

'end the IRS as we know it.'" Sadly, it does not stop there. Even President Clinton "has chosen to appease the demonizers by saying 'the era of big government is over.'"

Lewis' biggest fear is one I'm sure all of us here tonight share. As he warns, "We may have to get through this election with no real defense of government against its demonizers."

Here we have an example of what the press calls unbiased commentary: criticizing both Republicans and Democrats for not loving and defending the government nearly enough.

Wouldn't you like to see Anthony Lewis's column on our conference this weekend? Truth is, the situation is even worse than he thinks. He doesn't know the half of it.

From the establishment's point of view, there's only one thing more evil than not liking the government. It's not liking the Federal Reserve. At their convention, Democrats handed out gold-foil covered candy bars to the press, with Jack Kemp's name alongside those of the John Birch Society and Lyndon LaRouche.

The Democrats think that anyone who favors the gold standard, even in truncated form, is clearly crazy. Now, I'm not disputing that idea that Kemp is crazy. But his position on gold is the least crazy stance he has taken in his public life.

Last year, Pat Buchanan was hit with the accusation that some of his followers wanted to abolish the Fed, and he fought back admirably. He said, oh come on, guys, plenty of great economists want to get rid of the Fed. The press didn't know what to say, and went on to the next question. By the way, it's too bad Pat wasn't reading what those economists had to say about foreign trade, corporate profits, and labor unions, or the very legitimacy of the market.

As for the two major candidates, they would rather please

macro-money managers than the average taxpayer any day. They know who calls the shots in politics, and it sure isn't the regular guy.

In many ways, Alan Greenspan is surprisingly immune from criticism. Here's a guy who arranged a \$40 billion bailout of Mexico, at the behest of his friends in the investment banking industry, and on behalf of his clients in the largest New York banks. He lobbied Congress directly not to intervene. He called Rush Limbaugh to make sure he wouldn't complain about it.

Yet ask your average hack in either party what he thinks about Greenspan. He won't say, the guy's a grafter who should be fired, if not worse. He'll say: "he's doing a pretty good job." But what does a "pretty good job" mean? It means that so long as inflation is running at less than 5% and unemployment is less than 6%, the Fed is given a completely free hand. A blank check, so to speak.

Meanwhile Clinton says the age of big government is over. Why? Because he announced it. At the same time, he is calling for government to employ thousands of reading tutors, scatter them all over the country, and bring about a national goal of making every third grader literate by the year 2000. Actually, he could start with his own bureaucracies. Wouldn't it be ambitious enough to teach every GS-13 to read and write on a third grade level by the year 2000?

Then there's Bob Dole. He started off his campaign with a bang, calling for a 15% tax cut. A few days passed, and it turned out to be over three years. Two weeks later it had been stretched out to six years. Just the other day, a Kemp adviser told the *Wall Street Journal* that it is re-

ally over seven years.

This is a common tactic in fiscal policy. They promise to bind the hands of other politicians eight years down the road. But they refuse to be held to anything they said in a news conference yesterday. Given this, I've got the ideal tax plan that Dole and Clinton can agree on. They can promise to cut taxes 100 percent over 100 years.

Many of my Republican friends are sad that Dole is intractably behind in the polls. They are even sadder that Clinton is looking forward to a second term. They think it says something terrible about the American voter. In fact, it may not.

From the beginning, the problem with Dole's tax plan was not that his numbers didn't add up. Politicians' numbers never add up. The real problem is that the phrase: "tax cut" does not go with the name "Bob Dole." It's like socialism and Ludwig von Mises, the welfare state and Murray Rothbard, or free enterprise and Pol Pot.

It's not that people wouldn't want a 15% cut in their taxes. It's that they don't appreciate being lied to and manipulated year after year. Every winner of the presidency since Hoover has promised to lower taxes. Yet they go up every year. It would be hard enough

for a real tax cutter to get voters to believe him. But Dole just doesn't have credibility as a tax cutter.

And what is the second-most-important-part of his campaign? A massive new welfare program to distribute federal aid for private education. And listen to the grounds on which he defends the idea of educational vouchers: some people can afford top-notch education, while some cannot. And he says that's not fair.

The real problem is that the phrase: "tax cut" does not go with the name "Bob Dole."

Folks, if this argument were made in 1896, the person would be denounced as a Communist and run out of town. One hundred years later, he is made the Republican nominee for president.

Recently Dole's been getting the advice that he needs to go negative. He tried it the other day. He complained that Clinton waited *four whole years* before he raised the minimum wage. But even this tactic didn't help Dole in the polls.

But recently, I began to feel more hopeful about Dole's prospects. He really ripped into the idea that a head of government could oppress his people, deny them their essential rights, spurn all traditional standards of decency, use children as political tools, and spew out lie after lie to the very people he governs. Only trouble is, he was talking about Saddam Hussein.

I'm finding it increasingly difficult to take the U.S. government's denunciations of foreign governments seriously. It's even getting difficult to take the government seriously on issues like crime.

For instance, what are we to think when Bill Clinton threatens life in prison for anyone who harasses a religious group and burns down their house of worship? He doesn't have to look any further than his own Department of Justice to find the leading perpetrator of that kind of hate at Waco.

One way to look at this season is as the backlash of the governing elites. They've let us have our fun for a few years, and even allowed some radicals to get into Congress, but now they've called a truce. With Clinton and Dole, they are reminding us that the game is rigged. We have a choice between this guy or

that guy, but no choice about the nature of the system itself.

What the establishment can't change is the fundamental factors that are driving the trends that so

terrify the Anthony Lewis's of the world. Despite the supposed reform, the welfare state is still stealing from the productive to give to the unproductive. Quotas of all sorts are perpetuating injustice on an increasing scale. Taxes can't go any higher, yet government liabilities are in the \$15 trillion range.

When the right political leader comes along to explain, as

Harry Browne and Howard Phillips have, that we'd all be better off giving up our favorite program in exchange for paying no income taxes, we'll start to see a change.

But we don't have to wait for conventional political solutions. There are fundamental reasons why a system like the present one cannot last, whether or not anyone in the political arena wills a change.

Look at the rise of dissident social movements right now. At no time in a century and a half have we seen so many disparate groups in so many places daring to say to the federal government: you will go no further.

Managing a mixed economy such as ours can be a tricky business. Economic crisis, political crisis, and mass disobedience always threaten. I believe one of these may be at the door. And there's another thing we have going for us: our history. Anthony Lewis mentions the anti-government strain in American history.

In fact, it's more than that. To be an American means to burn with a passion for freedom from government tyranny. Mr. Lewis fears that this passion is still with us. I believe

I'm finding it increasingly difficult to take the U.S. government's denunciations of foreign governments seriously.

it is too. This present political moment, which seems so stupid, boring, and uneventful, is the calm before a storm so big that not even FEMA will be able to clean it up. ■

U.S. Out of Iraq

by Justin Raimondo

One of the greatest ironies of American history may well turn out to be that Bill Clinton, a draft-dodging peacenik during the Vietnam era, led the great revival of American interventionism in the post-cold war world. Haiti, Bosnia, and now Iraq—three times, our Commander in Chief has exercised his imperial prerogative and called his legions into battle.

Now that the Cold War is over, and the threat of international Communism is nonexistent, the new militarists are liberal do-gooders whose vast social engineering schemes have gone global. After all, if Big Government is the answer to all our problems at home, then it can also bring salvation to all the world's peoples. More importantly, despite all this talk about the "end of the era of big government" echoed by both parties, the fact is that our globalist foreign policy means that the era of Big Government will never come to an end. As long as the President can go to war without the consent or even the knowledge of Congress, the idea of limited, constitutional government is a fiction.

Of course, it isn't just liberal Democrats who are cheerleading Clinton's Iraqi misadventure. Both wings of the Establishment, the respectable Right and the tame Left, have climbed on board the campaign to dismember Iraq. Bob Dole's only

criticism of the President is that he has not been interventionist *enough*. Between the candidates of the two major parties, the only disagreement is over ends, not means; once again, Americans will be led into a major military incursion on the other side of the earth without a voice, a vote, or a choice.

The pretext of the American aggression against Iraq was Iraq's alleged incursion into the northern part of its own country where two Kurdish factions have been fighting for many years. In fact, the Iraqi government was invited to restore order, and to repel the invasion of the country by Iranian troops, by the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP). The Iranian-backed Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK), in alliance with the government of Turkey (which has been the worst oppressor of the Kurds, by far), had practically overrun all of Iraqi Kurdistan before the KDP, in desperation, turned to Saddam.

But the bipartisan defenders of U.S. policy in the region insist that "this is not about Kurdistan," as foreign policy maven Brent Scowcroft said to Larry King; it is about Saddam Hussein, who must not be

allowed to exercise sovereignty in his own country. Senators Sam Nunn, John Warner, and John Kerrey all nodded in agreement. All praised the extension of the so-called "no-fly zone" in the south (a thousand miles from Kurdistan) as a masterstroke. Think of what this means: the nation of Iraq has now been divided into three parts: the Kurdish north, now embroiled in a vicious civil war; the Shiite south, under the influence of the fundamentalist regime in Iran, and the center of the country, still controlled by Saddam Hussein and his Iraqi Baathist party.

The main beneficiaries of this policy are the Iranians, whose influence in the region is greatly enhanced, and Big Oil, specifically the Rockefeller-controlled Aramco Corporation, which has the franchise on the Saudi oil output, marketed by a consortium of U.S. oil companies controlled by the Rockefeller clan.

But what has any of this to do with defending genuine American interests in the region? The answer is nothing. The fact is that the ongoing war against Iraq hurts the United States by draining the U.S. Treasury to the tune of a billion dollars a month to defend the Saudis, and the various sheiks and petty princelings of the Gulf States—mostly from their own subjects.

We are told that we must go to war in the Middle East to defend our access to oil: but in fact Saddam is more than willing to sell his oil on the world market. It is the United States that is actively seeking to choke off the supply of oil, by forbidding Iraq to bring its oil to market as punishment for the "crime" of asserting its own national sovereignty. The absence of Iraqi oil from the world market drives the price of oil up, hurts the U.S. economy, and represents a dire threat to the finan-

cial security of ordinary Americans.

Aside from the Iranian government, the biggest beneficiaries of the U.S. strike are Iranian-backed Islamic fundamentalists in the region, from Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic, whose cause is backed by 30,000 troops and billions in U.S. aid, to the newly installed Islamic government of Turkey, a NATO member and key U.S. ally in the region.

The strategy of the United States appears inexplicable: we are building up Iran's influence, balkanizing Iraq, and creating a power vacuum that only the mullahs can fill. This policy looks suicidal, and it is: but it *does* make a twisted kind of sense if looked at from the point of view of the government of Israel. Iran's main competitor for the allegiance of anti-Zionist Arabs and Muslims is Syria, which is also the main enemy of Israel. As the power and prestige of Iranian-backed militias in the Bekkaa valley in Lebanon waxes, the influence of the Syrian-backed armies wanes. As the bombs fall on Baghdad, the newly-installed nationalist regime of Benjamin Netanyahu is trying to restart the peace talks

with Yasir Arafat.

If the influence of the hardline Syrians is reduced, Arafat will be forced to make some big concessions. In addition, the interposition of U.S. forces in Iraq will face the Syrians with the possibility of a war on two fronts: in the West, against the Israelis, and in the East against American troops in U.S.-occupied Iraq.

For that is the prospect of what we are looking at here: a U.S. military occupation of the region, as in Bosnia. The creeping expansionism of the U.S. "no-fly zone" in the south and the de facto protectorate of Kurdistan established by the U.S.

It is the United States that is actively seeking to choke off the supply of oil.

RRR *The Rothbard-Rockwell Report*. (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Periodicals Postage paid at Burlingame, CA 94010 and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to RRR, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editors*: Murray N. Rothbard (1926-1995) and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors*: David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Hans-Hermann Hoppe, Michael Levin, and Justin Raimondo. *Publisher*: Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor*: Sybil Regan. Subscription: \$49 for 12 issues. Single issue: \$5. Copyright ©1996 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

in the north will eventually have to mean the presence of U.S. forces on the ground in Iraq.

Vice President Al Gore, after prompting by Larry King during an interview on CNN, yesterday stated that he was sorry that President Bush didn't go all the way to Baghdad in 1992. Well, make no mistake about it: that is what they intend this time: a final solution to the Iraqi "problem," that will open the road to a whole series of major wars in the Middle East. All the while Russia will be looking on all this with a jaundiced eye—especially the prospect of a strengthened Iran and a large U.S. force just south of its border. Added to the anti-Slav religious war in the Balkans, what we are looking at is nothing less than the prospect of World War III.

American patriots have no choice but to oppose this mad policy of perpetual war for perpetual peace. We must reject the counsel of such fake conservatives as Bob Dole, who are pushing for war in the Middle East. The vital national interests of the United States are *not* being

served in Desert Storm II, just as they were not served in Desert Storm I. The policy of global interventionism that marked the Cold War era is now obsolete: it is time to put America first, to attend to overwhelming problems here at home.■

Timeless Advice

From a February 19, 1823, letter from the Rev. Sydney Smith to Lady Grey, wife of the British Prime Minister.

For God's sake, do not drag me into another war! I am worn down, and worn out, with crusading and defending Europe, and protecting mankind; I *must* think a little of myself. I am sorry for the Spaniards—I am sorry for the Greeks—I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Baghdad is

oppressed; I do not like the present state of the Delta; Thibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight for all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be champion of the Decalogue, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid the consequences will be, that we shall cut each other's throat. No war, dear Lady Grey!—No eloquence; but apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic! I beseech you, secure Lord Grey's swords and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote's armor. If there is another war, life will not be worth having.

“May the vengeance of Heaven' overtake all the legitimates of Verona! but, in the present state of rent and taxes, they must be *left* to the vengeance of Heaven. I allow fighting in such a cause to be a luxury; but the business of a prudent, sensible man, is to guard against luxury.

“There is no such thing as a 'just war,' or, at least, a *wise* war.”■

RRR

ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT

P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011

(ISSN 1080-4420)

Periodicals
Postage

PAID

AT BURLINGAME, CA 94010
AND ADDITIONAL
MAILING OFFICE