

---

An ADL Special Research Report

---

# From Columnist to Candidate: Pat Buchanan's Religious War



Anti-Defamation League  
1992



A report of the Civil Rights Division of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith  
823 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017

© 1992, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

**SPECIAL  
RESEARCH  
REPORT**

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Overview: Pat Buchanan in 1992	2
II. Buchanan's Career/Buchanan's Early Background	4
The Nixon Years	4
The Columnist	5
The world according to Pat Buchanan:	
On dictators	5
On South Africa	5
On democracy	5
On a Christian America	6
On abortion	6
On homosexuals and AIDS	6
On women	6
On immigration and ethnicity	6
On segregation	7
On "internationalist" Jews	7
On Israel	7
Operation Desert Storm	8
On Nazi War Criminals and the Holocaust	9
The Convent at Auschwitz	10
The 'Amen Corner'	10
Aiming For the Presidency	11
The Announcement	12
A Campaign on the Rise	12
Buchanan on Duke	14
The South	14
A Campaign on the Decline	15
The Larger Context	15
Conclusion	16
III Appendix: A Selection of His Remarks	17

**ADDENDUM: Pat Buchanan in 1993 and 1994 (after page 19)**

# PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

*“When we say we will put America first, we mean also that our Judeo-Christian values are going to be preserved, and our western heritage is going to be handed down to future generations— not dumped onto some landfill called multiculturalism.”*

With these words, Patrick J. Buchanan launched his bid for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1992. While Buchanan had never held elective office, he had long been an outspoken voice of the right as a journalist, commentator, and influential staff member of the Nixon and Reagan administrations. His nightly skirmishes on the Cable News Network program *Crossfire*, his weekly appearances on CNN’s *The Capital Gang* and NB C’s *The McLaughlin Group*, and his syndicated columns and weekly newsletter had given him substantial exposure.

As a candidate, Buchanan—trumpeting a nativist “America First” agenda—failed to capture a single Republican primary. Initially, however, his depiction of the United States as a country ill-used by its elected caretakers proved timely in a season of economic decline and pervasive voter anger. On February 18, 1992, in the nation’s first primary, New Hampshire Republicans cast a substantial proportion of their ballots—37 percent—for the challenger; President Bush was endorsed by 53 percent of the GOP electorate, a total considered unfavorable for a sitting President. Observers recalled the 1952 and 1968 Democratic primaries, when the respectively strong showings of Estes Kefauver and Eugene McCarthy impelled Presidents Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson to drop their re-election bids.

New Hampshire, however, was to be the high point in Buchanan’s candidacy; he would never capture as large a percentage of voters in any other state. As his appeal diminished and the possibility of his nomination grew increasingly remote, his insurgency came to be seen as less a Presidential bid for 1992 than a preparation for the 1996 race, and a personal mission to force public policy in a more conservative direction.

“It’s not simply about delegates and about nominations,” Buchanan said of his campaign. “It’s about the heart and soul of the Republican Party and the future of the country.”

The principles guiding Buchanan’s agenda for America’s future had been amply delineated in his truculent writings and television appearances. Although Buchanan had never explicitly advocated white supremacy, anti-Semitism, or segregation, his nativist and authoritarian views effectively promoted these prejudices in others. He had repeatedly derided secularism and immigration, and insulted blacks, women, homosexuals, and non-Europeans. He had championed totalitarian regimes abroad and denigrated pluralism and democracy at home.

More recently, grievance and hostility had come to inform his statements regarding Jewish concerns. A past supporter of Israel, he was now one of its severest critics, voicing sympathy for the PLO and comparing the Palestinian situation to apartheid. He had suggested that American Jews maintained a deeper loyalty to Israel than America, and were willing to undermine U.S. interests if Israel was thereby served. Moreover, he had regularly defended accused Nazi war criminals and lambasted the Justice Department’s investigation of these accused criminals. He had intimated that the extent of the Holocaust may have been exaggerated, and he questioned accounts of Holocaust survivors.

Were such positions the scattershot bigotry of a pundit, they would deserve public reproof; as the platform of an influential political figure and aspiring President, they now demand a more thoroughgoing scrutiny and censure. Buchanan’s politics have been defined by prejudice and rancor, if not outright hate: their ongoing expression across the editorial pages and television screens and convention halls of the United States amounts to an alarming crusade, and is the subject of this Report.

## I. OVERVIEW: Patrick Buchanan in 1992

A splintering of the conservative movement, his ideological ardor and caustic humor, partisan animosities in Washington, economic decline, the sour and resentful mood of the electorate: all of these contributed to Patrick Buchanan's political ascendancy in 1992.

Buchanan did not win or come close to winning a single, state primary in his recent campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination, and he quickly faded after a three or four month surge of attention. But while his candidacy was superseded by the inevitable renomination of President Bush and the emergence of the Ross Perot insurgency, Buchanan had already begun to establish himself as a national political figure whose name widely evoked a signature habit of mind, a style and political compass point. Even in defeat iconic figures have inspired and influenced popular sentiments and popular movements, as well as other politicians. The platform at the Republican National Convention in August was markedly influenced by the hard-line conservatism that Buchanan, more than any other individual, has recently energized.

Buchanan's national appeal was inflated at the start of his campaign by the idiosyncratic circumstances of a particular state—and by the way much of the media depicted these local idiosyncrasies as nationally representative.

New Hampshire proved particularly receptive to the angry cadences of Buchanan's 'America First' crusade, which depicted the country's elected officials as apathetic in regard to domestic ills while dispensing attention and resources abroad. The Granite State had been crippled by recession: in November 1988, when George Bush captured 63 percent of the state's vote, New Hampshire's unemployment rate stood at 2.3 percent; three years later it had tripled to 7 percent. The small state had lost 48,000 jobs, bankruptcies had risen by more than 300 percent, five of the seven largest banks failed, and welfare and food-stamp caseloads had climbed faster than in any other state.

Opposed to taxation—New Hampshire imposes neither income nor sales taxes—and mired in economic gloom, already unhappy voters were further embittered following the President's 1990 approval of a federal tax hike: Bush's promise not to raise taxes was credited for the 1988 primary win in New Hampshire that saved his campaign ("Thank you, New Hampshire," he declared on election night in November).

Buchanan exacerbated the widespread anger at the President, saturating local television with a close-up of candidate Bush asserting in 1988: "Read my lips, no new taxes." Buchanan poured \$1.5 million in television advertising alone into the nation's ninth smallest state (pop. 900,000), and campaigned there for 40 days.

Bush campaigned in the state for only four days: a serious challenge to an incumbent president by a novice politician was not expected. A Times-Mirror poll conducted in mid-January, five weeks before the February 18 primary, reflected a 66-20 percent Bush lead. While other polls indicated a somewhat closer race, state GOP chair Rhona Charbonneau predicted: "He's [President Bush] going to get 70 percent."

Bush went on to receive only 53 percent of ballots cast—a poor total for an incumbent—while Buchanan netted 37 percent. The results instantly conferred legitimacy to Buchanan's challenge, and the former commentator would proceed to collect 36 percent of Georgia's Republican ballots two weeks later.

His campaign, however, was essentially exhausted just as it became credible. He spent nearly his entire war chest in New Hampshire and Georgia, his staff was bare-boned (only two workers researched issues in Washington), and the campaign trail agenda was cobbled together by the speechwriter and strategist, Buchanan himself. Thanks to his large and sophisticated direct mail operation, he managed to fund his challenge through the entire primary season, but on an austere budget. The smallness of New Hampshire and the aftershock in Georgia camouflaged these fatal political deficiencies.

Buchanan's subsequent demise in the all-important primaries on Super Tuesday (March 10), when he cracked the 30 percent mark in only two of eight states, coincided with the entrance of David Duke into the race (Duke had not qualified for earlier primaries, with the exception of South Carolina). The appeal of the two candidates overlapped, and Duke's single digit showings in most of these states at once signified his irrelevance and pared his rival's totals, undermining Buchanan's status as a legitimate representative of GOP alienation. After Super Tuesday, Buchanan would claim as much as one-quarter of the Republican vote on only two occasions.

Ultimately, it is misleading to represent Buchanan's support merely as a protest vote, though this was the reason—as exit polling indicates—many Republicans voted for him. The day Buchanan's extensive and costly efforts in Georgia yielded 36 percent, he also received 30 percent in two states—Maryland and Colorado—where he had not campaigned at all. And a few days before, on February 29 in South Dakota, where Buchanan was unable to get onto the ballot, 31 percent of the Republican vote went to an uncommitted slate. “What this suggests,” Norman Podhoretz wrote in the May issue of *Commentary*, “is that anyone—or no one—running against Bush would have been assured of that 30 percent?” Podhoretz deduced:

“If, then, Buchanan began with an assured anti-Bush base of 30 percent, it follows that the best he managed to do in his own right was to jack it up by six or seven points. Worse yet from his point of view, in many states.., he went below the anti-Bush base, scoring as it were in negative numbers.”

Buchanan clearly failed to excite most Republicans (about 3,000,000 nationwide voted for him), but it is important to look to the possible consequences of the vote he did receive. Prior to the campaign season, it was not taken for granted that a 30 percent anti-Bush bloc existed: Buchanan first focused then galvanized a large antagonism toward Bush among the Republican rank-and-file. Another challenger may have had the same or greater success, but Buchanan alone challenged, and boosted his stature accordingly.

Many observers believe that the veteran columnist is too extreme to win national public office. His proclamation at the Republican convention of a “religious war” raging throughout the country—with its implication that those who dissent from his view of conservative values are spiritual traitors—typified his fiery campaign polemics. It echoed his long journalistic record as well: his isolationist and authoritarian bent; the pervasive sense of grievance or hostility that have informed his statements regarding the concerns of Jews, blacks, and other minorities; his denunciation of homosexuals, women's rights, secularism, and immigration, of pluralism generally.

Yet Buchanan has shown himself to be a significant player in mainstream politics, and he remains poised to become one of America's most influential conservatives whether or not he holds elected office. The impact of such an eventuality on issues of importance to Jews and Israel remains to be seen—but the prospect is already troubling. That his belligerent nativism has functioned for many as a compelling alternative to traditional forms of conservatism and to liberalism speaks unfortunately of a political environment in which appeals to the worst instincts of citizens often boost campaigns rather than doom them.

## II Buchanan's Career

### Buchanan's Early Background

Born in 1938 in Washington, D.C., Pat Buchanan was raised in a traditionally Catholic and fervently anti-Communist household. In his 1988 autobiography, *Right from the Beginning*, Buchanan explained that his ardent defense of his faith and his rightist convictions were instilled in him early on by his father.

Buchanan was educated in Catholic parochial schools, Georgetown University and Columbia University's School of Journalism. Shortly after his graduation from Columbia in 1962, he became an editorial writer for the now-defunct St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*. During his three-year tenure at the conservative newspaper, Buchanan repeatedly denounced the Reverend Martin Luther King and decried the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In a letter to his family, Buchanan noted that the *Globe-Democrat* allowed him "to hit as hard as I like, which is like a license to kill."

### The Nixon Years

In 1965, at the age of 27, Buchanan joined Richard Nixon's presidential campaign as a speechwriter and aide-de-camp. Following Nixon to the White House, he crafted some of Vice President Spiro Agnew's famous speeches assailing the media, a rhetorical battle Buchanan would later call "one of the great sustained polemics of the 20th century."

Documents obtained from Nixon's archives by the Boston *Globe* and *US News & World Report* reveal the Nixon-era Buchanan to have been an opponent of government-sponsored integration and unsympathetic to black people generally. He urged Nixon not to visit "the widow King" on the first anniversary of Martin Luther King's slaying, arguing that the visit would "outrage many, many people who believe Dr. King was a fraud and a demagogue and perhaps worse. Others consider him the devil incarnate... Dr. King is one of the most divisive men in contemporary history."

Later, in a 1971 memo to the President, Buchanan cited an *Atlantic Monthly* article that suggested the possible genetic inferiority of blacks: he called the article "powerful" and "seminal" and contended that its importance was "difficult to understate." If such theories were true, "it seems to me that a lot of what we are doing in terms of integration of blacks and whites—but, even more so, poor and well-to-do—is less likely to result in accommodation than it is in perpetual friction—as the incapable are placed consciously by government side by side with the capable?" Buchanan added: "And every study we have shows blacks 15 IQ points below whites on the average."

When these remarks were made public in January 1992, Buchanan countered that the memo had been a routine "intellectual exercise," according to the *Globe*, and had included a suggestion that the article be forwarded to Jewish intellectual Irving Kristol and New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan for "possible refutation."

Buchanan was himself refuted, however, in a 1970 note written by White House aide John Erlichman which quotes President Nixon as saying, "No good politics in PB's extreme view: segregation forever."\*

Indeed, after Nixon's re-election in 1972, Buchanan told the President that it would be a "tragedy" to "fritter away his present high support in the nation for an ill-advised governmental effort to forcibly integrate races." On another occasion he wrote to the President: "The ship of integration is going down. It's not our ship."

Buchanan often revisited racial themes, some of which he suggested could be used by the administration as wedge issues—issues that would polarize the electorate in the hope of enlarging Nixon's constituency. He confided to Nixon that "there is a legitimate grievance in my view of white working-class people that every time on every issue that the black militants loud-mouth it, we come up with more money."

In other memoranda obtained from the Nixon archives, Buchanan called Russian poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko "the porch-nigger of the Politburo" and referred to South Africa's 1960 Sharpeville Massacre, in which 67 blacks were killed, as "whites mistreating a couple of blacks."

---

\*As quoted in Nicholas Lemann's *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration & How It changed America* (Knopf, 1991), p. 210.

## The Columnist

After Nixon's resignation, Buchanan stayed on for part of Gerald Ford's term (he was not implicated in Watergate). When his bid to become Ambassador to South Africa failed, he resigned and launched his career as a newspaper columnist.

Buchanan's writings became notable for the same controversialist approach he had brought to the editorial page of the *Globe-Democrat* and to the Nixon administration, and for the certitude of his convictions. This quality, Buchanan and others have said, arises from his belief in an idyllic American era: the era of his youth in the 1950s. "We lived in a world of clarity and absolutes," Buchanan writes in his 1988 autobiography, *Right from the Beginning*,

...we grew up when the faith was unquestioned and patriotism unconstrained... From the time I was 14 until after I was 22, Ike [Dwight Eisenhower] was my president; and those years— of peace and prosperity, of unity and harmony, when America was at the pinnacle of her power and prestige—were the best years of our lives.

Buchanan calls this period "the American high." He remarked in a eulogy to his father, according to the *Washington Post*: "Dissent wasn't something I heard a great deal about until I left home and went to graduate school. By then, it was probably too late?"

In his work, Buchanan writes as though this lifelong ideology, the "clarity and absolutes" that continue to be manifest in an overriding allegiance to his version of conservative Catholicism and the remembered values of America in the 1950s, is everywhere under seige. Caustic and bellicose, he fires at a familiar gallery of perceived threats, often the victims of prejudice. At the same time, his ideology and its trajectory evidently have led him to defend totalitarians and accused Nazis. His "paleo-conservatism," says journalist E.J. Dionne, "is based more on the imperative of defending Western (and Christian) culture than on celebrating the free market": it is grounded in a fundamental antagonism toward pluralism.

*The world according to Pat Buchanan:*

**On dictators** — To Buchanan, authoritarian rulers like Francisco Franco and Auguste Pinochet were "soldier-patriots." His affinity toward strongman leadership surfaced in a 1977 column:

Those of us in childhood during the war years were introduced to Hitler only as caricature. Though Hitler was indeed racist and anti-Semitic to the core, a man who without compunction could commit murder and genocide, he was also an individual of great courage, a soldier's soldier in the Great War, a leader steeped in the history of Europe, who possessed oratorical powers that could awe even those who despised him. But Hitler's success was not based on his extraordinary gifts alone. His genius was an intuitive sense of the mushiness, the character flaws, the weakness masquerading as morality that was in the hearts of the statesmen who stood in his path.

Not surprisingly, Buchanan—while a White House aide in 1985—ardently defended President Reagan's controversial visit to a Bitburg, Germany cemetery that contained the graves of Nazi SS troops.

**On South Africa** — Buchanan has traditionally admired and defended Pretoria's white regime, which he has often referred to as the "Boer Republic" (after the Dutch natives who colonized the region). In 1990, he derided those who believed "White rule of a Black majority is inherently wrong":

But where did we get that idea? The Founding Fathers did not believe this. They did not give Indians, who were still living a tribal existence, the right to vote us out of North America. When they created the republic, they restricted the franchise to property-owning males, believing that not every man was qualified to rule, nor every people prepared for self-government.

If the past 30 years taught us nothing else, it has surely taught us that.

To elevate 'majority rule' to the level of divine revelation is a heresy of the American idea.

"Why are Americans collaborating in a UN conspiracy to ruin [South Africa] with sanctions?" he asked in 1986. He asserted that non-white, Third World hatred of South Africa "is rooted in racism and the resentment failure always feels for success.

**On democracy** — Buchanan has repeatedly vented anti-democratic sentiments. In 1991, he wrote: "'The cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy,' said Al Smith. The Happy Warrior had it wrong. If the people are corrupt, the more democracy, the worse the government?' Similarly, from 1990: "If Communism was The God That Failed the last generation, democracy, panacea for mankind's ills, hope

for the world, may prove the Golden Calf of this generation.”

Buchanan has expressed disdain for “the democratist temptation, the worship of democracy as a form of governance” and “the one man, one vote Earl Warren system.” He once crafted a purportedly improved Bill of Rights that restricted voting to those who had paid at least \$300 in taxes during the previous year.

***On a Christian America*** — Buchanan’s writings reflect an antipathy toward the First Amendment’s establishment clause—upon which the nation’s historic separation of church and state legally rests—because of what he perceives as the decline of Christianity in American public life.

In 1984, for example, Buchanan wrote articles on the subject of prayer in public schools in which he portrayed the debate as a conflict between Christians and non-Christians. Buchanan asked, “Should the United States be a Christian or pagan country?... America was a Christian country. A quarter of a century ago, without prior consultation with a democratic people, without support in precedent or the Constitution, the Warren Court undertook the systematic de-Christianization of America, beginning, but not stopping, with the public schools.” Buchanan complained in a June 1990 column, “we have let this country be driven to where the Ten Commandments cannot be posted in a public school, or a manger placed in a public park at Christmas..

A month later, Buchanan celebrated the retirement of Supreme Court Justice William Brennan: “Nominally Catholic, Brennan was a militant humanist who led the Warren Court’s relentless campaign to deChristianize America.”

***On abortion*** — While Buchanan defends Nazi war criminals, he has tried to invigorate his anti-abortion oratory by likening the practice to Nazi war crimes. “Something is terribly amiss’ he lamented in 1985, when we can be caught up in remorse over crimes committed in Eastern Europe four decades ago while overlooking the Holocaust going on within our own land, with 4,000 children being done to death every single day.”

***On homosexuals and AIDS*** — In 1977, Buchanan began his attack against homosexuals when he urged a “thrashing” of gay rights groups. Again, he evoked the Nazi era: “Homosexuality is not a civil right. Its rise almost always is accompanied, as in the Weimar Republic, with a decay of society and a collapse of its basic cinder block, the family?” In fact, “a visceral recoil from homosexuality is the natural reaction of a healthy society wishing to preserve itself” (1991).

Buchanan wrote of the burgeoning AIDS tragedy in 1983: “The poor homosexuals—they have declared war on nature, and now nature is exacting an awful retribution.” More recently he claimed that “from the homosexuals you get the blood supply tainted... their wives and their girlfriends get it who give it to the babies, you get the hemophiliacs’ blood supply and all the rest of it?” He has stated that “promiscuous homosexuals appear literally hell-bent on Satanism and suicide” and he has called homosexuals “sodomites” and the “pederast proletariat”; lesbians are the “butch brigade.”

***On women*** — After the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment, Buchanan wrote in a 1983 column: “Rail as they will against ‘discrimination,’ women are simply not endowed by nature with the same measures of single-minded ambition and the will to succeed in the fiercely competitive world of Western capitalism?” He added: “The momma bird builds the nest. So it was, so it ever shall be. Ronald Reagan is not responsible for this; God is.”

Last year, in response to the anger of women’s groups toward the Democrats who voted to confirm Clarence Thomas’s Supreme Court nomination, Buchanan wrote: ‘As the harridans of feminism unsheathe the castrator’s knife on their last unemasculated bulls, Republicans should revisit the Thomas battleground, and review how they won, and how they almost lost it all.’

***On immigration and ethnicity*** — In 1990, Buchanan worried that the United States was “endangered” by “the global rise of separatism, nationalism, and ethnic militancy” and pleaded for immigration restrictions: “The question we Americans need to address, before it is answered for us, is: Does this First World nation wish to become a Third World country? Because that is our destiny if we do not build a sea wall against the waves of immigration rolling over our shores.”

He went on to suggest that restricting new arrivals was by itself insufficient, because certain groups already ashore threatened “the ethnic character of... the United States”:

The Negroes of the ‘50s became the blacks of the ‘60s; now the ‘African-Americans’ of the ‘90s demand racial quotas and set-asides, as the Democrats eagerly assent and a pandering GOP prepares to go along.

Who speaks for the Euro-Americans, who founded the U.S.A.? ... Is it not time to take America back ?

“What happened to make America so vulgar and coarse, so uncivil and angry?” Buchanan is quoted as asking in a column by Charles Krauthammer. “Since 1965, a flood tide of immigration has rolled in from the Third World, legal and illegal, as our institutions of assimilation... disintegrated.” America had dropped from 90 percent to less than 77 percent European since 1950, Buchanan explained, and he issued a caveat:

“If present trends hold, white Americans will be a minority by 2050.”

Buchanan expressed the question of immigration as he saw it most directly years before, in a 1984 column: “The central objection to the present flood of illegals is they are not English-speaking white people from Western Europe; they are Spanish-speaking brown and black people from Mexico, Latin America, and the Caribbean.” Americans, he said, had to decide “whether the United States of the 21st century will remain a white nation.”

**On segregation** — Buchanan’s anti-integrationist sentiments while a Nixon aide and his objection to non-white immigration elucidate his preference for the segregated world of the late 1940s and early 1950s. “One wonders what a secret ballot would show if the older people in the black community were asked: Are you better off now than you were 30 years ago?” he writes in *Right From the Beginning*. “There were no politics to polarize us then, to magnify every slight. The ‘Negroes’ of Washington had their public schools, restaurants, bars, movie houses, playgrounds and churches; and we had ours.”

**On “internationalist” Jews** — According to press accounts, Buchanan wrote infrequently of Jews while serving President Nixon: on a few occasions, he advised Nixon to court conservative Jews. A column written shortly after he left the White House, however, presages the unfriendly rhetoric of his future phrasemaking. In 1975, he denounced the United Nations resolution equating Zionism with racism, but he added that “if permanent damage has been done, partial responsibility must rest with those Western intellectuals and internationalists, many of them Jews” who supported the U.N. in the first place. Expounding on this perceived irony in a later column, he launched a second fusillade against “the American intelligentsia, a significant slice of which is Jewish and avidly pro-Israel?” This repeated identification of Jews as intellectuals and “internationalists” is reminiscent of the pre-World War II bigotry of radio demagogue Father Charles Coughlin and industrialist Henry Ford, whose screed, *The International Jew*, remains a classic anti-Semitic text.

## On Israel

While Buchanan wrote columns in support of Israel at one time, he was by no means an “uncritical apologist for Israel” between 1967 and 1985, as he has described himself, nor a “Begin man all the way” [in reference to the late Israeli Prime Minister]. In 1977, he opposed President Carter’s endorsement of legislation that struck at the Arab boycott of Israel. In 1979 he claimed that, among other reasons (long gas lines, oil price hikes), Begin’s “prickly personality” had “raised in the minds of many Americans the question of whether continued unconditional support of Israel serves the national interest of the United States?”

Later that year he stated that many Americans perceive

Sadat... to be the man of peace and compromise, while Begin seems the intransigent bent upon settling and seizing forever the West Bank. Others, disenchanted with the results of foreign assistance, ask how long taxpayers must subsidize Israel with annual billions in economic and military assistance. Others ask why the United States is siding with three million Israelis— instead of 100 million Arabs who have oil.

Similarly, in 1981 Buchanan spoke of “Israeli intransigence” and speculated that “many Americans were growing bone-weary with carrying the diplomatic, economic and military cost of underwriting Menachem Begin’s policies.” In that same year he also branded Israel as an obstacle to peace and called for U.S. dialogue with the PLO.

On the occasion of Israel’s thirty-fifth anniversary in 1983, however, Buchanan described Israel’s presence on the West Bank as a “military occupation [that] by modern standards is neither severe nor oppressive?” He pointed out that Palestinian nationalism ironically flowered under Israeli occupation, and he ended his column with strong support for the Jewish state:

Israel remains a tough, resourceful, energetic nation, an offspring of the West, a strategic

asset to the West, whose current struggle merits sympathy and support, not only because it mirrors our own, but because its resolution will likely presage the outcome of our own.

Such support seemed to evaporate after the intifada began in December of 1987. Buchanan wrote in January 1988:

When the day comes that a Palestinian state is established, Gaza's riots will be recorded in its history like the "Boston Massacre" of 1770, when British troops fired on a rock-throwing mob of Americans, killing six but persuading thousands more in thirteen colonies that the break with London had to come, and soon. This time Palestinians did it right if you will. They got the attention of the world and, most important, of the Americans, not with some bloody massacre of defenseless women and children, but by the physical defiance of Israeli troops.

Buchanan's hostility toward Israel has increased in recent years. In April of 1989 he distorted the history of the UN Partition Plan, failing to examine the Arabs' refusal to accept it: "When Israel was created, a homeland for persecuted Jews after 2,000 years, one great wrong was righted; but another wrong was done—the Palestinian people. The bill has come due."

In January 1990 Buchanan described Israel's tragic mistaken attack on the U.S.S. Liberty as deliberate. He wrote:

That the United States would sit still for anything was brought home to the Israelis, long ago, on the third day of the Six-Day War, when Lyndon Johnson ordered a coverup of an Israeli rocket-and-machine gun attack on the U.S. intelligence ship Liberty off the Sinai, an attack costing the lives of 37 brave American soldiers.

When it suits them, our Israeli allies launch air strikes on Tunis, Baghdad or Beirut; they invade Lebanon; they even enlist U.S. traitors, like the Pollards, to loot the secrets of a nation that has manifested toward them an extraordinary indulgence.

In a March 13, 1991 syndicated column, Buchanan called Israel "a strategic albatross draped around the neck of the United States" and asked "... is it too much to ask her to behave more like a [democracy]—to the least among her people, the Palestinians?"

Decrying possible U.S. loan guarantees to Israel, Buchanan wrote in his syndicated column of September 18, 1991, "... it is propaganda to call that \$10 billion, 'humanitarian aid?' He added, "Israel's settlements policy is not only illegal and unjust; it is folly." He praised President Bush for asking Congress to delay the loan guarantees to Israel and said: "Even if his veto of the guarantees is overridden, he will have won high marks for his courage, and exposed Congress for what it has become, a Parliament of Whores incapable of standing up for U.S. national interests, if AIPAC is on the other end of the line."

Buchanan has attacked AIPAC and exaggerated its political strength. "AIPAC. . .the mighty American- Israel Political Action [sic] Committee, and hundreds of allied PACS, hold life-and-death power over the careers of countless U.S. politicians, who have permitted themselves to be cowed into a shameful silence." He has referred to the Democratic Party as "the diapered poodle of ... the Israeli lobby."

## **Operation Desert Storm**

Buchanan was a strong critic of America's involvement in the Persian Gulf war. In a November 10, 1990 column entitled "Why Do We Beat The War Drums?" he reasoned that "Kuwait was never an ally. And, unlike Hafez al-Assad, Saddam never blew up an American airliner or Marine barracks. Why, then, is Saddam's 'brutal, naked aggression' against Kuwait a *causis belli* for the United States when his 'brutal, naked aggression' against Iran was abetted by the United States?"

In a previous column, dated September 5, 1990, Buchanan defended Jordan's pro-Iraqi stance. ... [O]ne can only view with puzzlement the contemptuous attitude of U.S. officials. Flanked on the west by Israel, whose Likud party sees Jordan as dumping ground for its unwanted Palestinians, on the north by Syria.. on the east by Iraq, with which most of Jordan's vital trade is conducted, the king is desperately seeking a political solution."

Buchanan's later columns became more harshly critical of the U.S. involvement in the Gulf. He stated, in a January 23, 1991 column, that 'Anti-American riots are reported throughout the region,' and he said, when the war ends... the Palestinians, locked up by the curfew, with no income from the Gulf, all hope of 'liberation' dead, will be in the worst condition since 1948."

## **On Nazi War Criminals and the Holocaust**

Since the early 1980s Buchanan has repeatedly attacked those he has called “the hairy-chested Nazi hunters” in the Justice Department’s Office of Special Investigations (OSI). “Why not,” wrote Buchanan, “devote those sources to going after organized crime ... instead of running down 70-year-old camp guards?”

In a 1982 television interview with Allan Ryan, Jr., then OSI director, Buchanan questioned the wisdom of funding the OSI. “You’ve got a great atrocity that occurred 35-45 years ago, okay? Why continue to invest ... put millions of dollars into investigating that? I mean why keep a special office to investigate Nazi war crimes.. Why not abolish your office?” In that same interview Buchanan also said he saw no “singularity” about the Holocaust that would justify maintaining a special prosecution office.

Buchanan has maintained that accused Nazi war criminals John Demjanjuk, Frank Walus and Karl Linnas were victims of the Justice Department’s “fraternal collaboration” with the KGB. Buchanan referred to mounting evidence that “this devil bargain—between federal prosecutors and Soviet secret police— may have produced more than one horrible miscarriage of justice?” While a Reagan aide, Buchanan urged then-Attorney General Edwin Meese to halt the deportation of Linnas in 1987 on the grounds of the accused war criminal’s right to due process. Buchanan argued that evidence obtained from the Soviet Union by government attorneys should be ruled out as inherently suspect.

On another occasion, in June of 1985, Buchanan met in the White House with Eberhard Rees, a German rocket scientist who had succeeded Werner von Braun and a colleague of former NASA scientist Arthur Rudolph. Rees met with Buchanan to plead Rudolph’s case. Rudolph had been stripped of his United States citizenship and was being investigated as a Nazi war criminal for his role in utilizing slave labor during World War II. Although Buchanan denied that he was seeking to restore Rudolph’s citizenship, Rees told United Press International that the issue had been raised and that he felt very positive about the meeting. Elizabeth Holtzman, then Brooklyn District Attorney, called for Buchanan’s resignation. (While in Congress, Holtzman began calling for more systematic prosecution of Nazi war criminals in the U.S. In 1978, a bill popularly called the Holtzman Amendment rendered Nazi persecutors deportable and excludable from the United States; President Jimmy Carter signed the bill into law in 1979.) Holtzman said, “It is outrageous that a high level official of the Reagan administration, Patrick Buchanan, would have the audacity to hold a meeting at the White House with sympathizers of Nazi war criminal Arthur Rudolph.” A Buchanan column in July 1989 showcased Arthur Rudolph as an American hero victimized by his adopted country.

Earlier the same year, in the Chicago Sun Times of March 1989, Buchanan criticized the West for ostracizing Kurt Waldheim. Buchanan rationalized, “like others in Hitler’s army, Lt. Waldheim looked the other way?” (Previously, as Secretary General of the United Nations, Waldheim had been a frequent target of Buchanan’s scorn.)

In an attempt to cast doubt on the reliability of concentration camp survivors’ testimonies, Buchanan has referred to a “so-called ‘Holocaust Survivor Syndrome’ “which he described as involving “group fantasies of martyrdom and heroics.” Buchanan rejects indisputable evidence that the Jews of Treblinka were suffocated by carbon monoxide emitted from diesel engines. In a March 1990 column about John Demjanjuk, he wrote,

The Israeli court.. .concluded the murder weapon for 850,000 was the diesel engine from a Soviet tank which drove its exhaust into the death chamber.. .The problem is: Diesel engines do not emit enough carbon monoxide to kill anybody. In 1988, 97 kids, trapped 400 feet underground in a Washington, D.C. tunnel while two locomotives spewed diesel exhaust into the car, emerged unharmed after 45 minutes. Demjanjuk’s weapon of mass murder cannot kill.

(The facts, as documented in numerous scholarly works, are that different methods of gassing, including the use of exhaust and Zyklon B, were operating by 1942 in the death camps of Majdanek and Treblinka.)

In light of Buchanan’s previously held attitudes about the Holocaust, his departure from bedrock historical facts was not surprising. He has suggested that the attention accorded to the Holocaust was a preoccupation which served as a diversion from the evils of communism. He has written, “To what end, all this wallowing in the atrocities of a dead regime when there is scarcely a peep of protest over. . . the concentration camps operating now in China and Siberia, in Cuba and South Vietnam.”

Buchanan's blindness to Nazi evil found its way into a June 1990 column on mercy killing: "Is there a higher law, call it God's law, or natural law, to which man-made law must conform, or be invalid? And, if no higher law exists, upon what moral ground did we stand to condemn the German doctors whose 'crimes against humanity' consisted only of doing to the feeble-minded exactly what we seek to do today?"

On another issue related to World War II and the Holocaust, Buchanan has voiced his steadfast support for the actions of the Catholic Church and Pope Pius XII. In an interview in *Present Tense* magazine, Buchanan stated that "if my friends in the Jewish community feel Pat Buchanan, a traditionalist Catholic, owes some kind of apology for his religion or the history of this religion or the record of the Holy Father during World War II or the record of John Paul II, they can wait, because it's not going to be forthcoming."

## **The Convent at Auschwitz**

During the painful 1989 controversy over the presence of a convent housing Carmelite nuns at Auschwitz, Buchanan's defense of the nuns included formulating a kind of Holocaust "revisionism" rationalizing the Church's wartime policy of strict neutrality. Buchanan ignored the Jewish centrality of the Holocaust and wrote, "Films, books, plays speak of Hitler's pogrom: no one denies it; what is being resisted is a systematic campaign to exclude all others from the honor roll of the dead, to write us out." Claiming to respond for Orthodox Catholics, Buchanan noted, "The demand [that] we be more 'sensitive' to Jewish concerns is becoming a joke."

In an August 16, 1989 column, Buchanan labeled the criticism of the convent "scandalous?" He added:

"Here, we have it, the blood libel: Because Pius XII did not speak out publicly during the Holocaust, [then] the Catholic Church is morally culpable in Hitler's pogrom."

Buchanan's articles on the subject glossed over Cardinal Jozef Glemp's anti-Semitic barbs regarding the convent controversy. Glemp had stated: "We have our transgressions concerning the Jewish people, but today one would like to say 'Dear Jewish people, do not talk to us from the position of a nation raised above all others and do not dictate terms that are impossible to fulfill?'" In a column devoted to Glemp's statements, Buchanan said: "Cardinal Jozef Glemp's suggestion that the Jews had unique access to the media brought thunderous denunciation?" He then added, "Anyone heard even a mild chastisement of Yitzhak Shamir for a savage ethnic slur that hatred of Jews is bred into Polish Catholics? 'They suck it in their mother's milk,' Mr. Shamir said. This is something ... deeply imbued in their tradition, their mentality, like their loathing of Russia.' "

## **The 'Amen Corner'**

In the summer of 1990, Buchanan's rhetoric of grievance regarding Israel and Jews sharpened. During a discussion on *The McLaughlin Group* (August 26) regarding the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, Buchanan charged that, "There are only two groups that are beating the drums for war in the Middle East—the Israeli Defense Ministry and its amen corner in the United States?" In Buchanan's view, the "amen corner" includes American Jewish organizations and individuals such as ADL, AIPAC, New York Times columnist A.M. Rosenthal, and Henry Kissinger.

Buchanan further asserted: "The Israelis want this war desperately because they want the United States to destroy the Iraqi war machine. They want us to finish them off. They don't care about our relations with the Arab world."

Buchanan's statements recalled his hostility toward Israel in an earlier *McLaughlin Group* broadcast in June 1990 where he described Capitol Hill as "Israeli-occupied territory."

On September 14, 1990 New York *Times* columnist A.M. Rosenthal confronted Buchanan's anti-Israel and anti-Semitic slant. Rosenthal wrote: "We are not dealing here with country-club anti-Semitism but with the blood libel that often grows out of it: Jews are not like us but are others with alien loyalties for which they will sacrifice the lives of Americans." Buchanan responded in his September 19 column by stating:

... [Rosenthal's] column reeks of fakery. The "amen corner" crack is not "infamous." I never even saw it in ... what we have here..., is a contract hit, done..., in collusion with the same folks who used to feed me all that good stuff on Jesse Jackson when I was

considered more reliable. For the one character who has been howling about the “amen corner” is Abe Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League.

The New York *Post* editorial of the same date addressed Buchanan’s column and stated: “On occasion . . . it seems necessary to highlight the extent to which a given Op Ed column stands at odds with our principles. Today is such a day—as a consequence of the Buchanan column?” It added:

Lest there be any doubt that Buchanan’s reference to an “amen corner” was a reference to Jews, one need only look at his Aug. 25 syndicated column. He speaks in that article of “Israelis... goading us to attack” and lists American commentators who argue the pro-attack position. The names he selects are revealing: Abe Rosenthal, Richard Perle, Charles Krauthammer, Henry Kissinger. A series of identifiably Jewish names. These are the only individuals he cites. Yet Buchanan makes no reference to Sens. Alfonse DAMato and Richard Lugar...

Nor, for that matter, does Buchanan note that Arab states like Egypt and Saudi Arabia are known to favor a military strike against Saddam Hussein. Why this failure? Why the emphasis on Israel, its “amen corner” and commentators with Jewish-sounding names? And why, in yet another column, does Buchanan argue that war, if it comes, will see American kids “humping up that bloody road to Baghdad” — “Kids with names like McAllister, Murphy, Gonzales and Leroy Brown”? The names in this list are chosen just as carefully, we believe, as the names on his list of alleged warmongers: the Rosenthals and the Krauthammers and so forth. The “amen corner?” But Israel isn’t the issue here. Pat Buchanan used to like Israel. Now he doesn’t. Fine ...What concerns us is Buchanan’s attitude toward Jews as a group.

The *Post* ended its editorial:

...when it comes to Jews as a group—not Israel, not U.S.-Israeli relations, not individual Jews — Buchanan betrays an all-too-familiar hostility. A.M. Rosenthal did not produce a “contract hit.” He faced some painful facts.

The heated exchange between Rosenthal and Buchanan set off a full-scale journalistic debate about whether or not Buchanan was an anti-Semite. William Buckley, Jr., in a September 19, 1990 Washington *Post* column, expressed his concern over the angry confrontation between the two prominent journalists, whom he considers his friends. While criticizing Rosenthal’s attack on Buchanan as excessive, he added: “I deem Buchanan to be insensitive to those fine lines that tend publicly to define racially or ethnically offensive analysis or rhetoric?”

Buchanan denied charges of anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment and then proceeded to attack Israel’s “gratuitous brutality against Palestinian old men, women, teen-agers and children,” and “the caustic, cutting cracks about my church and popes from both Israel and its amen corner in the United States?” He also accused the American Jewish community of using a “branding iron wielded by a tiny clique to burn horribly heretics from their agreed-upon political orthodoxy?”

Speaking on *The McLaughlin Group*, Buchanan accused ADL of a “pre-planned, orchestrated smear campaign,” of calling newspapers around the country, “threatening them” if they didn’t cease publication of the Buchanan column. Calling his charge a lie, Abraham H. Foxman stated: “We will not allow these kinds of outrageous lies to go unchallenged... he knows the League is against censorship of any kind”

## **Aiming for the Presidency**

In November 1991, Buchanan revealed that he was considering a bid for the 1992 Republican Presidential nomination (Buchanan had come close to running in 1988, declaring: “Let the bloodbath begin”). He claimed that President Bush had “betrayed” the conservative movement and he lamented that ‘America has entered a post-Christian era.

Buchanan was not considered a serious threat to the President’s renomination, but some speculated that his challenge would further splinter an already fragile Republican Party, perhaps weakening Bush’s re-election prospects in November. Additionally, it was argued that even an unsuccessful Buchanan campaign could establish the commentator as the foremost conservative in American politics. “Buchanan’s challenge to Bush is not really about 1992,” wrote Charles Krauthammer. “It is about 1996. Its goal is not the presidency, but control of the conservative movement?”

“Ronald Reagan might not have been nominated in 1980 had he not challenged Ford in 1976,” noted

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak.

Appearing on *This Week with David Brinkley* on December 8, Buchanan heightened his criticism of the Bush administration: “[He] promised not to raise taxes and raised them... He said he wouldn’t sign a quota bill and then signed it.” While acknowledging that extremist Republican candidate David Duke “comes out of another tradition, to put it mildly” Buchanan said he would not be reluctant to address “valid conservative issues” associated with Duke—including racial quotas and immigration.

“I think God made all people good,” Buchanan explained. “But if we had to take a million immigrants in, say Zulus next year or Englishmen, and put them in Virginia, which group would be easier to assimilate and would cause less problems for the people of Virginia?”

“There is nothing wrong with us sitting down and arguing... that issue that we are a European country, [an] English-speaking country.”

Pressed, on the same program, to answer charges that he questioned the extent of genocide at the Treblinka death camp, he was asked by George Will: ‘Are you denying that hundreds of thousands of Jews died at Treblinka?’ Buchanan replied: “No. No, I certainly cannot deny that.”

When asked about his comments alleging that diesel exhaust could not have killed the Jews of Treblinka, Buchanan responded: “Well, look, you’re getting into a technical question.”

## **The Announcement**

On December 10, in Concord, New Hampshire, Buchanan announced that he would contend for the 1992 Republican nomination. Elucidating the non-interventionist, anti-foreign aid, anti-free trade themes that would become the hallmark of his campaign, he called for “a new nationalism” that would “put America first.” With communism largely vanquished, “old alliances” and “all the institutions of the Cold War” needed to be overhauled.

Buchanan excoriated the Bush administration for its purported neglect and mishandling of domestic life. “We Republicans can no longer say it is all the liberals’ fault,” he declared. Bush’s government comprised “men in whom we placed our confidence and our trust, and who turned their backs and walked away from us.” Proclaiming that George Bush “is yesterday and we are tomorrow” Buchanan added: “He is a globalist and we are nationalists. He believes in some *pax universalis*; we believe in the old republic. He would put America’s wealth and power at the service of some vague new world order; we will put America first.”

## **A Campaign on the Rise**

Buchanan’s ‘America First’ isolationism and anti-Bush fervor looked to find an agreeable reception in New Hampshire, the site of the first Republican primary. Mired in economic gloom and widely bitter over President Bush’s broken campaign pledge not to raise taxes, Granite State Republicans were inclined in large numbers to sympathize with Buchanan’s message, if not with Buchanan himself. George Will wrote: “... voters will, at least initially, look at Buchanan not as a potential president but as a megaphone for hollering in Bush’s ear.” Clayton Yeutter, then chairman of the Republican National Committee, called Buchanan “a one-state candidate.”

Buchanan’s New Hampshire campaign perpetuated the glib, xenophobic strain of many of his past columns. He repeated his endorsement of the “Buchanan fence,” a fenced-in trench running along the U.S.-Mexico border that Buchanan believed would curb illegal immigration. “They all come across in an area of 200 miles’ he contended. “For less than \$1 billion, you could put a depressed area in there and a fence and you can stop 90 percent of it.”

In an interview with the London *Sunday Telegraph*, he voiced his nativism even more plainly: “The U.S. should stand up for values, shared values. Why are we more shocked when a dozen people are killed in Vilnius than a massacre in Burundi? Because they are white people. That’s who we are. That’s where America comes from.”

In the same interview, Buchanan lamented what he saw as the cultural decline of Washington, D.C., his hometown: “The other day Shelly” (his wife) “went down Connecticut Avenue and these guys were sitting on the corner playing bongo drums. I mean, this is the town I grew up in.”

On January 6, Buchanan’s campaign manager Tony Fabrizio quit the campaign — in part, according to press reports, because he wanted Buchanan to focus on tax and economic issues, while Buchanan continued to sound anti-immigration themes.

As in his columns, Buchanan punctuated his campaign boilerplates with pungent, baiting one-liners:

— Though he called him “a very repulsive creature in a lot of ways,” Buchanan said he would accept Yasir Arafat as the “first president” of a new Palestinian homeland. “It doesn’t bother me. There are a lot of guys I don’t like who are running a lot of governments, including here in the United States.”

— In a speech at Dartmouth, Buchanan denounced foreign aid by calling American lobbyists for foreign investment “the geisha girls of the New World Order.” Bush advisor Charles Black, who has lobbied for Japanese fishing interests, “ought to be wearing a kimono.”

— On later occasions, Buchanan referred to ousted Haitian president Jean-Bertrand Aristide as “that dingbat priest,” the Japanese as “Mr. Bush’s little friends,” and Japan as “a pile of rocks over there.”

Buchanan complained on a January *Crossfire* broadcast that his views were being distorted through selective excerpting of lines and phrases by “the little crowd up in New York.” More likely, according to some observers, Buchanan’s savory fillips conveyed the essence of his ideology. “They are, in a way, the whole point of his America First’ campaign,” said Maureen Dowd of the *New York Times*.

During the last few weeks of the New Hampshire campaign, Buchanan saturated local television with advertisements attacking President Bush for raising taxes. Buchanan campaigned intensively, spending a total of 40 days in the state and \$1.9 million in advertising; Bush toured New Hampshire for four days. Referring to the Bush administration as “Skull & Bones International” -- after the elite Yale club whose membership rolls included the President—and deriding the New World Order as “globaloney,” promising a federal budget freeze, congressional and Presidential pay cuts, and tax breaks, Buchanan rose in the polls despite the absence of an endorsement from any prominent Republican Party leader.

New Hampshire residents cast their ballots on February 18: Buchanan received 37 percent of the GOP vote, President Bush captured 53 percent. The results were perceived favorably for Buchanan; in the past, incumbent Presidents who had struggled in New Hampshire eventually quit the race or were defeated in the fall.

Polling results indicated that those who felt most dispossessed by the recession voted for Buchanan: nine of ten Buchanan backers rated the economy “not very good” or “poor.” Overall, 58 percent of those who found the economy “poor” opted for Buchanan, as did 57 percent of those who said their financial situation had worsened over the past four years. Voter ideology proved insignificant, as Buchanan drew equally from those deeming themselves liberal, moderate, or conservative Republicans. Fifty percent of his supporters said they voted “to send a message.

“My friends, did I not tell you we would make history?” proclaimed Buchanan, undaunted by this latter statistic. He plied his now standard use of Revolutionary War rhetoric: “Today, from dawn to dusk, the Buchanan brigade has met King George’s army all along the Concord-Manchester-Nashua line. And I am here to report they are retreating back into Massachusetts.”

Buchanan, who had initially admitted that the nomination was “a very long-shot thing,” now spoke of winning it. He was buoyed by the success of his direct-mail solicitation, which helped him qualify for a larger sum of federal matching funds in March than the President. He decided to concentrate his efforts in Georgia, where the primary was to be held March 3, and to visit a number of the Southern “Super Tuesday” states—those states, eight in all, where Republican primaries would be contested on March 10. “We’ve got to find a state where we can go head-to-head with the President and beat him cold,” Buchanan remarked.

Before heading to the South, Buchanan delivered a speech at the 19th Annual Conservative Political Action Conference in Washington, D.C. which indicated a shift in the emphasis of his campaign. While continuing to assail Bush’s tax and economic policies, Buchanan grounded this February 20 address in racial, class, and social themes. He pilloried the President for signing the 1991 Civil Rights Act, claiming that it would lead to “reverse discrimination” and racial quotas:

Now, if you belong to the Exeter-Yale GOP club, that’s not going to bother you greatly... it is not the scions of Yale and Harvard.. .who bear the onus of this reverse discrimination.

It is the sons of Middle America who pay the price of reverse discrimination advanced by the Walker’s Point GOP to salve their social consciences at other people’s expense. If I

am elected, my friends, I will go through this administration, department by department and agency by agency, and root out the whole rotten infrastructure of reverse discrimination, root and branch.

Buchanan went on to attack increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, charging that the NEA, “that upholstered playpen of the arts and crafts auxiliary of the Eastern liberal establishment,” had been “subsidizing filthy and blasphemous art.”

“We’re heading South,” explained Buchanan’s sister and campaign chairman, Angela Bay Buchanan, in reference to the candidate’s rhetorical shift. “In New Hampshire, people had other things on their minds, like the economy and taxes, but he will return to his other themes in the South, where people have different concerns.”

Buchanan’s “other themes” proved to be divisive appeals to class and regional resentment and racial fears, which many compared to the shaded messages of bigotry that defined the Louisiana campaigns of David Duke. Duke, of course, was himself vying for the Republican nomination.

## **Buchanan on Duke**

Buchanan rejected any comparisons with Duke, and maintained that he neither sought nor welcomed Duke’s endorsement, nor any votes cast out of bigotry. He did not, however, repudiate the past Klansman and neo-Nazi.

In fact, Buchanan had formerly suggested in his columns that the GOP would be wise to emulate Duke. In 1989, when Duke’s election to the Louisiana legislature shocked the Republican Party, Buchanan wrote:

What Duke did, after he turned in his robes and signed up with the GOP, was run over and seize terrain vacated by the GOP.

He walked into the vacuum left when conservative Republicans in the Reagan years were intimidated into shucking off winning social issues so we might be able to pass moral muster with [NAACP head] Ben Hooks and Coretta King...

Right now, my sense is the GOP is throwing away a winning hand, and David Duke is only the first fellow to pick up the discards.

In October 1991, with the entire national Republican apparatus mobilized against Duke’s gubernatorial bid, Buchanan reproved the media for its unfavorable treatment of the Louisianan. “The national press calls these ‘code words’ for racism,” he wrote, referring to Duke’s repudiation of the welfare system and affirmative action, “but in the hard times in Louisiana, Duke’s message comes across as middle class, meritocratic, populist, and nationalist.”

Buchanan, also looking to pick up the discards of a winning hand with a message that came across just as he claimed that Duke’s had, now found himself Duke’s ideological compatriot. “David Duke is busy stealing from me,” he complained during the New Hampshire campaign. “I have a mind to go down there and sue that dude for intellectual property theft.”

On March 5, Buchanan criticized Duke publicly—if not with his customary fierceness—for the first time: “The things said and done by Mr. Duke in the past are well-known, and I do condemn them ... that includes marching in that Nazi uniform and membership in the KKK.”

## **The South**

As he toured the South in late February and early March, Buchanan tailored the politics of bigotry and division, in its coded and uncoded varieties, to a Southern fit. A lifelong admirer of the Confederacy (portraits of Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis hang in his study), he visited the Mississippi gravesite of his slave-owning great-great-grandfather who fought for the Confederacy in the Civil War, then paid his respects the following day at Beauvoir, Jefferson Davis’s retirement estate in Bixoi. He boasted that his Southern ancestors had been “troublemakers and rabid secessionists,” and he blasted “Yankee wimps” in Washington, D.C. He told the crowd at a Georgia rally, according to a *Washington Post* account, that Washington had been a nice Southern town “before all that crowd came rolling in and took it over.”

Buchanan repeatedly fumed over “reverse discrimination” and reiterated his belief that AIDS was “nature’s form of retribution” against homosexuals. A controversial television spot showed a clip from the short film “Tongues Untied” which depicted gay men in leather harnesses dancing together; the film had been partially and indirectly funded by the NEA. With George Bush’s face in the corner of the frame as

the film played, titles rolled across the screen: “The Bush administration has wasted our tax dollars on pornographic and blasphemous art too shocking to show. This so-called art has glorified homosexuality, exploited children and perverted the image of Jesus Christ.” Defending the ad, Buchanan called Bush “a conscientious objector” in “a great cultural war.”

On March 3, a day before the Georgia primary, a group of Jewish protesters heckled Buchanan at a rally in Marietta. He stated: “This rally is of Americans and by Americans and for the good ol’ USA, my friends.” While Buchanan later alleged that the remark was directed at the entire crowd, to many it implied once more that Buchanan believed Jews to be not wholly American. In response to the incident, GOP national chairman Richard Bond accused Buchanan of “heading toward a low-road message of anger, hate, and race-baiting.”

On March 4, Buchanan commanded 36 percent of the vote in Georgia. He also won 30 percent of the vote in two other states holding primaries that day, Maryland and Colorado.

On March 7, Buchanan lost the South Carolina primary to Bush by a margin of 67 percent to 26 percent, with David Duke capturing 7 percent. On March 10, Super Tuesday, Buchanan won 32 percent of the vote in two states, Florida and Rhode Island, and amassed between 22 and 28 percent in every other state except Mississippi, where he won only 17 percent (Duke snared 11 percent in that state, likely cutting into Buchanan’s total).

## **A Campaign on the Decline**

GOP leaders called for Buchanan to withdraw from the divisive and apparently unwinnable race, and a March 11 *USA Today* poll indicated that more than half of Republican voters also wanted Buchanan to withdraw. Nonetheless, the challenger claimed: “We have torn away one-third of the Republican party from the national establishment for good.” Appearing on *Nightline* on March 11, he told anchorman Chris Wallace: “I’m one of the few people in this city, Chris, who’s had the guts to stand up to the agenda of the special interests, whether it’s the civil rights lobbyist or the AIPAC lobby or the gay rights lobby, and say that their agenda is not in the interest of a good society and not in the interest of my country.”

Buchanan admitted that only “celestial intervention” could keep Bush from winning the Party’s nomination, but pledged to stay in the race. He predicted that the June 2 California primary, the campaign’s final stop, would be “the Antietam of the Republican Party”—in reference to the bloodiest battle of the Civil War.

After he claimed only 25 percent of Michigan’s voters and 22 percent in Illinois on March 17, falling behind in the overall delegate count by a margin of 729 to 46 (1050 delegates are needed for nomination), Buchanan announced that he would scale down his campaign activities while continuing to preach his brand of conservatism. He warned of a “big uproar” if he were denied a prime-time speech at the Republican national convention in August.

In April, Buchanan argued that his candidacy had made President Bush a stronger candidate. Taking credit for the forced resignation of NEA head John Frohnrnayer (“my first scalp”) and for President Bush’s admission that raising taxes was “a big mistake” Buchanan stated: “I think George Bush is a far better candidate in April than he was in December, January, or February. I think we’ve helped him sharpen the differences and disagreements” with Democrats.

After a few months of little campaigning or media attention, Buchanan mounted a short concerted effort in the days prior to the June 2 California vote. He received 26 percent of Republican ballots cast in that state, his best showing since Super Tuesday.

## **The Larger Context**

Buchanan claims that his critics excerpt phrases from his hundreds of pronouncements out of their original context, a claim that does not bear scrutiny. The recurrent emphases of his remarks, more than any particular quotation, reveal his fundamental ideology.

While Buchanan has not explicitly championed white supremacy or anti-Semitism, for instance, the body of his work that addresses black and Jewish concerns suggests an affinity with these habits of mind. However Buchanan might rationalize his remark about Zulus, for example, the hostility encoded in such a remark may be judged in a larger context: this context includes his derogatory civil rights and Martin Luther King editorials of the 1960s, his anti-integrationist White House papers, his defense of the apartheid regimes in South Africa, his idealization of the Confederate cause in the Civil War, his dozens of

slighting references to American and African blacks, his objection to Third World immigration (which, of course, embraces other races), and his bitterly anti-affirmative action politicking. “Now, instead of a tired Rosa Parks being denied a seat in the front of the bus on her way home from work,” Buchanan asserted recently, “it is an earnest white man, with a teaching credential, being denied a job at the local high school” The moral and historical distortion of Buchanan’s equation exemplifies not merely his objection to discrimination remedies, but his portrayal of these remedies as a threat to whites and white culture. “To Pat,” says columnist Mark Shields, “the diversity of America is not a strength.”

Similarly, Buchanan’s compulsion to praise qualities in Hitler especially resonates because he has questioned the generally-accepted view of the Holocaust, claimed that Holocaust survivors are afflicted with a “syndrome” that causes them to “fantasize” about their persecution, and complained that the genocide of Jews has received undue attention. He has championed a U.S. President’s visit to Nazi graves and defended a past target of his disdain, Kurt Waldheim, only after Waldheim’s Nazi past had been revealed. He has directed dozens of gibes at Israel and Jews, stoked interreligious hostility, labeled the United States “a Christian nation,” insinuated that American Jews would sacrifice non-Jewish American lives in war for the sake of Israel, conferred an exaggerated influence on Israel lobbyists in the forging of American policy, and conjured a Jewish conspiracy to slander him.

It should be noted that Buchanan’s sympathy for Palestinians and the PLO is “completely out of character,” as American Enterprise Institute scholar Joshua Muravchik has observed. “After all,” Muravchik writes, “the PLO’s closest comrades are such groups as the ANC [African National Congress] and the Sandinistas, who have no fiercer enemy in America than Buchanan.” Buchanan’s comparison of the Palestinian situation to apartheid, which represents Israel in a highly unfavorable manner, illuminates the sleight-of-hand this purportedly straight-shooting wordsmith can display when it advances his positions—since he staunchly supports the South African governments that have perpetuated actual apartheid.

## **Conclusion**

It remains unfortunate that hundreds of thousands of voters, even as an act of protest or grievance, would cast their ballots for a man so lightly committed to the ideals of American democracy. The preferability of a plural society is the first and most difficult of these ideals; it is the least acceptable to Buchanan. A consensus of values, not identity, binds a democratic people; Buchanan would have it otherwise. His imprint as a journalist, Presidential aide, and Presidential aspirant has been a disregard or hostility toward those not like him and a consequent displeasure with the exercise of freedom by these others—just as the founding Anglo-Americans were displeased when Buchanan’s Irish forebears emigrated to America, and in their displeasure burned Irish churches.

Buchanan’s displeasure has been expressed in a 30-year record of intolerance unmatched by any other mainstream political figure. The 1992 campaign indicated that his antagonism toward the modern multiethnic character of America is generally considered inappropriate in a candidate for the nation’s highest office; to his supporters, however, and by the standards of his record, his antagonism recommends him to that office. “I think we got a page in the history books;” Buchanan said of his 1992 campaign. It is now widely thought that Buchanan is hoping for an entire chapter: he is expected to return for a second run at the Oval Office in 1996. Many conservatives believe that he will have an influential role in the future of their cause.

### III. APPENDIX

#### PATRICK BUCHANAN: A SELECTION OF HIS REMARKS

*“Friends, this election is about much more than who gets what. It is about who we are. It is about what we believe, and what we stand for as Americans. There is a religious war going on in this country. It is a cultural war, as critical to the kind of nation we shall be as the Cold War itself, for this war is for the soul of America.”*

—Pat Buchanan, Republican National Convention,  
August 17, 1992

#### ***On American Jews and the Pro-Israel Lobby***

**1989:**

“To orthodox Catholics, the demand to be more ‘sensitive’ to Jewish concerns is becoming a joke.”

**1990:**

“There are only two groups that are beating the drums for war in the Middle East—the Israeli Defense Ministry and its amen corner in the United States.”

[In an August 25, 1990 column Buchanan criticized commentators urging military action in Iraq, naming Abe Rosenthal, Richard Perle, Charles Krauthammer and Henry Kissinger. On August 29, he wrote that the war in Iraq would be fought by ‘American kids with names like McAllister, Murphy, Gonzales and Leroy Brown.’]

**1991:**

“Even if [Bush’s] veto of the guarantees is overridden, he will have won high marks for his courage, and exposed Congress for what it has become, a Parliament of whores incapable of standing up for U.S. national interests, if AIPAC is on the other end of the line.”

#### ***On Nazis and the Holocaust***

**1977:**

“Those of us in childhood during the war years were introduced to Hitler only as caricature... Though Hitler was indeed racist and anti-Semitic to the core, a man who without compunction could commit murder and genocide, he was also an individual of great courage, a soldier’s soldier in the Great War, a leader steeped in the history of Europe, who possessed oratorical powers that could awe even those who despised him. But Hitler’s success was not based on his extraordinary gifts alone. His genius was an intuitive sense of the mushiness, the character flaws, the weakness masquerading as morality that was in the hearts of the statesmen who stood in his path.”

**1983:**

“Perhaps this endless search for Nazi war criminals, these endless re-enactments, on stage and screen, of Hitler’s concentration camps are good for the soul. To what end, however, all this wallowing in the atrocities of a dead regime when there is scarcely a peep of protest over the prison camps, the labor camps, the concentration camps operating now in China and Siberia, in Cuba and Vietnam?”

**1990:**

“Since the war, 1,600 medical papers have been written on ‘The Psychological and Medical Effects of the Concentration Camps on Holocaust Survivors.’

“This so-called ‘Holocaust Survivor Syndrome’ involves ‘group fantasies of martyrdom and heroics.’ Reportedly, half the 20,000 survivor testimonies in Yad Vashem memorial in Jerusalem are considered ‘unreliable,’ not to be used in trials...”

“The Israeli court... concluded the murder weapon for 850,000 was the diesel engine from a Soviet tank which drove its exhaust into the death chamber...”

“The problem is: Diesel engines do not emit enough carbon monoxide to kill anybody. In 1988, 97 kids, trapped 400 feet underground in a Washington, D.C. tunnel while two locomotives spewed diesel exhaust into the car, emerged unharmed after 45 minutes.

“Demjanjuk’s weapon of mass murder cannot kill.”

### ***On Immigration and Ethnicity***

**1990:**

“Does this First World nation wish to become a Third World country? Because that is our destiny if we do not build a sea wall against the waves of immigration rolling over our shores...”

“The Negroes of the ‘50s became the blacks of the ‘60s; now, the African-Americans’ of the ‘90s demand racial quotas and set-asides, as the Democrats eagerly assent and a pandering GOP prepares to go along.

“Who speaks for the Euro-Americans, who founded the U.S.A.?... Is it not time to take America back?”

**1991:**

“I think God made all people good. But if we had to take a million immigrants in, say Zulus next year or Englishmen, and put them in Virginia, which group would be easier to assimilate and would cause less problems for the people of Virginia?”

“There is nothing wrong with us sitting down and ..... that we are a European country, [an] English-speaking country.”

**1992:**

“The U.S. should stand up for values, shared values. Why are we more shocked when a dozen people are killed in Vilnius than a massacre in Burundi? Because they are white people. That’s who we are. That’s where America comes from.”

### ***On Civil Rights and Segregation***

**1969:**

“... many, many people... believe Dr. [Martin Luther] King was a fraud and a demagogue and perhaps worse. Others consider him the devil incarnate... Dr. King is one of the most divisive men in contemporary history.”

**1972:**

“The ship of integration is going down. It’s not our ship.”

**1988:**

“In the late 1940s and 1950s... race was never a preoccupation with us, we rarely thought about it. “There were no politics to polarize us then, to magnify every slight. The ‘Negroes’ of Washington had their public schools, restaurants, bars, movie houses, playgrounds and churches; and we had ours.”

### ***On Homosexuality and AIDS***

**1983:**

“The poor homosexuals—they have declared war on nature, and now nature is exacting an awful retribution.”

**1990:**

“With 80,000 dead of AIDS, 3,000 more buried each month, our promiscuous homosexuals appear literally hell-bent on Satanism and suicide.”

### ***On Women***

**1983:**

“Rail as they will against ‘discrimination,’ women are simply not endowed by nature with the same measures of single-minded ambition and the will to succeed in the fiercely competitive world of Western capitalism.. The momma bird builds the nest. So it was, so it ever shall be. Ronald Reagan is not responsible for this; God is.”

**1991:**

“As the harridans of feminism unsheathe the castrator’s knife on their last unemasculated bulls, Republicans should revisit the [Clarence] Thomas battleground, and review how they won, and how they almost lost it all.”

***On A Christian America***

**1984:**

“Should the United States be a Christian or pagan country?... America was a Christian country. A quarter of a century ago, without prior consultation with a democratic people, without support in precedent or the Constitution, the Warren Court undertook the systematic de-Christianization of America, beginning, but not stopping, with the public schools...

“The school prayer crusade, then, is the first great counteroffensive of a badly routed Christian community to recapture their occupied public schools and re-establish *their* beliefs as the legitimate moral foundation of American society.”

***On Democracy***

**1990:**

“If Communism was The God That Failed the last generation, democracy, panacea for mankind’s ills, hope for e world, may prove the Golden Calf of this generation.”

**1991:**

““The cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy,’ said Al Smith. The Happy Warrior had it wrong. If the people are corrupt, the more democracy, the worse the government.”

***On South Africa***

**1990:**

“Does it make sense to ruin a country until its regime agrees to make the homecoming queen of the Mandela Football Club the first lady of South Africa?”

## ADDENDUM: Pat Buchanan in 1993 and 1994

This supplement surveys Pat Buchanan's public record from the conclusion of his 1992 presidential campaign until the end of 1994.

While common wisdom holds that Buchanan's fiery polemic at the 1992 Republican convention dismayed moderate voters and damaged President Bush's re-election prospects, the speech's "culture war" formulation — already common to the religious right movement -- swiftly passed into regular use among the media and conservative and liberal elites.

In 1993 and 1994, Buchanan revisited this theme repeatedly; at the same time, he generally avoided the bigoted excesses of his past work — with some characteristic exceptions.

**Homosexuals:** Buchanan has continued to vilify gays and lesbians. In June 1993 he attacked Department of Housing and Urban Development appointee Roberta Achtenberg because of her lesbianism, and denounced the Senate for approving her: "if the party abandons the cultural war, millions, for whom that war is about the soul of America, will abandon the party."

Earlier, in September 1992, Buchanan declared: "Americans are a tolerant people. But a majority believes that the sexual practices of gays, whether a result of nature or nurture, are both morally wrong and medically ruinous.... Let me be blunt: We can't support this. To force it upon us is like forcing Christians to burn incense to the emperor."

In a January 1993 *Wall Street Journal* editorial that prophesied the Republican resurgence of November 1994, Buchanan issued his boilerplate cri de guerre: “We cannot raise a white flag in the cultural war, for that war is about who we are. Nor can conservatives become conscientious objectors -- because culture shapes politics, culture is the Ho Chi Minh trail to power. Surrender this province, and we lose America.”

Buchanan fixed his sights on one of the province’s recurrent threats: “Gay rights activists seek to substitute, for laws rooted in Judeo-Christian morality, laws rooted in the secular humanist belief that all consensual sexual acts are morally equal. That belief is anti-biblical and amoral; to write it into law is to codify a lie.”

**Immigration, Pluralism, and Culture:** Buchanan’s conviction that the United States is under siege by immigrants — and his preoccupation with the nation’s racial composition -- resurfaced in a June 1993 column: “By 2050, according to the Census Bureau, whites may be near a minority in an America of 81 million Hispanics, 62 million blacks and 41 million Asians. By the middle of the next century, the United States will have become a veritable Brazil of North America.” Citing inter-ethnic tensions (perpetrated by people of color) and the difficulties of assimilation, Buchanan argued:

“America needs to take what some have called a ‘time out’ on immigration: a closing of our southern frontier to invading illegals, by troops if necessary, a toughening of our asylum laws, a cutback on legal immigration to spouses and minor children of those already here.”

A month later he repeated his past call for a “16-foot wall” along “the fewer than 100 miles through which 90 percent of illegal immigration moves” across the California-Mexico border. He warned: “let us hope the L.A. riot, where aliens joined homegrown thugs to maim, loot and lynch, is not America’s future,” and he called for a “moratorium” on immigration.

Buchanan voiced his perspective the cultures of many immigrants during an address to the Christian Coalition annual conference in September 1993. Announcing that “I am not here to talk surrender terms, but to talk about how to fight and win the cultural war for the soul of our country,” he denounced multiculturalism as “an across-the-board assault on our Anglo-American heritage.” He stated: “Our culture is superior. Our culture is superior because our religion is Christianity and that is the truth that makes men free.”

**Israel:** Buchanan has written positively of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin since the implementation of the Israel-PLO peace treaty, but he has frequently advocated ending U.S. aid to Israel and Egypt (though Egypt is cited less frequently).

“If the Middle east is lost to Muslim extremism,” Buchanan noted in August 1993, “We will not be blameless in the debacle.

“Since 1967 we have given \$80 billion<sup>1</sup> to an Israel that used our aid and weapons to dispossess Palestinians and humiliate Arabs. We applied a moral double standard, denouncing attacks on Israel, but remaining silent at disproportionate and

---

<sup>1</sup>The actual figure, through 1992, was less than half that amount.

savage reprisals.”

In May 1993, Buchanan fixed blame on a familiar scapegoat — AIPAC and other American supporters of Israel. By mentioning these supporters in a column decrying foreign lobbyists, Buchanan smears them with a dual loyalty charge, as “foreign penetrators”: “In our nation’s capital, the power of the Israeli lobby and its allied PACs to punish foes and end careers is legendary.... Nothing new here.... What is new is the extent of foreign penetration. And, what is needed is for Americans to take their own country back.”

**John Demjanjuk:** Buchanan’s passionate defense of Demjanjuk included three columns in 1993 (at least ten in all since 1983) aiming not merely to exonerate Demjanjuk from the charge that he was “Ivan the Terrible” of Treblinka but also to whitewash his war record completely — despite widely recognized evidence that Demjanjuk served as a guard at the Sobibor death camp. In July 1993 he reiterated his 1986 claim that “Demjanjuk may be the victim of a greater miscarriage of justice than Alfred Dreyfus.” Buchanan’s ridiculous analogy suggests that Demjanjuk, a former SS volunteer who concealed his past, is a greater victim than Dreyfus, an utterly innocent scapegoat and emblem of French Jewry. Remarkably, Buchanan suggests that Nazi collaborators are as much victims as the Jews they helped kill.