

realization of the socialist tyranny involved in all of Clinton's programs—a realization that finally cut through the rhetorical fog of the "Mr. New Democrat"—joined with and was greatly multiplied by the loathing for Clinton the man.

During the 1992 elections, some of us worried that a Clinton administration, in addition to being bad for America and for liberty, would also cripple the right-wing movement strategically. For the usual pattern has been that Democratic administrations are "good" for Beltway organizations because the conservative heartland gets scared and pours money into their coffers. In that way a Clinton administration would unfortunately strengthen the conservative and libertarian Beltway elites that have long been dominating and ruining the right-wing movement.

To some extent, this has of course happened; but more important is a new phenomenon that none of us predicted: that Clinton and his crew would be so monstrous, so blatant, so objectively hateful, that it would drive into being from below a new and

burgeoning real right-wing movement that hates all of Washington, whether the actual rulers or the Official Conservatives and Libertarians who bend the knee in behalf of access and possible piddling reform.

Given this, what is the proper strategy for liberty? The first thing is for any conservative or free-market group or institution to be principled, radical, and fervently anti-Washington, and to avoid like the plague Beltway-itis, either in form or content. That is, to denounce rather than cultivate the Corridors of Power, and to call for principled and radical change rather than marginal reform, change that is clearly anti-Washington and anti-federal power.

Such proposals and programs should be designed, not for the eyes and ears of Beltway power, but to educate, inspire, and guide the extraordinarily sound instincts of the new grassroots movement. We are entering an era in which, happily, the principled position is evidently the proper strategy. More than ever before, principle and strategy are fused, in behalf of the victory of liberty.

**We have
America
to win;
we have
nothing
to lose
but our
chains!**

A second necessary task is informational: we can't hope to provide any guidance to this marvelous new movement until we, and the various parts of the movement, find out what is going on. To help, we will feature a monthly report on "The Masses in Motion."

After the movement finds itself and discovers its dimensions, there will be other tasks: to help the movement find more coherence, and fulfill its magnificent potential for overthrowing the malignant elites that rule over us. Increasingly, as these elites strive to crush us, it is no exaggeration to paraphrase the rallying cry of our former chief enemy: we have America to win; we have nothing to lose but our chains!

Cuba: a Modest Proposal

by M.N.R.

Maybe I'm missing something, but as an economist I sense a certain amount of inefficiency in our present Cuba policy: the Cubans go on rafts in the Caribbean, we pick them up, and then we return them to the Cuban island at Guantanamo Bay. Why not save a lot of resources, cut out the middleman, and just let every Cuban who wants to pour directly into Guantanamo? Then maybe the entire Cuban population of 11 million will

move to Guantanamo, and Cuba will be Libre.

What, you say that there will be "too many" people in the little area of Guantanamo? But I thought it was supposed to be statist, racist, and xenophobic to be opposed to "open borders" in any and all circumstances. So let's open the Guantanamo borders. Then U.S. taxpayers can keep all 11 million Cubans detained in a kind of concentration camp/welfare state. After all, Uncle Sap can support the world.

It would be a fascinating social experiment. Overcrowding? Well, let us say that the Cubans, herded into a tiny area, will end up, along with the restive Haitians, in a neo-Darwinian "survival of the fittest." As this slugfest and Hobbesian war-of-all-against-all heats up, maybe then we will realize that this is no longer the late 19th century, and that the U.S. can pull out of that naval base and fueling station altogether, and turn all of Cuba over to the Cubans.

In the meantime, the Cuban emigres in Florida are clamoring for a U.S. invasion of Cuba or, at the very least, for the U.S. to "unleash" them from the shackles of the Neutrality Act and let them invade Cuba on their own. Good. The Neutrality Act is a joke anyway, and it now only keeps private citizens neutral while the U.S. government wades hipdeep in every quarrel on the face of the earth.

Let's allow the exiles (in-

deed, let's encourage if not push the exiles) to take off on their own rafts and sail into Cuba, where they can duke it out, *mano a mano*, with Fidel and the Fidelistas. Whatever happens, and whoever emerges from the Cuban snakepit, the American people will be better off. ■

Nafta and the "Free Trade" Hoax

by M.N.R.

Now that Nafta has been safely passed in the estimable name of "free trade," the Establishment has at last deigned to let us in on the hoax. An article in the *New York Times* (Sept. 6) ruefully admits that trade barriers between the United States and Mexico, which Nafta was supposed to eliminate or at least sharply reduce, have, if anything, *increased* since Nafta took effect on January 1, 1994. Even though tariffs between the two countries have indeed been lowered, both the Mexican and the U.S. govern-

ments, driven by their respective special interests demanding protection, have rushed to raise such *non*-tariff trade barriers as phony health and safety regulations, government fees and taxes, anti-"dumping" measures, new rules of national origin and labeling requirements, and new and harsher environmental and labor regulations. All these new regulations, in addition to being statist and cost-raising in themselves, serve as barriers to trade between the two countries. Steel, meat, dairy, cement, lumber, oilfield pipe, paper and wheat industries in both countries have taken the lead in the protectionist clamor. The *Times* article also admits a point hammered at by Nafta's critics: that "the pact's sheer

complexity, with hundreds of pages of cross-referencing clauses and formulas, has befuddled even many customs agents."

Nor did this consequence take the U.S. Establishment by surprise. As the *Times* concedes: when "Washington and Ottawa reached a trade accord in 1988, [it] brought down tariffs but [it] was fol-

lowed by a host of new trade barriers." As Jeffrey E. Garten, Under Secretary of Com-

Now that Nafta has been passed, the Establishment has deigned to let us in on the hoax.