

North and his campaign, see the article, even though critical, by Jeffrey Toobin, "Ollie's Next Mission," *New Yorker*, Dec. 27.] ■

## Kristol On Buchanan: What Goes On Here?

by M.N.R.

I never said Irving Kristol wasn't smart. Unlike the second generation of neocons, who are mainly dolts jumped up to fame and fortune by the support of their elders, the first generation at the famed City College of NY alcove (Kristol, Bell, Howe, Lipset, et al.) were shrewd political analysts and polemicists trained in Trotskyite cadre tactics. Since the 1992 election, the Kristols, pere et fils (Irving and William) have not been at their most cogent. Trying to be Godfathers, senior and junior, and therefore the overall bosses of the Conservative Movement, the Kristols at least have to pretend to be "cultural conservatives," and are not able to simply take a narrow Kempian line of marginal tax cuts on the upper brackets and the heck with the culture. And clearly the culture front is now a major sore spot and focus of the conservative masses. The objective of the Kristols is to try, gently, to shut the conservatives up on the cultural front. And so they have been pushing two contradictory lines: (1) the culture war has been irretrievably lost, so please stop talking about taking back the culture; and (2) we're des-

tined to win and win big soon, on the culture front, so let's sit back and wait for it to happen, like the crumbling of the Berlin Wall (bringing in a phony anti-Communist point.) Seemingly totally contradictory, the real point is the common conclusion: urging the right to shut up about culture.

All of a sudden, out of this murk, Irving has written a shrewdly perceptive article on the true lessons of the struggle over NAFTA. (*Wall St. Journal*, Nov. 24). He says: "Forget Ross Perot. Think Pat Buchanan." Perot, Kristol goes on, is transient, a washout, because even though his movement is energetic and taps a large body of frustrations, Perot himself is arrogant, muddled, and self-destructive. Perot the man is a loser and will fade away.

Buchanan, on the other hand, writes Kristol, is, in contrast, "a man of considerable intelligence" and capable of "effective demagoguery." Pat can offer the populist constituency he could inherit from Perot "a seductive, sharply defined agenda, and he can articulate this agenda with force and passion." Not only that, but Pat has a "real" political vision, a distinctive vision, neither liberal nor conservative but "powerfully reactionary." Yes! That's it! Conventional wisdom, Kristol adds, says that a reactionary vision is hopelessly utopian and need not be taken seriously. But Kristol retorts that even if Buchanan couldn't get an electoral majority and win the presidency in '96, he could be "strong enough to wreck the GOP and change the nation's

political landscape."

Pat's 'vision,' Kristol sums up as economic protectionism, America First foreign policy, radically restricting immigration, and getting "ruthless-and not just 'tougher'" on crime and welfare. In short, to restore the "old Republic," the republic where "the streets were relatively free of crime and not many 16-year-old girls were having illegitimate babies." The establishment, says Kristol, commonly reacts by saying that Pat "goes too far" and therefore will have no impact. But the old Trotskyite understands populist appeals to the masses: "speak to the taxi driver on your next trip and you will discover that—regardless of race, age or sex—he (or she) thinks there's a lot to be said for going too far." Buchanan's vision, Kristol adds, comes to a lot of Americans "as a breath of fresh air after all the mostly empty and ineffectual chatter we have heard in recent years about 'change' and 'reform.'"

Kristol then puts on his political analyst's cap and shows how Pat could go about changing the face of American politics. If he ran again in the Republican primary, Kristol states he will just get wiped out again. No: a more clever route would be to run as the candidate of a third party, running as many candidates as possible throughout the country. A Buchanan race on a Perotvian populist third party ticket would undoubtedly not win in 1996, but he could easily get 15 to 20 percent of the vote, and the Buchanan party could elect some candidates to a number of offices

across the country, and perhaps even a handful could get elected to Congress. In that case, Kristol points out correctly, Buchanan "will have won. A new party will have been born, challenging the Republican Party for its portion of the political spectrum."

Moreover, Kristol goes on to discuss the inherent weakness of the "moderate" Republicans who run the party establishment. Lacking any principles or ideology, caring only about winning the next election, scorning "the vision thing," the Republican Establishment is incapable of either understanding the Buchanan challenge or meeting it with its own ideological alternative. As a result, the moderate Republicans have been slowly but surely losing their grip on the right-wing masses—in the same way that the John Major Tories in England, Helmut Kohl in Germany, and particularly the Progressive Conservatives in Canada have inexorably lost popular support. And, as Kristol notes, in Canada—which also has, like the U.S., a single district winner-take-all legislature, the ruling Conservative Party was literally wiped out in the 1993 elections (as was also the socialist New Democratic Party), to be replaced as the major opposition to the Liberals by the new paleoconservative Reform Party of Western Canada and the secessionist French *Bloc Quebecois* in Quebec. [The Reform Party, by the way, is an inspiring phenomenon: coming out of nowhere on a platform of lower taxes, lower government spending, and restricting immigration].

Kristol ends his article by say-

ing the Republican establishment is doomed, in the long run, in the absence of a vision that can rally the mass of Americans.

One important point that Kristol misses is precisely *how* Pat could "inherit" the Perotian mantle. One reason why

Libertarian Buchananites are very leery of a third party is that we have had long and bitter experience in the drain of resources involved in the arduous process of getting on the ballot in the separate states. But of course Perot had no difficulty whatever

## Quotes That Need No Comment

Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary said Friday that the Administration was worried about the adverse effects of cheap oil. . . .—*Los Angeles Times*

Conservatives believe that communities are very important and are eager to preserve them. That is one reason they opposed busing in the '60s and '70s. Vouchers, too, would tend to break up neighborhoods and communities by moving youngsters out of their local schools into many different schools in different localities. . . . Conservatives are happy that private schools are largely unregulated, and many send their kids to these schools. While they were tempted by the idea of a \$2,600 voucher, they also knew that taking government money inevitably leads to government controls. . . . In the conservative view, any program is likely to have unintended consequences, and new programs must first be tried on a small scale. So conservatives looking at the California voucher initiative were not about to be guilty of the same hubris as the liberals. They were not about to enshrine a voucher system in the state constitution. . . without knowledge of the unanticipated consequences.—Albert Shanker, *New York Times*

I was trying to get tenure. I was an untenured associate professor when I wrote them, trying to make the transition from litigator to provocative scholar.—Lani Guinier, on her controversial articles, *Los Angeles Times*

Bob Woolf, the pioneering Boston-based sports lawyer, . . . died on Monday night at a home he maintained in Hallandale, Fla. He was 65. "He was watching 'Monday Night Football' and he just didn't wake up," his daughter Stacey Woolf-Feinberg said yesterday. "He was in the peak of health and had been playing tons of tennis."—*New York Times*

What we are doing is replacing the inept, wasteful and ineffective bureaucracy, if you will, of the unfettered marketplace.—Judith Feder, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HHS, on the Clinton health alliance plan, *New York Times*

College women are victimized by these groups of men all the time, and sometimes they don't even realize it. That's why I don't think schools should allow men to live in segregated units; they should have to live with women as equals.—Chris O'Sullivan, social psychologist. Knight-Ridder Newspapers

Many gay men here [in San Francisco] . . . unwilling to face a measure of sexual deprivation and eager for the attention showered on the sick and the dying, are again practicing unprotected anal intercourse. . . . With homosexual identity and AIDS so intertwined, particularly in gay enclaves like the Castro, some men said they were attracted to the idea of getting sick because it would deepen their sense of belonging. . . . Some who are uninfected look at those who are sick and see their lives transformed with new meaning. . . one young man described his admiration for a friend in such circumstances. "He's got so much more focus now," the man said. "It almost in my mind makes it like a good thing that he has it. And I find myself wanting it."—*New York Times*

in getting on the ballot, since he was willing to invest many millions in the process. The Kristol scenario could only work if Perot and the Perotvian movement gave their full backing to Pat, monetarily and in grass-roots activity. A combination of Perot, Perotvians, and the whole-hearted backing of the conservative masses could prove formidable indeed. (I know I have warned in RRR of the lessons of the flop of the Marlin defeat in New York City, but this could be considered a special situation where everyone con-

cerned with saving New York as a city was anxious above all to get the disastrous Dinkins out of office.) But for this strategy to work, Perot and Pat would have to work closely together, and it is hard to envision Perot playing second fiddle to anyone. However, it is certainly true that Perot has been getting more conservative economically, and is increasingly anti-Clinton, and that bodes well for the potential alliance.

The most remarkable thing about the Kristol article, however, is a mystery. It calls to mind the famous remark of Sherlock Holmes in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, which roughly went: "The most remarkable thing about that night, Watson, is the dog that didn't bark."

**Where is the special neocon twist in this article, which we have come to know and love?**

Why didn't the dog bark? In other words, where is the special neocon twist in this article which we have come to know and love so well? Why doesn't Kristol

conclude, in the standard neocon manner, by warning everyone of the menace of Pat Buchanan, this Nazi, anti-Semite, fascist, Francoite, Klansman, bigot, and of German ancestry? Where are the smears and the hysterical cries of "Hitler?" How come the article is so darned, well *friendly*—ranging from value-free analysis to downright appreciative? The worst thing he

says about Pat is his "effective demagoguery," which, in neocon parlance, is almost a compliment. What's going on here? Surely, the Godfather is up to something sneaky. Is he trying to coopt Pat? Offering him a job in the (Kemp, Bennett, Cheney, Quayle—choose one) Cabinet?

It will be fascinating to see how this plays out. But Pat, remember the old motto: Never trust a Kristol bearing gifts. ■

## Impeach Boo-Boo!

by M.M.R.

Every UN Secretary-General has been a dictator and a pain-

in-the-neck, the active embodiment of at least the potential role of World Emperor. But Boutros-Boutros Ghali (known to UN watchers as "Boo Boo") is by far the worst of the lot. He has been the single most active Sec-Gen, continually pushing for UN troops, "peacekeeping," stopping "aggression," and in general throwing his weight around in the world arena.

It is good to see that Boo-Boo is now in a peck of trouble, even within the arrogant, highly-paid, immune-from-laws, and income tax-exempt "international community" that infests the East Side, more specifically the "Turtle Bay" area, of Manhattan.

The flap arose over what can be called the "downside" of "privatization": crookery, actual or potential, in government's granting contracts to private firms. The bone of contention is the highly lucrative private contracts for air transport of the UN troops and their entourage for all the literally dozens of "peacekeeping" operations around the globe. It seems that the United States' favorite air transport firm, Evergreen Helicopters, which has had long-time connections to the CIA, was getting outbid for contracts, especially by its Canadian competitor, SkyLink. And so Evergreen, aided by "friends" in the U.S. Mission to the UN, concocted charges that the eight members of the UN procurement office, in charge of the contracts, had engaged in hanky-panky with SkyLink to grant contracts to the Canadian firm.

With suspicious eagerness,