

fersonian, argued but worked together in happy harmony.)

And let us remember, while building this coalition: that we have nothing to lose but the chains forged for us by the America Last elites; we have America to win! ■

The New York Election: The Hidden Catholic Backlash

by M.N.R.

Upon our obtaining access to the detailed election returns in the New York edition of the *New York Times* (Nov. 4), it turns out that, as usual, my old friend and libertarian colleague Joe Peden was right: that the *Times* analysts distorted and misrepresented the facts of the New York election that should have been obvious from their own data.

Basically, the *Times*, which supported Mayor Dinkins to the hilt, saw no significant change in voting patterns from 1989: a marginal decline in black turnout, a marginal decline in the Dinkins vote among Jewish voters angered about the Crown Heights riot, some increase in white racism. Otherwise, Dinkins was the victim of the national recession. The massive and unprecedented turnout and outpouring of Giuliani voters on little Staten Island, which gave Giuliani a phenomenal 88,000 majority and the election (Giuliani's overall majority was 44,000), was written off by the

Times as solely the result of the concurrent referendum for Staten Island secession from the city. The Islanders voted for secession by a whopping 2 to 1 vote. To the extent that any ethno-religious shift was mentioned as playing an important role, the *Times* had the nerve to highlight a shift of white Protestants for Giuliani over the 1989 race. Well sure, white Pro-

testants raised their vote for Giuliani from 70 to 81 percent over four years ago, but considering that the WASP vote in New York is a pitiful six percent of the total, this change was of minimal importance.

It is true that the Staten Island majority for Giuliani was phenomenal. Thus, in the two middle and southern assembly districts of Staten Island, Giuliani

Quotes That Need No Comment

"Five hundred thousand dollars!" said the Rev. Raiford Wheeler of the Park Avenue Christian Church in East Orange [New Jersey]. "That's crumbs from Caesar's table. For us to sell out for half a million dollars is really a joke."—*New York Times*.

The ministers vehemently denied the assertions, made Tuesday by the Republican political strategist Edward J. Rollins, that the campaign had bought their silence. They said his remarks had done irreparable harm to the black church, a keystone of black community tradition and pride.—*New York Times*.

The political debate over the North American Free Trade Agreement is not about tariffs or . . . even mostly about trade with Mexico . . . It is about whether, in the aftermath of the cold war, the United States will try to expand its economic and political influence around the world or whether it will withdraw within its borders and try to go it alone . . . Coming at a turning point, the outcome could signify a change in direction or the continuation on a course.

In that respect, it is similar to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 . . . The actual provisions of that law . . . did little for the cause of black America. But . . . had Congress rejected this modest measure . . . it would have been crushing to the cause of civil rights.

Similarly, said Robert I. Hormats, a vice chairman of Goldman Sachs International, who has been a Government economic official under Democratic and Republican Presidents, rejection of the trade accord would be . . . "devastating to American foreign policy."—David E. Rosenbaum, *New York Times*.

Mr. [Howard] Stern's is a comedy of the put-down, only instead of picking on the polyester and blue-hair crowd, he socks it to currently protected species. Of Los Angeles looters, whose excuse is that they cannot find jobs: "Who's going to hire you? You've got 37 earrings in your ear, you look as if you stepped off the set of a rap video, your hat is on backwards and you've got your girlfriend's initials carved into your hair."—*New York Times*.

Today's young men are soft and weak. They sit in air-conditioned houses and drive air-conditioned cars. They love luxury too much. They have been ruined for hard, honest work.—Maharaj Hassan Maharaj, pearl fishing captain, Bahrain.

defeated Dinkins by 83.2 thousand to 8.9 thousand, no less than 90.3% of the vote. But in two southern Brooklyn Assembly Districts of Gravesend-Bensonhurst and Bath Beach, Giuliani defeated Dinkins by 47.6 thousand to 5.5 thousand votes, or 89.6%; while in two districts of Queens, Howard Beach/Ozone Park and Long Island City/Woodside, Giuliani trounced Dinkins by 56.3 thousand to 9.7 thousand votes, a ratio of 85.3 percent. Thus, just six out of the 61 Assembly Districts in New York City provided Giuliani with an overwhelming margin of 163,000 votes.

What is the salient characteristic of these six crucial Giuliani districts? Surely, the Brooklyn districts were not pouring out for the Staten Island cause. They are white, sure, and the white-black confrontation was certainly a critical aspect of the mayoral race. But above all, these are the core districts of Irish and Italian Catholics in New York City. Sure, the white vote shifted by six points since the previous race: from 71 percent for Giuliani in 1989 to 77 percent now. But who were these white votes and how did they change? (Hispanic votes are not counted as "white," and the 13 percent Hispanic vote dropped some of its old Dinkins fervor: from 65 to 60 percent.) The Jews, for all their complaining about Crown Heights, only shifted marginally, and their 17 percent total of the vote changed from 63-65 Giuliani to 68-32 Giuliani, most of the shift taking place among conservative Orthodox Jews in Brooklyn, who increased the intensity of their anti-Dinkins

vote. Thus, the Orthodox district of Borough Park voted Giuliani by 23.2 thousand to 3.1 thousand, a ratio of 88.2 percent. On the other hand, left-liberal secular Jews, classically located in the Upper West Side of Manhattan, may have lost some enthusiasm for Dinkins, but they turned out to vote in the old proportions, raising Dinkins's vote from 23.3 thousand to 25.9 thousand this year. No, the key was the white Catholics, who provided 28 percent of the vote, and who shifted en masse, and with a heavier turnout, from 80 percent for Giuliani four years ago to a massive 86 percent today.

The Dinkins defeat can therefore be attributed to a Catholic backlash. There were three points that particularly stuck in Catholic craws: Dinkins's continued insistence that gays be allowed to march in the traditional annual Irish Catholic St. Patrick's Day parade; Dinkins's vicious insult against Christopher Columbus at the time of his quincentennial; and Dinkins-backed public school Chancellor Joe Fernandez's attempt to ram compulsory pro-gay "education" down the throat of small children—an attempt that was stopped by the heroic efforts of Queens Irish Catholic housewife Mary Cum-

mins. The Italian shift was more massive and intense. The Irish, who constituted nine percent of the vote, raised their pro-Giuliani percentage from 69 to 78; while the Italians, twice as numerous as the Irish at 17 percent of the vote, shifted from 76 percent for Giuliani four years ago to 88 percent today.

But there was not a peep about

this Catholic backlash amidst the extensive election analysis by the *New York Times*. This is nothing new; for decades, the good gray *Times* has treated Catholics with unvarying contempt; to the *Times*, Catholics are at best an invisible entity. This invisibility is redoubled by the fact that Irish and Italian Catholics largely live in what in New York are known

as the "outer boroughs": Brooklyn and Queens, as well as Staten Island. And to the *Times*, the "outer boroughs" are places to be ignored, places that contain LaGuardia and Kennedy Airports and that's about it. For the rest, the left-liberal *Times* dismisses these boroughs as Archie Bunker territory. Manhattan—the home of the media, high finance, the wealthy elites, liberal Jews, Hispanics, and blacks—is the sole object, not only of the *Times's* concern, but that of other national media as well.

**For decades
the good
gray *Times*
has treated
Catholics
with un-
varying
contempt.**

No Manhattanite ever goes to the outer boroughs if he can help it—except in a cab to the airport—and Manhattan has only tiny pockets of Irish and Italians.

The Bronx gets a wee bit more attention from the media, if only because the Bronx is both closer to Manhattan than the other boroughs and is the only borough that is actually part of the mainland—which gives it a psychological edge in visibility over the benighted boroughs on Long Island or across the bay. And the Bronx, while it too has pockets of Jews and Italians, has many blacks, and is largely Hispanic. Once again, a focus on Manhattan with an eye on the Bronx, will give the Manhattan-bound analyst a totally distorted picture of the New York social and political profile.

The votes of the boroughs reflected their ethnic composition. Thus: Manhattan voted 58.6 percent for Dinkins, giving him a margin of 73,000 votes; while the Bronx piled up a 62.3 percentage for Dinkins, for a margin of 68,000 votes. These 141,000 votes were offset (a) by the fact that normally heavily Democratic Brooklyn voted only 50.5 percent for Dinkins, for a margin of only 11,000 votes, (b) allowing Queens and Staten Island to carry the day. Queens voted 60.9 percent for Giuliani, for a

108,000 vote margin, and Staten Island voted 82.6 percent for Giuliani, for an 88,000 vote margin. The victory of Rudy Giuliani was at one and the same time:

Blacks, who had voted 91 percent for Dinkins in 1989, upped the percentage to 95 this year. You can't get more bloc-ish than that.

a triumph of Irish and Italian Catholicism and of the outer boroughs, a conquest not only over deep-seated anti-Catholicism but over decades of neglect and contumely.

And of course New York was only one of many large cities in which black rule has been rolled back and replaced by white. The new racial tide in the cities cannot be overlooked.

Look at the cities where black mayors have been replaced by white in recent years: Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and now New York. And let us also not overlook the fact that, a week later, the WASP Steve Clark, mayor of Miami in the old days when that city was an Anglo southern town, was triumphantly elected to his old seat, defeating the shrill leftist Miriam Alonso, who brutally called for the majority Cubans of Miami to keep the seat "Cuban." This blatant racist call was rejected by the voters, partially because outgoing Cuban-American mayor Xavier Suarez supported Clark.

Lest we feel sorry for the blacks of New York because of white bloc voting, and echo the absurd attack of Slick Willie

when campaigning for Dinkins that whites don't want to vote for "the other," let us look at the black vote in New York. Blacks, who had voted 91 percent for Dinkins in 1989, upped that percentage to 95 this year. You can't get more bloc-ish than that. In fact, if we take the vote in the three most heavily black districts in the city: Crown Heights, and Bedford-Stuyvesant in Brooklyn, and Central Harlem in Manhattan, we find a grand total of 78.4 thousand votes for Dinkins, as against 2.4 thousand for Giuliani, a support of no less than 97.0 percent. Hey, and they said that the old Soviet elections were rigged?

It is true that black turnout fell off, particularly among black males, who only voted half as extensively as black females (black females constituted 19 percent of the total vote, males only nine percent!). This falls in with the pattern of ever-increasing—how shall we put it?—*anomie* on the part of black males. The day after the election, TV crews went up to Harlem to ask about how Harlemites felt about the Dinkins defeat. The answers were what one might expect: "It was a racist election"; "they stole the election," etc. But when asked by the TV interviewer whether they had voted, they replied: "Nah! I haven't got time to vote;" or "voting's a white man's game."

The political elites in New York, from Giuliani and Dinkins on down, are now talking the usual guff about unity and healing and putting all the conflict behind them. No savvy New Yorker thinks this anything but malarkey. The view of the

black males was best expressed by Alissa Cave, a 17-year-old high school senior, who reported that the members of her "class on government" agreed that under Giuliani, "their chances of going to jail are greater than of their being successful." Gee: wonder why? ■

That Brady Bunch

by M.N.R.

So—after years of stumping the country displaying the open sores of his Victimhood, Jim Brady and his harridan wife have managed to guilt-trip the nation into passing that moronic bill, to the wild applause of the corrupt media who triumphantly announce a victory over the National Rifle Association, of all the lobbying groups the only

one whose very mention is supposed to evoke hisses and boos from the deluded public. So what's next: the maimed Reginald Denny stumping the country calling for all of us to "fight crime" by outlawing bricks? The Republicans continue their gutless caving in, and the left-liberal goal of gun despotism goes up several notches.

The ultimate liberal goal, is to disarm the public, leaving the U.S. government with the monopoly of arms, a monopoly it will have to share, of course with the criminal classes (or rather, the *non*-governmental wing of the criminal classes). Leaving innocent citizens helpless before the armed might of government and criminals. "Humanitarianism" strikes again!

Far, far better was the old slogan of the Marxist revolutionaries, the direct opposite of left-liberalism: "Arm the people, disarm the State!" ■

a new high military position to be in charge of global war-making ("peacekeeping") to impose democracy throughout the globe. Not only should Congress turn the bum down, but it should abolish this new post altogether. ■

Korean War Redux?

by M.N.R.

Sometime last summer, I was talking to my old friend and libertarian colleague, the historian Joe Peden, about where, against what "Hitler," would the crazed William Jefferson Clinton strike next? Which of dozens of possible Bad Guys, "aggressors," or "non-democrats," would be next on the receiving end of American sanctions, bombs, missiles, or troops? I went down the list: would it be Bosnia, Somalia, Colonel Khaddafi, Saddam, the Iranian mullahs, etc? "Nah," said Joe, who is very perceptive in these matters. "It's going to be North Korea."

I was startled, but as I mulled it over, the prospect became ever more likely. And so I was not totally bewildered when I turned on the tube and had the bad luck to catch that beefy face and that hoarse Arkansas voice I detest so much: "North Korea will cease to exist as a nation." Ye gods! What better way for Willie to put together the pieces of his shattered and incoherent foreign policy: the image of weakness, the Bosnian, Somalian, Haitian disasters? North Korea! The very name reeks of

The Halperin Case

by M.N.R.

As a veteran anti-foreign interventionist, I must admit to a slightly different view from the rest of the Right on the Halperin question. There's a certain amount of amusement attached to the idea of appointing an anti-war and anti-secret intelligence activist into the heart of the Pentagon, sort of like appointing a veteran tax rebel to be head of the IRS.

But still I am strongly opposed to the Halperin nomination, not for his past sins, but for his current ones. For like most of the rest of the Left, Morton Halperin's anti-war principles suddenly collapsed with the end of the Cold War. He now favors all the post-Cold War interventions, including those of Bush and his current master, Clinton, whom he has apparently secretly served in a military advisory capacity. His prospective post is typically Clintonian-Orwellian: Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping, a new post which he would be the first one to grace. That's all we need to make our cup of gall complete: