

child, having memorized so many words, is initially more impressive than phonics children still struggling with "Ranger Don." But this advantage is quickly lost as the phonics child overtakes him in fluency (unless, as often happens, the look-say child figures out phonics for himself).

My guess is that self-esteem retains its dominant role in the debate because it is a distractor. It draws attention away from those differences nobody wishes to talk about. Phonics requires thinking while look-say depends more heavily on rote memory. The gap in reading would be wider were reading taught correctly, so out of fear of "racism," reading is taught incorrectly—while nobody will admit that this is what is really going on.

Laughable ideas like ebonics and pernicious ones like look-say resemble neurotic symptoms, disguising deep-seated problems that cannot be faced openly. When the disguises work, liberals cling to them compulsively, hence liberal faith in look-say and other discredited notions. When the disguise becomes too transparent, the result is hysterical denial. That is why liberals went bananas over ebonics.

RRR

THE RETURN OF THE CHINA LOBBY

Justin Raimondo

It was virtually inevitable that out-of-work Cold Warriors would fall back on Chinese Communism as the new boogymen. The *Standard*, that reliable

barometer of militarist chic, features a special issue on the Red-Yellow Peril.

For years labor unions and the left have been inveighing against China for the crime of providing quality goods at low prices. Now it's just like the old days of the Vietnam war: a grand reunion of Humphrey Democrats in their neoconservative incarnation and the heirs of George Meany, as Bill Kristol joins hands with the AFL-CIO in a new anti-Peking Popular Front.

The agenda of the anti-China left, painted over with a thin gloss of "human rights" rhetoric, is clear: the influx of cheap Chinese goods, especially textiles, imperils their base in the unions. Big Labor, whose political and financial base is rapidly shrinking, calls this the economic equivalent of Pearl Harbor—and they are hellbent on declaring a trade war.

The neocons, for their part, won't be happy until they have signed up some important allies. In a statement released on Feb. 28, four leaders of the religious right declared their support for trade sanctions against China: "Economic rights should not trump human rights," said the letter, signed by Gary Bauer, head of the Family Research Council; James Dobson, president of Focus on the Family; Don Wildmon, president of the American Family Association; and Richard Land, of the Southern Baptist Convention. The *New York Times* gleefully reports this as a "split in Republican ranks among social and economic conservatives."

Bauer attacks "realpolitik," countering an "idealism" he claims is

inspired by Ronald Reagan but sounds more like Woodrow Wilson. He fulminates, in the *Standard*, against "China's leaders [who] have exported weapons and nuclear technology to Middle Eastern states that are either bent on terrorism or determined to develop an 'Islamic bomb.'" The truth is that only one nation in the region has nuclear weapons, although no one is supposed to talk about it, and that is Israel.

The neocons won't be happy until they've started a shooting war with China.

Bauer also claims that China "has been linked to international drug trafficking," and that this is yet another reason for the U.S. to abandon its policy of "appeasement and cowardice." But what about our policy of "appeasement and cowardice" toward the chief exporter of drugs into the United States, a country, right on our southern border, whose elected officials, police force, and even the commander of the country's anti-drug effort, are in the pay of the drug lords: what about Mexico?

The Bauer Doctrine of no trade with authoritarian governments that wink at the drug trade and "beat and torture" their own people means, at least, no trade with Mexico: applied consistently and across the board, it means trade sanctions against a good chunk of the Third World. Besides hurting American consumers, the chief irony of this doctrine is that it would prop up the dictators it aims to depose. For such sanctions are bound to provoke a nationalist reaction in target countries, strengthening popular support for repressive governments and isolating opponents of the regime.

I leave aside the delicate question of whether—under these rules—anyone

should trade with the U.S., which has warred against so many other countries, bombed so many civilians, committed so many crimes like Waco, and is the world's leading champion of tax-paid abortions.

Jesse Helms weighs in with the complaint that "China isn't buying American." Noting that "Belgium buys more U.S. goods than China does," Helms asks: "Who benefits from this state of affairs?" Obviously not the textile manufacturers of North Carolina. Helms also claims that Chinese entrepreneurs do not always live up to their contracts, and that the Chinese authorities are not overeager to enforce them: even if true, not all contracts are enforce-

able, and American companies that make risky overseas investments should not expect to be bailed out every time a deal goes awry.

The editors of the *Standard* are glad to give a platform to moral posturing and calls for a gunboat-diplomacy trade policy, but their own concerns are of a far different order: the great crime of the Chinese, in the neocons' eyes, is that they were lying when they said "they wanted nothing more than to join this new world order. Well, they don't. And it is increasingly clear that the policies of the Chinese regime are the leading threat to that peaceful order," says the *Standard*. China is not only out to replace the U.S. as the hegemon of East Asia, but, we are told, "experts agree" the Chinese are "in the long term" determined "to challenge America's position as the dominant power in the world." This is no ordinary "rogue nation," the editors of the

Standard breathlessly announce, but a "rogue superpower."

But, wait a minute, what happened to the post-Cold War idea that the U.S. is the world's sole superpower? Up until now, the globalists have argued that, as the World's Only Superpower, global leadership has been thrust up on us, like Caesar beseeched by the Roman Senate to take the crown. Now, suddenly, there are two superpowers, one legitimate and the other a "rogue." (Rogue meaning, as always, a refusal to take State Department orders.)

Let these unnamed "experts," who conjure a new Yellow Peril, contemplate statistics cited by Congressman Christopher Cox (R-CA), in that same issue of the *Standard*: "Communist

China's per capita GNP in dollars ranks below such emblems of Third World poverty as Lesotho, the Congo, Senegal, Bolivia, Guatemala, and Honduras." Is Lesotho writ large really "the leading threat" to the American people?

The editors of the *Standard* opine that "the dream of a world that would not require American moral and strategic leadership has been a pleasant one," but it is "time to wake up."

What hypocrisy! The end of the Cold War has been a nightmare for the neocons who, in their fervent internationalism, find themselves increasingly isolated on the right. Their strategic response has been the creation of a new China lobby. The old China lobby, backed by the Nationalist government on Taiwan, was instrumental in reversing the "isolationist" consensus on the right in the late forties and early fifties, and the *Standard* hopes it can play that role again. **RRR**

**What
hypocrisy!
The end of
the Cold War
has been a
nightmare for
the neocons.**

**WACO—
THE RULES OF
ENGAGEMENT**

A documentary directed
by William Gazecki
(165 minutes)

Reviewed by
Burton S. Blumert

Almost three hours long, this meticulously crafted documentary film combines TV news clips, excerpts from the Congressional hearings on Waco, FBI and BATF film, and some poignant footage of David Koresh and other Branch Davidians, taped during their 51 days under siege.

We owe a great debt to Producer Dan Gifford and Director William Gazecki for this quality piece, which can keep the government crimes at Waco from slipping from public memory.

But the film does much more. It presents powerful new evidence that the FBI, not the Davidians, caused the fatal inferno at Waco. This dramatic moment in the documentary is provided by aerial film shot by an FBI surveillance aircraft 10,000 feet above the event using Forward Looking Infra-Red (FLIR).

FLIR, which looks like ordinary black and white film, actually measures heat not light. It clearly reveals that the FBI caused the fire, which destroyed the building and was responsible for most of the deaths. We actually see the two grenades launched from a Bradley tank explode into flames.

Even more horrifying is the revelation that FBI gunmen were stationed outside the only exit from the burning building. As the hapless