

problems of Lawrence Walsh as independent counsel is that his emphasis, perhaps because of the way his commission was set up, was on indictment and trial. Instead, the emphasis should be on ferreting out all aspects of the truth, on digging deep into the lives, fortunes,

and interactions of these people. Truth is the crucial point; indictments can always come later. In short, we need the sort of open-ended inquiry that is usually denounced as a "fishing expedition." Well, what's wrong with a fishing expedition? How *else* do you find any fish? ■

to know the winning issues to stress, they could do worse than trying to see what issues really drive the Left to distraction. And the answer should be all too clear: the Left will grudgingly allow Rightists to talk about marginal tax rates or cuts in the capital gains tax or even limited privatization of garbage disposal. What really sends them up the wall is any stress on the hot-button "social issues," any threat to roll back the vast "social gains" experienced in recent decades by the left cultural movement. In short, gains by the systematic assault on Euro-white heterosexual males in the name of "anti-racism," "multiculturalism," feminism, "transgenderism," and all the rest.

None of the horrendously leftist appointments of Bill Clinton could be challenged by conservatives because every one of them has cunningly come wrapped in the untouchable and sanctifying clothing of victimology and of "oppressed" groups, groups embodying a "diversity" that have become uncriticizable regardless of ideology.

Hence, Republicans rolled over and played dead for a monstrous parade of leftist appointments. Thus, Ruth Ginsburg, a left feminist with the general demeanour of a diminutive beetle, is hailed on all sides as a "moderate" and is virtually escorted onto the Supreme Court by both parties and all factions: the fact that she wants to crack down on "hate" thoughts goes unnoticed amidst the general festivity. Even the usually astute and principled jurist Richard Epstein,

Losing The Culture War: Republicans Roll Over For The Left

by M.N.R.

The Republicans in Congress have done good work in opposing some of the more egregious of Clinton's socialistic economic plans. So, why is it that the Republicans have failed shamefully and consistently (with one exception: see below) in opposing any of the horrible and egregiously leftist appointments that the Clintonians have hurled at our heads? Why have the Republicans rolled over and played dead, becoming groveling pussy-cats, as the Clintonians have come up with one ultra-left horror after another? The reason is that the Republicans have already lost the culture war. They have bought the leftist charge, hook, line and sinker, that *any* cultural opposition to the left is shameful, "racist," "sexist," "homophobic," and all the other smear slogans with which the Left has been able to bring all of its potential opponents to heel. The Republican Party, down deep, is the country club party, and the country clubs have long given up on the culture war, have long surrendered to the enemy. Only much of the right-wing masses remain defiant and unbowed, but, shorn of any spokesmen, and under continual barrage by the media, the intellectual elite and the bureaucracy, they have been largely reduced to sullen silence.

It has always been an irritating habit of the liberal media to hand out unsolicited advice to conservatives. In the decades before the Reagan triumph, the advice, in the name of "value-free pragmatism," urged the Republicans, for their own good of course and for the sake of their political health, to adopt the siren song of "moderation" (i.e. accepting the New, Fair, and various other "Deals" foisted on the country by the Democrats) and to abandon "extremism." One would think that conservatives would be deeply suspicious of any advice handed them by their mortal enemies, but that's not the way it appears to work. Even after Reagan's victory gave the lie to the moderates, the liberals continued their work, managing to deflect Reaganite "extremism" to the safer realm of economics, and away from the cultural issues in which the liberals are fanatically interested. If conservatives would like

only mildly critical of La Ginsburg in the *Wall St. Journal*, gladly concedes that she should be approved to the Court.

The Defective Condom Queen

Another horrendous appointment, that of the repellent gutter-mouth Joycelyn Elders to Surgeon-General, is meeting no real opposition. An ultra-leftwing Negress from Arkansas who wants to force sex "education" on all school kids from kindergarten up; a wisecracking condom-lover who decided to conceal a batch of defective condoms from the Arkansas

public; a triple-dipper into federal and state funds who engaged in financial peccadilloes as a board member of an Arkansas bank; La Elders specializes in vicious assaults on Christianity. Elders in her wisdom denounces the Catholic Church for not being "Christian," for complicity in slavery and the Holocaust, as well as for "aborting" the "way of life of the Native American [sic., she means "Injun," or Red Man]," and vilely attacks Protestant conservatives for having "slave-master mentalities" and for "conducting a love affair with the fetus."

If Washington were a city with any shred of decency, vicious Joycelyn would be ridden

out of town on a rail; instead, she is hailed for being "candid" and "plain spoken." Think of the fate of any white male who spoke with a fraction of Joycelyn's venom about any Politically Correct groups. It seems that in our current culture, only Negroes are allowed the luxury of plain speech.

It is interesting that Elder's defenders point to the precedent of C. Everett Koop, the Reaganite Surgeon-General. The sly implication that Elders is merely in a "tradition" of hectoring and loud-mouthed Surgeon Generals that transcends ideologies, ignores the fact that Koop's fanatical crusade for a "smoke-free America" was as Politically Correct as any movement can possibly be.

What happened to the good old days when Surgeon Generals (assuming we need such creatures at all) were dignified scientists who kept their mouths shut?

Lesbo Action

In one of his consistently brilliant monthly columns in *Chronicles*, Dr. Samuel Francis ("Crossing the Line," August 1993), puts his finger on the craven cultural surrender of conservatives in these appointments. He points out that, in the hearings over the appointment of the repellent ultra-left lesbian activist Roberta Achtenberg to

Assistant Secretary of HUD for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, all of La Achtenberg's Republican opponents except grand old Jesse Helms (R., N.C.) missed the crucial point. Senators like Lauch Faircloth and Trent Lott went out of their way to stress that their opposition to La Achtenberg was, Heaven forbid!, not due to her sexual "orientation," but only because she had used her power in San Francisco politics to try to cut off funds and school facilities from the Boy Scouts because they refuse to hire homosexual Scoutmasters. But in wimping out on the fundamental point, these "moderate" opponents, of course, studiously avoided trying to figure out *why* Achtenberg should take such a repellent position on a once revered institution in America. She took such a stand precisely because she herself has openly defined her entire life, including her politics, solely in terms of her "sexual orientation." Achtenberg's self-definition, her entire *reason* for being in politics, is to be a "lesbian activist." What *else* is she supposed to be doing in any position she's in, whether on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors or at HUD, but precisely to push the lesbian agenda? Which means to punish non-homosexual groups, to enforce "anti-discrimination" decrees to assure lesbian and gay affirmative action, and all the rest.

Sam Francis points out that La Achtenberg, like most nominees, brought along her family members to lend support and fondly introduced them to the Senate Committee. Since Achtenberg

Elders is an ultra-leftwing Negress from Arkansas who wants to force sex "education" on all school kids from kindergarten up.

is a proud lesbian, the first "family member" she introduced to the Senate was "my beloved partner, Judge Mary Morgan." It is interesting, too, that this undoubtedly ardent supporter of "separation of Church and State" also brought along to the hearing "her rabbi," presumably to sneak some sort of religious authority into the proceedings. Some "authority," since if any of the Senators had been an *Orthodox* rabbi he would probably have leapt up and shouted "unclean!" at Achtenberg and her entourage, especially including the pro-lesbian rabbi.

But no senator came anywhere close to shouting "unclean!," just as none of them talked of defrocking Judge Morgan. As Francis points out, even though "the hearing room must have looked a bit like Maya Angelou's Inaugural poem come to life," of the four committee members who voted against La Achtenberg, "not a one of them uttered a word of disapproval of her perversion, her immorality, or her grotesque tastelessness."

On the Senate floor, only Jesse Helms warned of "crossing the threshold," for the first time nominating a lesbian to a top government post. And, in return, the Senate liberals forsook any hint of senatorial courtesy to vilify the veteran Senator. Leading the parade was the egregious junior Senator from Illinois, Carol Braun, who (as we shall see further below), speaking from her presumptive overweening moral authority as a Negress, and speaking in the current language of psychobabble, declared herself "frightened to

hear the politics of fear and divisiveness and of hatred rear its ugly head on this floor." No one came to Jesse Helms's defense.

Back To The Closet (Bedroom)!

The problem with La Achtenberg is not that she is a lesbian in her private life, a fact about which no one would or should give a rap; the problem is that Achtenberg is a "lesbian activist," defining her entire life and political career in terms of her sexual activity/preference/orientation. As Sam Francis puts it, today's "queer militants" demand that "men and women be defined through their sexuality, that sexuality becomes . . . the defining dimension of the personality, with other

dimensions being suppressed or ignored." It would therefore not occur to a "sexually normal male heterosexual" nominated to a high government post, adds Francis, "to bring along his girl friend or his mistress to his confirmation hearing and introduce her to the senators. . ."

The cry of the Cultural Counter-Revolution should therefore be, to all the rebellious sex and "gender" groups: "Back to the Closet!" Or rather since "the closet" is a cramped and dark place where no one in his right mind would reside, "Back to the Bedroom!" What's wrong, after all, with sex in its proper place, the *privacy* of the bedroom? Indeed, the whole point of sex is that it's supposed to be private, and no one else's business. In

Rating Senate Republicans

Cloture on National Service

Clinton's national service, however "popular" it may be, is bad news for three reasons: not only for its expense to the taxpayer, and its provision of what amounts to welfare for young people who might come from wealthy families. Worst of all is its collectivist thrust: that "community service" in non-profit activity is somehow morally superior to productive work to benefit consumers, work that of course receives its due income on the free market. The Republicans in the Senate were on the way to blocking this monstrous scheme by filibuster, when five Republican renegades broke ranks to vote for cloture on July 30, so as to ram through Clinton's national service scheme.

Special minus votes for the Renegade five:

Cohen (Maine)

Chafee (Rhode Island)

Durenberger (Minnesota)

Jeffords (Vermont)

Hatfield (Oregon)

Ginsburg on the Court

Rating Republican votes on the Ginsburg Supreme Court appointment is all too easy. Only three Republican Senators had the guts to oppose this left-feminist disgrace to the Court, all in the name of "moderation," but actually in deference to the victimological groups Ruth Ginsburg embodies.

Three Republican profiles in courage:

Helms (N.C.)

Nickles (Okla.)

Smith (N.H.)

Pluses for the three: minuses for everyone else.

the words of the old adage, "as long as you don't scare the horses." But the whole point of the sexual militants is to "scare the horses," to be in yo' face, to make sex into a public proclamation and a public definition. And yet, these same people are always declaiming about "the right of privacy" and that "government should stay out of the privacy of the bedroom." OK, here's a bargain for you. "Society" and government agree to stay out of the privacy of the bedroom, and in return, you guys keep that bedroom private!

We must return to an America where it would be just as idiotic and absurd to campaign for office as a "lesbian" or "gay" activist as it would to campaign as a "heterosexual activist."

Succumbing to Braun, or Braun Over Brains

As the only Negress in the U.S. Senate, Carol Braun has, for that very reason, been accorded by her colleagues the status of that body's unquestioned moral arbiter. Morally, La Braun rules the roost. During late June, in two dramatic confrontations, La Braun established her total dominance over her elders and betters.

First, Jesse Helms (again!) was in the process of putting through the Senate a routine extension of a patent for the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, a variant of the Confederate flag. Shaking and crying and yelling, La Braun harangued the Senate about slavery and oppression, that with this flag extension slavery, "like Dracula, has come back to haunt us," and that the proponents of the

flag patent "would keep us slipping back into the darkness of division, into the snake pit of racial hatred," and blah blah blah. In fact, of course, it was the yelling and quivering La Braun who was injecting divisiveness and racial hatred into this simple bill. Worse yet, because of her very stand, the Senate reversed itself, and defeated this innocuous "symbol of racism and slavery" by a vote of 3 to 1.

After Braun's speech, everyone rushed up to commend her "courage," her demonstration of the fact that one person can make a difference, her embodiment of the "value of diversity." And after Braun's speech, as a friend of mine witnessed on TV, Senators Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer (Dems., Calif.) rushed up to "administer therapy" to La Braun.

Braun's conquest of the Senate is a shameful example of the vicious hatred of the South that permeates American life today. When that conqueror of the South Abraham Lincoln came to Richmond after the War Between the States, he had the band play "Dixie" in order to symbolize healing the great war. After the horrors of the carpetbag governments of Reconstruction were rolled back, that is from the mid-1870's down to recent

years, the victorious U.S.A. honored the Confederacy, and tried to heal the battered South. But now all that is over, and ultra-Reconstructionists have set out to make the South pay and pay, once again. Why is there far more hysteria about slavery *now* than there was in the 1870s? Why can't the North and South "put that war behind them?" Clearly, because we are now in the hands of a vicious ultra-carpetbagger regime, which desecrates the symbols of the Old South continually, and seeks to rub Southern noses perpetually in the muck.

Probably the most despicable response to Braun's rantings was that of that old stage Southerner, Senator

Howell Heflin (D., Ala.). Having first supported the UDC flag bill, Senator Heflin got up and declared that his granddaddy fought for the Confederacy, but that "we must get racism behind us." Heflin is a traitor to the Old South. Howell Heflin, suh, is a scalawag and a Black Republican, and there are no worse epithets for a Southerner to receive.

But this was not to be the end of the day's triumph for Carol Braun. During the Judicial Committee's hearings on the Ruth Ginsburg nomination, Senator Orrin Hatch (R, Ut.) made the common Borkian comparison

We are now in the hands of a vicious ultra-carpetbagger regime, which desecrates the Old South continually.

between *Roe v. Wade* and the famed *Dred Scott* decision of 1857. Hatch's point was that both decisions were bad in making judge-created law, law

outside the jurisdiction of the statute or the Constitution. Mentioning *Dred Scott* was the signal for Braun to leap in with her own critique of constitutional interpretation. In her trademark quivering, yelling, and crying manner, Braun denounced Hatch for somehow being a defender of slavery, although Hatch was trying to imply precisely the opposite: that *Dred Scott* was as

illegitimate a judicial decision as *Roe v. Wade*. Agree with Hatch or not on his interpretation or analogy, the chucklehead Braun missed his entire point. No matter: Braun's ranting demagoguery about being "the only descendant of a slave in this committee" swept the day; still worse, Senator Hatch actually grovelled to Braun and "apologized"! So duplicitous was Braun that when reporters asked her who her "slave ancestors" were, she had no idea! Anything for a cheap shot!

Some moral authority is La Braun! Arguably, Braun is the least moral person in the not exactly pristine U.S. Senate. An ultra-leftist who hung around Communist front groups, a product of the sleazy and leftist

**Arguably,
Braun is
the least
moral per-
son in the
not exactly
pristine
U.S. Senate.**

Harold Washington machine in Chicago, a "welfare queen" who engaged in hanky-panky with her mother's welfare check, a Senatorial victor who promptly

traipsed off to Europe with her lover at taxpayers' expense, this numskull can have no legitimate claim to any moral authority whatever. But just being a Negro sweeps the board.

For her part, the sainted La Ginsburg did not prove very impressive as a legal theorist. Trying to refute Hatch, Ginsburg asserted that "there is a stark distinction" between *Dred Scott*

and *Roe*. Since *Dred Scott* upheld the right of slavery, whereas *Roe* expanded universal autonomy. Sure, Ruthie, but only trivially true; after all, no one asserted that *Scott* and *Roe* were *the same case*, just common examples of alleged judicial activism.

Why La Lani?

There is, of course, one and only one glaring exception to this pusillanimous surrender of the Republicans to the "multicultural" Clinton appointees. Why the exception? Why swallow all the others, yet fight back (successfully) to stop Lani Guinier? La Lani seems no worse than any of the other appointees; indeed, in contrast to most of the others, she is clearly intel-

ligent and well-spoken, she didn't pout or cry or shake, and a debate over her Black Calhounian views would have been highly instructive.

So why La Lani? Here is indeed a mystery. The standard view is that Clint Bolick of the Left-libertarian, Kochtopusian, Institute for Justice, was able to mobilize opposition to Guinier by calling her a "quota queen" and making that slogan stick. But why isn't "condom queen" or "defective condom queen" equally effective?

No, another explanation for the Guinier Exception seems more plausible. The agitation against La Lani really began, not with Bolick, but with two highly influential left-liberal Jewish sources: the Jewish *Forward*, a venerable organ of Social Democracy, and the left-liberal American Jewish Congress. Jews have been sensitive to quotas ever since the old days of university admissions quotas, which were explicitly geographical and sometimes implicitly religious. And yet, of course, all these affirmative action Queens and Princes implicitly and sometimes explicitly champion racial quotas, so even this explanation is not completely satisfactory. Perhaps the real story goes back to Lani's West Indian mulatto father, the historian Professor Ewart Guinier, many times a "Fifth Amendment Communist" in the old days. Perhaps the answer lies in the old sectarian wars of the Left; who knows, maybe the major sin of the Guiniers, father and daughter, is that they defended Palestinian rights. It would bear looking into.

The Culture War

Yes, we are engaged in a war far more vital and more cataclysmic than a war over marginal tax rates. We are engaged in a titanic struggle over culture, indeed over the very soul of America. We are fighting for our lives and for our souls. Clinton promised us a ruling elite that "would look like America." He has given us a veritable Freak House, a zoo, a Chamber of Horrors. One apparition is worse than the other. We want leaders who look and think and act not "like America," whatever that may be, but as America can be and should be and once was. We want our America back, the America of 1930s movies, the America that "looked like" and could produce a Jimmy Stewart, a Clark Gable, a Barbara Stanwyck, a Katherine Hepburn, cultural icons and plots that could uplift and inspire and reflect our most cherished values and aspirations. This is not simply an exercise in cultural nostalgia; we want our America back, the America of thrift and self-respect and respect for private property, the America of a strictly limited and decentralized government. We want our wonderful America back, and we mean to have it. ■

A New Libertarian Country... Again!

by Joe Melton

There is among libertarians a recurrent desire to escape our

social ills, and to run off to their own New Country somewhere, a country to be peopled only by the pure of heart. Some of these versions of purist separatism are confined to taking over a town or county in some remote area: "Why don't all libertarians move to... Yucca County, and Take It Over?" All such projects founder on the simple and yet profound question: Who the Hell wants to live in Yucca County?—a profound question because those who might want to live there are in fact *already* there. To put it another way: all such projects are crackpotty because they, in one form or another, give up advantages of location, or, at the limit, give up the advantages of the market economy and existing society in order to retreat to the hills or to some island, in Randian Utopian terms, to "Galt's Gulch." Even our corrupt and State-ridden world enjoys numerous advantages of society and the market which, however crippled, few sane people wish to abandon.

Going Underground

Over the past forty years, these New Country or Retreatist projects have been legion. There was the guy who decided to escape the toils of the State by Going Underground, which in his case meant literally *Going Underground* by building beautiful cities somewhere in a cave. Another decided to Escape the State by going "Nomad," that is, by being always on the move, living in some trailer with no fixed abode. What happened to these people? Who knows? Who cares? By the very nature of their

projects, they disappeared, were Lost to History, which is undoubtedly best all around.

Among retreatist projects, however, New Country schemes are perforce more formal, since they require more than one or two eager schismatics. Many of the schemes have been elaborate, involving the drawing up of a New Constitution or new laws (often written by a Hungarian-American-Randian real estate developer in Colorado named Mike Oliver), as well as engineering blueprints of just how a new country will be founded or built. Usually, however, they suffer from at least one fatal flaw: trying to take advantage of some legalistic quirk in international law. In this way, the New Countryites are akin to Tax Rebels who, while properly contemptuous of all legislative and bureaucratic government, for some reason deeply believe that *let them* (the rebels) have the chance to present their constitutional arguments in a court, and the Honorable Judge will react to the Rebel's speech goggle-eyed, and declare, in effect: "By God, sir, you're right! I hereby declare the federal income tax unconstitutional!" Why the Tax Rebels don't realize that the Honorable Judges are part and parcel of the governmental system they deplore, and are not simply instruments of Sweet Reason, passeth understanding.

The North Sea Project

The first New Country scheme was, in a sense, the most thorough and the most lovable, foundering however on their legalistic reliance on the formal-