

public possessing little knowledge of history or theology, Clinton's remarkable statement went unreported.

But, as we all know, it is Hillary, not Slick Willie, who is the hard-core ideologue in the White House. Hillary's

theological agenda was perceptively unveiled recently by the knowledgeable, if admiring and liberal, Kenneth L. Woodward, religion editor of *Newsweek*.

[Kenneth L. Woodward, "Soulful Matters," *Newsweek* (Oct. 31, 1994), pp. 23-25.] In a lengthy exclusive interview with Hillary, Woodward reports that our Lady Macbeth

simply considers herself "an old-fashioned Methodist."

Hillary's pronouncement is not as absurd as it might first seem. Hillary Rodham was born in northern Illinois Yankee country, in the Chicago suburb of Park Ridge. Her grandparents told stories about their Methodism in early 19th century England, not many generations removed from the founding of Methodism by John Wesley. Hillary's family were pious Methodists, and Hillary herself was inducted into the Social Gospel by the Rev. Donald Jones, the then youth minis-

ter at her Park Ridge First United Methodist Church. I am sure that we are all gratified to learn how Hillary got her start in the cause of "social reform"; as Woodward fondly puts it, the Rev. Jones "developed his privileged

suburban students' social consciences by taking them to visit migrant workers' children."

The most important passage in Woodward's article is his explanation of the importance of Methodism within the American Protestant spectrum: "More than other Protestants, Methodists are still imbued with the turn-of-the-century

social gospel, which holds that Christians have been commissioned to build the Kingdom of God on earth."

Only a few brush-strokes are needed to complete the picture. The Rev. Jones, a frequent visitor to the White House, but who seems at least to have a sense of humor and perspective that the arrogant and self-righteous Hillary totally lacks, puts it this way: Even today, says Rev. Jones, "when Hillary talks it sounds like it comes out of a Methodist Sunday-school lesson." And: "Hillary

views the world through a Methodist lens. And we Methodists know what's good for you."

Now obviously, and of course, a lot of this is Hillary's drive to "reinvent" herself, that is, to create a duplicitous false image, to make herself less threatening to the angry American public. And surely the late nineteenth-century Social Gospelers would be horrified at the current multi-gendered, condomaniacal Clintonian Left, to say nothing of the rapid revolving of poor John Wesley in his eighteenth-century English grave. But there is definitely a direct line of descent from the Methodist Social Gospelers of the nineteenth century to St. Hillary and the monstrous Clintonian Left. Mix into "old-fashioned Methodism" liberal doses of Marxism, the New Left, the pagan pantheist New Age, and the multicultural and sexual revolutions, stir briskly, and you get the current ruling horror that we all face, and are trying to roll back out of our lives. We face, in short, regardless of what hairdo or persona she affects next week, the evil Witch in the White House. ■

There is a direct line of descent from the Methodist Social Gospelers of the 19th century to St. Hillary and the monstrous Clintonian Left.

The Paradigm Kid

by M.N.R.

It's gotten to the point that whenever I hear of some "great new libertarian," I

wince, sit down slowly, and make sure I've got a good grip on some smelling salts in one hand, and on my revolver in the other. Anyone remember James Pinkerton, the Brave New Libertarian of the Bush Administration? He was a young lad out of the West, a White House aide, always gassing about "the new paradigm," thereby bringing to Washington a fashionable new philosophy-of-science term three decades old. What exactly the "new paradigm" was supposed to be was somewhat murky, but it was definitely supposed to be a rolling back of Big Government.

What's happened to The Pink since? What always happens to bright young policy wonks after they hit Washington: they stick there like glue, shifting around every few months from one thinktank to another, doing a little project, a little teaching, but always keeping their hand inside the Beltway, waiting for their next Big Chance.

Well, Pink thinks he's found that Big Chance, in the form of a New New Paradigm. You judge how much it has to do with rolling back Big Government or advancing liberty. Pinkerton has a "Column Right" op-ed in the *Los Angeles Times* (October 6), in the form of an open letter to Colin Powell, urging Powell to run for President

in 1996.

Falling at the feet of Colin Powell is, in the first place, bad enough. What is Colin Powell's attraction for *anyone*, much less an alleged "libertarian," whether New Paradigm or Old? That he is a person of no known views on any political subject? That he Won, or helped win, the Gulf War? Big deal. That's heroism—to clobber a hopelessly outgunned and outclassed country, and to bulldoze masses of surrendering Iraqi soldiers into the sand? Because he's a black guy who looks good in a uniform? What sort of nonsense is this?

But that's not the half of it. Lots of Republicans who have no taste for ideology or principle are hankering after Powell. The real doozy is the policy this "libertarian" is urging Powell to pursue. He wants Powell to concentrate on One Big Issue, and that issue is to revive, on a much grander scale, Franklin Roosevelt's collectivistic Civilian Conservation Corps, in which unemployed urban youth were packed off to the countryside, were housed in barracks, and proceeded to plant, as Pinkerton tells us, no less than "3 billion trees." Pinkerton wants Powell to revive and update the CCC by shifting the emphasis to welfare; Powell could take millions of youth out of the inner cities, and end both crime and welfare as we know it. As Pink puts it, "we need a million kids out of the ghetto and

into the fresh air"; there, the Powell Corps could use those kids' street smarts to plant 6 billion trees, "and launch the recycling equivalent of Desert Storm." Wow! *That's* better than midnight basketball! 2AM tree-planting!

What about Slick Willie's national service program"? Peanuts, snorts the Pink, "weenie." Willie is only inducting 20,000 kids into his teeny program. Waxing rhapsodic, Pinkerton is exultant: a new and bigger CCC would mobilize the entire spectrum from Jesse Jackson to Bill Bennett: both of these worthies, promises Pinkerton, could be united by Powell "on the same all-star team."

So what does Pink's New New Paradigm have to do with libertarianism? And doesn't this swollen CCC sound like Big Government? Big, small, who cares, answers Pink, "the issue isn't big versus small, it's smart versus dumb." So the new thing is going to be Smart Government!

Well, the media all said it during the Bush years. Young Pinkerton was smart, smart as a whip, full of new ideas, one of the brightest of the Bushie thousand points of light.

Look fella, if you're big on planting trees, you're not going to find much scope inside the Beltway. Why don't *you* get out of town quick, stop polluting American public opinion, and get yourself out there to Idaho or Wyoming or somewhere, and start plant-

ing the first 100,000 trees yourself, and report back after you've finished? ■

The Arduous Calling of Religious Conservatives

by Rabbi Mayer Schiller

I think that trying to restrain an entire contemporary age is like a passenger in a carriage holding on to the seat in front of him in order to stop the carriage. He determines himself in continuity with the age, and yet he wishes to hold it in check. No, the only thing to do is to get out of the carriage, and so hold oneself in check.

—Soren Kierkegaard

In a Western world seemingly bent on its own destruction the duty of religious conservatives is multi-layered and painfully difficult.

Before exploring the nature of this task it would be helpful to spend a moment clarifying our terms. The words liberalism and conservatism simply do not do justice to the apocalyptic nature of the struggle to which G-d has summoned all good men in our era. They are soft words that seem to speak of issues about which there are debates, elections, campaigns and over which good men may disagree.

Let us lay this pleasing

myth to rest quickly and speak the truth for my time with you is short this morning.

Liberalism is not a political creed. It is a vile combination of sickness and evil. Its hatred of faith, decency and all the beautiful norms and traditions of Western Man has come to dominate the world we live in. It has polluted everything in life that we once cherished: our schools, sports and entertainment; our courts, government and military. It rules supreme even in our mainstream religious denominations. The Democratic Party is its standard bearer and has been for 62 years. The Republican Party meekly acquiesces to whatever perversity it spews forth.

Talk of the Republicans brings us to the second term requiring definition: Conservatism. If by Conservatism we mean a clear and firm commitment to the faiths of our civilization, to the unique fusing of Sinai, Bethlehem, Greece, Rome and the Northland which is Europe and in America heavily flavored by the standards of Anglo-Saxondom, then Conservatism is just another word for normalcy and the good, in short for decency.

There used to be a unified political movement in America that spoke in clear terms for this sense of the good. It has periodically threatened the establishment via the enthusiasms which surrounded MacArthur, McCarthy, Goldwater, Wal-

lace and Reagan. The last mentioned achieved electoral success, but was effectively de-fanged, having little if any effect on our national and civilizational decline.

Today in the place of this movement we find a wide assortment of remnants, who have managed to survive the tidal wave of decadence that has washed over this once magnificent civilization.

Let us briefly identify them; There are those Catholics who have managed to retain their faith despite the forces unleashed by Vatican II. These Catholics find their voice in journals and newspapers ranging from *The Wanderer*, *Crisis*, *Fidelity*, *New Oxford Review* and *First Things*, who believe that their own hierarchy is still essentially on their side, to those who seriously question that proposition such as *Latin Mass* and *The Remnant*, to those such as *The Angelus* and *The Roman Catholic* who are convinced that their problems begin at the top.

There are pockets of the Reformed Church, Lutherans and Anglicans, who still man the barricades of their centuries old faiths.

And last, but certainly not least among believing Christians there are the amazing evangelical and fundamentalist movements, who long ago buried by the media, have outlived both Darrow and Mencken to now emerge as the largest force for good on the American scene.

There are the paleo-cons of