

RRR

ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 1994

VOLUME V, NUMBER 9

Invade the World

by Murray N. Rothbard

When Communism and the Soviet Union collapsed several years ago, it seemed evident that a massive re-evaluation of American foreign policy had to get under way. For the duration of the Cold War, U.S. foreign policy was simply a bipartisan interventionist crusade against the Soviet Union, and the only differences were precisely how far the global intervention should go.

But when the Soviet Union fell apart, a rethinking seemed absolutely necessary, since what could form the basis of U.S. policy now? But among the intellectual pundits and elites, the molders of U.S. and even world opinion, virtually no rethinking has occurred at all. Except for Pat Buchanan and us paleos of the John Randolph Club, U.S. foreign policy had proceeded as usual, as if the Cold War collapse never happened. How? Buchanan and the "neo-isolationists" urged that American intervention be guided strictly by American national interest. But the liberal/neocon alliance, now tighter than ever before [now that Soviet Communism, which the neocons were harder on, has disappeared], pretended to agree, and then simply and

cunningly redefined "national interest" to cover every ill, every grievance, under the sun. Is someone starving somewhere, however remote from our borders? *That's* a problem for our national interest. Is someone or some group killing some other group anywhere in the world? *That's* our national interest. Is some government *not* a "democracy" as defined by our liberal/neocon elites? *That* challenges our national interest. Is someone committing Hate Thought anywhere on the globe? *That* has to be solved in our national interest.

And so every grievance everywhere constitutes our national interest, and it becomes the obligation of good old Uncle Sam, as the Only Remaining Superpower and the world's designated Mr. Fixit, to solve each and every one of these problems. For "we can-

(Cont. page 3, col. 2)



THE EAR

by Sarah Barton

Howard Stern has dropped out of the Libertarian Party race for governor of New York. His official excuse is the court's recent refusal to exempt him from the financial disclosure law; as he says, his financial records are private and no one has a right to them. Fine, but Stern has tired of the race ever since the LP convention: he quickly became out of reach to his old friends in the LP, and he never lifted a finger to help the LP get the 15,000 signatures needed to put Stern on the ballot. Stern also did little or nothing to promote

(Cont. next page, col. 1)

INSIDE

<i>The New York Political Circus</i> , by M.N.R.	6
<i>For Mel Bradford</i> , by M.N.R.	12
<i>Rumor Unfounded!</i> , by M.N.R.	14
<i>A Midsummer Nut's Dream</i> , by Joseph Sobran... ..	14
<i>Civil Rights for Gays?</i> , by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.	16
<i>Stealing Futures</i> , by L.H.R., Jr.	18
<i>Killing Mortgage Companies</i> , by L.H.R., Jr.	19
<i>P.C. Watch</i> , by L.H.R., Jr.	21

includes the eminent "book-ends" Bailey and Dershowitz, who, allegedly, received \$1.5 million apiece for the hearing period.

It turns out that one of the reasons that the three-judge panel booted out the disgraceful Whitewater whitewasher Robert Fiske, is that Fiske was a long-time buddy and business associate of none other than Bernie Nussbaum. Why haven't the press told us this before?

Query: if the death penalty deters no one from crime, how come that Mafia death threats are notoriously effective in deterring witnesses from testifying? Is it because people take the Mafia a lot more seriously than the government?

From a Canadian subscriber as to why, Reform Party or not, that country is in even worse shape than the U.S.: "We have no Buchanans or Sobrans or Rockwells or Rothbards or Dornans. We don't even have any *American Spectators* or *National Reviews*, let alone a *Rothbard-Rockwell Report*."

I'm not a rock'n roll fan, but I'm going to buy a Paul McCartney CD. At a recent

Atlanta concert, the former Beatle came out draped in the Georgia state flag, which incorporates the battle flag of the Confederacy. To a huge ovation, Paul praised the battle flag as the banner of freedom, and urged that Georgians protect their state flag from those who would "reform" it. The free press quashed all news of this, of course.

The *New Republic*, which praised the ADL's fibs about the religious right as "tolerant and pluralistic," is having the vapors over a comic strip, and has to fan itself to keep from fainting. In an episode of "B.C." a caveman writes to a friend across the ocean: "Is it true that over there, you have freedom of religion?" "Yes," the answer comes back, "and if the hotshots in the black robes have their way, we'll soon be free of it altogether." ■

(Invade cont. from pg. 1) not stand idly by" while anyone anywhere starves, hits someone over the head, is undemocratic, or commits a Hate Crime.

It should be clear that there is now virtually no foreign policy distinction between the liberals and the neocons, the Tony Lewises and Bill Safires, *Commentary* and the *Washington Post*. Wherever the problem is, the liberal/neocon pundits and laptop bombardiers are all invari-

ably whooping it up for U.S. intervention, for outright war, or for the slippery-slope favorite of "sanctions." Sanctions, the step-by-step escalation of intervention, is a favorite policy of the warmongers. Calling for immediate bombing or invading of Country X as soon as a grievance starts would seem excessive and even nutty to most Americans, who don't feel the same sense of deep commitment to the USA as Global Problem-Solver as so the pundits and elites. And sanctions can temporarily slake the thirst for belligerence. And so it's sanctions: starving the villains, cutting off transportation, trade, confiscating their property in terms of financial assets, and finally, when that doesn't work, bombing, sending troops, etc. Troops are usually sent first as purely "humanitarian" missionaries, to safeguard the "humane" aid of the UN "peacekeepers." But in short order, the benighted natives, irrationally turning against all this help and altruism, begin shooting at their beloved helpers, and the fat is in the fire, and the U.S. must face the prospects of sending troops who are ordered to shoot to kill.

In recent weeks, in addition to humanitarian troops, there had been escalating talk of American "sanctions": against North Korea of course, but also against Japan (for not buying more of U.S. exports), against Haiti, against the Bosnian Serbs (always re-

ferred to as the "self-styled" Republic of Srpska—this in contrast to all other governments "styled" by others? Jesse Jackson wants the U.S. to invade Nigeria pronto, and now we have Senators Kerry (D., Mass.) calling for sanctions against our ancient foe Canada, for not welcoming New England fisherman in its waters.

OK, the time has come to get tough and to get consistent. Sanctions are simply the coward's and the babblers' halfway house to war. We must face the fact that there is not a single country in the world that measures up to the lofty moral and social standards that are the hallmark of the USA: even Canada is delinquent and deserves a whiff of grape. There is not a single country in the world which, like the U.S., reeks of democracy and "human rights," and is free of crime and murder and hate thoughts and undemocratic deeds. Very few other countries are as Politically Correct as the U.S., or have the wit to impose a massively statist program in the name of "freedom," "free trade," multiculturalism," and "expanding democracy."

And so, since no other countries shape up to U.S. standards in a world of Sole Superpower they must be severely chastised by the U.S., I make a Modest Proposal for the only possible consistent and coherent foreign policy: the U.S. must, very soon, Invade the Entire World! Sanctions are peanuts; we must

invade every country in the world, perhaps softening them up beforehand with a wonderful high-tech missile bombing show courtesy of CNN.

But how will we Look in the Eyes of World Opinion if we invade the world? Not to worry; we can always get the cover of our kept stooges in the UN, NATO, or whatever. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who is already reneging on his agreement to run for only one term as UN Secretary-General, is perfect for the job; no more power-hungry UN official has ever existed. But what about the Security Council? That's OK, because we can always buy off the abstention

of China or whoever for a few billion. No problem.

And then the whole world will subsist under the US and UN flags, happy, protected, free of crime and poverty and hate. What could be more inspiring?

A few isolationist, narrow-minded, selfish, callous, and probably anti-Semitic gripers, however, are bound to complain. They like to talk about various "lessons," for example, Somalia. They like to say: well sure we can get in

and "win" easily, but how do we get out? What are our success criteria for the mission? In order to fix up democracy, genocide, poverty, hate, etc., we the United States, must create the country's infrastructure, set up and train its entire army and police (preferably in the U.S.). We must teach the benighted country

about freedom and free elections, create its two Respectable political parties, and begin with a massive multi-billion dollar aid program to make everyone healthy, wealthy, and wise, provide an educational program (replete with dropping huge bags of food by plane so CNN can do hand-

springs—even if some of the "helped" are killed by the bags), outlaw smoking and junk food, and feed them all with tofu and organically grown mangoes.

But what about the Getting Out Party? What about our universal experience that when U.S. troops get out, the whole aid, infrastructure, etc. go down the drain? The solution is simple, though it had been far overlooked because some narrow-minded selfish fascist stick-in-the-muds will raise a fuss. The solution: We

There is not a single country in the world which, like the U.S., reeks of democracy and "human rights."

Don't Get Out! Ever. So we don't have to worry about preparing the natives for transition. We should stay in there and cheerfully Run the World. Permanently, For the good of all. A Paradise on Earth. We can call it, the "politics of meaning."

But how will we have the manpower to do the job of occupying? Don't worry about it. In the first place, we can have a 20-million man and woman army, suitably gayized and feminized and Politically Corrected, marching in there with food packages, medicines and hypodermics in one hand, and guns and condoms clutched in the other. We've got plenty of manpower options; we could bring back the draft, we could restore the Peace Corps, and/or we can set up a huge Buckley-Clinton type National Service program, where kids "pay back society" by spending two healthful, fun-filled, maturing years setting up infrastructure in Zaire or Haiti or North Korea. With this program, the kids could "pay back" the Earth. What? You say that some of our kids might pick up diseases or get shot along the way? Well, that's OK, because, as they say these days, every failure is a "learning experience."

And then, of course, the USA will only provide the backbone of the permanent forces of World Occupiers. The rest of the slots will be filled by troops from every other world country, headed by the UN, NATO, etc., pro-

viding equally healthful and joyful experience for other occupiers: Zairians, Ukrainians, Vietnamese, etc. To see Vietnamese troops, for example, occupying Holland, would provide instructive and globally democratic lessons in multiculturalism and mutual love of all peoples. The hard-core narrow-minded will of course have to be dealt with severely, but I am confident that massive educational programs, orientation courses, teachers, books and pamphlets, etc. will change the common climate of ethnic hate to love and understanding. In addition to teachers, hateful and undemocratic attitudes will be stamped out by a legion of shrinks, therapists, counselors, etc.

How will all this be financed? Every nation will, of course, contribute its "fair share" of expenses, but since the U.S.A. is the world's Only Superpower, we must face the fact that the U.S. will have to be paying the lion's share—maybe 80 to 90 percent—of the program.

And of course there are always narrow-minded, backward, selfish dogmatists, who will balk at this program, and claim that it is too "costly." There are always a few rotters who know the price of everything and the value of nothing. But again: not to worry. There will be a massive transpartisan educational effort, from all parts of the spectrum, from the Clintonian or Jacksonian Left to the dozens of self-pro-

claimed "free-market" think-tanks, who, suitably financed by government and by corporate elites, will pour forth tomes instructing us that the program will "pay for itself;" that it is in the best tradition of the Free Market and Democracy; that these expenses are not really costly because they constitute "investment in human capital" and will therefore *save* the taxpayers money in the long run, etc. Thus, clearing up all the hookworm in the world will so reduce medical costs that we will all be paying *less* money. Eventually.

Any residue of complaint, any who survive this educational effort—and let's face it, there are a few rotten apples in every barrel—will be sent to "educational retraining centers," where their objections will be put to rest, and, after a few healthful years in these camps, chopping logs and reading the collected works of left, liberal, neocor, and Pragmatic Libertarian pundits, I am sure that they will emerge, happily adjusted, to the Brave New Global Democracy of tomorrow.

The above presents the consistent implications of our persistent policy of intervention, and it outlines the system toward which this country has been tending.

The question is: How do we derail this trend? How do we Take it Out? How do we prevent "1984"? Unfortu-

nately, the Republican Party, while significantly better than the Democrats on domestic policy, has been, if anything, worse and more interventionist on foreign affairs. Note the Republican take on Slick Willie: they accuse him of bumbling, evasion, continual changes of line (all true), but except on Haiti, they don't really oppose intervention *per se*. Sure, it would be nice to have a clear-cut, consistent foreign policy, but clear-cut in *what* direction? A clear-cut Enemy is not exactly an un-mixed blessing.

Meanwhile, things are far from hopeless. There is both an anti-war and paleo-grass roots ferment in this country that is heartwarming. There are all sorts of manifestations: Conservative Citizens Councils, county militia movements, sheriffs who refuse to enforce the Brady Bill, rightist radio talk show hosts, lack of enthusiasm for American troops getting killed in Somalia or Haiti, a Buchananite movement, and increasingly good sense on this question from syndicated columnist Robert Novak. Meantime, the least we at *RRR* can do is accelerate the Climate of Hate in America, and hope for the best. ■

The New York Political Circus

by M.N.R.

For political junkies like myself there is nothing quite so bracing as the tangle, the complexity, the ethnopolitics, the back-stabbing, and the

d o w n r i g h t
sleaze of New York politics in an election year. The state elections laws establish, for each primary, a state convention in late May, or early June, followed by a primary in September. A party convention endorsement carries more than moral or financial clout; one

crucial clause mandates that a losing candidate for a state post gets automatically on the ballot in the party's September primary, *provided* that he gets at least 25 percent of the vote at the convention. Getting anything less than the magic 25 percent means that the poor candidate can only get on the primary ballot via petition, a route which, in New York, has been deliberately made arcane and extremely difficult by the state's ruling political class. Going the petition route costs a great deal of time, money, and energy, and only someone with the unlimited funds or sup-

There is nothing quite so bracing as the tangle, the complexity, the ethnopolitics, the back-stabbing, of New York Politics.

port of Ross Perot in 1992 never has to worry about the process.

1994 is an election year for all the major New York posts: Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, Comptroller, and Attorney-General in the executive branch, and U.S. Senator. All these plum jobs are now in Democrat hands, and the Republicans, rising up throughout the nation in this horrible Age of Clinton, have been feeling their oats this year. Unfortunately, as usual, the New York Republicans quickly began their traditional mode of shooting themselves in the foot.

There have long been not two but four major (or at least quasi-major) parties in New York. In addition to the Democrats and Republicans, there is the Liberal Party, founded by Jewish Social Democrats in the Ladies Garment Workers and Hat Workers Unions after World War II to provide a Left-Democrat alternative to the Communist-dominated (now defunct) America Labor Party; and the Conservative Party, founded by the Buckley family to form a principled conservative opposition to the then Rockefeller-dominated, Leftist Republican party. Ever since, the Conservative Party, now dominated by Brooklyn Conservative head Michael Long, has been struggling between principle and pragmatism, with the latter, of course, all too often winning out.

This year seemed to present a golden opportunity to