

institutions of self-government, they have remained in hiding. For all I or most Americans might know, the soundest elements may be loyal military men and Communist Party stalwarts in the bureaucracy—people who show up for work in the morning and know how to take orders. These are the so-called “conservatives” that American journalists are fond of deploring, if only as a convenient way of needling Washington conservatives who insist—all evidence to the contrary notwithstanding—that they are the party of individual liberty. Obedience and unreflecting loyalty are the characteristic virtues of ideologues and party hacks everywhere, whichever C-word they use to identify themselves with.

Perhaps this explains the incredible gullibility displayed by conservative anticommunists who, before the arrival of Gorbachev, never had a good thing to say about any Soviet leader. Even the Committee for the Free World, whose *raison d'être* was the sort of knee-jerk anticommunism (complete with enemies lists) that might have made McCarthy blush, disbanded in a mood of despair-in-victory that has no name but is the opposite of *schadenfreude*.

Now that the American right is part of the establishment, they are prey to the same follies, the same blind faith in progress that used to characterize liberals. They cannot learn the lessons the U.S.S.R. can teach, because they are too busy advocating enterprise zones, voucher plans, increased immigration, minority set-asides, state capitalism, and the New World Order. Inexperienced in the ways of real power, they are pawns in the hands of their latest leader, George Bush, a master politician who makes no secret of his contempt for the conservative movement whose leaders fawn upon him with the guilty sincerity of a puppy that has just made a mess on the rug. Don't listen to their occasional criticism of the President: just look at their calendars or count how many pictures of themselves arm-in-arm with George and Barbara they send out to supporters. Simply put, Washington conservatives and their hero President Bush—in the guise of defending free markets—are now championing the latest version of Roosevelt's NRA, and they are keeping the country on a steady course toward the total state. *Nazdarovje*. 

The Sistine Chapel

by Harold McCurdy

Still under judgment by the God of Light
The Popes at Rome drove Michelangelo
To labor eleven years on ceiling and wall
To tell the terrible story of the Fall
And the more terrible story of Christ's right
Uplifted axe-hand poised for the last blow.

Nowhere is Christ the infant seen; nowhere
The Star in the East, or Wise Men following it;
Nowhere the pitying Christ; nowhere the mild
Helper of weakness, tender to woman and child;
But Power Supreme, too much for flesh to bear,
Even a Vicegerent's of the Infinite.

Within this vault of terror who could breathe
The salt air off the waves Columbus crossed,
Or dream toward freedom in the windy West?
In gnarled sonnets the artist himself confessed
The burden of the dread he bent beneath
Of being for his sins forever lost.



Anna Myeck-Wodecki

Jack and Jill, or Why I Am Not a Conservative

by Andrei Navrozov

He who has seen the present has seen everything, said Marcus Aurelius, and this is why the floor of my study is made concave by the aggregate weight of all the newspapers and magazines I have acquired since moving to Cambridge: I simply cannot bring myself to throw away a single page of newsprint. In this sense I am a conservative.

Let me reach into the moldering pile. "Our ideas have crossed the front lines and conquered our enemies' consciousness." Is this Enoch Powell, in the *Spectator* of June 25, 1988, hailing the national revival of the Russian Empire? I read on:

Let us suppose that the Reds only think they are fighting for the glory of the International . . . and in fact are shedding their blood, however unconsciously, for nothing other than the restoration of the Divinely Protected Sovereign

Andrei Navrozov, formerly editor of The Yale Literary Magazine, lives in Cambridge, England.

State of Russia. . . . If this is the case, it means that the "White idea," having crossed the battlelines, has conquered their subconscious minds. . . . We have triumphed. . . . The White idea has been victorious.

No, this is not Enoch Powell but an intellectual forerunner of his, a Russian monarchist named Vasily Shulgin, writing in 1922. Shulgin was one of the founders of *smenovkehovstvo*, or the "changing landmarks" movement, of which the modern historians Michel Heller and Aleksandr Nekrich say in their *Utopia in Power*:

The changing landmarks movement arose among the right-wing, conservative sectors of the Russian intelligentsia. Efimovsky was a monarchist, Ustryalov and Klyuchnikov supporters of Kolchak, Shulgin a monarchist, and Gredeskul a right-wing Cadet. They all "changed their landmarks" when they came to the conclusion that the White cause was