanan and the soft left of Ralph Nader and various labor and environmentalist groups. Ross Perot was noticeably absent and uncharacteristically silent, and probably his mixture of conspiracy theory and egomania would not have contributed much toward success anyway. But there is one opponent of GATT who received little attention, perhaps in part

because he is not an American at all and in part because what he had to say about the agreement and what it represents is so devastating that the GATT-crats would have few bullets with which to shoot back.

That opponent is Sir James Goldsmith, who like Mr. Perot is a self-made billionaire but unlike the Texan is not given to interrupting his sermons with tales of terrorists in his backyard trying to kidnap him. Mr. Goldsmith is also a member of the European Parliament, and much of what he has to say in his book The Trap reflects his experience and his misgivings about the current plans for European unification that are to the continent what NAFTA and GATT are to the United States and its neighbors. The Trap was a best-seller in France when it was published in 1993, but its English translation, appearing in this country the following year, was barely noticed, despite the imminence of the GATT debate.

Mr. Goldsmith's arguments against GATT involve a good deal more than the specific economic objections one might expect from a businessman. Indeed, his argument involves an assault on the whole fabric of the global regime that has come to be called the New World Order and the elites that run it, and the main danger he sees in the agreement, the regime, and its elites is that they seek to replace national autonomy with a transnational apparatus of power under their own control, divorced from either popular or legal restraints.

Mr. Goldsmith rejects the concept of free trade, arguing that the internationalization of economies renders the Ricardian doctrine of comparative advantage obsolete. Hence, nations can no longer specialize in producing and selling goods for which they are particularly suited because "political systems can be transformed, technology can be transferred instantaneously anywhere in the world on a microchip, and capital is free to be invested wherever the anticipated yields are highest." The populations of undeveloped nations are thus new entrants to the world economy "in direct competition with the work forces of developed countries," and the latter can expect to see global free trade drain their nations of their jobs, capital, and, eventually, their sovereignty. Those who stand to gain from the entrenchment of the free trade global empire will be "those who can benefit from an almost inexhaustible supply of cheap labour. They will be the companies who move their production offshore to low-cost areas; the companies who can pay lower salaries at home; and those who as a result will receive large dividends. But they will be like poker players on the Titanic. The wounds inflicted on their societies will be too deep, and brutal consequences will follow."

But of course the national states in which these corporate elites are headquartered are ceasing to be "their societies" in any significant sense. "The new phenomenon of our age," he writes, is

the emergence of transnational corporations,
with the ability to move production at will
anywhere in the world, in order to

systematically benefit from lower wages wherever they are to be found. ... The globalization of the market is vital to them, both to produce cheaply and to sell universally. Because they do not necessarily owe allegiance to the countries where they operate, there is a divorce between the interests of the transnational corporations and those of society.

The dimensions of the new global power structure are more than economic, however, and the means by which the emerging global elite seeks to extend and entrench its hegemony are only in part economic. "The West," Mr. Goldsmith writes, meaning the dominant elites who prevail in the nations of the West, "believes that its destiny is to guide or coerce diverse human cultures into a single global civilization. It cannot tolerate the coexistence in the world of different cultures. ... This acute form of cultural imperialism is reinforced by international business, which considers that it would benefit from the destruction of social diversity and its replacement by a global monoculture hungry for western-type products." "Global democracy," "nation-building," and (most recently) U.N. "peacekeeping" missions are the current incarnations of the imperative to reconstruct and manage the planet along "Western" lines.

Mr. Goldsmith argues that one of the most brutal consequences of GATT and the regime it institutes will be the destruction of the rural and agricultural societies of the Third World as the "Western"-imposed economic modernization that GATT is supposed to encourage uproots whole populations from their cultural and

economic soil and drives them into megalopolises as urban proletariats or into the developed world as culturally alien immigrants. The "morbid intumescences" that deracinated and impoverished urban masses create he sees as the direct result of the "Green Revolution" and the intensive, scientifically based, elite-dominated, and high-capital agribusiness it spawned. Mexico's Chiapas revolt that erupted the day NAFTA went into effect is fueled by the same nightmarish perception by its peasant participants.

In the United States, he sees the transformation already well under way. He cites the Time magazine cover story of April 9, 1990 that predicted that by the early part of the next century, "the average US 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," and he cites Oakeshott and Santayana to the effect that "one of the disasters that can befall any community is that its shared understandings, in other words, its common culture, be dissipated in too rapid or too sweeping change."

Whatever the outcome of this extraordinary and grand experiment, it will be impossible to avoid social torment. The destabilization and in some cases social breakdown of the cities, the multi-ethnic, multi-tongued population, the rapid geographic mobility which has resulted in uprooted nuclear or broken families, have all contributed to widespread disorientation.

Instead of the emerging global regime based on free trade and

denationalization for the benefit of global managerial imperialism, Mr. Goldsmith argues for what he calls "regional trade blocs" and subsidiarity in social policy and political authority, the very opposite of the Maastricht Treaty, which seeks to create a supranational, centralized, bureaucratic state -- a homogenized union. It would destroy the pillars on which Europe was built -- its nations. It would convert Europe into one multicultural space, in which national identities would be fused and sovereignty abandoned. It would coerce ancient European nations to merge into the ultimate artificial state. As George Orwell remarked, it is characteristic of intellectuals to pass over in incomprehension the dominant political passion of the age. Today, that passion is the search for national identity. And this is the moment when European ruling elites are seeking to destroy the identity of every European nation.

The later chapters of The Trap are rather marred by Mr. Goldsmith's invectives against science and technology themselves, and he winds up praising non-Western cultures and religions for their vision of man fused with nature in distinction to the Western view of man as nature's master. He is right that the Enlightenment lies at the root of both Marxist and Western managerial globalism and the imperial homogenization they command, but he grossly overstates the need to retreat from scientific modes of thought. He winds up his book with a long quotation from a letter to President James Buchanan from an Indian chief that warbles endlessly on about how "we are part of the earth and it is part of us." All of this is nice, but, as he notes, the chief was able to write the letter only "with the help of an amanuensis,"

and it is only because such institutions as writing, pen, and paper were produced by the civilization of the West that the chief was able to compose it at all. The Hindu, Buddhist, and primitive cultures animated by the visions of man as a merely passive appendage of nature that Mr. Goldsmith so warmly endorses remained the victims of nature -- and the victims of whatever rivals were able to master nature more effectively -- precisely because of their vision. It's not just the Enlightenment and its legacies that Mr. Goldsmith winds up rejecting but the whole body of Western civilization since the time of the Ionian natural philosophers. Without that body of thought and discovery, the people of the West too would have long since disappeared beneath the hooves of nature or their human adversaries.

Nevertheless, apart from such excesses, The Trap remains a classic source for the case against the transnational power that now has the allegiance, not of a small band of ideologues, but of the leaders of the major economic, political, and cultural forces of the world. Whatever tricks and slogans pseudo-revolutionaries like Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole may devise to steal the authentic revolution that put them in power, Mr. Goldsmith's argument is one to which an increasing number of Americans and indeed non-Americans subscribe. It is those who share his beliefs and values, from Chiapas to Chicago, who constitute the real revolutionaries at the end of the 20th century, and regardless of the national and cultural divisions that separate them, they

should start working together against a common and global enemy that has come to define both the conventional right and the conventional left. They have nothing to lose but the chains those enemies are forging for them.■

(The Trap, by Sir James Goldsmith, is available from Carroll and Graf Publishers, Inc., New York, 207 pages, at a price of \$20.00.)

Takeouts:

The divorce is particularly true of GATT itself, which Mr. Goldsmith describes as "yet another international bureaucracy whose functions will be largely autonomous. They report to over 120 nations and therefore, in practice, to nobody. Each nation will have one vote out of 120. Thus, America and every European nation will be handing over ultimate control of its economy to an unelected, uncontrolled, group of international bureaucrats."

Mr. Goldsmith is not alone in this insight. Critics of NAFTA pointed out that the reforms of Mexican agriculture the treaty promotes would drive the Mexican rural population off the land and toward the budding "morbid intumescences" of Los Angeles and San Diego;

Modern individualism [which serves to rationalize the uprooting] regards all social structures and obligations, even those created by the family, as impediments to self-realization, and therefore as forms of oppression.

[CHRONICLES, July, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

'A Boundless Field of Power'

Does the U.S. Constitution still exist? There is one simple way to answer this question. Read any article or section of the 200-year-old document written to provide the citizens of a free republic with a short and simple guide to what their government can and cannot do and ask whether the language you have just perused remains operative today. With the possible exception of the clause requiring that the president of the United States be more than 35 years of age, hardly any of it does. Almost all of the "important" parts of the Constitution -- the First Amendment, the commerce clause, the 14th Amendment, war powers, etc. -- today, through the endless machinations of lawyers and the meddling of judges and courts, means something other than, and sometimes the direct opposite of, what the plain sense of the language says, and in addition there are at least two "unimportant" parts, the Second and 10th Amendments, that have virtually disappeared. Unable to twist and torture the language of those amendments to suit their fancies, the courts have simply ignored them and pretended they no longer exist.

Instead of the plain text of the Constitution, what we have today are merely the collected musings of various judges and justices, organized into convenient little formulas like the

"Lemon Test" or the "reindeer rule" and arbitrary definitions of such matters as "obscenity," "privacy," and "interstate commerce," that simply emerged from the whims and private dogmas of the magistrates, if not from those of beardless clerks just hatched from the nests of Cambridge and New Haven. Not only does the "constitution" that such formulas compose remain unratified by the states or the people but most citizens do not even know it exists at all and fondly imagine that the document of Madison and Hamilton still governs the government.

Nevertheless, if the old Constitution has vanished from the courts, the minds of the judiciary, and the instruction of the law schools, it does sometimes still kick in the memories of the people themselves. The resurrection of the Second Amendment last year in a massive popular rebellion against congressional violations of the rights of gun owners is clear evidence of this, as is an even more remarkable resuscitation of the other part of the Lost Constitution, the 10th Amendment itself.

Long dismissed by late 20th century jurists as without substance to anyone save antiquarians and Southern segregationists, the 10th Amendment was considered by Thomas Jefferson to represent "the foundation of the Constitution," and he warned George Washington that "to take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn ... is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition." In the last few years, as gun owners, farmers and ranchers, the governors of half a dozen states, and even Republican presidential candidates have stepped forward to invoke

the amendment and denounce the federal government for its systematic invasions and violations of the states rights the amendment protects, Jefferson's warning remains as relevant as ever. Indeed, Republican leaders like Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole, who have crooned and gabbled about the amendment all year and claim to have based parts of their "Contract with America" on it, ought to think about what it really means as Jefferson and most other constitutional authorities of the Old Republic understood it.

Republican invocations of the 10th this year have been instigated mainly by what the GOP considers its stroke of genius in designing a welfare reform measure that works through "block grants" to the states from the federal government, and the party's leaders repeatedly make the claim that this apparent decentralization of power represents a restoration of the amendment and a devolution of power to the states. Of course it does no such thing, if only because the funds of the block grants come from the federal government, or, more exactly, the American taxpayer, so that citizens in Alabama and Wyoming will still wind up paying for welfare in New York and California. Indeed, the flaw of block grants and the whole concept of "revenue sharing," beloved of modern Republicans, was exposed by Andrew Jackson in his veto of a law sponsored by Henry Clay that would have awarded funds from the sale of federal lands to the states for their own internal purposes. "It appears to me," wrote Jackson, "that a

more direct road to consolidation cannot be devised" than Clay's revenue sharing proposal. "Money is power, and in that government which pays the public officers of the states will all political power be substantially concentrated. The state governments, if governments they might be called, would lose all their independence and dignity," and the officers of the states "would, in effect, be the mere stipendiaries and instruments of the central power." Having devised compelling empirical arguments for the outright abolition of welfare, the Republicans proceeded to ignore their own ideology and develop a welfare plan that not only perpetuates the most thoroughly discredited public policy of the federal government but does so through a dishonest and dangerous rationale.

If it were only Republicans who invoked the 10th Amendment, citizens might be well advised to ignore all the noise being made about it, but in fact no small part of the authentic Middle American resistance to the federal leviathan is wrapped up in more serious discussions of the 10th and the real federalism of which the amendment remains the heart. There is hardly a single issue involved in that resistance today that is not closely connected with it. Not long after the silly "Brady Law" requiring a federally mandated waiting period for the purchase of handguns went into effect, several sheriffs in the Western part of the country announced that they would refuse to enforce the law in their jurisdictions. At least one of them, in Montana, was upheld

by a federal judge on the grounds of the 10th Amendment. In other states, governors themselves have invoked it, citing federal intrusion into such matters as education (Virginia), federal abortion regulations (Pennsylvania), welfare for immigrants, (California and Florida), and unfunded mandates generally. In Nevada last year, local ranchers, with the support of a county commissioner, nearly had a gunfight with officials of the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management when the citizens decided to ignore federal regulations on land use and started building their own road where federal regs declared they couldn't.

"We were proving our point that they don't have jurisdiction," said the county potentate, who habitually carries a copy of the Constitution (the old one) in his pocket. In other areas, similar conflicts between locals and federals -- over environmental regulations and laws, for instance -- have provoked the same kind of confrontations that are beginning to resemble older fights that took place at Lexington, Concord, and Fort Sumter.

Conservative academics can explore the theoretical justifications for secession all they want, but the real action these days isn't in talking the talk but in walking the walk, and in the last couple of years, plain citizens who have never heard of Alexander Stevens and care little for Jefferson Davis have started their own secession movement. Unlike the theoretical movement, they are not inventing reasons to avoid political activism or to start their own country. What they want to secede

from is not the country itself but Washington and the leviathan headquartered there, and fantasies about throwing the Yankees out of Atlanta do nothing to advance the cause they share with the more serious and principled advocates of secession.

Nevertheless, the 10th Amendment movement, if it is a movement, wouldn't be hurt by a bit more command of theory and principle before it marches up Bunker Hill. In the 1970s, the New Right was also contemptuous of political theory, and when its leaders finally gained some measure of political power, they quickly found that they had only a foggy idea of what they wanted to do and why they wanted to do it. The result was that the successful New Right was quickly gobbled up by neo-conservatives, who were possessed of a clearer vision of what to do with the power they craved but could not win through elections.

There seems to be a similar problem with the leaders of 10th Amendment activism, as illustrated by the remark of one newly converted apostle of states rights, Utah Gov. Michael Leavitt, last year. "I'm not arguing for this [states rights] on the basis of some ideology. I'm arguing for more state autonomy based on the fact that what we've got isn't working." This, of course, is simply the voice of pragmatism, a principled refusal to invoke principle, and like all pragmatism it will eventually be swallowed up by someone or something else. Mr. Leavitt, it must be recalled, is not only a governor but also a Republican.

The main danger the 10th Amendment movement faces is also its

main strength, namely, precisely that it is not "principled," that it is a response to practical grievances experienced by those who have come to perceive the federal government as the main cause of their grievances. Hence, the danger is that as soon as those specific grievances are removed or massaged (which is exactly what much of the Republicans' Contract tries to do), the movement will wither. Moreover, serious supporters of 10th Amendment federalism need to remember that whatever costs federal aggrandizement imposes on the states and citizens, there are many who gain from it and from the calculated obsolescence of the amendment. That is one major reason why the segregationists' use of the amendment never went very far. Having happily wallowed in federal grease when checks for farm subsidies were in the mail, the Southerners could not expect to be taken very seriously when they whined about states rights in the face of federally enforced integration.

A movement for restoring reality to the 10th Amendment can be taken seriously, not just when pragmatists like Gov. Leavitt learn something about the principles they casually and ignorantly invoke, but when social and economic groups are willing to support real federalism even against their own interests. The artfulness of the political revolution that has destroyed authentic republicanism and converted state and local government into Jackson's "mere stipendiaries and instruments of the central power" is that the revolution succeeded in wedding social and economic groups to that power. Just as Hamilton and Clay tried to

buy up and bind together local interests with their projects for national banks, tariffs, and internal improvements, so the architects of the modern managerial state have constructed a federal architecture that buys up and binds together strategic social and economic elites. The intellectual and verbalist classes have been bought by federal funding of education, the arts, and humanities and by federal entrenchment of a radically expanded interpretation of the First Amendment that allows the eggheads to mouth off about any stupidity that pops into their heads without fear of local sedition and obscenity laws. Labor and racial minorities have been bought by federal legislation that creates special privileges for them. Big Business (including agribusiness) has been bought by direct subsidies and monetary and tax policies that favor bigness and concentration over smaller competitors. The new proletariat created by mass immigration is being bought simply by the federal leviathan's refusal to enforce its own laws against illegal entry and by forcing the states to assume the burdens that ensue. The only people who have not been bought are Middle Americans themselves, who are expected to pay for the bargains they're getting and to endure their consequences in silence. That, of course, is why there is an incipient Middle American Revolution at all.

Simply because so many Americans now depend, directly or indirectly, on the federal leviathan and the other peoples' money that it so generously shares with those who have no right to it,

restoration of the 10th Amendment in the way that Jefferson and Jackson would have wanted may not now be possible. But even a partial restoration would rip much of the guts out of the leviathan and so disrupt it that it could no longer function, and there can be no doubt that in recent years there have emerged several concrete social and economic groups with real and deep interests in at least some restriction of federal power. If enough such groups can crystallize and invest their revolt with a serious understanding of what federalism means and how it can be advanced, then a real restoration of the 10th Amendment, and not merely Republican manipulation of slogans, may become possible as Americans come to perceive the real costs of the "boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition," to which the destruction of the Old Republic has delivered us as Jefferson warned it would.■

[CHRONICLES, August, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Roads to Revolution

For at least a month after the mass murder in Oklahoma City on April 19, the official sentinels of the federal leviathan threw themselves into a state of panic that was probably unprecedented in the country's history. It remains unclear how much of the hysteria and paranoia they injected into their own minds they actually believed and how much they simply fabricated in a desperate effort to smear their enemies in the national outback and prepare for a concerted crusade of political repression; but what became obvious in the bombing's aftermath is that the elites entrenched in the mega-state and its fortifications in the dominant institutions of culture and the media are coming to resemble the doomed defenders of 15th-century Constantinople helplessly watching the Ottoman hordes swallow one province after another and inexorably proceed toward a capital inhabited by an isolated and terrified populace of court functionaries, eunuchs, and courtesans. If the popular contempt for Washington that surfaced in last year's congressional elections excited the anger and fear of the nation's rulers, the Rorschach Test of Oklahoma City seemed to drive them over the edge into a condition close to full-blown insanity.

The unspoken premise of their response to the bombing was

that the entire American people had gone crazy, tucking semi-automatic weapons under their windbreakers, concocting fertilizer bombs in their backyards, signing up with militias, hate groups, and fundamentalist churches, and harboring the darkest conspiracy theories about the United Nations, the Jews, the BATF, and Hillary Clinton. No one was safe. The sinister accomplices of Timothy McVeigh were everywhere, and indeed in the days following the bombing, the FBI received no fewer than 8,000 "tips" identifying the mysterious "John Doe 2" as the man down the street, the fellow in the super-market, the guy in the next motel room last night. Reporters solemnly asked House Speaker Newt Gingrich whether he thought his mild critiques of "big government" had contributed to the act of madness in Oklahoma, and at least two prominent black journalists tried to blame the massacre on white men in general. Gun control groups tried to implicate the National Rifle Association, while the New York Times, the Washington Post, USA Today, the major news magazines, and countless pundits and self-appointed "experts" on extremism sought to connect gun owners, home schoolers, the religious right, tax resisters, Confederate Flag defenders, largely non-existent "white supremacists" and neo-Nazis, and, most of all, the ominous and sinister "militia movement" with the bombing.

Foremost to use the atrocity for political purposes, President Clinton, in what was perhaps the most repellent act in his low and unnotable career, chose to exploit the occasion of an ostensible commemoration of the victims of the massacre to link conservative talk show hosts to the kind of language that

supposedly incited the bombing, and a few days later he tried the same tactic to smear the NRA with the same opaque accusation. In the meantime, he concocted a frightening legislative package that enhances the police powers of the federal government to levels that Felix Dzhershinsky would have envied, all for the purpose of spying on and controlling his more outspoken critics on the right under the guise of "fighting terrorism."

Of course, the entire delirium was founded on a false but never-questioned assumption -- that the bombing was in fact the work of anyone on the "right" in any sense. Mr. McVeigh, who has exhibited serious mental problems since he was a teenager, had no connections to any right-wing group or movement. He had apparently attended one meeting of the so-called "Michigan Militia," along with his pals, the Nichols brothers, one of whom had started blabbering sentiments the militia members found objectionable and was promptly told to leave and not come back. None of them was ever a member of the Michigan Militia or any other militia group, as the Michigan Militia itself quickly announced, and some weeks later Mr. McVeigh's lawyers stated that their client firmly denied any membership with any militia organization. Nevertheless, for weeks, virtually every newspaper in the country repeatedly inserted into every news story the sentence, worthy of Lyndon LaRouche, that "McVeigh has been linked with the militias." But as a matter of fact, the only real "link" that existed between Mr. McVeigh, the other main suspect, Terry

Nichols, and any organized group was that they had both served in the U.S. Army and had both seen service in the Persian Gulf War. Mr. McVeigh's zest for blowing up Iraqis whenever the opportunity presented itself helped earn him speedy promotion to sergeant and a chest full of medals, and it perhaps tells us more than we want to know that the unprovoked slaughter of Iraqis by American forces in that war seemed to elicit the only talents Mr. McVeigh possesses and that the army seems to have been the only institution in Mr. McVeigh's otherwise undistinguished life in which he was able to do anything well. If it's a "link" to Oklahoma City you're looking for, the Persian Gulf War seems to have provided some excellent schooling.

Whether the regime's campaign of smear, terror, and repression will succeed in silencing its enemies and critics remains to be seen, but regardless of the delusions and misconceptions the regime's watchdogs have invented, they also, perhaps unintentionally, managed to uncover a real and important truth about the major social and political divisions that are beginning to redefine American political culture. That truth is that, even though the Oklahoma City bombing was apparently the work of a small and isolated band of crackpots unconnected to any larger organization or movement, the ruling elites of this country are sitting on top of a political bombshell that is considerably larger and more dangerous to them than anything Sgt. McVeigh could pack into a rental truck.

In their zeal to expose the alienation and resentments that supposedly fed the bombing, the national media did in fact reveal at least parts of this truth. Thus, Washington Post reporter Dale Russakoff, in a news story of May 5, interviewed the citizens of Meadville, Pennsylvania, on their reaction to the bombing and their general view of the nation and the world. What he discovered was an authentic populist counter-culture that defines itself outside and against both the federal government and the dominant cultural mainstream of sit-coms and fast-food, fabricated compassion for minorities and teary pseudo-science about endangered insects.

Few residents of Meadville seem to be members of militia groups, and few express much sympathy for or interest in them. One local, owner of a small manufacturing company, told the reporter, "I don't want anything to do with them, but I think I understand their attitude. If you ran a small business, you'd understand too. People are being squeezed more and more all the time. The government makes it impossible for small business to stay in business. Pressure just builds over time."

If that sentiment is dismissed as the voice of a disgruntled capitalist, it's matched by similar thoughts expressed by workers.

A roofer told the Post reporter that his neighbors who own farms are being driven out of their livelihoods; "if a cattail grows, it's a wet land; if a beaver moves, it's a habitat." Another, asked about the Oklahoma City bombing, said he thought it was "a

damned good start"; "if we think we'll take control of our destinies without some bloodshed, that's pretty naive thinking on our part. There's no peaceful solution to this problem. There are too many people living unfairly off the system. Every day I go to work to support people on welfare. The American dream they sold us was the American lie, they're waiting there to take it all away."

Yet another Meadvillian said he believed the federal government itself perpetrated the bombing so it could create a crisis and suspend civil liberties (and given Mr. Clinton's draconian "counter-terrorist" legislation, that interpretation hardly seems implausible). "I'd just as soon go down the middle of the road myself," he said, "but to combat radicals like our government -- the IRS, the EPA, OSHA, who come in our company like the Gestapo, picking on us because we generate money -- you've got to have radicals like militias."

The residents of Meadville are in fact generally a conservative lot, and Republicans win easily in the area. But what these citizens have to say about their government and its agenda is just a little bit different from the harmless nostrums about "family values" and balanced budgets that Mr. Gingrich and Phil Gramm are trying to feed the country as the "Republican Revolution." What these citizens are talking about, even when they don't know it, is revolution plain and clear. Moreover, while most of their grievances about Washington are perfectly

consistent with conventional conservative complaints about Big Government, high taxes, and bureaucratic intrusions, their explanations of their problems and their solutions for them are rather different too.

Many had seen videos or read material about the "New World Order" and the United Nations conspiracy to seize power and destroy national sovereignty, and not a few listen to shortwave radio programs that advocate hanging politicians with nylon rope.

In other parts of the country, U.N. conspiracy theories, coupled with more violent resistance to taxes and regulation, form the framework of an incipient revolutionary consciousness. In some Western states, the Chicago Tribune reported recently, federal law enforcement officials have contracted what is now known as "Weaver Fever" -- a syndrome characterized by reluctance to take armed action against dissidents, even when they're known to have violated the law. The explanation of "Weaver Fever" is supposedly that the feds are treading more carefully in the wake of the blundering and perhaps murderous siege of white separatist Randy Weaver's cabin in Idaho in 1992 when federal goons shot and killed his wife and son. The feds don't want yet another massacre because it's bad for P.R., you see, and maybe also they've begun to learn that if you shoot down innocent citizens long enough, the citizens start shooting back.

What is striking about the revolutionary consciousness in Meadville and many other locations -- in the West and Northwest as

well as in the Midwest and South -- is that its adherents, Republicans and conservative though they may be, are not conservative movement groupies, and they don't learn their sense of desperation, their pet conspiracy theories, or their flirtations with political violence from conventional or mainstream conservative media and direct mail barons. These are people whose consciousness is self-generated, bred by the economic and cultural annihilation they and their communities are facing, and the very fact that they are drawn to bizarre conspiracy theories and fantasies of armed resistance suggests that they lack any other plausible explanation for the abyss they face or any political strategy for avoiding collapse within it. Why shouldn't they talk conspiracy and revolution, when all the establishment conservative movement offers them is more chicken doodle about the glories of free trade, more unrestricted immigration, more police power for the federal leviathan, more tax cuts for Big Business, and more contempt for and indifference to the Middle Americans whose votes elect Republican majorities?

What the Oklahoma City bombing has uncovered, then, is the beginnings of a clear revolutionary movement of the right among Middle Americans, a movement that is indeed misinformed as to the causes of their dispossession and not particularly adept at understanding what to do about it or how to formulate or accomplish their goals, but displaying nonetheless a firm rejection of the federal leviathan and a clear perception of who

their enemies are and what the triumph of their enemies would mean for them and the way of life they want to live. While conspiracy theories about the United Nations and other fixtures of Populist Right demonology may be useful in engendering distrust of what those demons symbolize, those theories fail to identify the real political and cultural forces behind the symbols, and often they merely breed a mentality of despair, an apprehension that the demons are invincible and that the only recourse is to burrow deeper and deeper within a foxhole of fantasies.

It is doubtful that the conservative mainstream in the United States has much to offer the Middle American revolutionaries in Meadville and points west (and south and north and east). Bound to an insipid Republican Party that merely exploits Middle American resentments because it is confident its constituents have no other place to go, mainstream conservatives are too timid and too oblivious to the abyss that Middle Americans really confront to embrace anything approaching an authentic populist radicalism.

The "religious Right" and its leaders, when they are not apologizing to the Anti-Defamation League for their agenda, have already succeeded in diluting their own potentially radical platform by wrapping themselves in the political mainstream and positioning themselves to bargain and wheedle concessions from the regime instead of mounting a crusade to attack and dismantle it.

What the radicalism of the populist and revolutionary right needs is not only an alternative to a conservatism that is merely

the obverse side of the mega-state's bad coin but also an alternative to the conspiratorial and pseudo-paramilitary infantilism that now informs it, a world-view that can more accurately identify and analyze the real enemies of Middle America who tremble in their salons over the march of an angry people they despise, and a strategy that can express the political goals that a Middle American movement should pursue, a political means for winning those goals, and an ideological vehicle that captures the real grievances of a dispossessed and exploited populace and mobilizes their anger for serious revolutionary victory. There is no reason those needs cannot be met, and those on the right who understand how to meet them need to start driving the vehicles of the Middle American revolution now, before Mr. Clinton's little experiment in smears and repression pushes them off the road.■

[CHRONICLES, September, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Natural Born Kulchur

In the tumid political underbrush of the summer, there were a number of interesting and even important new sprouts, as Pat Buchanan slowly pushed aside Phil Gramm as the favored candidate of the Republican Right and almost all of the rest of the blossoming aspirants to the throne of Reagan and Bush withered in the indifferent heat of the season. Neither Richard Lugar nor Lamar Alexander nor Arlen Specter attracted the slightest interest, and even one-speech wonders like Alan Keys and certifiable crackpots like Bob Dornan produced only yawns. Mr. Buchanan's emergence as a serious candidate was due, of course, to the fact that he alone actually has something to say -- about trade and the economic interests of the nation, about immigration and the nation's cultural identity, and about foreign policy and the nation's political interests in the world -- that remains undreamt of in the platitudinous squints that serve as what most other Republican leaders are pleased to call their "visions."

Yet throughout the summer Sen. Robert Dole continued to hold the lead in public opinion polls, presumably not because of any vision he glimpses or has been able to share with his disciples but merely because he remains the most publicly visible of the announced candidates. It is to be expected that his commanding

lead in the polls will begin to shrink as the campaign coagulates, but the Kansas senator was clearly determined to keep the lead, and the steps he took to do so provided what was perhaps the most instructive escapade of an otherwise tedious stage of the campaign.

His principal such step was his delivery in Los Angeles on May 31 of a speech about contemporary American popular culture, an oration that was barely five pages in length but offered intellectual munchies for the pundits for nearly a month afterward. Indeed, it was probably the most noticed speech Mr. Dole has ever given in his long career, and it may yet help him not only retain his lead in the opinion polls but also serve to nail his banner to the party's mast next year.

The main topic of Mr. Dole's remarks, of course, was Hollywood and all the wicked films and lyrics its corporate aesthetes have inflicted on us in recent years. The speech recalled Vice President Quayle's wisecrack about a television sitcom a few years earlier and immediately gave the pundits their cue to moan about the looming repression of the arts for which the Republicans secretly pine -- even though barely a month earlier the exact same sages had wagged their beards in grave approval when President Clinton launched his own assault on radio talk-show hosts for inspiring the Oklahoma City bombers. Mr. Dole, however, is not Dan Quayle and knew how to handle himself. It was obvious that he was inviting controversy in a way that Mr. Quayle neither sought nor understood how to greet, and perhaps for that reason the savants who make it their business to protect the Republic

from censorious philistines for the most part did not rise to the bait Mr. Dole so slyly offered them.

The speech was in many respects a stroke of political genius, since it not only gained Mr. Dole the headlines he wanted but also gave him what his main rival at the time, Mr. Gramm, had been unable to get -- a credential as a spokesman for the moral and religious issues that today animate the passions of no less than a third of the GOP. Mr. Gramm, an economist by his education, refuses to talk or think about much of anything but economic matters and economic policy, and as a result, when he persistently refused to discuss or support these issues after the social conservatives of the party persistently insisted he do so, he began to flounder. Mr. Dole therefore presented himself as a spokesman for social issues at just the moment that Mr. Gramm's failure was being noticed and before Mr. Buchanan could run off with those issues all by himself.

Moreover, Mr. Dole donned the mantle of moralism in such a way that he committed himself to nothing whatsoever, and this is a large part of the genius of his Hollywood speech. Never known as a foe of abortion, a champion of prayer in school, an enemy of pornography, or a drummer of the public virtue, Mr. Dole in his speech carefully contrived to avoid committing himself or the party or the government to doing anything at all about the evils he was denouncing. Never once did he insinuate censorship or even suggest that Americans who agreed with him should just refrain

from going to the movies. His remarks thus gained him a solid reputation as a moral reformer without any commitment to any reform.

That reputation was immensely bolstered and maybe even invented in the days just after the speech, when the professional Christians of the Beltway sallied out of their cells to chuckle and coo over Mr. Dole's moral leadership. Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition, fresh from his own rhetorical abasement before the Anti-Defamation League, saluted the Dole speech as "eloquent" and acknowledged that the Majority Leader was definitely on the right track to receive the Coalition's imprimatur. Gary Bauer of the Family Research Council also praised the speech, and came even closer to endorsing Mr. Dole because of it, while William Bennett was trundled out of his ever-darkening obscurity to add his own approval.

And indeed much of the praise was merited. Mr. Dole blasted Hollywood for producing films that dwell on sex and violence and distributing lyrics, especially those of black rap groups, that are little more than the contents of their singers' lower intestinal tracts. It is out of character for the Majority Leader, a politician far more comfortable with building coalitions and balancing vote tallies, to talk about public morality, but if he's learned how, there should be every reason to support him.

The problem is that both Mr. Dole's speech about Hollywood and popular culture and the eagerness with which the Christian

Right embraced it points to what is really and more deeply wrong with American culture and actually helps explain why the kinds of endeavors Mr. Dole complained about are so dominant. The problem, in a teacup, is that neither Mr. Dole nor his fans in the Christian Right nor most of his supporters among American conservatives have the foggiest notion of what a popular culture should be. They have no such notion because the "visions" by which they have entranced themselves have no room for culture, and since no one else in the United States knows what a culture is or ought to be either, we are left with the morbid concoctions of Hollywood and the crippled musical droppings of Snoop Doggy Dog.

Mr. Dole's cultural preferences are evident in the films of which he expressed approval. While he condemned Oliver Stone's "Natural Born Killers" and Quentin Tarantino's "True Romance" as "films that revel in mindless violence and loveless sex," a characterization manifestly not true about the latter film, he praised such masterpieces as Disney's "The Lion King," intended as a children's movie but capable of providing morally salubrious entertainment for senators, and "True Lies," a virtually unwatchable chase movie that has the strapping Arnold Schwarzenegger massacring people far more mindlessly than Woody Harrelson and Juliette Lewis in Stone's repulsive but carefully made film about two serial murderers. To be fair, Mr. Dole admitted later that he hadn't seen any of the films he was talking about. It might have helped if he had. Then again, it might not

have.

What is really frightening about American culture is that the films Mr. Dole praised are in no way preferable to those he damned. The only objection he or anyone else on the American right ever raises to any film is that it "glorifies sex and violence," though even such blood-soaked epics as "Natural Born Killers" and "The Godfather," which also earned a good deal of preachy wind from the right when it appeared in the 1970s, clearly don't. What far less bloody films that no one on the right pays much attention to often say about the nature of man, society, and the universe is often far more degraded and dangerous than a few scenes of improbable shoot-outs and bedroom wrestling matches. Mr. Dole praised "Forrest Gump," a pleasant and sentimental tale about a wise moron played by Tom Hanks, but it never occurred to him to mention Hanks' performance in "Philadelphia," a non-violent and superficially decent film that is a protracted propaganda piece for the normalization of homosexuality. Mr. Dole expressed disgust for 2 Live Crew, but John Lennon's cuddly lyrics in "Imagine" about a world without country, property, or religion are far more subversive and far more influential. Lennon's fantasies of a one-world utopian communism are in fact the essence of what both the left and the neo-conservative right believe today.

If it's really evil films you want, however, the "slasher flicks" popularized in the 1980s and intended to appeal to pre-teens and adolescents -- Wes Craven's interminable "Nightmare on

Elm Street" series is typical -- are perhaps the most evil ever made. Their persistent theme, cemented throughout numberless sequels, is that evil is stronger than good, that the monster that appears to have been destroyed at the end of the last installment is really indestructible, and that there is nothing anyone can do about it. The theme is in fact the core idea of Satanism, but I recall no one among conservatives or the religious right remarking on this. For that matter, even downright wholesome movies like the "Star Wars" series never clearly distinguished the moral character of the heroes from that of the villains. The former are physically attractive, while the bad guys wear helmets and uniforms vaguely reminiscent of stormtroopers, but there is no clear explanation of why one side is good and the other bad.

In fact, the most violent films Hollywood has produced in recent decades offer the clearest moral distinctions. No director was more notorious for depiction of graphic violence than the late Sam Peckinpah, but in "The Wild Bunch," "The Getaway," "Pat Garrett and Billy the Kid," and a host of other films, he drew sharp distinctions between good characters able and willing to assume burdens of responsibility for each other and bad characters who recognize no bonds or loyalties beyond their own greed and lust. For Peckinpah's heroes, it is the social bond -- of an outlaw band, friendship, husband and wife -- that makes them human, while for his villains, it is the denial or betrayal of such bonds that makes them evil. The same is true in Tarantino's

"True Romance," where the heroic characters are those willing to take risks and even lose their lives for wife, husband, or son, while everyone else, driven by greed, winds up literally killing each other. Of course, there's no reason why children should be allowed to see such a film, but Republicans might learn something from watching it.

But they probably wouldn't, and neither would the religious right, because in the United States the "official right" has little interest in anything that doesn't affect politics and the pocket-book. Immersed in an essentially hedonistic and economistic world-view that recognizes nothing more important than material self-interest, the right is unable to form or even comment intelligently upon a culture, a normative way of life that transcends and shapes the pursuit of both power and money rather than being shaped by them. Hence, all that the right, religious or Republican, wants from culture is for it not to offend whatever habitual prejudices and tastes they happen to retain. The best kind of culture for them is what they think prevailed in the 1950s, when Pat Boone and Fabian crooned nothing that disturbed their affluent slumbers and Lucy and The Beaver reconfirmed every week the eternal virtues of an already crumbling nuclear family where the father figure was an object of ridicule whose authority was to be evaded and undermined.

Mr. Dole concluded his speech by quoting approvingly the words of Mark Canton, president of Universal Pictures. "Any smart

business person can see what we must do," Mr. Canton remarked, "make more 'PG' rated films." But a culture consisting of nothing but children's movies is no more a real culture than Tupac Shakur is a real artist. What really smart "business persons" ought to be able to see is that when we ask nothing more of our culture than to be left alone to make money and run for president, what we will wind up with is exactly what we have now.■

[CHRONICLES, October, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Where the Buck Really Stops

"The question is," Humpty Dumpty tells Alice in Through the Looking Glass, "which is to be master -- that's all." As over-employed as the quotation may be, it nevertheless communicates a perennial truth that most people forget when it comes to understanding not only the answer but also the question itself, a truth that almost always explains much of the unpleasantness that speckles human history. In the discussion of national sovereignty, the question of who is to be master is in fact the only relevant question to ask at all.

Sovereignty, by definition, concerns the issue of who is to be master, whether it has to do with who or what agency makes the final decisions that settle the course of a political society's internal affairs or with the external independence of the society from others. The two senses of sovereignty, of course, are closely related, since an internal sovereign -- king, people, parliament, the states, the federal government -- cannot claim to be the final arbiter of affairs if an external force in the form of another power is able to back up its own claim to that position. Much of American history has revolved around the question of who was to be master within the union, a dispute ostensibly settled by military power in the 1860s, and more

recently, with which head of the federal master that emerged from the Civil War was to dominate the others. In the mid 20th century and since, the presidency has made a pretty strong claim to sovereignty, and the cute little sign that Harry Truman kept on his desk that read "The buck stops here" was in fact little more than a not-very-subtle pretense that the chief executive is really the monarch of the United States. Some, but by no means all, bucks stop at the president's desk, and it is a claim that has not the slightest shadow of constitutional or historical validity, but it is in part because Mr. Truman really believed it and tried to act on it and in part because of the blunt coarseness of his personality that today is celebrated as his most endearing trait, that he was perhaps about as close an imitation of Il Duce as this country has ever produced.

In the 1990s, the question of who is to be master in the American house is reviving, with presidential candidates and governors invoking the 10th Amendment and a healthy anti-government popular resistance bubbling merrily in the boondocks. It is probably not an accident that the resurrection of the question of who is to be sovereign within the nation is occurring at the very same time that the question of external sovereignty is emerging as well. The appearance of both issues -- who is to be master of the United States and whether the United States itself will continue to be a sovereign nation-state at all -- ought to tell us that at the present time, no one can provide a clear answer. There is no clear answer simply because no one today holds enough power to sustain an answer against rivals. Power

relations, both within American society and between the United States and the external forces that are causing its national sovereignty to dwindle, are in flux, and only when those relations are stabilized by the rise of a master force on whose desk the buck really does stop will there be a clear answer to the question.

Internally, the conflict over sovereignty is clearly linked to the continuing struggle for political and cultural power between Middle American populism, on the one hand, and the incumbent elites that currently have a grip on power, on the other. The elites are deeply entrenched in and aligned with the federal leviathan and make use of it to stay in power and to define the public order to reflect their interests. Hence, the popular rebellion against the leviathan, manifested in the 10th Amendment movement, the anti-immigration movement, the tax rebellion, the resistance to the economic destruction of the middle class through free trade and economic globalization, the militia movement and the Second Amendment coalition, etc., can be understood socially as a rebellion of the American middle class against the elites. Although the rebellion remains so far undefined and spontaneous and lacks a coherent strategy or leadership, the obvious goal emerging within it is the dismantlement of the leviathan and the restoration of state and local sovereignty, coupled with the social and cultural pre-eminence of Middle America as the publicly defining core of the

national order. The elites, whether directly lodged in the central state or merely affiliated with and dependent on it through subsidies, tax policies, legal privileges, and ideological identification with the tendencies of the mega-state, are right to perceive the rebellion as their enemy.

But the same social division between the elites and Middle America underlies the conflict over the issue of external sovereignty as well. While multinational business, the national/global security bureaucracy and its academic and think-tank allies, and transnational institutions like the IMF, the United Nations, NAFTA and GATT, etc., have developed a common interest in the erosion of sovereignty and the effective though gradual transfer of power to agencies beyond the control of the U.S. government or the American people, the defense of national sovereignty remains firmly located in the American middle class. The conspiratorial mythology of "black helicopters" and U.N. troops occupying the country that circulates among the militias, themselves largely middle class in social composition, is direct evidence of this, though the incoherence and banality of much of the mythology suggests that those who are attracted by it possess only the most opaque comprehension of the attack on national sovereignty. Nevertheless, however dim the perception of the real threat to national identity and coherence, the very existence and widespread popularity of the mythology suggests that Middle Americans increasingly recognize that the national canopy under

which they have lived and worked since the founding of the nation is beginning to vanish and that its disappearance is not merely the product of irresistible and anonymous "historical forces" but rather the result of deliberately contrived and consciously designed efforts. The sinister goals that the mythology assigns to the conspiracy against sovereignty betrays the profound alienation from the dominant elites that Middle Americans are beginning to feel.

The correlation of the Middle American rebellion with resistance to the contrived destruction of American nationhood should hardly be surprising. The late Christopher Lasch noted the long historical connection between nationalism and the middle class, dating from the 16th century.

A large part of the appeal of nationalism [to the middle class] lay in the state's ability to establish a common market within its boundaries, to enforce a uniform system of justice, and to extend citizenship both to petty proprietors and to rich merchants, alike excluded from power under the old regime. The middle class understandably became the most patriotic, not to say jingoistic and militaristic, element in society.... Whatever its faults, middle-class nationalism provided a common ground, common standards, a common frame of reference without which society dissolves into nothing more than contending factions, as the Founding Fathers of America understood so well -- a war of all against all.

Though Lasch was writing of a middle class that is now fairly remote in history, the same fundamental interests explain the persisting attachment of Middle America to nationality. It is

only through the protective shield that the institutions of nationhood and national sovereignty provide that men and women of the middle rank of human society can expect to receive any protection at all. Lacking the wealth, power, educational skills, and social connections to protect themselves against dominant internal elites or aggressive foreign enemies, the middle class must depend on nationhood and its affiliated institutions -- constitutionalism, the political institutions of republican government that allow for the representation of middle class interests, the legally enforceable defense of private property, the national defense of both the territory and the economic interests of the nation (which are identified with the interests of the middle class itself) -- for its very existence. Any dilution of the national identity, any fracturing of the shield of sovereignty or of nationhood, then, will always be perceived, and correctly so, as a threat to the middle class, in ways that neither aristocrats nor bureaucrats, neither proletarians nor praetorians, will comprehend. Aristocracies can expect to get along even if the nation vanishes completely, and for an underclass, life will remain much the same regardless of where the buck stops.

Moreover, in the 1990s, as Lasch also noted, the decline of the nation-state is closely connected to the decline of the middle class. Free trade and economic globalization are in part intended to flatten middle class incomes and reduce middle class bargaining

power with businesses that can produce their goods in Mexico and Thailand. The importation of an immigrant proletariat with no historical or emotional bonds to the nation helps drive the multiculturalist and anti-white assault on middle class institutions and cultural hegemony, and immigration is itself, as Peter Brimelow notes in his recent book on the subject, part of the "war against the nation-state." The construction of transnational authorities in the United Nations, NATO, NAFTA, GATT, and their sisters contributes to the political subordination of the middle class to goals and policies favored by the elites that manage and benefit from the new structures.

The struggle over sovereignty, then, is not merely a verbal and academic battle over an abstraction of political theory but rather over who and what will run the country and even whether the country will continue to exist. Partisans of globalism, on both the left and the pseudo-right, may sneer at those who see threats to sovereignty in every U.N.-authorized military mission abroad and every transnational convention to manage the global environment, protect global women and children from their husbands and parents, and put global criminals on trial in global courtrooms. But the truth is that all of these and many other efforts concocted by the globalist elites in this and other countries are concerted attacks on national sovereignty, the nation-state, and the social groups that rely on sovereignty as a framework for their own existence and identity. Having

disengaged, materially and psychically, from the underlying body of their national societies, these elites no longer perceive a need for nations to satisfy their economic, political, or cultural purposes. Their needs, in the form of the command of the populations, natural resources, and territories of nations, can now best be met through extra-national modes of organization, and indeed, the continued existence of sovereign nations, populated by particular peoples with particular cultures, acts as a brake on and an obstacle to the satisfaction of the needs of the elites.

That, at least, is how the elites and their partisans see it. The truth may be somewhat different, as suggested by the outcome of most international gatherings that are supposed to "manage" and "reconstruct" the global economy. Such gatherings rarely produce any results that are not dictated by the perceived national economic interests of their participants, and for all the rosy rhetoric about "one world," a "borderless economy," and a "new world order," the persistent truth is that nations continue to exist. They continue to exist simply because the people inside them live and work together in ways that are different from the ways other peoples in other nations live and work, and their political leaders, democratic or not, understand this and reflect it in what they demand for themselves and their peoples at the fancy conclaves where they are supposed to be transcending petty interests and thinking about the welfare of all mankind.

But "mankind," as Spengler said, is a zoological expression.

It has no meaning apart from its specific cultural and political incarnations, and within those incarnations there must be a controlling power somewhere, and that power is sovereignty, the place where the buck really does stop. In the epoch in which Americans now live, there is no such place for the simple reason that no social force, neither the Middle Americans who seek to decentralize power and preserve the sovereignty of the nation, nor the incumbent elites who want to keep power in the mega-state and fuse the mega-state with institutions outside and beyond national control, is able to mobilize sufficient power to institutionalize its vision of what the nation should be and how it should be governed.

This is not really a bad situation, because it suggests that the power of the elites has slipped a bit while that of the Middle American resistance has prospered, at least to the point that it can sometimes check and restrain its adversaries. But it is not a situation that can or will last. Sooner or later, one force or another will gather sufficient power to answer the question of who is to be master, and if the nation and its defining social core are going to survive, Middle Americans need to make sure the buck stops with them.■

[CHRONICLES, November, 1995]

Principalities and Powers

Samuel Francis

Victims of Blunt Force Trauma

Even before the end of the trial of Los Angeles police officer Mark Fuhrman for the crime of white racism, the percentage of black Americans who believed that Officer Fuhrman's most celebrated victim was innocent had risen from 60 percent before the trial to a whopping 78 percent by the time the prosecution rested. It is never easy to find 78 percent of any large group in the United States that agrees on much of anything, and the proportion of blacks who believe O.J. Simpson did not commit the murders of which he was accused is exceeded perhaps only by the percentage who think the landing on the moon is merely white racial propaganda. Whatever the other differences between the two main races of the country and their cultures, nothing in recent memory advertises the profound perceptual gulfs that divide them more than the protracted and preposterous circus in Los Angeles that raised to stardom such obscurities as Judge Ito, Marcia Clark, Johnny Cochran and a throng of semi-educated technical experts who proved incapable of explaining the esoterica of their craft to a bewildered court.

In the last few years, the American judicial system has become almost as much of a joke as the U.S. Congress, although the antics of the new Republican majority in the latter institution

serve to keep congressional comedy fresh. The courts have become notorious for magistrates who shamelessly inject their own prejudices and opinions into the cold majesty of the law, permit ruthless criminals to bargain their way to freedom, and impose the most draconian punishments on citizens who have committed at worst only minor legal infractions. But juries are not much better, especially whenever a case before them is even remotely colored by racial issues. It is now commonplace for black jurors to announce after a trial that they voted to acquit black defendants plainly guilty of serious felonies just because they didn't want to see any more young black males go to jail, and the almost universal cynicism among whites that Mr. Simpson would be acquitted or get a hung jury suggests that few citizens any longer expect the courts to provide real justice in any case involving race. The ease with which the Simpson defense team succeeded in making the Officer Fuhrman's supposed racial epithets the main issue in the trial betrays the degree to which racial right-think rather than any commitment to mere justice is now the prevalent concern of the court system.

The foolishness of the Simpson trial inevitably recalls the judicial destruction of the white police officers who subdued Rodney King in 1991, but the fate of those white men at the hands of a criminal justice system rigged against whites is now largely forgotten. Yet those officers at least received a reasonably fair verdict in their first trial before the federal leviathan waddled in to make their ruin certain in their second, constitutionally repugnant, and politically mandated tribunal. But what happened

to Sgt. Stacy Koon and his colleagues looks like the justice of Solomon compared to what befell two Detroit policemen in the episode now known as the "Malice Green case."

Like any case involving white policemen and a supposed black victim, the case made national news for a brief while in 1993, not least because it looked like yet another chance to whack the white power structure for its "institutional racism" and because it seemed to be a possible sequel to the merry yarn of the illustrious Rodney. But there were clear differences between the Green case and that of the "black motorist" of Los Angeles. In the former, there was no videotape to be distorted for the misinformation of the public on national television, and there were no riots to display the "rage" and wounded self-esteem that the spectacle of four law officers wielding their truncheons against a strapping, drunken, and uncontrollably violent criminal helped produce in Los Angeles. Hence, the Malice Green case as a national story withered rather quickly, and had it not done so, the patent miscarriages of justice against the white cops might well have produced riots of a rather different hue. Yet the full story has never, as far as I know, attracted the slightest attention from the national media.

On the night of Nov. 5, 1992, two Detroit police officers named Larry Nevers and Walter Budzyn approached a parked car in the nether parts of Detroit, the same area where race riots erupted in 1967. The car they approached resembled one reported

stolen earlier, and it was stopped outside a building they say was known to be a crack house. As they reached the car, they realized it was not the stolen vehicle, but they did recognize one of its occupants as a person with a record of drug violations. Officer Nevers asked the other gentleman, a 35-year-old black male with a history of petty criminal charges named Malice Green, for his identification.

Green, accompanied by Officer Budzyn, walked to the other side of the car, and Nevers soon heard sounds of scuffling. According to their later account, Green was holding something in his fist that he refused to release. Budzyn yelled that he was holding drugs, and both officers had to struggle with him. Green kicked Nevers in the chest, and Nevers, who says Green tried to seize the handgun at the officer's side, struck Green several times with his flashlight. What eventually fell out of Green's hand was a rock of crack cocaine.

During the struggle, an emergency medical vehicle happened to pass by, and several other officers were required before Green could be completely subdued. By that time unconscious, he was placed in the ambulance and taken to a local hospital. He never woke up, and by the time the ambulance reached the emergency room, Malice Green was dead on arrival. Within a few hours it became clear that the careers, if not the lives, of the two officers who had tried to bring him in were also defunct.

Neither the Detroit police department nor the city's

political leaders lost any time in deciding what had happened and what would happen. Within 18 hours, the precinct commander brayed that "They murdered this man for no other reason than the fact that he was black," and Detroit police chief Stanley Knox proclaimed at a press conference that "This is not Simi Valley, and we will convict here." Simi Valley was the location of the first trial of the four Los Angeles policemen in the Rodney King case in which they were mostly acquitted. At the time Chief Knox uttered this thought, there had been no criminal charges filed and no completed investigation, and the very comparison with the King case was certain to inflame the racial passions in which the case was at once submerged.

Nevers and Budzyn were suspended without pay at about the same time, and Chief Knox was able to forbid a Police Review Board investigation of the case, a decision unprecedented in the city's history. Within 72 hours of Green's death, Detroit Mayor Coleman Young announced on national television that the two policemen were murderers, and within three weeks, the city had reached a settlement with Green's family for \$5.25 million. The city's legal settlement thus conceded that Green was an innocent victim even before criminal proceedings against the policemen had been initiated. If that wasn't enough to send the message that the city wanted them convicted, the police department proceeded to fire both officers during the pre-trial examination on the grounds of "conduct unbecoming an officer for having committed second

degree murder."

From the beginning, the NAACP was at the center of the onslaught against the two officers. As Nevers has written, "This case gave them more fuel for their racist fires. I lived through this case and witnessed black racism at its absolute finest. The racism was perpetrated by the local chapter, by powerful black officials in the city, and black members of the Detroit Police Department in concert with members of the Prosecutor's Office.... [The NAACP] organized marches, demonstrated, and proclaimed they would investigate this case personally. The NAACP also raised money for the family and paid the funeral expenses of Green."

At what reporters were pleased to call "the trial," Nevers and Budzyn were tried simultaneously but by two different juries. One of the juries consisted of 11 blacks (the sole white man later told a radio talk show host that his colleagues had "pressured" him into voting for conviction), and who should one of them turn out to be but the vice president of the local chapter of the NAACP, a fact never disclosed during the jury selection or the trial itself. Shortly before the jury retired to consider its verdict, it was sequestered and provided movies to watch for its edification. The first film was Spike Lee's classic in Afro-racism, "Malcolm X," which begins with the videotape of the Rodney King beating, a burning American flag, and a voice-over that identifies "the white man" as "being the greatest murderer on earth." Mr. Lee and Malcolm would have had no problem getting

onto the Nevers-Budzyn juries, but the piece of resistance at the "trial" was the autopsy report.

The autopsy was conducted by Dr. Kalil Jiraki, who testified that Malice Green's death was due to "blunt force trauma" (i.e., the blows from Nevers' flashlight). What was not disclosed was that there was a second autopsy, by Dr. Jiraki's supervisor, Dr. Bader Cassin, whose suspicions were aroused. Dr. Cassin noticed that Dr. Jiraki had claimed that he had examined the brain of the deceased and sliced into it, thereby determining the cause of death. But when Dr. Cassin examined the brain a day later, he found that Green's brain was intact. This would not be possible if the brain had been sectioned previously.

Moreover, while Dr. Jiraki testified at the trial that the amount of cocaine in Green's body (determined to be .50) was insignificant and insufficient to cause death, several months earlier, in July, 1992, he had ruled somewhat differently in the death of another black suspect who had died after multiple blows to the head administered by police officers (who in that case were also black). In the earlier case, that of James Brooks, who weighed 45 pounds more than Green, Dr. Jiraki held that the cause of death was "cocaine addiction." The level of cocaine in Brooks' body was .38, rather less than the level in Green's. Neither Green nor Brooks suffered any skull fracture, nor any swelling of the brain or lung edema, but both had enlarged hearts often associated with drug abuse. Brooks had consumed no alcohol, but

Green had. If it was possible for a smaller amount of cocaine to cause the death of a heavier man who had not been drinking, then it should have been possible for cocaine, and not the blows from Nevers' flashlight, to kill Malice Green, who had alcohol in his system.

None of these facts emerged at the trial. Though it was known that a second autopsy had been performed, the judge didn't allow that to get in the way of what was obviously a witch hunt. Even so, there was testimony from three other medical experts that challenged the blunt force trauma theory. Two forensic pathologists testified that cocaine and alcohol definitely contributed to Green's death, and a neuropathologist testified that "absent the blows this man would have died anyway.... Blunt force trauma was definitely not the cause of this man's death." The blows to Green's head, she testified, were superficial. This testimony alone ought to have established reasonable doubt.

But reasonable doubt is no longer a valid legal principle in the trial of white policemen charged with the murder of a black. Both Nevers and Budzyn were convicted and sentenced, Nevers to 12 to 25 years and Budzyn to 8 to 18 in prison, terms they are now serving. Their appeals for a mistrial have been denied by local courts, and they're now appealing to the Michigan Supreme Court. While the case evaporated quickly as a national news story, it continues to excite attention in Michigan. It remains to be seen whether anti-white forces can prevent further appeals from being

heard or some reasonable facsimile of justice from being served.

Even if justice is served and Nevers and Budzyn are released and exonerated, it also remains to be seen if anyone cares. As they prepared their appeals to the Michigan Supreme Court last summer, the New York Times and an army of other newspapers were rehearsing the story of "black journalist" Mumia Abu-Jamal, awaiting execution in Pennsylvania for the murder in 1981 of a white police officer in Philadelphia. The evidence against Abu-Jamal is pretty overwhelming, to the point that even most of his acolytes don't really claim he's innocent, but because of some supposed irregularities at his trial and the adroitness of his legal and public relations cohorts, there was a worldwide movement, instigated in this country by The Nation among others, to get him a new trial. "Free Mumia" posters are said to be common as far away as Berlin, and just before the convict's scheduled execution last August, French President Jacques Chirac took it upon himself, along with several other liberty-loving European strongmen, to urge mercy and justice for this most recent victim of white racism. I'm told by a friend who's a diplomatic correspondent that the conservative Monsieur Chirac did so at the behest of his good friend, Georges Marchais, leader of the French Communist Party, whose zeal for racial justice is as legendary as that of The Nation itself. In the event, Mumia survived, mainly because the court system renders the execution of convicted murderers all but impossible within a generation. Laugh if you

will at the belief among blacks that O.J. is innocent, but the silliness of that claim pales next to what the white left has persuaded itself to believe in the case of Abu-Jamal.

But there is no worldwide movement, or even much of a neighborhood rally, for a new trial for Nevers and Budzyn, nor for the Los Angeles Four, nor for any of the other white victims of black criminals and their Afro-racist allies. Anti-white forces and their white allies have no problem mounting nationwide or worldwide campaigns as part of the race war they want to instigate, but the absence of any resistance among whites or even of much consciousness of what is happening suggests who will be the victor when that war is over.■