

## The Kennedy Case: What Kind Of Republican?

by M.N.R.

That egregious sleaze-bag, Teddy Kennedy, the last shred of "camelot," is, according to the pundits, at long last politically vulnerable. All libertarians, one would think, regardless of other differences, would be united in wanting to bring Teddy down, to get him out of Washington. But what *kind* of Republican would do best against him? We can easily assume, without fear of contradiction, that there is no heroic, full-fledged, politically viable libertarian available to run against Teddy in Massachusetts. Failing that, there are two contrasting paths available for those libertarians who wish to work inside the Republican Party. One route: to go for "socially tolerant" Republicans, heedless of their positions on foreign policy; in short, to go for Rockefeller Republicans. This is the counsel of Eric Rittberg and his Republican Liberty Caucus (RLC), who holds up moderate, high-tax, but indeed "socially tolerant" California Governor Pete Wilson as the very model of a "Liberty Republican." In contrast is Justin Raimondo and his Libertarian Republican Organizing Committee (LROC), who, stressing an isolationist, anti-war foreign policy, counsels libertarians to go rightward to support such paleo-conservatives as Pat Buchanan.

Well, here's a practical test, which doesn't even involve foreign policy. Teddy is bad on every conceivable issue. But what issue would get anti-Kennedy juices

flowing among his hitherto loyal, largely Irish Catholic constituency? Griping about capital gains taxes? Or focusing on the latest example of Teddy's disgusting antics? Anyone who is honest would have to say the latter. But how could a "socially tolerant" Republican hammer away at Teddy's ethical and moral failings? How could he do so without abandoning his much-vaunted "social tolerance," the major point of the RLC position?

On what grounds could he denounce Teddy's actions? The answer is, he couldn't, and a "socially tolerant" opponent of Kennedy would kick away a golden opportunity.

There is a lesson here far beyond the case of one repellent, though powerful, Senator. We libertarians are trying to mount a mighty ideological counter-revolution against the welfare-warfare state of the twentieth century. The essence of the Progressive, New Deal, left-liberal revolution of that collectivist century was a monstrous assault upon the liberties, the income, and the sensibilities of what the great *laissez-faire* economist and social scientist William Graham Sumner called the Forgotten Man, the average, hard-working, thrifty, God-fearing, and good-hearted, middle-class and working-class man and woman who has been fleeced, looted, outraged, and trampled upon by organized left-and-center liberalism via its control of the State apparatus, and by controlling our dominant cultural insti-

tutions. A key part of that demoralizing statist assault has been upon the American family, and upon the religious values and morals that had given that family its sustenance. Aggressive atheism and hedonism are part and parcel of that assault, and any counter-revolution against statism cannot afford to overlook this extremely important moral and cultural dimension.

Consider this: Modals,

RLCers, and all other libertarians who have not yet made up your minds on this issue: Suppose that we're right. Suppose that you've got a choice of mounting a successful counter-revolution against the Leviathan State, at the price of giving up the dubious joys of

**A key part of that demoralizing statist assault has been upon the American family.**

reveling in open Kennedy-type sleaze (and "open" is of course the operative word in this whole dispute, since no one, no matter how socially right-wing, is proposing to batter down closed bedroom doors to spy on what she-nanigans may be going on). Would you accept this bargain? And if you wouldn't, and I suspect that this is precisely what all of you "socially tolerant" would *not* do, what does this say about the strength and breadth of your libertarian commitment, of your *bona fides*? For are you, after all, only what Tom Fleming describes in his superb article in the May *Chronicles*: ["The New Fusionism," pp.10-12] "lifestyle libertarians"

looking "for nothing more exalted than a justification for their vices"? Is that what it's all been about, all these years, O generation of vipers? •

## Yugoslavian Breakup

by M.N.R.

Yugoslavia is at the point of civil war, but before anyone starts blubbering about what in the world can have gotten into this "proud nation," be assured that there ain't no such animal. There is no such nation nor is there such a thing as a "Yugoslav people." Yugoslavia is not a nation but a geographical abortion, a monstrosity that ensued from the chaos, the vengeance, and the cabals of World War I and its sorry aftermath. The victorious allies split apart and fractured the defeated Austro-Hungarian Empire. This sundering was performed not in the name of "national self-determination," but in the equality of this process some nations were destined to be far more equal than others. Particularly privileged was Serbia, a nation on Austria-Hungary's southern border, which had set off World War I by contriving to assassinate Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914. Out of the tragedy and ferment of that war, Serbia managed to carve a new Greater Serbia out of parts of the defeated Empire, particularly by suckering the intellectual leaders of the Croats and the Slovenes into adopting a phony and artificial "South Slav" (Yugoslav) ideology and then forming a new Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. When the Croats found that this

kingdom, instead of a fraternity of "south Slavs," was merely a mechanism for Serb hegemony, they grew restless and began to move for greater Croat freedom. When the Serbs assassinated the great Croat Peasant leader Stefan Radic in 1928, the Croats moved to form a separate Croatia, whereupon the Serb King Alexander established a unitary royal dictatorship and called it "Yugoslavia."

Another hapless people forcibly incorporated into Yugoslavia were the Macedonians, on the southern border of Serbia, another people seeking restoration of their ancient independence. The results of the crumbling of the Ottoman Empire and of World War I, however, were the carving up of Macedonia among the Greeks and the Serbs. Bulgaria, arrogantly claiming that the Macedonians are only "western Bulgars," was aced out by unfortunately picking the losing side of the last Balkan War and of World War I.

Macedonians forced into Yugoslavia formed the militant revolutionary organization, IMRO (International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization), which assassinated the tyrant King Alexander in 1934. After that the Yugoslav Regent Prince Paul, particularly after 1939, moved toward devolution of power toward the nationalities, actually bringing Croat ministers into the Cabinet. Paul also followed a neutral policy in World War II. British intelligence therefore engineered a military

*coup* on March 27, 1941, installing a hard-line Serb military dictatorship in Yugoslavia. This pro-British government quickly moved to sign a Treaty of Friendship with the Soviet Union on April 5.

Mussolini, boobishly trying to revive and expand the Italian Empire, had invaded Greece at the end of October, 1940, but his war of conquest was going badly, and the Greeks were counter-attacking successfully. Hitler was preparing to mobilize the countries of Eastern Europe for his mighty assault against the U.S.S.R., but he was obliged to delay this strike to bail out his Axis partner in Greece. Hitler's offer to mediate the Italy-Greece dispute was rebuffed by a Greece prodded by Great Britain, and so Hitler determined to launch his conquest of Greece before mounting an invasion of Russia. The sudden British coup in Yugoslavia in March 1941 induced Hitler to include that country in his Greek campaign ("Operation Maritsa"), which he began on April 6. The Yugoslav campaign was successfully concluded in eleven days, and Greece was mopped up two weeks later.

Ever indulgent to his unreliable Axis partner, Hitler allowed Italian troops to help invade Croatia, while German forces invaded Serbia. Serbia was, understandably enough, treated as hostile, and subjected to permanent German military occupation, whereas the Germans and Italians treated the Croats as fellow enemies

**Yugoslavia  
is not a  
nation but a  
geographical  
abortion.**