

[CHRONICLES, January, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*How Do I Hate Thee? Let Me Count the Ways.*

The cinders of the World Trade Center had barely crumpled to the earth before President George W. Bush had it all figured out.

"America was targeted for attack," the president explained to the nation barely twelve hours after the first plane hit the Manhattan skyscrapers, "because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world." That explanation may have provided some comfort, though perhaps not much enlightenment, to the mystified and terrified millions who were wondering what was happening and why, but it was an explanation on which the president and many others soon enlarged. By September 20, Mr. Bush could offer the country an expanded account of the motives behind the bloodiest single act of mass murder in history. "Americans are asking, 'Why do they hate us?'," he said during his address to a joint session of Congress, and again he had the answer at his fingertips:

They hate us for what they see right here in this chamber: a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms: our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.

Among those statesmen who admired both the president's rhetorical gifts as well as the profundity of his political philosophy was

the now largely forgotten football star, Jack Kemp, who advised the public in his syndicated newspaper column, that "I would add ... they also hate our democracy, our liberal markets and our abundance of economic opportunity, at which the terror attacks were clearly directed." But even this incisive analysis failed to exhaust the creative powers of the ruling class and its spokesmen in fabricating flattering, self-serving, misleading, and transparently false explanations as to the motives of the terrorists who planned and carried out the Sept. 11 attacks.

National Review, once the leading conservative magazine in the country, mainly echoed the themes sounded by the president and Mr. Kemp. "The United States is a target because we are powerful, rich, and good," it bustled in its Oct. 1 editorial. "We are resented for our power, envied for our wealth, and hated for our liberty." And, like many of those offering such reasons for the attack, NR was especially concerned to smother any suspicion that the attack may have been due to U.S. support for Israel. Two weeks after the editorial just cited, senior editor Romesh Ponnurru sallied forth to explain it once more.

The radical Islamists' broader quarrel is with American power: not with the uses of that power, but with the fact of it. We are infidels. And we are liberal, capitalist, modern, powerful, and rich; therefore hated. Benjamin Netanyahu made the point well when he wrote in the aftermath of the September massacres that the Islamists do not hate the West because of Israel; they hate Israel because of the West. They call us, not Israel, 'the Great Satan.'

Mr. Netanyahu's point, as dubious as it was, is nonetheless something of an insult: Arabic attacks on Israel have nothing to

do with Palestinian claims to the land on which Israel now sits nor with continuing complaints of Israeli repression, but are really the fault of the United States and the "West" in general (the unstated implication, of course, is that the United States and the West therefore owe Israel their continuing and unbounded support, since there would be no attacks on Israel without the West). Norman Podhoretz, after a ranting attack in a letter to the New York Post on conservative columnist Robert Novak for even mentioning the role of American support for Israel as a cause of the Sept. 11 attacks, unbosomed in the Wall Street Journal sentiments largely identical to those of Mr. Netanyahu. So did George Will, who assured us that the terrorists' targets were "symbols not just of American power but of its virtues," explicitly quoted the former Israeli premier as telling us, "They hate 'Zionism as an expression and representation of Western civilization'," and added, "And they hate America because it is the purest expression of modernity -- individualism, pluralism, freedom, secularism." Columnist Paul Greenberg, apparently unable to think of any further virtues for which we were attacked, contented himself by telling us,

the haters need no reason to hate us. It is enough that we are who we are -- a free and powerful people.... They can't bear our happiness, our prosperity, our power, and most of all the realization that others want to model themselves on us and build their own free societies.

The list could go on, but it soon became apparent that

suggesting that U.S. policies in the Middle East -- either U.S. support for Israel or our role in the 1991 Gulf War against Iraq - - was a certain road to ruin. Nevertheless, the barest acquaintance with what Osama bin Laden and his merry band of cutthroats have said and are saying about the private war they are waging show that hatred of "democracy," the "West," "liberal markets," and the "virtues" of which Mr. Will boasts have absolutely nothing to do with it.

In 1995, for example, as the Washington Post reported on Sept. 23, authorities in the Philippines arrested a gentleman of Pakistani extraction who was discovered to be planning the bombing of 11 American commercial airliners on behalf of bin Laden's network. The draft communique in the suspect's possession was quite explicit about the motives that drove him and his accomplices: "The U.S. government gives military aircraft to the Jewish state so the Jews can continue fighting and killing. All of this is a result of the U.S. government's financial and military support of the Jewish state. All people who support the U.S. government are our target."

If that is not clear enough, consider what bin Laden himself told Time magazine in January, 1999, about President Clinton's bombing of Iraq the previous month: "There is no doubt that the treacherous attack has confirmed that Britain and America are acting on behalf of Israel and the Jews, paving the way for the Jews to divide the Muslim world once again, enslave it and loot

the rest of its wealth." He uttered similar sentiments in an interview with PBS: "Once again, I have to stress the necessity of focusing on the Americans and the Jews for they represent the spearhead with which the members of our religion have been slaughtered. Any effort directed against America and the Jews yields positive and direct results -- Allah willing." Bin Laden is upset mainly because he thinks U.S. forces have defiled Muslim holy sites in his native Saudi Arabia by military occupation, but retribution for the deaths and damage we have inflicted on Iraq in 1991 and since, as well as our support for Israel against the Palestinians are also major termites under his turban.

That the U.S.-Israeli alliance plays a major role in instigating terrorist attacks against us -- a bit more of a role than radical Muslims' distaste for Martinis, the stock market, women like Nicole Kidman, and other achievements of "modernity" -- ought to be obvious. Acknowledging that role has nothing to do with whether we should or shouldn't support Israel or pursue our current policies toward Iraq. Like every other policy, these should be judged by the standard of what they contribute to our national interest, not whether a handful of fanatics (Muslim or Jewish) approve or disapprove them. Moreover, it's dangerous to deny and disguise the truth about the role the U.S.-Israeli relationship played in motivating the terrorist attack as so many public leaders and opinion-makers have. "Keep your friends close, but your enemies closer," Don Corleone advised, and one purpose of

staying close to enemies like Osama bin Laden is to understand why they do what they do. If we have a false understanding of his motivations, especially one instilled in us by our own "leaders" and presumably shared by them in their own policy deliberations, don't bet on catching the terrorist mastermind any time soon, closing down his organization, or anticipating where and why it will strike next.

Sensitivity about the Israeli connection clearly lay behind a good many of the denials and cant that the ruling class threw up around the Sept. 11 attacks, but there was perhaps another purpose as well. The general thrust of virtually all of the false explanations of the attack and the motivations of the attackers was to praise not only the United States but also the kind of social order that the ruling class wants to build and govern -- the very sort of transnational global "society" that is animated by Mr. Will's much-treasured "modern virtues" of "individualism, pluralism, freedom, secularism" -- and the larger purpose of the rhetorical and analytical fog that was spread around the attacks was precisely to assist in the legitimization and consolidation of ruling class hegemony and the global regime it is constructing.

Indeed, the genius of the American and more generally the Atlantic ruling class is that it is able to manipulate the meaning of words, symbols, and cultural icons that really signify almost the opposite of what the ruling class twists them to mean. It was grimly amusing to watch multinational corporations suddenly sport

American flags in the wake of the attacks. A couple of years ago, when Ralph Nader's activists asked several Fortune 500 companies to recite the Pledge of Allegiance at their public board meetings, almost all simply refused. Patriotism and nationalism, however, can sometimes be useful, or at least manipulation of their symbols can be, and in the weeks after the Sept. 11 attack, the ruling class lost no opportunity to massage the public mind as it pleased, mainly for the benefit of its own regime. The self-congratulatory explanations of the attack were only part of the campaign, but two features of it stand out.

(1) Nationalism as Globalism: The sudden sprouting of Old Glory at corporate headquarters and in glossy magazine advertisements did not really signify a return to national loyalties and patriotic sentiments, nor did the constant and cloying invocation of patriotism by political leaders. On the contrary, the purpose of such exhibitions was to invest old and accepted symbols like the flag, patriotic songs, and patriotic images with the new universalist and globalist meanings that help legitimize the New World hegemons. That is why we were told constantly that not only Americans died in the World Trade Center towers but lots of other people from other countries too; that is why President Bush and other leaders kept banging the drum about how wonderful most Muslims and Arabs were and how the terrorists didn't represent real Islam, which is part of the New World Order and of the New World America. That is why there was such a

studied avoidance of any serious consideration of the immigration issue -- not just trivial visa security policies but actually reducing or halting the number of foreigners who are allowed to enter, roam around at will, and stay as long as they please. That is why also the constant subtheme of the post-attack discourse was the danger of "hate" (especially from "white hate groups") and "hate crimes." The multinational dimension of the alliance -- with Great Britain, ostensibly with NATO, and with various Arab or Muslim states like Saudi Arabia and Pakistan -- re-emphasized the globalist scope and substance of American power. Almost every assertion of nationality, patriotism, and national security was immediately diluted or modified by counter-assertions that insisted that such affirmations should not be taken as abandonments of or distractions from America's global mission and universal character or the transnational utopia of "modernity" that the ruling class was building.

(2) Identifying an Enemy: One of the major problems that the Atlantic ruling class has experienced since the end of the cold war (and even well before that) is that it lacks a credible enemy.

Almost ever since it began to form in the late 19th century, the ruling class has had one enemy or another to bounce off of -- Imperial Germany, Nazi Germany and its allies, the Soviet Union and its empire. Now they're all gone, and despite desultory efforts in the last decade to define Japan, international organized crime, China, or Serbia as New Enemies, none of them



quite worked or served the more useful purposes of having an enemy at all. Terrorism does serve such purposes. "In human beings," wrote Konrad Lorenz, the pioneer of behavioral biology, "the feeling of togetherness which is so essential to the serving of a common cause is greatly enhanced by the presence of a definite, threatening enemy whom it is possible to hate." Terrorism as the Enemy not only serves to induce a much-needed feeling of "togetherness" and mass solidarity under ruling class dominance but also functions as a plausible excuse for enlarged state power, further global activism, and more direct control of the population and, eventually, of the vindication of the regime and its political formulas. If bin Laden and his network are defeated or destroyed, the mantra will be that it was America's global power and all the "virtues" of "modernity" that defeated them.

What stands out in the response of the American ruling class to the Sept. 11 attacks is not so much the skills of real leadership it displayed as its amazing capacity to turn the whole attack and its aftermath into an opportunity for cementing its own dominance in the United States and its larger, long-term agenda for the planet. Osama bin Laden and his friends ought to learn something from the experience: The richest irony of the most lethal attack on the United States in its history is that, so far from seriously wounding or destabilizing the American mega-state, the attack and the New Enemies who planned and perpetrated it actually helped to increase its power and promote the interests of

the elites that run it.■

*[CHRONICLES, February, 2002]*

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*The Tyrant's Lobby*

As wars in American history go, President Bush's crusade -- excuse me, campaign -- against terrorism doesn't really rate in the Big Leagues. American military action so far in Afghanistan is not even comparable to what it was in the Gulf War of 1990-91, and put next to the American Civil War, World War I, or World War II, the current adventure barely registers. Nevertheless, that doesn't mean that the war business is not proving useful to those ever on the alert to stamp out constitutional freedoms and, along with them, those dissidents who exercise and enjoy them.

Almost from the very moment of the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11 last year, an endless parade of experts, non-experts, wanna-be experts, and used-to-be experts have strutted forth on television, radio, and in the opinion pages of newspapers to explain to Americans how they are going to have to accustom themselves to less liberty, how they'd better not complain about standing in line at airports for two hours or more and having their toenail clippers and bottle openers pocketed by an avaricious, largely untrained, and manifestly incompetent security staff, and how we all have to start pulling together to root out the terrorists amongst us. Of course, due to the crackpot immigration policies of the federal government for the last three decades, there are in

fact terrorists amongst us, and the Justice Department eventually admitted that there were some 250,000 aliens in the United States to whom it wished to talk about their possible role in terrorism but whom it was entirely at a loss to locate.

Yet, even as various political leaders and public figures told us to shut up, sit down, and prepare for our forthcoming servitude calmly, neither the government nor the experts for the most part emitted the least discomfort with official immigration policies or the vast hordes of immigrants, many from Arabic lands, that fluttered across the nation. As I noted in a previous column, as far as the American Ruling Class is concerned, the Constitution is expendable, but immigration and the multicultural and multiracial checkerboard it creates remain sacrosanct, unquestionable, and untouchable.

Just how expendable constitutional freedoms were soon became clear. Within a month of the terrorist attacks, the Congress passed and the president signed a bill vastly expanding the powers of the federal government to spy, investigate, surveill, and wiretap, to the point that civil libertarian Nat Hentoff wrote that the new law represented "the worst attack on the Bill of Rights since World War II." For a gentleman of Mr. Hentoff's persuasion, that's saying something, since it means the law is worse than Joe McCarthy, J. Edgar Hoover, the House Un-American Activities Committee, or Richard Nixon, but Mr. Hentoff is a zealous (and largely consistent) defender of liberty, and he perhaps overstated the case -- but not by much. Under the law, as law professor Jeffrey Rosen explained in The New Republic, "If

your colleague [unknown to you] is a target of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act investigation, the government could tap all your [own] communications on a shared phone, work computer or a public library terminal."

For whatever reasons, then, there really are terrorists inside the country and others outside who'd like to get inside, and it makes sense to allow federal police and intelligence services a certain amount of elbow room in tracking them down. But there was every indication that the elbow room, like a space warp in a science fiction story, would quickly balloon into a vast and uncharted universe of its own.

By the time of the anthrax attacks of last October, some in the tyranny lobby were actually banging the drum for what could only be called an undisguised police state. A popular historian named Jay Winik published in the Wall Street Journal on Oct. 23 a long article entitled "Security Comes Before Liberty," in which he expounded the glorious precedents of Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt in suspending civil liberties during the various "national emergencies" that their own policies helped to manufacture. Mr. Winik began his little rationalization of despotism with a glowing account of the torture of a suspected terrorist by Philippine police for several weeks in 1995. The terrorist eventually belched up information that betrayed and prevented an airline hijacking and attack similar to those later committed on the World Trade Centers last year, and Mr. Winik made

it entirely clear that the procedures employed by American police are woefully and regrettably backward compared to the more sophisticated techniques of their Philippine colleagues.

Mr. Winik's article was mainly a theoretical manifesto to show that police statism is as American as -- well -- Lincoln, Wilson, and Ole Moosejaw himself. The real case for torture was advanced when the Washington Post ran a story about how some federal authorities, dismayed by the refusal of various terrorist suspects to gas and spew their secrets voluntarily, are now pondering -- shall we say -- "alternative strategies." "Among the alternative strategies under discussion," the Post reported without cracking a smirk, "are using drugs or pressure tactics, such as those employed occasionally by Israeli interrogators, to extract information. Another idea is extraditing the suspects to allied countries where security services sometimes employ threats to family members or resort to torture." The article quoted one unnamed (for obvious reasons) FBI agent as saying, "But it could get to that spot where we could go to pressure ... where we won't have a choice, and we are probably getting there." I agree; we probably are.

By the week after this report, who should start bolstering the case for the outright legalization of torture but that icon of progress and liberty, Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz. Speaking in St. Louis, the hero of a thousand courtroom crusades - - excuse me, campaigns -- for the underdog spoke up for the

legalization of dousing the underdog with gasoline and setting it on fire. "Even torture may not be off the table as an information-gathering tool, Dershowitz said," the St. Louis Times Dispatch reported on Nov. 5. "But there must be a national debate about the circumstances in which torture is permissible and who should have the power to decide when to use it." Right-oh. We wouldn't want to just lurch into torturing anyone for just any reason at all, would we? It's good we have such apostles of constitutional law as Mr. Dershowitz around to tell us how to do it and who gets to authorize it.

As to who might some of the guests in the nation's new torture chambers be, don't bet your box cutters they'd be confined to Arabs and Muslims. Almost from the beginning of the war on terrorism, there was a steady and increasingly loud hum about right-wing "hate groups" and their exact relationship to the Sept. 11 attacks. It may not have been entirely a coincidence that the very week after the anti-terrorism bill passed into law, the FBI acknowledged that it had no idea who was sending out anthrax envelopes and hazarded the guess -- it was nothing more -- that it might be the work of "hate groups." There was and is no more evidence for that than that the germs were being sent by the Girl Scouts -- or for that matter by such violent groups as the Jewish Defense League, the Animal Liberation Front, and various environmental terrorist groups -- but it was the "hate groups" of the right that got their names smeared across the headlines.

"Hate groups," of course, now include not just really violent or hateful groups but also nearly any organization that defends the Confederate Flag, advocates a halt to mass immigration, supports the Second Amendment, denounces homosexuality as a sin, or expresses militant opposition to abortion, and some of the witch-hunting phonies who pose as "experts" on "hate groups" even try to rope in leaders of the "religious right" like Pat Robertson and Gary Bauer. As it turned out, however, the line on "hate groups" and their supposed connection to recent terrorism was as confused and without substance as the concept of "hate group" itself. In September, Newhouse News Service released a story titled "America's racist-right fringe groups laud terror attack," in what was an obvious and rather ham-fisted effort to "link" the "haters" with those who really did commit terror. One of the few "hate group leaders" the story could find who expressed any sympathy for the Sept. 11 attacks was a sad chap in a place called Ulysses, Pa., who ranted cheerfully about "Satan's children, called Jews" and expressed the hope that "may the World Trade Center burn to the ground." Even on the thither frontiers of politics, however, such sentiments were hard to come by, but that didn't stop federal authorities from blithely speculating on their responsibility for the anthrax mail or the mainstream media from smearing them with some connection, however vague, with Sept. 11 itself. Eventually, unable to produce any evidence whatsoever of serious "hate group" sympathy with or involvement in terrorism,



the witch hunters began to change the official line. By mid November, the press was reporting that, so far from expressing sympathy for the Sept. 11 attacks, "some [hate] groups are using the events as a recruiting tool," as the Washington Post reported on Nov. 10. "White supremacy groups have used images of the burning World Trade Center towers on fliers as a way to argue that the United States should close its borders to new residents." At the same time, Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center admitted that it was doubtful that "neo-Nazi, Ku Klux Klan or domestic militia organizations" were behind the anthrax campaign.

"We have leaned toward a foreign explanation or a madman with a microbiology degree," Mr. Potok solemnly pronounced, as though he had any grounds or qualifications at all for "leaning toward" any explanation whatsoever.

Nevertheless, if one subtext of the aftermath of Sept. 11 was that the Constitution is expendable, another was that while foreign terrorism might be a problem now, the real enemy remains "white racism" and "hate," and even if no evidence of "hate group" involvement was immediately available, mechanisms were being developed that made real evidence perhaps not so necessary after all.

The possibility of outright torture was one such mechanism, but another popped up when Attorney General John Ashcroft suddenly announced that the Justice Department would now monitor conversations between attorneys and their clients in terrorism

cases. A grotesque and blatant violation of long-standing criminal procedure and constitutional law, the decision produced a few squeaks from the administration's Democratic opponents but no serious opposition. A few days later, no doubt emboldened by the silence, the administration announced that it was authorizing secret military tribunals for foreigners charged with "terrorism" either in the United States or abroad in places like Afghanistan. Based on a "precedent" from the Roosevelt era, when German spies and saboteurs were tried before similar tribunals in secret and then executed, the new procedures were justified as necessary to protect the lives of jurors from reprisals and the functioning of the U.S. government, and the president himself explained that it simply is "not practicable" to require the tribunals to operate in accordance with "the principles of law and the rules of evidence" that pertain in real criminal trials. Of course, we have had trials of terrorists before without their comrades murdering the jurors or paralyzing the government, and there's no reason to think we can't continue to do so. Probably the real reason for the secret trials is that the government simply lacks the evidence to convict a good many suspects whose involvement in illegal activities is by no means provable under established rules of evidence and procedure; therefore, we change the rules of evidence and procedure in order to throw them in jail or (why not?) drag them in front of a firing squad.

How far the attack on civil liberties will go, how long their

erosion will endure (if indeed it doesn't prove to be permanent), and how many innocent and law-abiding Americans, as opposed to non-citizens who really are terrorists, will suffer remains to be seen. It's quite true that most of the extraordinary measures so far adopted or proposed are directed against foreign terrorists and not at Americans at all, but having demonized as "hate groups" even law-abiding and non-violent dissidents on the political right, the government and its extensions and allies in the Ruling Class may well find it expedient in the future to use the "precedents" of the Bush administration to justify locking up or silencing political forces that have nothing to do with terrorism but a great deal to do with defending the right to keep and bear arms, resisting the New World Order, protecting national sovereignty, opposing immigration, or upholding traditional cultural symbols and icons. To the mentality of the Ruling Class, there is little practical and virtually no moral difference between American militias and similar groups on the unreconstructed right, on the one hand, and the Islamic mass murderers of Al Qaeda, on the other. There is, quite literally, no telling what the Ruling Class will do or how far its greed for power will reach once it has liberated both its mind and conscience as well as its actual policies from whatever constitutional and legal restraints remain it has so far been unable to shatter.■

[CHRONICLES, April, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*What Neo-Cons Do on Their Summer Vacations*

It is not today exactly a secret of state that neo-conservatism has become the dominant expression of what passes as the American "right" -- and that its victory is also the reason why it is necessary for more serious conservatives to use the qualifying phrase "what passes for" in describing the American right at all and to place the word "right" itself in quotation marks. Much like the proverbial rat race, the controversy between "paleo-conservatives" and "neo-conservatives" is over, and the rats have won. The best proof of the victory is that the major media, when they describe a neo-conservative, generally call him a "conservative" plain and simple, as though he alone were representative of the type. The fact remains that most Americans who call themselves conservative at all almost certainly continue to mean by the term more or less the same thing that paleo-conservatives mean, but what "most" of any group think, believe, say, or do usually has little connection with what the minority that defines and directs the group does or how it does it. In political and ideological movements, as in bridge clubs and transnational empires, oligarchies prevail.

Like any other gang of conquerors, having taken over and redefined the American right, the neo-conservatives need to decide

what they want to do with the bottomless pits of wealth and power their victory enables them to pocket and to survey the territory they have gained. In the December issue of the Atlantic Monthly, neo-conservative journalist David Brooks tries to do just that. Mr. Brooks, as the sidekick of Weekly Standard editor William Kristol, has for some years now been trying to formulate a refried version of neo-conservatism known as "national greatness conservatism," which is really not much more than a triumphalist tour of various by-ways of American history and culture in terms of the current globalist and multiethnic conglomeration of Big Government, Big Business, and Big Culture that actually prevails in the United States and which it is the main business of neo-conservatives to conserve. The subject of his article in the Atlantic, Mr. Brooks' grand tour of what he thinks is America's heartland, is part of this formulation.

The article, "One Nation, Slightly Divisible," concerns itself with the political division between what television commentators on election night, 2000 labeled the "red" and "blue" zones that voted for the Republican or Democratic tickets respectively (for the first time since the French Revolution, red became the color of the right). The political divisions are also symbolic of deeper social and cultural divisions, and that is the problem for "national greatness conservatism," you see. If we're going to have the sort of "nationalism" that neo-conservatives like Mr. Brooks and his friends at the Weekly Standard favor, then divisions within the nation are rather a no-no. The sort of organic nationalism that actually develops from real subnational,

regional differences is what at least some paleo-conservatives favor, and the politico-cultural divisions symbolized by the red and blue zones correspond to the territories of what paleos generally call, on the one hand, "Middle" or "Heartland" America and, on the other, the Metropole located in New York, Washington, and Los Angeles, among other, lesser urban megaliths. In paleo-conservative theory and strategy, it is the antagonism between Heartland and Metropole that defines the major political issues of the day, and it is through the political mobilization of the Heartland that the hegemony of the Metropole can eventually be smashed and something like a traditional American order restored.

It is Mr. Brooks' contribution to neo-conservative theory and strategy that he tries in his article to define the Heartland out of existence or at least out of political relevance, for if the Heartland doesn't exist, then neo-conservatives can expect to preside forever over the National Greatness they have succeeded in conserving.

To substantiate his theory that Heartland America is vanishing or, perhaps more precisely, is coming to accommodate itself to the hegemony of the Metropole, poor Mr. Brooks actually was obliged to leave his beloved Washington, D.C. suburbs and go to the Heartland itself. There, much like Sir Richard Burton in nineteenth-century Africa or perhaps more like Baron Munchausen, he discovered all manner of wondrous things and sometimes even did such things himself. He ate meatloaf in locally owned, family

restaurants and came to the conclusion that the availability of restaurants that serve meatloaf marks the geographical boundary between Red and Blue America. He had conversations with men and women who had never been to college. He saw a number of real tattoo parlors. He attended church and spoke to the ministers afterwards. Mr. Brooks, to his credit, acknowledges that he doesn't belong in Red America, that he is entirely a product of Blue America -- specifically, Montgomery County, Maryland, which "is one of the steaming-hot centers of the great espresso machine that is Blue America" and "is full of upper-middle-class towns inhabited by lawyers, doctors, stockbrokers, and establishment journalists like me." Red America, for Mr. Brooks, is Franklin County, Pennsylvania, "a rural county twenty-five miles west of Gettysburg" that includes the towns of Waynesboro, Chambersburg, and Mercers and was originally settled by "the Scotch-Irish and has plenty of Brethren and Mennonites along with a fast-growing population of evangelicals." "The joke," Mr. Brooks confides to his snickering audience,

that Pennsylvanians tell about their state is that it has Philadelphia on one end, Pittsburgh on the other, and Alabama in the middle. Franklin County is in the Alabama part. It strikes me as I drive there that even though I am going north across the Mason-Dixon line, I feel as if I were going south.

It's amazing that Mr. Brooks didn't take a revolver along with him for protection, but he surely must have made certain that his name, address, and blood type were sewn securely into his

underwear.

Mr. Brooks went to Franklin Country because he wanted to answer the questions, "Are Americans any longer a common people? Do we have one national conversation and one national culture? Are we loyal to the same institutions and values?" and the answer he came up with, despite his discomfort with meatloaf and tattoo parlors, is that we are. Acknowledging that there are differences in taste, income, education, and even some deeper values, Mr. Brooks tries to puncture the theories of the "culture war" put forward by, among others, Pat Buchanan and Gertrude Himmelfarb. "I found absolutely no evidence that a Stanley Greenberg-prompted Democratic Party (or a Pat Buchanan-led Republican Party) could mobilize white middle class Americans on the basis of class consciousness," and "almost nobody I spoke with understood, let alone embraced, the concept of a culture war." The editor of a local newspaper assured him that "we would never take a stance on gun control or abortion.

One finds little crusader zeal in Franklin County. For one thing, people in small towns don't want to offend people whom they'll be encountering on the street for the next fifty years. Potentially controversial subjects are often played down.

Mr. Brooks certainly doesn't try to deny that the residents of Franklin County are conservatives, but "The conservatism I found ... is not an ideological or a reactionary conservatism. It is a temperamental conservatism. People place tremendous value on being agreeable, civil, and kind.... They appreciate what they



have. They value continuity and revere the past."

Mr. Brooks' conclusions after his adventures in anthropological research were that

a lot of our fear that America is split into two rival camps arises from mistaken notions of how society is shaped. Some of us still carry the old Marxist categories in our heads.

We think that society is like a layer cake, with the upper class on top. And, like Marx, we tend to assume that wherever there is class division there is conflict.

The truth, he tells us, is that society, or at least American society, is more like a high-school cafeteria, in which different categories of students come and go, sit together or apart, and mainly leave each other alone. "All these cliques were part of the same school: they had different sensibilities; sometimes they knew very little about the people in the other cliques, but the jocks knew there would always be nerds, and the nerds knew there would always be jocks. That's just the way life is."

Mr. Brooks uses this dubious and rather strained metaphor to get to his conclusion, which one suspects was formulated well before he ever rolled into Franklin County at all:

What unites the two Americas, then, is our mutual commitment to this way of life -- to the idea that a person is not bound by his class, or by the religion of his fathers, but is free to build a plurality of connections for himself. We are participants in the same striving process, the same experimental journey.

In other words, we are a "credal nation" committed to nothing save the upward mobility and endless ascent that the creed's pursuit of

happiness guarantees us. It is not class, religion, race, region, or culture that binds Americans together but their "commitment," their assent to the creed, the "idea," that we are not so bound at all. Conveniently, Mr. Brooks went to Franklin County and discovered the very same neo-conservatism he left in his cubicle at the Weekly Standard.

What Mr. Brooks is telling us -- and perhaps more importantly, telling his neo-conservative colleagues -- is that the Heartland is really no threat to them or their values. It's not a cauldron bubbling with lynch mobs, Brownshirts, and toothless, smelly old men with shotguns in their pick-up trucks. Maybe they do eat meatloaf and get tattoos, but a sport like Mr. Brooks can drive all over Franklin County and never get called a bad name. And, if the Heartland is not really a threat to the Metropole, then we can all get along in National Greatness as part of the "same striving process, the same experimental journey." If there is no Buchananite "culture war," then neo-conservatism really is the new national orthodoxy.

I haven't been to Franklin County, but I readily grant that Mr. Brooks' description of it is probably largely accurate. It's rather his interpretation that is open to question. In the first place, it's not surprising that there's no bubbling cauldron, no "crusader zeal," or that Franklin County is not Salem, Massachusetts in 1692 or even Dayton, Tennessee in 1925. Few places anywhere are. Nor is it surprising that residents avoid

controversies that have little to do with their personal lives. Most people do, and most people don't think about subjects like abortion and gun control as much as "establishment journalists" do. The absence of firebrands and crackpots in Franklin County tells us nothing about where it would or does line up in a culture war; it only tells us that Mr. Brooks can't quite imagine a culture war that is not waged by firebrands and crackpots.

But the whole point about the culture war that leaders like Pat Buchanan have talked about is that they are conflicts between precisely the "normal" people of places like Franklin County and the real zealots, firebrands, and crackpots in the Metropole. It's not Pat Robertson or Jerry Falwell, for all their flaws, who are abnormal, let alone most of their followers, but the Susan Sontags, Alan Dershowitzes, Julian Bonds, Kevin Costners, Dan Rathers, and Hillary Clintons. If Mr. Brooks wanted to find weirdos and a fanaticism for using power to uproot one culture and manufacture and impose another, he should have stayed in Montgomery County.

As for the Karl Marx "layer cake" model of society, I'm sorry, but it's not only Marx who thought so. It's anyone who observes accurately the distribution of power, political and cultural, within a society. The jocks and the nerds may know each clique will always exist, but you can bet the nerds never wonder which one occupies the top layer. People who try to tell us that society and the distribution of power within it are not invariably

hierarchical, with winners and losers, rulers and ruled, tend to be the rulers themselves or at least on their side. That's what they want the ruled to believe.

And that's what the neo-conservatives want the rest of us, the Heartland wherever it is and those who speak for it, to believe. Mr. Brooks' cafeteria America, like neo-conservatism itself, is a descendant of the pluralist sociology of the 1950s that purported that there was no ruling class, no power elite, and no class or cultural conflict in America. It was all just one vast suburban development, in which mass corporations, unions, and government bureaucracies balanced each other and mass universities and their intelligentsia concocted pseudo-scientific rationalizations for the American Century. And just as neo-conservatism is the descendant of those rationalizations, so is the present-day regime of the Metropole descended from the phony "pluralism" of the 1950s.

There is, finally, probably a good reason why the local newspaper editor in Franklin County doesn't want to take a position on such issues as abortion or gun control. Fifty years ago, she would have, and the positions would have been ferocious and dismissive opposition to both. Today she won't, because support for gun control and abortion has become so powerful, even in places like Franklin County, that a small newspaper has good reason to avoid the controversy entirely. The Metropole, in other words, is winning, if it hasn't already won. Having made a desert

by means of ruthless cultural and ideological regimentation, the Metropole -- and its neo-con apologists -- now calls it the Heartland.

Nevertheless, Franklin County, and all the rest of the Heartland, may yet surprise us. With the right leadership and the right explanations of the threat that it and its culture (which is not in the least anything like an "experimental journey" but a real way of life) are facing from the smiling mask the Metropole and its apologists present, what has become the bottom layer of the national layer cake may still decide to put itself on top again. ■

[CHRONICLES, May, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Who Rules America?*

Is there a ruling class in the United States, or are we, as David Brooks suggests in his December, 2001, Atlantic Monthly article (discussed in my previous column), more like a high-school cafeteria in which separate but equal cliques of "jocks," "nerds," and others munch meatloaf together amicably, with no one clique telling the others what to do? Mr. Brooks' memories of his high school are, to say the least, rather different from mine, but be that as it may, his analogy really doesn't apply to the United States on the eve of its absorption into the global stewpot. His view is reminiscent of (and, I think, descended from) the so-called "pluralist" or "consensus" school of sociology that prevailed in academic circles in the 1950s. According to that view, espoused chiefly by a lady named Suzanne Keller, elites do indeed exist, but in modern and especially American society, they are what she called "strategic elites," competing with and balancing each other, so that none unites with the others and none predominates over the others. Sometimes one elite or a temporary coalition of elites is more powerful than the rest, but that doesn't last long, and as a result political freedom is preserved from the overwhelming domination of a single, monolithic power. Modern society, Miss Keller argued, was just too complex for a

single, unified elite to monopolize power and constitute what is usually called a "ruling class."

The strategic elite model is more or less a sociological version of what the American Founders themselves thought they were building into the constitutional structure, with "factions" rather than "elites" checking and balancing each other in the different chambers and branches of the federal government. Happy as it might seem and real as such socio-political balances sometimes are, that's not the way it is in this country today, nor has it been for several decades.

The main rival to the "strategic elite" theory was the "power elite" model, associated mainly with C. Wright Mills and more recently with his disciple, G. William Domhoff. The Mills theory is that a ruling class does exist in the United States and that it consists of the families who constitute a social "upper class" (and are listed in the Social Register, a major primary source for Domhoff) and actually own controlling blocs of stock in the major corporations. Power elite theorists make some allowance for the emergence of corporate managers, whom they see as subservient to and assimilated within the old ruling class, and for what Mills called the "warlords," military leaders whom he believed were gaining more and more power during the age of global warfare. Domhoff, who is somewhat more careful in his analyses than Mills, is of particular interest to conservatives because in his 1967 book, The Higher Circles, he has a chapter exploring the sometimes subtle differences between his views and those of such stalwarts of the Old (and conspiratorial) Right as Dan Smoot and the young

Phyllis Schlafly. All three essentially identified the same people and groups as the dominating forces in American society, but Domhoff rejected the purely conspiratorial analysis his counterparts on the right offered and saw the motivations of the elite more in terms of its structural interests than in those of ideological purpose.

The problem with the Domhoff-Mills theory, however, is that (1) no matter how long your family has been listed in the Social Register, that really doesn't give you any power, except maybe to exclude uncouth guests from your yachting parties, and (2) it really ought to be obvious that the kinds of folks Professor Domhoff mainly talks about -- the Morgans, Adamses, Lodges, etc. - - don't run much of anything important anymore apart from yachting parties.

So far from the old American Upper Class absorbing and assimilating the managers who run their banks and corporations, the truth is, as James Burnham saw in the 1940s, the managers have all but assimilated the owners and promote themselves into the Upper Class (through joining its clubs, sending their kids to their schools, emulating its manners, and sometimes even marrying their daughters). The reason the direction of assimilation happens this way and not the other is that the managers are the ones who have the real power, and status, like most other things, follows power.

Managers have the real power because they have the technical



and managerial skills to make the banks, corporations, unions, universities, big media companies, and government bureaucracies run. Owners, no matter how much stock they own, don't, unless they make a special effort to acquire those skills through education, and not all that many stockowners from the old Upper Class do so. As business historian Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., writes, although "wealthy families ... are the beneficiaries of managerial capitalism," there is "little evidence that these families make basic decisions concerning the operations of modern capitalistic enterprises and of the economy in which they operate," and "members of the entrepreneurial family rarely became active in top management unless they themselves were trained as professional managers."

It is, in a word, technical and managerial skill that yields power, both within the mass organizations themselves that now dominate modern society and in the society itself. You or I may own 90 percent of the stock in General Motors or Chase Manhattan, but any effort on our part to run the company would result in bankruptcy within a year. We would have to rely on professional managers, and even if we fired them, we'd have to hire others with the same skills.

It makes a considerable difference whether the ruling class consists of traditional Upper Class stockowners and entrepreneurs or of technically trained managers. For one thing, the old Upper Class, the grande bourgeoisie of American society and the old

ruling class from at least the Civil War to the Depression, was more or less rooted in traditional social institutions. It passed on its property and wealth, the basis of its power, through inheritance, and therefore it had a strong vested interest in maintaining both property rights and what are today called "family values." The family indeed, as well as the local community, religious and ethnic identities, and the cultural and moral codes that respected and legitimized property, wealth, inheritance, social continuity, the personal virtues that helped people acquire wealth and property, and small governments unable to threaten these things, all served as power bases for the bourgeois elite. Such is not the case with managerial elites.

Managerial elites depend on the technical skills that enable them to gain and keep power inside the mass organizations. Their major structural interest lies in preserving and extending the organizations they control and in making sure those organizations are perpetuated. The bourgeois virtues and bonds that served the old elite as instruments of power mean virtually nothing to managers, who can no more pass on their professional skills to their children than the stock owned by the old bourgeoisie can confer the skills needed to run organizations. Hence, managers tend not to depend on families very much, to get divorces and have children who grow up to be loutish illiterates rather than the well-bred young Yalies cranked out for generations by the old elites. The managerial scion may inherit whatever wealth his

managerial daddy agglomerated, but unless he has the personal brains and discipline to get himself similar skills, he can't step into daddy's shoes at the family firm the way a young Rockefeller or Morgan could. But even aside from the family itself, managers simply don't need bourgeois structures to maintain their power -- not the local community, not religion and ethnicity, and not the same cultural and moral codes. Indeed, such institutions merely get in the way of managerial power. They represent barriers against which large corporations and other mass organizations are always colliding, and the sooner such barriers are smashed, the more reach and power the organizations, and the managerial elites that run them, will acquire.

Managerial elites, in other words, have a structural interest in delegitimizing traditional bourgeois institutions and moral codes and in constructing and legitimizing their own, and the later history of the last century and the early history of the present century witnesses the managerial "deconstruction" of the older institutions and codes and the imposition of their own. The managerial codes incorporate the ideological premises of universalism (because managerial interests are global, detached and disengaged from any particular place or group and extend across many different nations, races, religions, and cultures) and what William H. Whyte in The Organization Man called "scientism," "the premise that with the same techniques that have worked in the physical sciences we can eventually create an exact science of

man" (because the managerial skills on which the elite depends are based on the application of "science" to social, economic, and political relationships). The managerial portrait of human beings bears more resemblance to the little cut-out figures you see in sociological charts and tables than to any human being who ever really existed. An elite that really thinks this is what human beings are like will not hesitate to "plan the economy," design "communities," bomb harmless peasants, manipulate public opinion, impose forced busing, set up concentration camps, or do anything else it can imagine is in the best interests of "humanity," "humankind," "the Future," or whatever other abstraction it has fixed upon. It is precisely because the managerial elite has succeeded in liberating itself and the societies it dominates from the provincialism of traditional societies that it is so dangerous and so inclined to tyranny -- and so susceptible to penetration and manipulation by well-organized ethnic minorities that retain strong identities.

But is it a "ruling class" or merely a gang of "strategic elites"? A ruling class as the term is conventionally used in sociology is usually more hereditary than the managerial elite seems to be, but aside from that characteristic, a ruling class is mainly distinguished by its unity and its ability to make its own interests prevail over those of rival elites. The unity of an elite is usually established through its ideology, the ideas, beliefs, and values it shares that help identify its interests and

justify the elite's pursuit of them. In the case of the managerial elite, there can be little question that what has been known in the United States since the New Deal era as "liberalism" has served as the main managerial ideology, while what used to be known as "conservatism" served as the main political ideology of the old, declining, and now largely defunct bourgeois elite. As the bourgeois elite ceased to exist, its ideology became irrelevant, and "neo-conservatism," an up-dated version of conservatism that explicitly defends managerial interests and values, replaced it. Managerial liberalism reflects the values of universalism and scientism and offers clear rationalizations for the "progressive," "scientific," "enlightened," and "cosmopolitan" managerial class in its struggle for social and political power against the "backward," "repressive," and "provincial" bourgeoisie. Moreover, managerial liberalism is acceptable to almost all the managerial elites in different kinds of organizations -- to big businessmen in large corporations, academics and eggheads in mass universities, the permanent bureaucracies of labor unions and government agencies. Even if individual managers don't believe in liberalism themselves and even if their behavior often contradicts what it formally demands of them, it remains the major public expression and rationalization of their shared group interests.

Between the New Deal and the Reagan administration, the dominance of the increasingly unified managerial class and its

ideology was indeed challenged and balanced to some degree by bourgeois conservatism, which still flourished outside the nation's metropolitan areas and still commanded both large material resources and considerable human loyalty. By the 1980s, however, the bourgeois elite was a spent force, its own economic interest largely dependent on the managerial economy itself and its cultural values and codes the objects of contempt and even of sanctions by managerial liberals and (perhaps more important) the new managerial right called "neo-conservatives." Not only does the managerial class constitute a unified and dominant ruling class, but, well beyond that, it is also approaching exactly what Gaetano Mosca, one of the main architects of the modern theory of elites, had warned against: "The absolute preponderance of a single political force" as an "essential element in any type of despotism." While the old bourgeois elite was too decentralized and limited in its power and reach to constitute a monolithic social and political hegemony, the managerial class does, and what we are now witnessing is the managerial obliteration of whatever remnants of bourgeois freedom and culture still exist and the managerial regimentation of social differences -- rationalized by the new managerial codeword, "diversity."

The idea that "strategic elites" check and balance each other and co-exist in the same kind of bucolic amity that Mr. Brooks' "jocks" and "nerds" enjoy or in the harmony that obtains between the ebony and ivory on Stevie Wonder's piano keyboard is not only

wrong but is actually a deliberately fostered managerial delusion itself. As long as the ruling class can induce its subjects to believe that it doesn't really exist at all and that the elites that do exist are merely distinct and separate groups that compete against each other, it can preserve the illusion that something like freedom continues to thrive. Like most ruling classes, however, it can fool its subjects only so long before the truth about who really rules them and what remains of their country smacks them in the face.■

[CHRONICLES, June, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Immigration Reform's New 'Palatable Face'*

Almost immediately after the attacks of Sept. 11, the Open Borders Lobby knew it was in trouble. The immediate, obvious, and logical implication of 19 aliens entering the country entirely legally and proceeding to carry out the biggest single act of mass murder in human history is that the United States needs to close its borders, at least for a while. The attacks ought also to have suggested that our immigration policies are seriously flawed and in need of radical reform and that allowing literally millions of aliens to pass our borders virtually at will creates not only security threats but a vast range of other problems as well.

Most Americans did indeed perceive these implications of the Sept. 11 attacks, but for the last several months proponents of mass immigration have fought to smother in its political cradle any efforts at reform to which these perceptions might have given birth. The lobby has followed essentially three tactics, each of which is essentially an enhancement of tactics it used before Sept. 11: (1) concede the need for some reform, especially in such merely procedural matters as visa security, screening of foreign visitors, and expelling expired visa holders, but avoid and oppose any and all comprehensive immigration control measures such as a moratorium or drastic and permanent reductions in



numbers of immigrants; (2) continue to smear those who have actively supported immigration control as "racists," "extremists," etc., so as to prevent them from gaining legitimacy or influence through their claims that Sept. 11 proved they had been right all along about the immigration danger; and (3) posture as the true or "responsible" advocates of real and effective immigration reform whose efforts are in danger of being hijacked and discredited by the aforementioned "extremists." So faithfully have these tactics been followed by a series of apparently unconnected opponents of immigration control that one is tempted, if one did not know any better, to posit an actual conspiracy among them to pursue a common and concerted plan.

The reason for the urgency that the Open Borders zealots felt was expressed by one of its adherents, Tamar Jacoby, whose article in the March Reader's Digest, "Don't Slam the Door," generally follows the tactics described above. "Phones rang off the hook at radio call-in shows," Miss Jacoby panted in her depiction of the national reaction to Sept. 11. "Angry messages flooded Internet chat rooms. Members of Congress soon joined in, demanding that the country freeze all visas for six months, even station troops and tanks on the borders."

Most Americans probably have no recollection of the sort of xenophobic hysteria she portrays, but readers should recall that Miss Jacoby, a denizen of Manhattan, perhaps harbors a somewhat overwrought view of the national heartland and spies beasts lurking there that few others can see. Nevertheless, allowing for some exaggeration, she is certainly correct that most Americans

did grasp that the reckless mass immigration policy of the federal government was at least indirectly responsible for Sept. 11 and were furious in their demands that it be rectified. As she pointed out, a Fox News/Opinion Dynamics poll found that 65 percent of the public favored "temporarily sealing the U.S. borders and stopping all immigration" until the war against terrorism was over. The House Immigration Caucus, an obscure bunch of lawmakers who oppose current federal immigration policy, leapt from a mere 16 members before Sept. 11 to a rather more impressive 62 by the end of February. In politics the cliché is that the squeaky wheels gets the grease, and clearly grassroots wheels have been screaming ever since Sept. 11 for Congress to do something to protect the nation it claims to govern.

Miss Jacoby, however, was by no means the first of the pro-immigration warriors to roll into battle against the popular demand for immigration restrictions after Sept. 11. That distinction probably belongs to a gentleman named Stephen Steinlight of the American Jewish Committee, who unbosomed his thoughts to a large audience in New York on Nov. 14 in a speech entitled, "The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography." Mr. Steinlight's argument was that American Jews, who have traditionally been in the forefront of support for liberal immigration policies, should rethink their position, not just because of Sept. 11, but also because "we cannot consider the inevitable consequences of current trends [in immigration] -- not

least among them diminished Jewish political power [italics in original] -- with detachment.... We have an enormous stake in the outcome of this process, and we should start acting as if we understood that we do." He was explicit in endorsing what he called "a pro-immigrant policy of lower immigration," mainly out of consideration for the interests of his own religious and ethnic group, but not at the expense of embracing what he called the "white 'Christian' supremacists who have historically opposed either all immigration or all non-European immigration (Europeans being defined as Nordic or Anglo-Saxon), a position re-asserted by Peter Brimelow."

Mr. Brimelow, author of Alien Nation, which virtually all sides of the immigration controversy acknowledge as the major recent book arguing against mass immigration, soon became the demon of choice for the post-Sept. 11 Open Borders witch hunters. Indeed, while Mr. Steinlight's insulting and false characterization of him and his book in the published version of his speech was rude enough, the notes of a member of the audience make clear that the speaker did not hesitate to indulge in a little ethnic name-calling as well. Mr. Steinlight described Alien Nation as "a book I abominate; it is entirely objectionable and racist" and called Mr. Brimelow "a Brit continuing cultural Buchananism with a British accent." He also cast aspersions on Mr. Brimelow's character -- "I'm honest; he's not" -- and motives (Brimelow contributes to a "brutal ethnocentrism").

Mr. Steinlight's speech set the tone of tolerance and enlightenment for the "debate" on immigration that quickly ensued, and the next installment soon popped up in a conference sponsored by neo-conservative David Horowitz's Center for the Study of Popular Culture on "Immigration and National Security," held in Washington on Jan. 29. Unlike Mr. Steinlight, the Horowitz cabal was civil enough and refrained from insults and ethnic slurs against those who disagreed with it, and it even offered some speakers who called for substantial reductions in immigration. Nevertheless, what was most remarkable about the conference was the total absence of the most prominent and active advocates of immigration reform in the country. Not only was Mr. Brimelow not invited but neither was Roy Beck of Numbers USA, Glenn Spencer of Citizens United, Wayne Lutton of The Social Contract, Dan Stein of FAIR, John Vinson of Americans for Immigration Control, or a host of others long active in the immigration controversy. As Mr. Horowitz described the purpose of his conference to a mutual friend, the point was "to put a more palatable face on immigration reform," which is simply neo-con-speak for co-opting the mainstream immigration reform movement and subduing it to neo-conservative goals and purposes. Conservatives familiar with the tactics and techniques of the neo-conservative conquest of mainstream conservatism in the 1970s and '80s will perhaps recall the strategy as it was deployed against them and their causes.

Indeed, the Horowitz conference even adopted some of the

exact same codewords that Mr. Steinlight had used in his address in New York a few months before. Mr. Steinlight endorsed what he called the "patriotic assimilation" of immigrants, and the Horowitz conference also endorsed the same concept with the same phrase to describe what seems to be a kind of intensive brainwashing course for immigrants in the do's and don'ts of the Credal Nation dogmas so beloved of neo-conservatives. Mr. Steinlight also inveighed against bilingual education and insisted that immigrants learn and speak English; this too popped up as a permissible reform among several speakers at the Horowitz gathering.

But mostly the speakers at the Horowitz conference were careful to rehearse all the approved mantras, some of them contradicting others, of the Open Borders Lobby itself, regardless of what reductions in numbers or demands for assimilation they supported. Immigration has always been a good thing; we're a nation of immigrants; America is based on a creed; immigration brings a valuable mix of different peoples (though there's really no difference among different peoples); diversity is a good thing (though immigrants need to assimilate); assimilation is happening (though left-wing multiculturalist elites won't let it happen); most immigrants want to assimilate (though assimilation means little more than speaking English and getting an entry-level job at a fast-food stable). Even speakers who clearly supported more drastic reductions in numbers were careful to wrap their remarks

in this kind of rhetoric, which grants the pro-immigration premises the Open Borders Lobby wants to govern the entire discussion of the immigration issue.

Similar installments of pseudo-reform quickly followed, one of the more notable being a vicious little piece of journalistic sheep-dip penned by Jonah Goldberg of National Review in the Los Angeles Times, which complained that "ideologues" (i.e., Peter Brimelow, Pat Buchanan, and, I'm proud to say, me) "have hijacked an important debate." The "debate" we hijacked, of course, is the one in which such luminaries as Mr. Goldberg claim to have been engaged before we proponents of "racial gloom-and-doom ideologies" sneaked into the airplane with our verbal box-cutters at the ready. Buchanan's arguments against immigration in his recent Death of the West have "marginalized the entire debate about immigration at the exact moment that the issue needs all the intelligent discussion it can get," Mr. Goldberg spouted. This, indeed, is quite rich. When did Mr. Goldberg ever express any interest whatsoever in immigration control prior to Sept. 11 and the surge of grassroots demands for it? What does he have to contribute to the "debate" now, other than the ugliest ad hominem attacks on those who have sought a real debate for years? Like Mr. Steinlight and the worthies of the Horowitz conference, Mr. Goldberg has only the most tepid recommendations -- criminals shouldn't be allowed to immigrate, nor illegal immigrants accepted. "We need to respond," Mr. Goldberg intrepidly demands,

"to the fact that the president of Mexico is developing political constituencies on both sides of the border to influence politics on both sides of the border." How "we" should "respond" he never says, though I, for one among the gentlemen he attacks, have written numberless columns opposing it for years. When has Mr. Goldberg ever mentioned it before?

The Goldberg onslaught makes clear what is going on, even if the earlier installments of "palatable" immigration control did not. The Sept. 11 attacks raised public awareness of the insanity of our open border policies to explosive levels of political temperature, and it soon became obvious that mass immigration might be in trouble from populist political forces that the American ruling class cannot control and its neo-conservative stalwarts cannot co-opt. Therefore, those who have been demanding immigration control for years -- Peter Brimelow, Pat Buchanan, et al. -- must be demonized, lest the nation begin listening to what they have been saying. Moreover, simply crushing all immigration control, as the lobby has successfully done for decades, wouldn't work any more, so some fairly innocuous concessions have to be accepted, and at the same time that experienced, knowledgeable, and well-known critics of mass immigration are demonized, a new crowd of pseudo-critics has to be deployed to do the demonizing and offer the policy concessions. Those following these tactics were by no means confined to the few mentioned so far. Much the same techniques were employed by Linda

Chavez, perhaps the queen bee of the Open Borders Lobby, whose Wall Street Journal essay in November titled "Don't Seal the Borders" argued against any serious measures to restrict immigration and who attacked Mr. Buchanan's new book in February as sounding "downright un-American." So did neo-conservative Paul Greenberg, who attacked Buchanan first (mainly for his 1992 speech at the Republican National Convention, writing "the hate was thick enough to cut, and the mob -- I mean the crowd [actually, he means the Republican delegates] -- loved it.") and then eventually got around to immigration (like Mr. Goldberg, Mr. Greenberg is not exactly famous for a long record of thought and writing on the immigration issue, but that doesn't stop him from pronouncing on what should and shouldn't be done; a moratorium, even for six months, is in the category of "bad ideas"; creating "a unified agency to guard the borders" is a good idea, as, to the neo-conservative mind, any and all enhancement of government power always is).

What is essentially a neo-conservative onslaught on the new grassroots movement for effective immigration control will probably succeed. Not only does it offer the mirage of success and acceptability to a movement desperate for any victory but also it has the support of the American ruling class, which demands mass immigration as a new proletarian power base. Sept. 11 was, in a grim and unwelcome way, an opportunity to achieve the radical reforms needed to control and reduce mass immigration, but thanks



to the tactics of smear and co-option deployed by the neo-conservatives, it's likely to be an opportunity missed.■

[CHRONICLES, August, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Will Europe Survive?*

The recent emergence in Western Europe of increasingly successful political parties based on opposition to Third World immigration, and the utter failure of such parties to appear at all in the United States, raises the question posed in the headline of this column. Most Americans of sensible political views for the last century have assumed that Europe was a goner, a political and cultural basket case that had to be pulled out of the streets of history by massive infusions of American treasure and blood in two world wars and throughout the cold war. Now, it begins to seem as though it is America that will succumb to mass immigration and the cultural and racial extinction it promises, while there is in Europe at least a glimmer of political resistance to that fate.

The most obvious glimmer, of course, is in France, where Jean Marie Le Pen, after three decades of crusading against immigration, placed second in the French presidential primary in April, only to fall victim to a globally orchestrated campaign of vilification and demonization that clearly made it impossible for him to win more than 18 percent of the vote in the general election in May. Nevertheless, the major consequence of the Le Pen balloon was not what happened in France but what occurred in

the Netherlands. There the result of the vilification of Le Pen was the outright murder of the man who was more or less the closest analogue to the French political leader, Pim Fortuyn, one day after the French vote.

The Fortuyn murder, by a left-wing crackpot, tends to make conspiracy theories obsolete. No one need speculate any longer that some secret cabal of the ruling classes orders assassins to eliminate troublesome political figures who just won't shut up or go away. All the ruling classes now have to do is launch precisely the kind of vilification against such figures that the entire European and American press vomited at Le Pen (or earlier against his counterpart in Austria, Jorge Haider, or around the same time and to a somewhat lesser degree against Fortuyn himself). It is now well known to everyone that there are so many free-floating nuts allowed to roam at large through European and American society that the proper sort of vilification campaign can be relied upon sooner or later to trigger one or more of them into eliminating the designated figure. Some friends of Pat Buchanan wondered in 1999 when he was being vilified in the American press in much the same way if that was the real purpose; whether it consciously was or not, it remains a small miracle that Mr. Buchanan -- or indeed, Mr. Le Pen, or Mr. Haider, or any such leaders in Europe or America -- remains alive today.

Of course, Mr. Fortuyn, an open homosexual of Marxist background, was not really similar to Mr. Le Pen except in his opposition to immigration into his country. Mr. Fortuyn was notable for having once wisecracked, when subjected to the ritual

accusation of "racism," "Don't call me a racist. I know more about Moroccan boys than anyone at this table." It was Mr. Fortuyn's case against immigration that Islam is, as he called it, a "backward religion" that had missed the Enlightenment and was utterly incompatible with the tolerance of homosexuality and liberated womanhood that now pertains in all Western countries. He was obviously entirely correct about this, though whether it's the most compelling reason to oppose massive Islamic immigration into Europe is another question. It certainly has never been Mr. Le Pen's main objection.

A traditional and devout Roman Catholic as well as a French nationalist, Mr. Le Pen is probably as close to being a Gallic Pat Buchanan as any European can be. What is distinctive about him is that he is not in the monarchist-*proto-fascist* tradition of Charles Maurras, nor (as columnist Jonah Goldberg stupidly wrote) "nostalgic for the Vichy government," nor even that he has nursed resentments about the loss of Algeria for the past forty years. Mr. Le Pen preaches no doctrine, threatens to overthrow no governments, and denounces no demons, despite the false smears of him that he is an "anti-Semite." Washington Times editor Wesley Pruden wrote what is perhaps the dumbest line ever penned about Mr. Le Pen (and there have been entire libraries of dumb lines written about him) when he remarked (April 23) that

All that the first round of voting actually demonstrated was that 17 percent of the voting population stand with a man of anti-Semitic beliefs. This is even reassuring if we can take the Le Pen vote as credible evidence that

only 17 percent of Frenchmen hate Jews. Most of us thought it was a lot more than that. Burning synagogues has become the latest fad in the nation that regards itself as the arbiter of fashion.

Of course, the dozen or so recent synagogue burnings in France have nothing to do with Mr. Le Pen or his supporters, and indeed the French nationalist is well-known (and virtually unique on the European right) for being pro-Israeli. The attacks on Jewish targets in France have been the work of the very Muslim immigrants against whom Mr. Le Pen has warned these many years, even as dullards like Mr. Pruden have chortled about how mass immigration gives us cheap nannies and exotic restaurants.

The larger point is that while leaders like Mr. Le Pen oppose immigration because they want to preserve the France of Joan of Arc, leaders like Mr. Fortuyn oppose it because they seek to preserve the Europe of Elton John. Although it's by no means clear that the latter is worth preserving at all, it may be that those Europeans who want to preserve it will prove to be more numerous and more decisive in European politics than those who, like Mr. Le Pen, harbor far more conventional conservative and right-wing goals. The reason is that the political culture of the right-left polarity, and especially the side that Mr. Le Pen represents, seems to be pretty much defunct, while the neither-right-nor-left nationalism of Mr. Fortuyn (rather similar to that of Jorge Haider and several other anti-immigration nationalists across Europe) seems to be rising.

Asked in an interview with Newsweek just before his death, "You dislike the term 'right-wing' to describe your program. Why?" Mr. Fortuyn replied, "There is no longer a distinction between

progressives and conservatives. People are thinking in a non-ideological way.... In my program there are elements of left and right." And indeed, despite Mr. Le Pen's conservatism and allegiance to the political right, his own success has in large part been due to his ability to combine elements of the left (mainly a commitment to working class welfare and economic security policies) with his nationalist appeal and thereby wipe the socialist Maurice Jospin off the political map. In Calais, the largest French city under Communist control, where a party member has held the mayoralty since 1973, Le Pen came in first in the presidential primary and the Communist candidate fifth, "with much of his lost vote apparently going to Le Pen," as the Washington Post reported.

What enables such parties -- not only in France, the Netherlands, and Austria but also now in Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Switzerland, and perhaps in Great Britain with the British National Party, which won its first local government seats this spring -- to win working class votes is not that they can outbid more conventional parties of the left in pandering to demands for more welfare, health care, etc., but that all the usual Republican Party blather about "free enterprise" and the "free market" is

simply absent from their rhetoric and they don't need to run from it when appealing to working class voters. That allows them to dwell on the issue that really drives their success, immigration itself and the crime, threats to jobs, educational problems, and general cultural inundation it causes. And it is precisely because both the Republicans in this country and most of the "alternative parties" of the right that occasionally (or should I say perennially) challenge it cannot seem to emancipate themselves from such rhetoric that they never go anywhere.

The inevitable result of the rhetoric of Economic Man is to convince working class voters that the candidate is merely a shill for business interests and that whatever noises he makes about protecting the average man and woman from is so much eyewash designed merely to snare their votes. When conventional Republicans like Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, and the Bush clan imitate populist noises for that very purpose, the result is to confirm what the voters already suspected, and the ultimate consequence is that what could and should have been an almost irresistible and invincible means of mobilizing a mass following for a serious right-wing political force has been ruined through its cynical exploitation by cheap politicians.

The apparently indissoluble union between the forces of the American political right and a rhetoric of Economic Man that never appealed to anyone but businessmen and their well-paid journalistic parrots and today only frightens and alarms just

about everyone else is one reason a nationalist right cannot emerge in the United States. A second lies in our political system and its lack of the proportional representation that most European democracies enjoy; the substantial fragments of the electorate that parties of the "right" (if that's the proper term for them) in Europe have been able to win allow the parties' leaders to gain public office, remain in the public eye, and build on their accomplishments. Our system, allowing only a winner-take-all result, forbids that.

But the third and perhaps the most important reason the American right has failed to form an alternative to the deadheads of the GOP is that many on the American right are deadheads themselves who really don't want anything more than to keep out of office the political figures whom they have been persuaded to hate the most. Almost everyone who worked in any of the Buchanan campaigns has told me repeatedly that what he incessantly heard from conservatives who refused to support Mr. Buchanan during all his campaigns was that "we just can't afford to let the Democrats win." Having petrified itself by concocting the most labyrinthine, terrifying, and implausible conspiracy theories about Mr. Clinton, his wife, and the drug-smuggling, murdering, sex-crazed camorra he brought to Washington, the mainstream right failed to define any serious political issues with which it could attack its foe. Immigration, free trade, global crusading, pandering to racial minorities -- every measure or policy that Mr.



Clinton supported, the right adopted itself. Its only objection to him was that he was a crook and a sex fiend, and if the Democrats were successful at proving nothing else, they easily showed that Republicans were not much better on either count.

The brute truth is that most of the good folk who compose the American right (certainly its leadership) simply have no understanding of how to create, organize, publicize, and maintain an effective political party that is neither a pale shadow of the Grand Ole Pirates they have just abandoned nor a political version of the church of their choice, where they can listen forever to their favorite sermons and rehearse eternally their banal hymns to bourgeois virtues and the dogma of Economic Man. If the American right wants or would even be attracted to any political vehicle that offered more than that, there is simply no evidence for it in its entire history since the New Deal era.

Eventually there may appear on the American political scene a party able to do something like what Mr. Le Pen, Mr. Fortuyn, and Mr. Haider, to name only the best known figures, have done or are trying to do. Eventually those parties in Europe or parties descended from them may accomplish what they are seeking, an end to the mass immigration that now clearly threatens to overwhelm the populations and civilizations of the continent. If they or we can ever accomplish that goal, there will be plenty of time -- and plenty of disposition -- to splinter and recombine in new political configurations that can fight, bicker with, and even

shoot each other to their or our hearts' content. If neither they nor we do accomplish it, then there won't be time -- or purpose -- for much of anything, and whatever political quibbles arise will be among a new people entirely alien to those few wretched Europeans who descend from us and have managed to survive what mass immigration creates in place of what Europe's new nationalism is trying to conserve.■

[CHRONICLES, September, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Hate, Inc.*

No sooner had victory in Afghanistan by the forces of Truth, Beauty, and Global Democracy been announced and the still uncaptured and undeceased Osama bin Laden declared by President Bush himself to be unimportant (no doubt the reason the administration put a \$25-million reward on his head last fall), than the top-ranking officials of the U.S. government informed the nation that terrorist attacks within the United States were a virtual certainty. On May 19, Vice President Cheney told Meet the Press, "The prospects of a future attack on the United States are almost certain. Not a matter of if, but when." The very next day FBI Director Robert Mueller told a gathering of district attorneys in Washington that suicide bombings and other terrorist attacks inside the United States were "inevitable," that "there will be another terrorist attack," and "we will not be able to stop it." And the day after that, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld told a Senate committee that terrorists will "inevitably" gain control of "weapons of mass destruction" and would not hesitate to use them against us. For all the administration's chest-thumping about the glory of driving the mad mullahs of the Taliban from the field of battle, it might seem that a certain degree of skepticism about the scope and meaning of our "victory" is in order.

The officials who pronounced their solemn warnings were probably correct, and certainly for a nation that has insanely allowed some 30 million aliens from the most backward portions of the globe to settle here in the course of the last three decades, terrorist attacks are the least we should expect. In a study released in May the Center for Immigration Studies in Washington found that no fewer than 48 foreign-born radical Muslims have been implicated in terrorism in this country since 1993 and that they have manipulated almost every possible means of admission to the United States: Some have indeed come as students, tourists, and business travelers; others, however, have been Lawful Permanent Residents and naturalized U.S. citizens; while yet others have snuck across the border, arrived as stowaways on ships, used false passports, been granted amnesty, or been applicants for asylum.

A week or so later U.S. News and World Report detailed the profiles of "more than three dozen American jihadists, many of them previously unknown," and many of whom "are U.S. citizens, native born or naturalized," though "a fair number are African-Americans, who make up nearly one-third of the nation's Muslims."

The arrest of native-born American Jose Padilla, now known as "Abdullah al Muhajir," on charges of plotting with al Qaeda to deploy a nuclear bomb in the United States, points to the same phenomenon, as does the estimate of terrorist expert Peter J. Brown, who says there may be as many as "1,500 to 2,000 American passport-carrying recruits who have shown up in the ranks of al Qaeda in the past decade." President Bush was right the second time about Osama bin Laden: He's not particularly important, and neither is Afghanistan. What's important, and a threat to the

nation, are the alien hordes the Open Borders lobby has insisted on importing into this country through the immigration policy it has succeeded in dictating against the wishes of most Americans.

Rather belatedly, then, the administration last spring began taking steps to deal with what is now rather fetchingly known as "homeland security": not only the creation of yet another behemoth government agency at the Cabinet level, larger than any other department save the Pentagon, with a budget of \$37 billion, 170,000 employees and combining 22 existing federal agencies, but also the long-sought "unleashing" of the FBI a week or so before by the abolition of the attorney general's guidelines for domestic security and terrorism investigations. Given the magnitude of the threat as estimated by administration officials and the internal location of the threat as indicated by the figures provided, the government build-up and crackdown might seem entirely justified. In fact, however, it will do little to deal with the real and existing internal security threat but much to endanger what remains of American political freedom and dissent, especially from the ideological right.

The creation of the "Department of Homeland Security" ought to speak for itself, and indeed congressional criticism of the proposed department concentrated on the claim that it didn't go far enough, that the department had no intelligence gathering powers of its own, and that both the FBI and the CIA should be absorbed within it. Doing so would complete the evolution of what

could only be called an American Gestapo, an agency that would in fact dwarf the secret police of the German National Socialist government and approach being able to swallow the rest of the federal government itself. There is no reason whatsoever to believe that creating such an agency would improve federal counter-terrorist policies or reduce the threat of terrorism, internal or external, in any way.

But it's the abolition of the Attorney General's guidelines for FBI investigations that are of more interest than yet another sequel to the never-ending epic of the governmental Frankenstein.

Imposed in 1976 by Gerald Ford's Attorney General Edward Levi, the guidelines were intended to curb the supposed "excesses" of the Bureau of that and earlier eras when it actually carried out essential functions of national security by spying on communists and other enemies, harassing subversives, and surveilling known security risks like Martin Luther King, Jr. Some of the Bureau's domestic security activities, such as J. Edgar Hoover's personal animosity toward the Ku Klux Klan and other opponents of the "civil rights movement," did indeed go too far, and in one case an FBI undercover agent seems to have instigated the actual murder of a "civil rights worker"; but Hoover himself annually and publicly reported the general nature of his agency's activities to Congress, and there was a wide if somewhat vague national consensus about what he and his G-men were supposed to be doing. It was only the political triumph of the left in the wake of

Watergate and the post-Vietnam era (and the flaccidity of the Republican right under weaklings like Ford) that allowed restrictions on the Bureau (and the CIA) to be imposed at all.

The Levi guidelines effectively made it impossible for the FBI to investigate what was in that era the very real terrorism of the far left. The guidelines imposed what is known as a "criminal standard," under which the Bureau could not open an investigation of a group unless it knew the group was involved in or planning criminal activity. A mere rhetoric of violence, simply calling for violent overthrow of the government, assassination of public officials, or bombing public buildings, wasn't enough to justify an FBI investigation.

But of course if the FBI knew the members of a group actually were planning or involved in crimes, it had no reason to investigate at all; it then had reason to arrest them. Moreover, the guidelines contained a Catch-22: You couldn't investigate a group unless you knew there was criminal conduct. But you couldn't know there was criminal conduct unless you investigated.

Under the guidelines, the FBI really couldn't do much at all to keep nutty groups that may have had links with terrorists or hostile foreign powers under surveillance. As a result of the guidelines, the FBI dropped its investigation of the Weather Underground Organization in 1979, and two years later, when remnants of the Weathermen were committing a series of armored car robberies and murders, the FBI didn't have a clue -- literally.

Only when a roadblock by local police after a robbery and brutal murder on Long Island nabbed several Weathermen (and Weatherwomen, including the long-missing Kathy Boudin) in 1981 did it become clear that real terrorism -- not just ordinary robberies -- was involved.

In that era, then, there was good reason to get rid of the guidelines, although any attempt to do so was immediately greeted with denunciations from the left (and not a few from the libertarian "right") of "fascism" and "McCarthyism." Today, however, the situation is rather different.

Today the violent, disloyal, and revolutionary left, in league with hostile foreign powers, seems to be either defunct or dying (although there are scads of Weathermen who simply vanished and have never been found, and several million dollars from the 1981 armored car robberies has never been located), and they're not much of a physical danger. Why blow up the government when you essentially control it anyway? Today the great enemy, the great target for any renewed campaign of domestic security, is what is called "Hate."

"Hate," of course, does not necessarily mean real hatred but what the leftists who have acquired cultural hegemony in recent decades like to call hate. Mostly what they are talking about is merely political dissidence on the right that includes not only real "hate groups" that carry out violence against minorities (very few, if any, to my knowledge; almost all the violent



incidents associated with "the right" in the last 20 years or so have been committed by individuals rather than actual groups or organizations) but also groups that simply take what these days are considered to be unfashionable or "ultra-conservative" positions: opposition to immigration, support for the Confederate flag, opposition to abortion and homosexuality, support for the Second Amendment and resistance to gun control, and similar issues. While the "mainstream" or "neo-conservative" "right" generally avoids these issues or is actually on the other side of some of them, support for them has fallen into the hands of largely grassroots groups that by definition lie outside the mainstream created by the dominant left-right political establishment.

One of the major tactics of the political left in recent years has been to destroy this grassroots opposition to some of its most cherished goals by demonizing it as "Hate" and "linking" it to groups that actually do advocate or at least play with violence. In fact there is very little connection, and most groups in the grassroots right avoid advocates of violence like anthrax. Nevertheless, there is an entire industry of "hate hunters" like the Southern Poverty Law Center of Morris Dees, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and similar groups that specialize in raising vast sums of money by claiming that "hate groups" are about to unleash violence against the government, Jews, liberals, ethnic groups, abortionists, homosexuals, etc.

Their "research" is usually transparently biased if not factually worthless, and their own political orientation is obvious. A few years ago I heard a lecture by publications director Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center in which he alleged that religious right leaders Pat Robertson and Gary Bauer had "provided the moral atmosphere" for the murder of homosexual Matthew Shepard in Wyoming -- a claim that is as preposterous as it is ideologically driven. As investigator Laird Wilcox, who has researched the so-called "watchdog" groups extensively, has written, "Activists with a hidden radical agenda find antiracist organizations very amenable to manipulation.... In rational terms, class struggle Marxism-Leninism is a hard sell. However, when it is reframed as anti-racism and anti-fascism, much of the onus is gone."

But the fact is that professional hate hunters like Mr. Potok and his ilk have influence on both federal and state and local law enforcement agencies. Their "experts" often testify in trials and provide seminars for law enforcement and intelligence agencies on what constitutes the "real threats" to national security, and the cops and bureaucrats whom they brief often don't know any better.

Faced with demands from the public and their superiors to "stop terrorism" and get information on groups and individuals too obscure for most media to cover, they eagerly gobble up whatever propaganda masked as "research" or "intelligence" the hate industry feeds them. In 1999, the industry helped produce a report for the FBI itself warning of massive right-wing violence

on the eve of the change of the millennium. There was of course no such violence. The same sources were largely responsible for the similar "black church burnings" hoax of 1996 -- there were precious few such acts of arson that were racially motivated.

There is of course a real need for the federal government to investigate real domestic security threats, and the thousands of aliens who represent such a threat should be and probably are at the top of the Bureau's list these days. But there will come a day when the new masters of the federal leviathan will steer its attention toward other groups that represent no threat to the nation at all and whose only offense is their perfectly legal support for perfectly legal causes that just happen to jeopardize the total power for which the left has long reached and which it now -- thanks to mass immigration and the Bush administration -- nearly has within its grasp. ■

[CHRONICLES, November, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*Prophesying War*

As the summer before the first anniversary of the September 11th attack dwindled to a sweltering end, the Bush administration desperately sought some plausible reason for the war against Iraq that its chieftains so desperately wanted to wage. The appeal to the "weapons of mass destruction" that Saddam Hussein supposedly (and probably) harbors and which he was alleged to have deployed "against his own people" (meaning the Kurds, who live within Iraq but who distinctly do not consider themselves to be Hussein's "people") was the main, but by no means the only, plausible reason offered. In the months since Saddam Hussein once again became a target of American military power, every conceivable villainy was attributed to him. Insight, the weekly news magazine of the militantly pro-war Washington Times, even revived "John Doe II," the mysterious and elusive accomplice of the late Timothy McVeigh in the Oklahoma City bombing of 1995. The FBI has long since concluded that John Doe II never existed (mainly, one has to suspect, because they could never find him or identify him, anymore than they have managed to find or identify the real anthrax killer of last autumn), and the public has long since lost interest in Mr. Doe. But Insight managed to produce a source who claimed that John Doe II not only really exists but was an Iraqi

agent, though exactly why Saddam Hussein would have wanted to blow up a building in Oklahoma remained obscure.

Then there was the mysterious meeting between the supposed mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks, the also late Mohammed Atta, and officials in the Iraqi embassy in Prague not long before the attack. That claim, apparently first disclosed by New York Times columnist William Safire, was bounced around the news media for months before Newsweek last May more or less effectively showed that it wasn't true. But, lo and behold, if it didn't resurrect itself in the neo-conservative Weekly Standard, of all places. The Standard is not exactly a cool voice of objectivity on Middle East questions (neither is Mr. Safire) and especially on the war against Iraq, so the claim of the magazine's executive editor Fred Barnes that Atta really did meet with the Iraqis in Prague, according to what the Czech ambassador to the United States had told him, should be met with some skepticism. Yet Mr. Barnes did not hesitate to draw out the import of the meeting, if it did take place, which is that

The meeting has political and international importance. A connection between Iraq and Atta, an al Qaeda operative under Osama bin Laden, bolsters the case for military action by the United States to remove the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq.

That conclusion, of course, is a non sequitur, especially since Mr. Barnes acknowledged that "Whether Atta and al-Ani [the consul at the Iraqi embassy in Prague with whom Atta was supposed to have met] discussed plans for September 11 is unknown." If we don't know what they talked about (if they did meet), how can their

meeting possibly constitute a "connection" between Iraq and the Sept. 11 attack? Moreover, Mr. Barnes identifies Ahmed al-Ani only as an Iraqi consul. He never alleges that the consul had any intelligence or covert action role. For all Mr. Barnes or anyone else knows, the consul and Mr. Atta may have talked about stamp-collecting or even the possibility of Mr. Atta's traveling to Iraq. There is no evidence whatsoever that the meeting had any sinister purpose, even if it occurred.

It would not be at all surprising to read in the conservative and neo-conservative press that Saddam Hussein was behind the Kennedy assassination and is harboring Nazi war criminals, but what the case for war against him really suggested was the analogous case for the FBI-BATF attack on the Branch Davidian compound at Waco in 1993. Just as the cult's leader, David Koresh, was alleged to be storing illegal weapons, so is Saddam alleged to harbor "weapons of mass destruction." Just as Koresh was accused of molesting children, so is Saddam's regime accused of tortures and brutalities previously known only to those communist tyrannies with which the United States and the West were once pleased to conduct profitable trade relations. Just as Koresh refused to allow police, federal law enforcement, or any other governmental agents to examine his premises, so Saddam refuses to permit the searches of his own country that the United States and the United Nations insist on conducting (until last summer, that is, when Baghdad announced its willingness to permit

a search, an offer greeted only with sneers from Washington). And just as one may not unreasonably suspect that the Clinton-Reno Justice Department really wanted to launch a violent and massively lethal attack on the Waco compound, so one may even less unreasonably believe that the administration is determined to wage war against Iraq, regardless of what its government has done or plans to do.

The more or less "official" reasons usually trotted out by the administration and its apologists for waging war don't hold water (which is why there are so many phony reasons bobbing to the surface of supposedly serious public discussion). The "weapons of mass destruction" argument is a case in point. Lots of countries with governments even less pleasant than Saddam's have similar weapons, and the science and technology of producing such arsenals are now widely available. Anyone with the skills, money, and will to do so can get themselves a few "weapons of mass destruction." The thing for the United States and other powerful states to do about this is not to wage war against every state that looks like it might have or eventually get such weaponry but to make it entirely clear to everyone that if such weapons are ever used against the United States or American targets abroad, the result will be the immediate incineration of the country using them. There are few governments led by despots so stupid or crazy that they can't understand that, and Saddam Hussein -- as his behavior for the last several years shows -- is not of their number.

There remains also the fact that, whatever Saddam did to the Kurds, he has done absolutely nothing to the United States (nor, for that matter, to Israel, unlike Israel itself, which in 1981 launched an unprovoked air attack against Iraq's nuclear reactors at Osirak). Prior to the Gulf war, it was generally understood in American political culture that unprovoked attacks of the kind we launched on Iraq in 1991 and are contemplating launching again today were forbidden by the rules of civilized nations and civilized warfare. But not only did the Gulf war itself jettison that principle, subsequent U.S. military actions in Somalia, Haiti, and the Balkans also rendered it obsolete. Today President Bush has already pronounced, and the neo-conservative press has duly gloated over, his doctrine of "pre-emptive war," a doctrine long ago anticipated by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor itself. Today one can't expect such piddling trifles as the fact that Iraq has never in its entire history done anything to harm any American, threaten the security of the United States, or even interfere with our operations and interests abroad to constitute serious barriers to blowing the country to powder or overthrowing its government and imposing our own "regime" upon it.

As for achieving these latter goals, there is no question that a U.S. war against Iraq would lead to a fairly quick and (for us) reasonably bloodless victory. But one reason for avoiding a war is that the conflict might well not be confined to the two countries. It should be pretty clear by now that neither any



European "ally" nor any Arab state will support a U.S. war against Iraq under present circumstances. There is, however, a chance that some Arab states might side with Iraq, especially if they see that Iraq is merely the first state in the region to be targeted.

In 1991, out of fear that other Arab states would join Iraq, Israel was pressured into not responding militarily to Saddam's rather inept Scud attacks on Tel Aviv. Today, the Sharon government has made clear that it will not be so cooperative and has explicitly vowed to retaliate if attacked. Indeed, one imagines Mr. Sharon sitting up nights hoping the Iraqis will attack, and certainly his government has openly urged the United States to attack Iraq. If Israel and the United States together launch a war against Iraq, will other Arab states stay out of the war? Even if they do, what will be the future of any friendly relationship between us and the Arabs after further decimating Iraq?

Then there's the question of establishing a "democracy" in Iraq to replace the current regime. Not only is a real democracy out of the question, there is every likelihood that Iraq, once the iron fist of the Hussein regime vanishes, will simply break apart.

Kurds in the north would want to create their own state out of the Iraqi corpse, inciting Kurds in neighboring Turkey to demand autonomy there as well and destabilizing that country too. Shi'ites in the south of Iraq would like to create either their own state or join with Shi'ite Iran, no friend to Iraq. There are

other minorities -- ethnic, religious, political -- that would profit from the dismemberment of Iraq. Even if the country remained intact, what can "democracy" there possibly mean? Its people have no tradition of voting, of political participation, of respecting political dissent or tolerating political opposition, and there is absolutely no reason to believe that any sizeable number of Iraqis want such gimmickry or that it could function effectively there. What "establishing democracy" really means is, first, the military conquest and occupation of Iraq by American troops and, second, the construction of the kind of soft managerial system there that we built in occupied Europe and Japan after World War II. The more realistic global managers, like Henry Kissinger, argue that "democratization," aside from all the fantastic rhetoric that accompanies it, is really in our interest because it means that the "democratized" states will be less likely to attack or threaten us. That is true only if by "democratization" is meant the establishment of a bureaucracy, an economic elite, and an intelligentsia that are closely wedded to and dependent on their Western analogues. In that sense, "democracy" in such places as Iraq and Afghanistan is possible, but creating it involves a good deal more than military power and handing out civics textbooks along with chocolate bars and condoms.

Will there in fact be war? It's hard to see what considerations of power, domestic or foreign, could prevent it.

The main war party, as always in Middle Eastern issues, is the pro-Zionist, neo-conservative cabal, headquartered nowadays in the Pentagon under Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle and echoed relentlessly in the "conservative press" -- the Wall Street Journal editorial page, the Weekly Standard, National Review, the Washington Times, Insight, etc. Within the administration neo-conservative Zionists effectively dominate the Defense Department, the staff of Vice President Cheney, and the National Security Council. Only Secretary of State Colin Powell and some allies (probably old cronies) on the Joint Chiefs of Staff have advised caution. Outside the administration the pro-war forces enjoy the unqualified and even more bellicose support of the "Christian Right" of Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, Franklin Graham, and other apostles of divinity. If we measure what a Marxist would call the domestic political "correlation of forces," there is no reason at all to think the administration will not initiate a war against Iraq, probably sometime in the fall or winter of 2002 or 2003.

There is, of course, every reason why serious conservatives should oppose such a war and the administration that starts it. Not only would the war violate every conservative principle of justice and create far more dangers for Americans in the near and distant future in the Middle East (not to mention our own country) than already exist, but it would also augment the dominance of the neo-conservatives slaving for it. Having locked himself into the policies they are demanding, Mr. Bush could not easily rid

himself of them and their destructive and dangerous counsels. Not only would they entrench themselves in a position of cultural dominance from which they could define "conservatism" itself (as the "Christian Right" will discover once it has served neo-conservative purposes) but also they would enjoy virtually unchecked political power within the federal government itself.

The coming of a transparently aggressive war against Iraq, followed in all probability by further American military aggression against other Arab states in the region, and coupled with the administration's equally transparent efforts to construct and legitimize the infrastructure of a police state inside this country, go far to render the very concept of "conservatism" of any kidney meaningless. Those who still adhere to that label or to what it is supposed to stand for will soon, if not already, have to ask themselves what there is in this country that they really want to conserve. ■

[CHRONICLES, December, 2002]

*Principalities and Powers*

*Samuel Francis*

*World War IV*

Be not deluded, just because the United States goes to war with Iraq, that it will not also extend to the entire Middle East the jihad on which President Bush and his court of neo-conservative gurus and Zionist Weltpolitikers have embarked us. Well before any public announcement of whether we would or would not actually make war on Iraq, the gaggle with which the president permits himself to be surrounded was plotting how they could escalate the war far beyond the "liberation" of Baghdad. That the most extreme of the cabal wanted an expanded war for their own ulterior reasons was not open to doubt -- almost all those crowing the most loudly for a full-scale war in the Middle East were well-known partisans of Israel and its interests, though none was honest enough to disclose that the protection of Israel was his major purpose -- but what was of somewhat greater interest was their use of the ideological chocolate sauce of "global democracy" in which they enveloped their case for what is nothing more than the most naked military aggression and war-mongering.

In recent years, the world has heard little of Michael Ledeen, the gentleman who gave the United States the Iran-Contra scandal of the 1980s when he helped arrange the secret deal by which Israel provided weapons to guerrillas fighting the

Nicaraguan Sandinistas in return for a U.S. "tilt" toward Iran in its war with Iraq. But by last summer Mr. Ledeen was back in print in a long op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal (Sept. 4) in which he sounded one of the first and bluntest declarations of what he and his colleagues in the Washington field office of the Mossad expected of their colony.

"By all indications," Mr. Ledeen lamented, the discussion of the impending war against Iraq "will be about using our [he means U.S.] irresistible military might against a single country in order to bring down its leader." How silly of us. The real goal, you see, should be the far loftier one of continental emancipation. "We [again, he means U.S.; it is always prudent to clarify to which nation Mr. Ledeen's plural personal pronouns allude] should instead be talking about using all our political, moral and military genius to support a vast democratic revolution to liberate all the peoples of the Middle East from tyranny." Perhaps it is needless to say that when Mr. Ledeen speaks of "liberating all the peoples of the Middle East," he is not thinking of the Palestinians, any more than when he refers to "tyranny," he is not thinking of Israel.

The war, you see again, "is not just a war against Iraq" but rather "against terrorist organizations and against the regimes that foster, support, arm, train, indoctrinate and command the terrorist legions who are clamoring for our [there's that word again; in this context, however, it is simply not clear to which country Mr. Ledeen alludes] destruction. There are four such regimes: in Iran, Iraq, Syria and Saudi Arabia."

And all this time, you thought we (meaning the United States) were going to wage a "war against terrorism" because of the September 11 attacks of last year, that our enemy was Al Qaeda and its leaders and the Taliban regime that harbored them and refused to give them up. That indeed was the ostensible reason offered by the president and his spokesmen, and that is why the administration spent so much time and energy trying to concoct some, however remote, connection or "linkage" between the Baghdad regime and Al Qaeda, if not the actual terrorist attacks of 9/11.

To date, all such "linkages" have proved far too opaque to incite any but the most belligerent of country-western patriots to thump their chests and strum their guitars for war against Iraq. Now, we learn that the real enemy is not Al Qaeda at all or even the despicable Saddam Hussein but the major Arabic and Muslim states of the region, none of which in the last decade has done much of anything to antagonize, threaten, or harm the United States.

Not to be outdone, the September issue of Commentary magazine sported an article that puts even Mr. Ledeen's zest for transcontinental conquest in the shade. The article, by the magazine's retired editor Norman Podhoretz, a leading apostle of neo-conservatism, was titled "In Praise of the Bush Doctrine" and was ostensibly (the word "ostensibly" cannot be overworked when discussing the foreign policy agenda of the neo-cons) a good Republican cloth coat of an article that boomed the genius of the incumbent chief executive. In fact, although Mr. Podhoretz

spouted the anticipated flattery of Mr. Bush's insipid oratory as what he called "the heights of sublimity," the article was really an elaboration of the "Bush Doctrine" of "pre-emptive war," whereby the United States asserts the right to attack just about any other nation it wishes regardless of the actual level of threat or harm the targeted country has offered us. Mr. Podhoretz, however, concluded his manifesto by calling for "pre-emption" well beyond anything Mr. Bush had thus far contemplated. What he called for in fact was nothing less than the initiation by the United States of "World War IV."

Mr. Podhoretz pondered the awesome problem of whether the United States has the will to fight World War IV -- the war against militant Islam -- to a successful conclusion, and [whether] we [i.e., the United States] then have the stomach to impose [italics in original] a new political culture on the defeated parties. This is what we did directly and unapologetically in Germany and Japan after winning World War II; it is what we have indirectly striven with some success to help achieve in the former Communist countries since winning World War III; and it is George W. Bush's ultimate aim in World War IV.

How Mr. Podhoretz knows that this is the president's "ultimate aim" and why he, rather than some official spokesman, is the proper person to announce it to the public are not explained, but the foes with whom "we" have to deal in the coming global armageddon exceed even those listed by the valiant Mr. Ledeen. "The regimes that richly deserve to be overthrown and replaced," Mr. Podhoretz lectures,  
are not confined to the three singled-out



members of the axis of evil [Iraq, Iran and, of all places, North Korea]. At a minimum, the axis should extend to Syria and Lebanon and Libya, as well as "friends" of America like the Saudi royal family and Egypt's Hosni Mubarak, along with the Palestinian Authority, whether headed by Arafat or one of his henchmen.

Leave aside the geopolitical exhortations offered by other members of the Zionist-neo-conservative cabal and consider merely the war demanded by these two, Mr. Ledeen and Mr. Podhoretz, alone. The enemies' list in their crusade includes not only Al Qaeda and Afghanistan as well as Iraq, but also Iran, Syria, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority (not to mention North Korea and, we may assume, in good time, China itself). The mind reels at the scale of the world conflagration in which these gentlemen are so eager to embroil this country, yet at no time has either one of them offered a single reason why the United States should regard any of these states as an enemy. Mr. Ledeen assured his readers that not all the countries on his little hit list were Arabic, because of non-Arabic Iran, but what all the targets do have in common is that they are in some sense enemies of Israel, not the United States. Lebanon and Egypt, the most improbable of the enemies listed by Mr. Podhoretz, seem to harbor groups like the Syrian-backed Hezbollah and pro-Palestinian factions that Israel would like to see exterminated. Saudi Arabia, of course, is a major ally of the United States in the region, and if its religious and political culture make it both an anachronism and a source of funds for

anti-Israeli terrorists, it is far from representing any serious threat to this country or its interests. Indeed, we have every reason to ensure that the Saudi government endures and prospers, not to antagonize or overthrow it.

But whatever the reasons the United States and the Bush administration should not only ignore the advice of characters like Mr. Ledeen and Mr. Podhoretz but consider placing them under surveillance as possible agents of a foreign power, the main purpose of the global war they are trying to start is simply to make the United States the perpetual enemy of the entire Arab-Muslim world, so that we will have no other "ally" in the region that reaches from Morocco to Indonesia but the small and increasingly desperate state of Israel. Embarking on outright wars with virtually every major Arab country in the region would not only expose this country to dangers it has no reason whatsoever to court but would lock us into perpetual and bottomless support for Israel and the expansionist designs of the Sharon government. There would be no other state in the region with which we could balance our relationship with Israel, except for the inconsequential micro-states of the Persian Gulf. It is precisely that perpetual animosity between the United States and the Arabic world that Mr. Ledeen, Mr. Podhoretz, and their fellow intriguers are seeking, not the protection of Israel from any immediate danger and certainly not the safety and interests of the United States.

The ulterior purposes of neo-conservative foreign policy ought to be transparent to anyone who has followed it for any length of time, but what is also noticeable in the rationalizing formulas that the neo-con sages develop for their policies is the reliance on the rhetoric of global democratism that has been gushing abundantly from Beltway think tanks and publishers for the last two decades. It is the "vast democratic revolution" we are going to construct in the Middle East that is our real goal there, Mr. Ledeen assures us, and Mr. Podhoretz frankly urges the "imposing" of "a new political culture" on the vanquished. As I remarked in my column last month, what this really means is not so much "democracy" in any classic sense as the soft managerial regimes that have emerged in the Western world in the last century. The elites that run the West today would quickly meld with those that would emerge in the Middle East under the whip of a "MacArthur regency." Yet even this kind of political and cultural engineering might prove difficult in the Arabic-Muslim world, regardless of how many bayonets we are willing to sit upon there. As former Navy Secretary James Webb pointed out in the Washington Post, ironically on the same day Mr. Ledeen's piece appeared in the Journal, war with Iraq alone would probably force us to occupy that country for the next 30 years. That, of course, is almost exactly what the neo-cons want to happen.

But despite the fraudulence of the "democracy" they are demanding we "impose" on the Middle East, the global democratism

to which they offer lip service does possess a life of its own. It is a direct descendant of the "export of democracy" by means of military aggression undertaken by the original Jacobins of the French Revolution, an export that embroiled all Europe in war, revolution, and social and political chaos for a generation and wound up finally in the simple military dictatorship and naked imperialism of Napoleon Bonaparte. It is an ideology thoroughly appropriate for aggression and imperialism because it has long since convinced itself that it has a monopoly of virtue, that anyone or any institution that deviates from its model is devoid of virtue, and that its monopoly gives its high priests and holy warriors the absolute right to exterminate any such deviation without mercy or restraint, to trample out the vineyards all across the earth. Mr. Ledeen plainly says of the four states he wishes to conquer, "all are tyrannies." Some are, no doubt, but at least one (Saudi Arabia) is merely the kind of tribal monarchy that has flourished among nomadic peoples since long before Mohammed's time, while others are merely authoritarian regimes that allow the non-nations they rule to be held together at all. It is quite true that none of the governments is a "democracy" in any sense, classic or other, and that is clearly what Mr. Ledeen really means when he says "all are tyrannies." The Jacobin mind is simply incapable of comprehending that "tyranny" and the absence of the kind of "democracy" it wants to "impose" are not at all the same thing.

Mr. Ledeen and Mr. Podhoretz may merely be exploiting the quaint and harmless-sounding noises of "democracy" to justify and recruit support for a generation of chaos that would make that of the old Jacobins look like a tea party, but there are some who seem really to believe such rhetoric and for whom the "export of democracy" really is important. In what was evidently a ghost-written column in the Washington Times last September, the now-almost forgotten Jack Kemp gasped out the cliches and sonorities behind which Mr. Podhoretz's World War IV is lurking. "The globalization of peace, democracy and free markets has been the hallmark of America's foreign policy," Mr. Kemp chirped happily.

It is what Abraham Lincoln summed up as the predicate of his political philosophy when he said the Declaration of Independence is what 'gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world, for all future time.' The 21st century must not be an American century alone, but rather a century of liberal democracy and freedom for all.

It's hard to tell who's more dangerous, Mr. Ledeen and Mr. Podhoretz with their cynical invocations of democratic banalities to justify war, conquest, and the interests of a foreign country, or such children as Mr. Kemp who are unable to see beyond the banalities to the realities of power that lie beneath them. After all, it's the capacity of those very banalities to induce human beings to initiate wars and conquests in their behalf that makes such noises at least as dangerous as the people who merely seek to exploit them for their own purposes. ■