

cans or neoconservative job-hunters) do not cave in and support Dole out of pity or misplaced hatred for Clinton. Such a gesture, if widespread, could contribute to dire consequences. Allow me to outline the reasons why I think this is so.

First, there is no value in attaching oneself to a sinking ship, particularly if it deserves to sink. Second, while Dole has spent a great deal of energy courting Powell and Kemp, he is merely using those on his right only to abandon them. During the Republican primaries, Dole sought aid from Christian right voters in the South, and with an assist from Ralph Reed, won over many of them in South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia. But once the Christian vote was under his belt, Dole began to move in the opposite direction, expressing his openness to "tolerance" and pro-choice vice presidential candidates, and finally developing a new appreciation for affirmative action.

To be sure, Dole halted his leftward march long enough to pose for pictures with Cardinal O'Connor of New York. He also smiled beatifically while the Cardinal depicted him as an opponent of abortion. But the next day, Dole was wooing Colin Powell as a running mate. He courted the retired general furiously but Powell stayed away. He then picked the next best thing in Kemp, who, if possible, is even more self-consciously egalitarian.

Third, it might be argued that a Dole presidency would be worse for the real right than another four years under Clinton. The only "right" that Dole consistently accommodates is the neoconservatives. On June 21, the *Wall Street Journal* explained tendentiously as well as ungrammatically that "foreign policy conservatives are bolting the Clinton

camp, endorsing Dole's campaign bid."

As one picked one's way through such newspeak, it became clear that neocon job-seekers, having been disappointed by Clinton's reluctance to employ them or seek their counsel, had turned their attention to Dole. Joshua Muravchik, Penn Kemble, Samuel Huntington, and "Reagan human rights chief" Richard Schifter are among those "conservatives" who have defected to the other side, after having previously gone over to Clinton in 1991 (an embarrassing point that the neocon *Journal* understandably omits).

A Dole-Kemp presidency featuring these global social democrats and hyper-Likudniks would be a

raging bull internationally while being domestically indistinguishable from the present administration. It would likely be the worst of all presidential possibilities, combining liberal social policies at home with aggressive internationalism and selective appeals to "human rights" abroad. Dole-Kempism would be Clinton-Gorism with a vengeance, and inasmuch as it would be presented as Republican and "conservative," anyone who criticized it from the right would be branded as a kook.

Dole also seems to believe that he can win a sizable part of the Jewish vote by allying himself with Zionist hardliners. Whence another reason for his grabbing hold of neoconservative personalities. But here too he is stupid as well as opportunistic. In a poll, though about 35% of American Jews supported the Likud coalition of Netanyahu, more than 50% expressed sympathy for the Labor Party and its peacemaking efforts. Likud supporters include all of the Jewish conservative principals.

**A Dole  
presidency could  
be worse for the  
real right than  
another four years  
under Clinton.**

A cautionary tale may be in order to drive home these remarks. In a CNN interview conducted on July 14, Kemp tried to illustrate Dole's taking a moral stand. The example that came to his mind was the way Dole had vigorously sponsored the Martin Luther King national holiday. Unlike opposition to affirmative action, it was not something on which Dole had backed down.

Conservatives should leave it to liberals and neocons to reward Dole for his beau geste. Their own course should be to abandon him to his ungrateful friends on the left, and to await a Clinton victory with moderate expectations. A second Clinton term is not likely to be worse than any term won by Dole; nor will it likely be described as the work of conservative Republicans reaching out.■

## Media Flames of Hate

by Hugh Murray

**T**he politicians and media have stressed the alleged white racism behind large numbers of fires at black churches in recent months. Yet, in an Associated Press story by Fred Bayles (*Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* of 5 July 1996 on page 1), he acknowledges with the headline, "Arson study finds little racism proof."

More important is how the Clinton Administration and the media have manipulated this story by ignoring significant data. Thus, in October 1995, the day before the Million Man March on Washington, Malik Zulu Shabazz, a spokesman for Unity Nation declared in a speech televised nationally by C-

Span, that he had a 'hit list' in his pocket of black Christian ministers who opposed his philosophy. He repeated his threat more than once during his oration. Has anyone bothered to ask Shabazz if any of the ministers whose churches were burned were on his hit list? Perhaps, black racism may be the source of some of these fires.

Surely, black racism is the source of other arsons. Detroit is slowly being razed every Devil's Night, when many blacks celebrate Halloween by torching buildings. And when a jury acquitted Los Angeles policeman of brutality charges after they sought to subdue Rodney King, the career criminal who had sped at over 100 mph inside the city and then refused to obey the officers, blacks showed their disapproval of the verdict by rioting, beating whites, Hispanics, and Asians, and by burning stores, especially those owned by Koreans.

Why should the burning of a black church by a white receive a heavier penalty than the burning of a Korean store by a black? And recall the black racist who set fire to Freddy's Jewish-owned store in Harlem, killing whites and blacks. The racist was upset because Freddy was not renewing a sublease to a black-run store. But the Jewish owner of FreddyUs was simply following the dictates of the owner of the building—a black church which wanted to evict the black store!

More people were killed during the fire at FreddyUs in Harlem than in all the church fires in recent years. More financial loss occurred during the Los Angeles riots than in all the church fires. So, why not focus on those black arsonists responsible for Freddy's and Los Angeles? Why, instead, has there been the focus on the church fires?

Arson is arson. Those who set fires to houses or to houses of worship, to stores or to store-front churches deserve to receive the same kinds of penalties, whatever

the color of the arsonists. And whatever their color, they are all guilty of hate crimes.

The church-fire hoopla has been an attempt by liberals to make penalties for whites harsher than those for blacks, and to spotlight rare incidents of white racism, when the nation is wracked in the violence of black racists.■

*Hugh Murray wrote us this note from Milwaukee.*

## Bureaus Are Bureaus

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

**A** key part of the Pentagon's public-relations blitz since the end of the Cold War has been its supposed smart weapons. Though these hi-tech missiles and aircraft are hugely expensive, they held out the promise that a bureaucracy could innovate. Using lasers and "Stealth" technology, they would make wars easier to win and cost fewer American lives in the process.

The Gulf War was a demonstration program for these "smart weapons." To get an idea of the cost, only 8 percent of the bombs dropped on Iraq were actually "smart," but they accounted for 84 percent of the expense. This fact alone raises questions, given every bureaucracy's propensity to spend more bucks for less bang.

But did these smart bombs work? The American people were told they did. The Pentagon released a Hollywood-style video of a smart

bomb diving down the air shaft of a Baghdad building and blowing it to bits. The clip was shown again and again in the campaign to get billions more for such weapons.

But a new and still-secret report from the General Accounting Office has done to the Pentagon's claims what the bomb did to the Baghdad building. After four years of investigation, the GAO found that smart bombs didn't perform any better than old-fashioned dumb bombs.

Just after the war, for example, George Bush said the Patriot missile system had shot down 41 out of 42 Iraqi Scuds. A correction came from the Defense Department saying the record ranged from 40 to 70 percent accuracy.

Then the numbers really began to slip. Congressional investigators and independent researchers concluded that the Patriot may not have hit more than one target, a report never formally denied by the military. It appeared that the nation had been the victim of another bureaucratic hoax, along the lines of the NEA's claim to support only good art.

According to the GAO, the Patriot was not the only dud. Tomahawk missiles didn't live up to their billing either. For all the hype, "smart" technology wasn't capable of cutting through the fog, clouds, and smoke created by other bombs. And with tons of bombs dumped every day (as many as

fell daily on Germany and Japan in World War II), pilots couldn't tell what they were hitting. For all the expense, the laser, electro-optical, and infrared guidance systems proved nearly useless.

The biggest scandal of all is the Stealth fighter. At a cost of \$106 million per plane, it performed no better than any old regular jet. The Air Force claimed an 80 percent

**Super-expensive smart bombs didn't perform any better than old-fashioned dumb bombs.**