

smear names that cut off thought and engender emotive hate response: "racist," "sexist," "homophobic," "anti-Semitic," "mean-spirited," and perhaps the rest of the panoply: "ageist," "lookist," "logist," and what have you. It doesn't matter: in the mouths of this generation of vipers, smear labels become a badge of honor. It all reminds me of two characters in a Dostoevsky novel. One insults the other at length, and the other guy says in effect: "You are *so low* that *nothing* you say could insult me!"

Is there anything left except the name "libertarian" to distinguish these Official Libertarians from regular, honest-to-God leftists? The answer is: not much, and less and less, as time goes on. Probably the average leftist is, by now, less anti-Christian and perhaps less egalitarian than Modal Libertarians. Since the economists among them still have a vestigial affection, on efficiency grounds, for cutting marginal tax rates of upper income groups, we will probably see the better-heeled Officials opting for their bosom buddy, the left-neocon Jack Kemp, although their hearts may be for Bill Weld, while the more nomadic types opt for Nancy Lord on the Libertarian ticket in '96. But it makes little difference: the entire crew is as scurvy a lot, both in person and in print, as one is ever likely to meet.

In the continuing argument over abortion, pro-lifers like to twit pro-choicers about all the wonderful people the world would have lost if their mothers had chosen to abort them. But the argument can cut both ways.

In contemplating the current generation of Big Government libertarian turncoats and renegades, the case for retrospective—or even retroactive—abortion begins to seem overwhelming. ■

The Anti-Clinton Election

by M.N.R.

There have been seven major elections since the black day in November that the monster

Clinton was chosen President; and every single one has been a thumping repudiation of Slick Willie and all of his works. Soon after the presidential election, moderate conservative Paul Coverdell upset the Clintonian incumbent Senator from Georgia, Wyche Fowler. Then the moderate conservative Riordan upended the multicultural leftist Woo to become mayor of

Los Angeles; and moderate conservative Kay Bailey Hutchison captured Lloyd Bentsen's seat as Senator from Texas. It was all very well for the Clintonian media to claim that all these races were local and constituted no referendum on Clinton; but in each case, except L.A., the Clinton Administration urged the voters to support it by back-

ing the Democrat; and even though Democrat incumbent Robert Krueger tried to run to the right of Clinton, the President sent his Number 2 campaign honcho, Paul Begala, to Texas to run the Krueger campaign, and it was a particular joy to see Begala end up with egg on his face as he engineered disastrous TV spots that made Krueger look like an idiot. And in the last race before this November, militant Christian conservative Mike Huckabee—the other man from Hope, Arkansas—pulled the remarkable feat of

beating the odds-on favorite, President Clinton's hand-picked buddy, for Lieutenant-Governor of Clinton's home state of Arkansas. That was four for four against Clinton.

This November there were three major races, each a test of the Clinton Administration. In New York City, the nerdy disaster David Dinkins, the city's first black mayor, though running

on the Democratic ticket in an overwhelmingly Democrat city, was beaten by 2.5 points by Republican nominee Rudy Giuliani. The Giuliani victory came even though President Clinton stumped the city several times for Dinkins, even stooping to condemn whites who failed to vote for people differing from them. This racist remark by

Every single vote has been a thumping repudiation of Slick Willie and all of his works.

Clinton was particularly nervy because, in the previous Dinkins-Giuliani race in 1989, about thirty percent of whites had voted for Dinkins, whereas Dinkins corralled about ninety-five percent of the black vote. Which racial group was failing to vote for different folk?

Particularly sweet was the New Jersey voters' repudiation of their monster Governor Jim Florio, who went back on his "no new tax" pledge when elected four years ago by promptly socking New Jerseyites with the biggest tax increase in the state's history. While Florio's popularity plummeted for a while, popular amnesia, coupled with a continuing barrage of pro-Florio propaganda by the media, hailing the thuggish Florio's "statesmanship," seemed to revive the governor's approval rating. This summer, indeed, Florio's Republican opponent, Christine Whitman, ran such an abysmal and bumbling campaign that Florio spurted way ahead in the polls, and the Democracy and the media were hailing the idea that high taxes and repudiating a no-tax pledge was, happy day!, no longer poison at the polls. La Whitman, a country-club moderate, was unhappy with proposing tax cuts or with attacking Florio's tax record. Refusing to attack the incumbent, Whitman passively allowed the Florio forces, led by Number 1 Clinton campaign maven James Carville, to portray her as ignorant and out of touch with the New Jersey masses. She also surrounded herself with incompetents, led by her left-liberal brother as her

campaign manager.

Not only did Clinton stump New Jersey for Florio, but so too did the Boss Lady Herself, Hillary Rodham, who called on New Jersey voters to "send the nation a message" in the Florio election. Hillary made no bones about proclaiming Florio as her kind of Democrat. Well, New

Jerseyites sent us all a message, all right, by sending High Tax Florio packing by a margin of two percent, snatching victory from the jaws of defeat. A key move that turned the election around was when Mrs. Whitman roused herself last summer, deposed her inept brother, and brought aboard the savvy con-

Quotes That Need No Comment

Though Alexander Cockburn and Patrick Buchanan approached the subject somewhat differently . . . they had total agreement, an amazing feat in itself, on one point: Yeltsin is a dictator. Considering the extra-constitutional (read illegal) measures Yeltsin continues to take to eliminate his political opposition . . . it is even more amazing to see how everyone (including our own democracy-loving government and free press) continues to see this man as the only hope for democracy in Russia.—A. Jan, *Los Angeles Times*

An English professor at Penn State causes a reproduction of a Goya female nude to be removed from her classroom because she feels oppressed by it. As a feminist student activist tells us, paintings like Goya's are "a form of pornography" that rose because "Playboy wasn't around back then."—Rod Dreher, *Washington Times*

The Russians and we produced nuclear weapons to flourish at one another and played the game of calling bad names when there had been nothing at issue between us that need have prevented our living in the same world and when we were actually, for better or worse, becoming more and more alike—the Russians emulating America in their frantic industrialization and we in imitating them in our persecution of non-conformist political opinion, while both, to achieve their ends, were building up huge governmental bureaucracies in the hands of which the people have seemed helpless.—Edmund Wilson, *The Sixties: The Last Journal*

In *Patriotic Gore*, [Edmund] Wilson questioned the central myth of the American republic, which is also, paradoxically, the cornerstone of our subsequent empire—*e pluribus unum*—the ever tightening control from the center of the periphery. Wilson is pre-Lincolnian . . . He sees virtue, freedom, in a less perfect union. Today's centrifugal forces in the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia he anticipated in *Patriotic Gore* where, through his portraits of various leaders in our Civil War, he shows how people, in order to free themselves of an overcentralized state, are more than willing, and most tragically, to shed patriotic gore.—Gore Vidal, *The New York Review of Books*

Wilson's meditation on the Civil War and war and the nature of our state was published and: "There is shock after shock," as Penn Warren put it, "to our official versions and received opinions." But . . . unhappily, many others are in place to act as shock-absorbers. They also shroud the martyred Lincoln with his disingenuous funeral address at Gettysburg in order to distract attention from the uncomfortable paradox that his dictatorship—*forbidden word in a free country*—preserved the union by destroying it.—Gore Vidal, *The New York Review of Books*

One does get the impression that the Jews regard themselves as having a monopoly on suffering, and do not want the Negroes to muscle in.—Edmund Wilson, *The Sixties: The Last Journal*

servative campaign manager, Ed Rollins. Rollins' stress on activism and positive ideas led Whitman to adopt and push the thirty percent tax-and-expenditure-cutting plan of editor Steve Forbes and free-market economist Larry Kudlow. Positive emphasis on tax-cutting by Whitman pulled out the election, and this redoubled the importance of the "message" of the New Jersey election.

Finally, in Virginia, the robotic former State Attorney-General Mary Sue Terry was literally crushed for the governor's race by the youthful conservative and religious rightist George Allen, by a vote of 58 to 41 percent. Mary Sue Terry suffered by being a part of the ruling Democratic establishment in Virginia, and by being in the same party as the hated President Clinton, even though Terry tried her best to ignore the presidential scene. Once again, Terry began far ahead, and then Allen came up in a marvelous surge, to become the first Republican governor of Virginia in many years.

While Terry tried to distance herself from Clinton, she flopped by being "tough on crime" the Clinton-liberal way: that is, by calling for more severe gun control. Virginians were easily able to see through this ploy, and to back the conservative Allen route of being tough, not on "guns," but on *criminals*—in his case, calling for an end to parole, and for keeping violent criminals in jail. Allen also took a sensible stand on abortion. Whereas Terry was an all-out abortion rightser, Allen called

for parental notification before minors could have an abortion. To the average person, it seems bizarre that minor children must have parental consent before getting any surgical procedures in general, but don't need to when it comes to an important operation such as abortion. Even women, who seem these days to be far more leftist than men, voted for Allen, perhaps aided by the fact that Allen is a handsome family man whereas pro-Allen militants like Ollie North pointedly claimed that the Virginia governor's mansion needs to be filled by a happy family with children—a pointed reference, not merely to existing bachelor Governor Wilder, but to the fact that the rather severe and unsmiling Mary Sue Terry is both unmarried and childless, a fact calculated to raise eyebrows in socially conservative Virginia. And so it's a consistent seven for seven against Clinton. The only disappointment of the November election was the defeat for Virginia Lieutenant Governor of the heroic young Christian paleolibertarian Mike Farris. Farris, a bright 42-year old attorney and Baptist minister, a prolifer and religious rightist, is a major leader of the wonderful home schooling movement, author of books on home schooling, and founder and president of the Home School Legal Defense Association. Smeared by liberals and "moderates" as a religious theocrat, and a school censor, Farris simply is promoting home schooling and the right of public school parents to pull their kids out of compulsory condomization or from having to study books offensive

to their faith. Rather than a "theocrat," Christian paleo Farris wants the State off the back of himself and fellow Christians. What's wrong with *that*?

Unfortunately, Farris's race was sabotaged by liberal Republicans from the very beginning. They were incensed when Farris, backed by the religious right, won the Lieutenant-Governor nomination at the June GOP convention, beating left-wing Republican Bobbie Kilberg, former Bush White House aide. Farris pointed out that the Republican liberals' call for a "big tent" has to work both ways: neither wing should be driven out of the party, and each should support the others' candidates. But while Republican rightists loyally supported Coverdell and Hutchinson when *they* won the primaries, the Republican left, put to the test, viciously sabotaged the Farris campaign: including Kilberg and the Republicans for Choice. Liberal Senator Warner (R., Va.) viciously refused to support Farris, but Allen, to his credit, backed his running mate. The result of this liberal sabotage is that Democrat Donald Beyer defeated Farris by 54 to 46 percent of the vote. But this is only Farris's first race, and he did commendably well, getting considerable more votes (785,000) than Terry did in her gubernatorial race (730,000). So we can expect to hear more of young Farris in the future. But the Republican Left should be put on notice; any more of these shenanigans, and conservatives will walk anytime a Republican liberal is nominated; and then it will be war to the knife.

The New York City election bears more detailed analysis. Giuliani's 34,000 vote majority was made possible by victories in the conservative boroughs of Queens and Staten Island, the latter alone providing the margin of victory. The usually heavily Democratic borough of Brooklyn only carried for Dinkins by a small majority, the Italian district of Bensonhurst going for Rudy by nearly 7 to 1.

The centerpiece of the New York election was the interconnected issues of crime and "quality of life"—the latter meaning domination of the New York streets by muggers, robbers, aggressive begging bums, crack dealers, and piles of rotting garbage. Things had gotten far worse under the four years of Dinkins, a passive boob who only stirred himself every fall to reroute airplanes out of LaGuardia Airport to make sure that no noise would disturb his beloved national open tennis tournament at Flushing, Queens.

The biggest single black mark against the Dinkins regime was the disastrous race riot in Crown Heights, Brooklyn in August 1991. In the Crown Heights riot, an accidental killing of a black child by a car in the entourage of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Menachem Schneerson, on his

weekly trip to his wife's grave, touched off a massive three-day black riot. It began when the Hasidic Jewish driver of the offending car was beaten, robbed, and almost killed by a black mob, which, for three ensuing days and nights, roamed the streets of the area shouting "Kill the Jews!" by which they meant the identifiable black-frock-coated Hasidics who had remained in the Crown Heights neighborhood. Finally, a visiting Australian Hasid, Yankel Rosenbaum, was indeed killed by a

black mob, and his brother Norman has popped up from time to time as an avenging angel, seeking justice. One problem for Dinkins is that the festering sore continues, since the alleged killers of Rosenbaum were freed by a mostly black jury, despite seemingly overwhelming evidence against them.

An even deeper problem out of Crown Heights

for Dinkins was the fact that his police force surrounded the Crown Heights area, and for three days stood there doing nothing to interfere with the rioters, even retreating when the mobs taunted them and threw rocks at the police. It was only on the third night when the police finally moved in, cracked down, and put an end to the continuing riot. Why did Dinkins

and his black Police Commissioner, Lee Brown, do nothing for these three fateful days? (This is the very same Brown who was promoted, from this egregious failure, to become President Clinton's Drug Czar.) The official view is that Dinkins and Brown suffered from a strange languor and passivity, a sort of *folie a deux*. Continuing Jewish agitation in New York, coupled with the unavenged murder of Yankel Rosenbaum, spurred Governor Cuomo, in late 1992, to appoint state investigator Richard Girgenti to head a one-man investigation of the Crown Heights riot.

This summer, as the mayoral campaign was heating up, parts of the Girgenti Report, in the time-honored manner, were leaked to the press, and the news was not good for Mayor Dinkins. It turns out that Dinkins and Brown only moved when the police, sickened at being ordered to do nothing to stop the carnage, finally threatened to mutiny, and not to report for work unless they were permitted to move against the rioters. It was only then that Dinkins caved in. While the official Girgenti report was apparently softened to avoid condemning Dinkins and Brown for anything more than their curious languor, rumors persist that the policy of passivity was a deliberate one: designed to permit the black masses to "vent" their frustration at the accidental death of the black boy, plus, of course, at four hundred years of oppression and racism.

As a result, Crown Heights was uppermost on New Yorkers'

The policy of passivity was a deliberate one, designed to permit the black masses to "vent" their frustration.

minds this summer, and the result was a considerable weakening of Jewish enthusiasm—even by the traditionally left-liberal Jews of Manhattan—for the Dinkins regime. Long-time Jewish liberals were slow in endorsing the Mayor, or even in signing his petitions. And while liberal Jewish districts in Manhattan still went for Dinkins, they were not with the huge majorities, or turnouts, of yesteryear.

There was little enthusiasm for the liberal Republican Giuliani, but, as a long-time prosecutor, his image of being tough on crime stood him in good stead. Giuliani's victory was made possible by the return of the legendary founder of campaign consulting, Little Napoleon Dave Garth. The campaign of the liberal Garth repelled conservatives, but it succeeded in humanizing Giuliani's image. New Yorkers now want a tough Mayor, but not a mean one, and Garth got Rudy to change his severe hairdo, smile more, and walk the streets kissing babies of every ethnic hue. Indeed, in playing the unity card to the hilt after his victory, Rudy Giuliani uttered what was probably the Repellent Phrase of the Year from any politico: "I promise that no ethnic group in this city will escape my care." No, no, let them "escape your care," Rudy!

A great campaign consulting story has emerged from this campaign. Shortly before the election, Dave Garth had a public debate with the almost equally legendary top consultant for Dinkins, the leftist Bob Shrum. After the debate, Garth

came over to Shrum: "Well, kid, you may be a better debater than I, but I'm going to win on Nov. 2." And of course Garth was right.

An important lesson for rightists has also emerged from the Dinkins-Giuliani campaign. Many conservatives and libertarians have been hankering for a rightist third party, not a sectarian one like the Libertarians, but a broad coalition for right-wing populism. The idea of such a party would be to act as an implacable club upon the Republicans, so that if the Republicans nominated another Rockefeller-Bush type, the new party could nominate one of its own people, and break the Republicans until they wised up. As a veteran third-party person myself, I confess to a sneaking fondness for such a tactic.

But the Conservative Party has been pursuing this tactic in New York for many years, and with considerable success. The Conservative Party was founded on such a strategy, it has long-time name recognition in New York, and it has no trouble getting on the ballot. It has, in the past, obtained hundreds of thousands of votes for its candidates. In this mayoral election, the Conservative Party, joined by the fourth or fifth leading state party, the Right to Life Party, nominated the intellectual and municipal bond expert George Marlin for Mayor. Marlin enjoyed seemingly ideal conditions for his race. A tall, humorous, articulate intellectual, an expert on Chesterton, Marlin was running against a Giuliani who is a committed liberal, a champion of every liberal cause in-

cluding gay rights. Marlin received glowing coverage from the liberal press, enchanted both by his personal qualities and his neocon backing—backing that included ardent endorsements from Bill Bennett and the *Wall St. Journal*, as well as from the heroic Mary Cummins, who stopped compulsory multigendered education in the public schools, and brought down leftist School Chancellor Joe Fernandez.

Given all these advantages, how did George Marlin do? Did he provide the balance of power, or even get a decent percentage of the vote? On the contrary, George Marlin, despite his ballot status on two party lines, received only 16.9 thousand votes, a disastrous 0.95% of the vote. Less than one percent makes the typical Libertarian Party vote seem bountiful!

Well—if George Marlin can get only less than one percent on an established party line under ideal conditions, there is no hope whatever for a national third party in the foreseeable future. The broad right-wing masses are, for good or for ill, committed to the Republican Party, and it is within the ranks of the Republican Party that the battle of right-wing populism against country-club liberalism will have to be fought. It is all very well for the Republican Party to be a Big Tent, but it is a tent that the right-wing must dominate, not just for platform disputes, but for candidates as well, from the President on down.

On the ballot propositions in the election, the big news is the crushing defeat of the school voucher scheme in California,

a welfare-state Trojan Horse prepared for us by Left-Libertarians and deluded conservatives. The voucher plan, which received fervent and indeed hysterical endorsements from the entire media panoply of left-libertarians and neoconservatives, was totally crushed by a vote of 70 to 30 percent, losing in every one of California's 58 counties. The voucher scheme would have brought the private schools of the state under government control, but the measure was defeated because affluent suburbanites—the heart of the California electorate—came to realize that the voucher scheme was an updated compulsory school busing plan, that would have wrecked the fairly workable suburban schools by compelling them to accept inner-city youth who are often ineducable and criminals to boot. Indeed, a major credit for defeating the voucher Prop. 174 should go to our own Lew Rockwell, who, in a widely read article in the *L.A. Times*, clued the suburbanites to the dangers of school vouchers. Note, for example, this rueful retrospective on the defeat by ardent voucher supporter, Left-Libertarian Alan W. Bock, writing in the once hard-core libertarian, now neocon, *Orange County Register*:

"Even in Orange County, where voters might be expected to be philosophically friendly...[to vouchers]—but where the government schools do seem to be several notches above the quality of those schools in south-central Los Angeles and the rest of the state—a majority voted against giving parents in other parts of

the state a fighting chance to opt out of the failing government system."

Giving parents "a fighting chance" is of course a euphemism for welfare payments extracted from long-suffering taxpayers. In a free society, there is no call for "vouchers" or for "expanding choice" by robbing taxpayers. The only good "voucher" is a dollar, a dollar that one can spend on any desired good or service, but of course the dollar, in a free society, must be earned by one's own merits, and not gained by robbing productive taxpayers. No one deserves more of a "choice" or a "chance" or "voucher" than he has earned on the market by productive effort.

Bock goes on with this re-creation that reeks of welfareism and egalitarianism at its most blatant:

"It's a sad but true aspect of the nature of most human beings that if they don't feel a sense of crisis about their own particular circumstances, it's hard to develop the kind of empathy with those in worse circumstances that will impel people to act to relieve those others."

Scratch a "libertarian" these days, and you will find... a leftist. ■

Bosnian Update: No Peace, No Peace-Keeping

by M.N.R.

The quintessential craziness of the Bosnian situation is em-

bodied in this paradox: we are forced to cheer because the peace agreement failed in Bosnia, while the bloody conflict continues and expands. Why? Because our top priority is keeping U.S. troops out of the mess, and Slick Willie is pledged to send 25,000 U.S. troops into Bosnia *as soon as* a peace agreement is signed. The troops would be there to "keep the peace," whatever that may mean, and so that means no peace, no "peacekeeping" troops. No peace for Bosnia, means no war for the U.S.A.

The UN mediators had worked out a peace agreement, which the Croats, and the Bosnian Serbs, finally signed. The Serbs signed with great reluctance, for they would have had to give up the greater chunk of the Bosnian land that the Serbs had won on the ground, and cede it to the Muslim central government. But the Serbs were willing to sacrifice to end the crippling U.S./UN economic embargo, and to get the international force off their backs. For a while it looked as if the 25,000 American boys would indeed be shipped to police the Bosnian hell-hole. But fortunately, the Muslim authorities, after dancing around the issue, angrily turned down the peace agreement at the last minute, griping that they would not sign unless and until the evil Serbs were forced to give up all of the territory they had won by force of arms.

While good for the cause of U.S. non-intervention, however, the Bosnian Muslims acted like the spoiled fools that they are. Why did we at RRR hail the Bosnian Serbs when *they* failed