

unpleasant experiences, but as they concern an event the U.S. had nothing directly to do with their justification remains unclear. When pressed, their supporters reply that they warn us of the dangers of hate, a topic I will return to.

At the moment the most conspicuous Holocaust fuss concerns Switzerland's financial dealings with Germany during World War II. The Swiss, declaring themselves neutral, accepted gold and other property from the German government; despite the completion of negotiations with the Allies at the end of the war, the claim is now being made that Switzerland owes descendants of Holocaust survivors anywhere from \$70 million to \$5 billion. It not only appears that Switzerland will be paying, but other countries such as Argentina are now beginning their mea culpas about their relations with Nazi Germany.

The Swiss affair comes just after the appearance of Daniel Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, the cause of a huge stir. Goldhagen's supposedly "controversial" thesis, which earned him prizes, and the attention of the media and the academy, was that the average German's participation in the Final Solution was uncoerced. What nobody was able to explain was where the controversy lay. Had previous historians claimed that Germans liked Jews? Was the problem Goldhagen's scholarly methods? But that sort of academic sniping does not normally draw headlines.

Or was Goldhagen saying that Germans were inherently evil? Not officially; Goldhagen denied this repeatedly, and assured interviewers that the Germany his book described no longer exists.

### A Note From Our Fearless Publisher

Our late, great editor Murray N. Rothbard was absolutely courageous in dealing with controversial issues. How he would have loved Professor Michael Levin's "Enough, Already." Of course, we don't publish articles just because they're controversial. They must be original, truth-telling, and of the highest quality. These are the grounds on which I urge you the reader to judge this essay. As to the Establishment, although Professor Levin displays his usual brilliance and precision, that will not matter. He and the *Triple R* will be vilified. But what else is new? We owe it to you, to the memory of Murray, and to the principles we share, to give you the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. *Nothing* will stop us from doing so.

Burton S. Blumert

Actually, *Executioners* does implicitly push such a message; it is impossible to miss the anger as Goldhagen almost obsessively catalogs instance after instance of knowing malefaction by ordinary Germans. After all, what else can be the point of repeating what everyone knows, except the stoking of resentment? A book like Goldhagen's written about any other group would have been condemned as straight-out hate literature, but the time had found the man, for hate literature about Germany was suddenly acceptable.

The Swiss and Goldhagen affairs are just the most conspicuous instances of an unmistakable trend. The Holocaust has acquired its second wind and is, if anything, more alive than it was even ten years ago. There is now a permanent Holocaust Room in my sons' high school. Recently touring Germany was an exhibit entitled "War of Destruction: The Crimes of the German Army, 1941-1944," whose aim, according to its catalog, is to give the lie to the idea that ordinary German soldiers might have acted out of a sense of duty, and conducted themselves with reasonable decency.

At about the same time the New

School in New York ran an exhibit of photographs of Jewish children deported from France. One reviewer was prompted to ask "What is the point, so long after the event?" But the question was merely rhetorical, and immediately answered by a torrent of cliches: "[I]dentity is returned. Dignity is restored. From an anonymous mass of bone and ash, they become again Henri, Annette, Rachel..."

Often the hidden and not-so-hidden message is that the rules of moral common sense must give way where the Holocaust is concerned. Neutrality, a position which, adopted more frequently, would have saved untold millions of lives in recent centuries, is henceforth to be considered "unspeakable" where the Swiss are concerned, according to the *New York Times's* Thomas L. Friedman, because neutrality is impossible in the face of pure evil. The thought that the Swiss government might not have wanted to be invaded, or see its young men die in a fight that did not concern them, is simply out of bounds. Predictably, Friedman advises Switzerland to build a Holocaust museum.

The Holocaust also sanctions boundless hyperbole. A spokesman

for the American Jewish Committee recently asserted that, in attacking God's chosen people, Hitler had attacked God. An even more extreme statement of this sort is Robert Nozick's, in *The Examined Life*: "the Holocaust is an event like the Fall in the way traditional Christianity conceived it, something that radically and drastically alters the situation and status of humanity.... Like a relative shaming a family, the Germans, our human relatives, have shamed us all. They have ruined the reputation of the human family.... The human species is now desanctified; if it were ended or obliterated now, its end would no longer constitute a special tragedy."

From a Christian point of view, according to Nozick, there are now three significant events in human history: Man's fall, his redemption through the sufferings of Jesus, and the undoing of that redemption by the Holocaust. Christ could not have died for our sins, since the sin of the Holocaust is too big. God's promise that His Son's death redeemed us is no longer operative, perhaps because, Nozick speculates, when God made the promise He had no idea we would do anything so monstrous. Thanks to the Holocaust, "the Christian era has closed."

One problem momentarily detains Nozick, as it should anyone who imputes such cosmic significance to the Nazis. What about all the other atrocities that have been committed throughout history, especially in this century? "There is no point in arguing about comparative cruelty and disasters," he airily replies. But

there is indeed. In fact, there is so much point that it should get us wondering what precisely is behind all the Holocaust-mongering.

So let's remind ourselves of a few facts. The Holocaust is not the worst atrocity in all history, or of this century. It is not even the second worst atrocity of this century.

According to the *Guinness Book of World Records*, that distinction is held by the depredations of Comrade Mao Zedong in the two decades following his take-over of China in 1949. No-one knows exactly how many people died at the hands of the Communist regime, but the number is at least 30 million and possibly as many as 65 million. Jasper Becker's recent *Hungry Ghosts* esti-

**Why are there no museums sprouting up everywhere to commemorate the victims of communism?**

mates that ideologically driven and ruthlessly enforced agricultural policies caused the deaths of perhaps 30 million Chinese between 1959 and 1961 alone. That's ten million people per year, ten times what the Germans, for all their vaunted efficiency, achieved. To put it another way, Mao and his cronies killed as many of their own countrymen as died as a result of World War II.

Second place in the enormity sweepstakes, of course, is held by Uncle Joe Stalin. While mass murder was a tool of the Communist regime in Russia from its beginnings under Lenin until the old Bolsheviks disappeared in the 1960s, Stalin outdid himself in the Great Terror of the 1930s. Again nobody has exact figures, but the forced collectivization of farming cost at least five million lives in the Ukraine

alone, and the purges took at least an equal number.

Germany was of course much smaller than China or Russia, but, surprisingly, the Nazis don't even hold the record for the proportion of a nation's population killed during an extermination campaign. That honor goes to the Cambodian Communists under Pol Pot, who between 1975 and 1979 managed to kill more than 30% of Cambodia's then-population of 8 million.

Two questions thus present themselves. The first is, simply, why are there no museums sprouting up everywhere to commemorate the victims of communism? Why aren't there exhibits dealing with the Russian Shoah? Why are the names of the labor camps in the Gulag less familiar to American schoolchildren than Auschwitz? Why isn't Maoism the textbook example of evil? The answer, I'm afraid, is that American and European intellectuals, who control the agenda on matters such as historical significance, are considerably more sympathetic to what Mao, Lenin, Stalin, and Pol Pot were trying to accomplish than to Hitler's aims. They see Stalin's Terror and Mao's Great Leap Forward as ghastly mistaken means to a wholesome end, grisly distortions of an ideal in itself admirable, namely equality.

As intellectuals like to put it, there would be nothing wrong with socialism if it could only be made to work, if only its imposition didn't always incur such frightful human costs. But the Hitlerite idea of racial hierarchy, and its corollary of racial purity, is seen by intellectuals as intrinsically odious. The sheer idea of a group celebrating its racial virtues is repugnant, even if it did not hurt a fly. Academic intellectuals find Marxism's consequences a bit

of an embarrassment, but still they teach Marx as a serious thinker. You will never hear academic intellectuals call the mountain of corpses created by Stalin a challenge to Christ's redemptive service.

This is also why the Holocaust is not allowed to become part of the past (and why, with the passing of the Holocaust generation, we are beginning to hear about the woes of the children of Holocaust survivors). Right now the country is facing extraordinary racial difficulties. For reasons no-one fully understands—I know I don't—the American intellectual establishment attributes these difficulties to "racism," and thinks they can be solved by strenuous avoidance of all racial thinking.

As an instrument in the propaganda campaign against such thinking the Holocaust is a Godsend, A Lesson For Us All About Where Race Hatred Leads. The Holocaust has thus been grafted onto, and become continuous with, the crusade for minority rights and what is seen as an ongoing struggle against discrimination. That is where the will to build all those museums and mount all those exhibits comes from, and why the discovery of evil in the heart of the German people is a major event. The Gulag is never taken as a lesson for us all about envy, egalitarianism, class animosity, or economic hatred, since intellectuals aren't so sure those are bad.

The second, more difficult, problem is that of finding a reasonable attitude to take toward the Holocaust in the present overex-

cited climate. The tendentiousness and sanctimony of "Holocaust affirmers" can prompt a reaction to the opposite extreme, much as one feels impelled to disagree with everything the obnoxious office know-it-all says. This impulse is natural, but not to be indulged uncritically: even clubhouse lawyers are occasionally right.

It is a mistake, for instance, to let one's exasperation express itself in Holocaust denial. The Holocaust happened. Evidence is overwhelming that the Nazis did try to exterminate European Jewry, and managed to kill between five and six million. It should not be hard for

conservatives and libertarians to believe that a totalitarian government is capable of such a thing. Second, it must be admitted that the Holocaust was one of the darkest episodes in history, made worse by the cold rationality with which it was carried out, and puzzling by the heights that German culture had previously attained.

Friends of liberty might wish to use the

Holocaust to teach lessons of their own. Like the communist excesses, it shows what powerful governments with a strong sense of mission can do. It shows the overall evil of socialism (for, after all, the Nazis were National Socialists). It shows the dangers of economic envy, in this case the envy felt by ordinary Germans still suffering the consequences of the first world war toward the highly successful Jewish community. For the same reason the Holocaust has nothing to tell us about the "racism" that supposedly

permeates the United States; whites do not wish to avoid blacks because of the wealth of blacks, or their undue influence in the professions.

But it would be a mistake to try to top liberals in Holocaust-mongering. The main offense of liberals, more than their willful misunderstanding, is that of beating people over the head with an event that should be fading into history. It is understandable that Jews wish to keep the memory of the Holocaust vivid, just as it is understandable that Southerners remember Reconstruction, that Australian aborigines memorialize the arrival of Europeans, or that any other group focus on the high and low points of its history. But for everyone else, enough is enough. **RRR**

**The Gulag is never taken as a lesson for us all about envy, egalitarianism, class animosity, or economic hatred.**

## COME HOME, PAT

Justin Raimondo

**P**at Buchanan has defected to the War Party. The conservative leader who once rejected the blandishments of Empire has made the growing anti-China war hysteria his own. The man who declared that the throne of the Emir of Kuwait is not worth a single American life now thinks that Taiwan is worth plenty of those lives. What happened?

For many conservatives, including Pat, the implosion of Communism and the end of the Cold War meant the end of a conservative rationale for global interventionism. In this connection, Pat's opposition to the Gulf War and his call for the U.S. to get out of Nato won him an

even more devoted following. So his reversal is bad news for the conservative movement and the Republican Party: both may be even more inundated by the anti-Chinese war propaganda being generated by the neoconservatives, who have at last found a stand-in for the Kremlin.

Unlike many of my libertarian friends and allies, I was willing to write off Buchanan's anticapitalist tirades as inchoate "populism," so long as he stuck to the concept of foreign policy outlined in his 1991 *National Interest* article, "America First and Second and Third." In this essay, Buchanan traces America's career as world-saving global crusader, mocking McKinley's claim that "God had told him to take the Philippines." The allied victors of the Great War were "an alliance of empires" that "held most of mankind in colonial captivity." He writes approvingly of the fact that, even as the Nazis and the Soviets divided up Europe, "we saw, in the world's bloody conflict, no cause why our soldiers should be sent overseas to spill a single drop of American blood."

In appropriating the slogan of the principal opponents of that war, the America First Committee, Buchanan symbolically debunked the interventionist mythology that depicts WWII as a glorious "anti-fascist" crusade. "How other people rule themselves," he added, "is their own business."

Yet in a now all-too-typical warmongering column (April 17, 1997), Pat touts the manifesto of the Sinophobes, *The Coming Conflict With China* by Ross Munro and Richard Bernstein, and declares that we must defend Taiwan against

"Red" China or else "we would be finished in Asia." (Oh no!)

In Taiwan, "China would have an unsinkable aircraft carrier directly athwart the sea lanes through which pass the raw materials and oil on which Japan depends for survival." This, by the way, is the same Pat who wants to punish Japan for the crime of selling us cars we want to buy at prices we want to pay.

A few years ago, Pat sneered at the idea of a Chinese threat. But now we are supposed to be worried that "China has used her hoards of cash from U.S. trade to build her war machine." Denouncing "appeasement," Pat bellows that it is "time to show Beijing there are still a few Americans who never learned how to kowtow."

If Pat is so worried that we might be "finished" in Asia, why did he call for U.S. withdrawal from South Korea in 1991? "If Kim II Sung attacks, why should Americans be first to die?" Back in the good old days, Pat declared that "it is time we began uprooting the global network of 'tripwires,' planted on foreign soil, to ensnare the United States in the wars of other nations, to back commitments made and treaties signed before this generation of American soldiers was even born."

Given this premise, then why should Americans be the first to die to protect Taiwan or any other foreign nation?

Pat has written eloquently of the forces of nationalism that toppled Communism and are now sweeping through Eastern Europe, yet he ignores the effect of Western intervention on rising Chinese nationalism—intervention that, as exemplified by the pro-

drug Opium Wars, has a long and despicable history.

By threatening to fight for the warlords of Taiwan—who only recently adopted "democracy" to mask their repression of the native Taiwanese—the United States will provide the Peking regime with a new ideological rationale.

How do we explain Pat's defection to the camp of the interventionists, where, in chorus with his former enemies, the neoconservatives, he calls for policies that must lead to war with China? In spite of the fact that the late Chinese leader, Deng Xiaoping, was famous for his maxim "to be rich is glorious!" and that the country is rapidly taking the capitalist road, Marxism-Leninism is still the official ideology of the regime. Pat is beating the dead horse of Communism, just for old time's sake.

What led to Pat's sudden reversal? In fact, it's not so sudden. To begin with, Pat has been an interventionist for most of his political life. As a fervent anti-Soviet, he took the Buckley-CIA line that we must embark on a world-saving crusade to destroy the Red Menace—and if we have to lose our old Republic in the process of achieving "victory," so be it.

Warmongering has been associated with the conservative movement for so long, and the non-interventionist history of the movement so deeply buried, that the temptation for a conservative politician to pander to ingrained militarism—and the wealthy special interests that promote it—is always great.

It would be easy to say that Pat has "sold out"—but this is not quite accurate. The ideological roots of his turnaround can be traced back to his growing hostility to the free market and his always bellicose stance,

**Here is  
where  
"economic  
nationalism"  
leads:  
war.**

which involves his calls for yet more military spending. The essential error of this talented political leader, his insistent trade protectionism and growing anti-capitalism, has led directly to his reversal on the foreign policy front.

Here is where "economic nationalism" leads: to the spectacle of Pat threatening war if the Chinese cut into Hollywood's profits by allegedly pirating Madonna videos. [RRR]

## THE AMISH AS A TEST CASE

L. H. R., Jr.

**A**merican history is chock full of separatists. That's not surprising, considering the country was established in a separatist act. One of the great evils of war and economic crisis was to unify the country under a single authority, and quash the rights of lower-order groups to self-government.

Almost everyone buckled under, especially religious groups. Before the second world war, for example, churches did not routinely hoist the American flag at their altar. After all, this was a sanctuary where the state had no authority. Many Christians considered it a desecration to display the state's battle emblem. Churches might pray for political leaders, but they did not worship "the state as God walking on earth," in R.J. Rushdoony's phrase.

But the second world war was a loyalty test for the entire country. Contrary to popular history, entering the war was a hugely controversial act, requiring much lying and scheming on the part of Roosevelt and his affiliates, foreign and domestic. A mass movement of resisters had been building for the decade prior to Pearl Harbor, an event that worked to silence critics rather than truly change minds about the merits of involving ourselves in European politics.

During that war, American churches were challenged to enlist in the homefront campaign. They

were to support the troops, which also turned out to mean cheer as their sons were drafted, morally corrupted, mutilated, and murdered in distant lands. The bare minimum requirement for churches—and this was especially true for Catholics—was to fly the American flag, and to open assemblies with the anti-Southern pledge of allegiance.

Today, the U.S. flag remains on the altar and in the sanctuary of most churches. The best possible interpretation of the U.S. flag is that it represents the freedom to worship. If that is the case, there should be no tradition, much less an expectation or a requirement, that this flag be flown in church. More and more, orthodox congregations are removing it. You might suggest this in your home church, and see what happens.

Some resist on broader grounds. The Amish, to their credit, have traditionally been impervious to outside governance. They have never flown the flag in their communities. They have resisted all manner of imposition. Much to the government's chagrin, they even managed

Dear *Triple R*:

Start sending me (or renew) your newsletter:

- \$49 for 1-year;  \$98 for 2-years;  \$147 for 3-years.
- Enclosed is my tax-deductible contribution (made out to CLS).
- Send information to the friends I've listed on a separate sheet.

Credit card number: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. Date \_\_\_\_\_

Or phone 1-800-325-7257 for VISA, Amex, or MasterCard charges.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

*Triple R*, Center for Libertarian Studies, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011