

community," which itself has always been rife with jealousies and "prejudices" among varying degrees of skin color. Darker-skinned women, for example, are anxious to marry "upward" with lighter-skinned males. It is no accident, therefore, that such black conservatives as Tom Sowell and Alan Keyes are very dark-skinned, and that their rhetoric against the black leftist elite is often shot through with attacks against these leaders' generally light-skinned mulatto color. Sometimes they accuse the leftist leaders of not being "authentically" black.

Thus, Innis will definitely not win the mayoral Democrat primary, but he will be useful to Giuliani by openly raising racial issues.

Meanwhile, since substantive issues are scarce, the big battle between Dinkins and Rudi during June has been over semantics. Our age is all too often a battle over the politics of language, and its Political Correctness, and the big issue now is what term to use in referring to the Crown Heights riot of blacks against Jews in the late summer of 1991. Jews call it a "pogrom," and then raise the question why Mayor Dinkins stood idly by while a pogrom raged in Brooklyn. Giuliani has now taken up the cry, and denounces the "pogrom" at every oppor-

tunity, especially when addressing Jewish groups. Dinkins, on the contrary, denies it was a "pogrom," a term, he says, that only refers to assaults against Jews organized by the government (as in Czarist Russia). Dinkins therefore maintains it was only a "riot."

From a strictly linguistic viewpoint, Dinkins is probably right, but of course his position opens him up to the well-known charge of "insensitivity" to Jewish concerns, and, of course, always peeping just beneath the surface, to Hitler and The Holocaust. One Jewish reply on the linguistic front is that the Crown

Heights riot was a "*de facto* pogrom," whatever that may be.

Talk of politics as the triumph of symbolism over substance! ■

## Goldwater Reconsidered

by M.N.R.

Here's a good rule of thumb: Beware all conservatives who are praised extravagantly by Left-liberals. The latest conservative to get treatment 180-degrees different from the old days is, of course, Barry Goldwater. In mid-June, the octo-

genarian former Senator was suddenly trotted out: in an article in the *Washington Post* and in an appearance on "Larry King Live," to come out squarely in favor of gays in the military. The same liberals who, three decades ago, denounced Goldwater as a nut and a danger to the Republic now hold him up as the lovable "Mr. Conservative" against the nutty and dangerous group that good old conservatism has now become. It reminds me of the old Tennessee Williams line: "Mendacity! Ah smell mendacity!"

What's happened to Barry? In an excellent article reporting on the issue, Ralph Z. Hallow writes in the *Washington Times* ("Goldwater Allies Say He's Wrong On Gays," June 12) that Goldwater's position stems from his libertarian view that "government should stay out of people's private lives," Hallow notes that Goldwater's statement "reveals that doctrinal tension between conservatism's libertarian strain, which objects to government intrusion in private lives, and conservatism's moral strain, which says government has no business undermining traditional standards of behavior." It is not surprising to find Karl Hess, the Grand Old Man of left-libertarianism and Goldwater's 1964 speech writer, hailing Goldwater's position as consistent with his "unshakable libertarian principles."

It is also not surprising to find Goldwater and Hess hopelessly confused in their alleged expounding of libertarianism. In the first place, joining the military automatically surrenders

**Dinkins's position opens him up to the well-known charge of "insensitivity" to Jewish concerns.**

one's "privacy"; the very essence of military life is an infringement on privacy. Moreover, there is no more "right" to enter the military than there is a "right" to be hired as a deep-sea diver; it depends on one's qualifications as defined by the organization in question. If the military decides that open gaydom destroys the essential cohesion of a unit, that should be an end to the question.

Secondly, Goldwater's "unshakable libertarian principle" goes far beyond the right to be a homosexual in private; he also favors a Phoenix city ordinance outlawing "discrimination against homosexuals" in the workplace. The old Barry Goldwater, the Goldwater of 1964, would have recognized the difference between a wish and a right, and would have recognized the vicious invasion of private property rights embodied in any and all "anti-discrimination" laws, for gays or anyone else.

In fact, there has been a tremendous change for the worse between the old and the new Goldwater. The new Goldwater has the nerve to parrot the liberal line that anti-homosexual discrimination in the military is analogous to anti-black discrimination decades ago. I say "the nerve" because the old Goldwater, if we can remember that far back, opposed the entire vicious "civil rights" and "anti-discrimination" structure, including the original laws concerning blacks.

The *other* former "Mr. Conservative," Bill Buckley, as usual takes his fumbling, rococo position somewhere in the middle

between the two camps. Defending the genuine conservative position is a good selection: Gary Bauer, saying "it grieves" him that Goldwater doesn't understand the social struggle, Rep. Bob Dornan, and two figures very familiar to readers of RRR. Lew Rockwell speaks pungently, more in anger than in sorrow: "When I was in college, I sent \$300 to Goldwater for his presidential campaign, and I want my money back." And Paul Gottfried points out that Goldwater was considered a conservative in the 60s because he spoke for the issues that then mattered most to conservatives: anti-communist foreign policy and dismantling the welfare state. Paul adds that Goldwater was probably never conservative on social issues, but then, social issues weren't that important in the 1960s.

An excellent insight by Paul, but I would add that, apart from abortion, a genuinely new issue introduced by *Roe v. Wade*, most of the other social issues are the consequence of the rampant victimology ushered in by the "civil rights," anti-black-discrimination laws of the 1960s, and that the entire 1960s Right, including Goldwater and Buckley, were staunchly opposed to civil-rights tyranny. In short,

whatever their sins in the 1960s, Goldwater-Buckley conservatism is far worse today; and the critical conversion was deciding later to put "civil rights" far above the genuine rights of private property.

I sympathize with Lew Rockwell's disillusion; like almost all conservatives of his generation, Lew cut his political eyeteeth

with the Goldwater campaign of 1964. Our difference here is generational: I was an Old Right Taft Republican, and my opposition to Goldwater stemmed not only from his anti-communist internationalist foreign policy (which he shared with *National Review*), but also to the personal fact that Goldwater, as an Eisenhower delegate to the 1952 convention, partici-

participated in the outrageous theft of the Republican nomination from Taft by the Wall Street-Rockefeller forces, a campaign that used the internationalist media to smear Taft viciously, and used their control of a network of banks to blackmail Taft delegates into voting for Eisenhower. So from my perspective, Goldwater was, from the very beginning, an internationalist sellout rather than a man of "unshakable principle." (On the 1952 outrage, see Chesly Manly, *The Twenty-Year Revolution: From Roosevelt to Eisenhower*, Henry

**Goldwater favors a Phoenix city ordinance outlawing "discrimination against homosexuals" in the workplace.**

Regnery, 1954.)

So, in short: while Goldwater-Buckley conservatism of the 1960s was a far way down from Old Right-Taft conservatism of the 1940s and 50s, it still shines far above current Goldwater conservatism and Buckley conservatism (if he can ever figure out what it is) like a beacon.

Well, one thing I'll say for the current Goldwater: he's against U.S. intervention in Bosnia. I don't know if it compensates for his idiotic prediction that "I think Clinton's going to do all right," but at least it shows that Barry hasn't yet become a social democrat. May as well look on the bright side. ■

## Conservatives and the Role of Congress

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

Conservatives are going through another of their periodic intellectual spasms over the relationship between the executive branch and Congress. The controversy, which dates back to at least the New Deal, centers on which branch of government should have the say in budgets, regulatory policy, foreign affairs, and judicial appointments.

Even though the Constitution makes Congress the preeminent branch of government, during the 1980s, conservatives argued for an imperial presidency. Of course, they didn't call it that. Instead, they argued that *Congress* was imperial, a trespasser

on the justly expansive powers of the president.

Conservatives had been semi-imperialists on this question when Nixon was chief executive, but they started salaaming the White House when Congress

questioned Ronald Reagan's foreign mercenary armies, and naturally, the argument spilled over into domestic policy.

By the late eighties, it was an article of the conservative faith that the president had, and

## More Quotes That Need No Comment

In Andrew Motion's book [on Philip Larkin] we have the constant sense that Larkin is somehow falling short of the cloudless emotional health enjoyed by (for instance) Andrew Motion. . . . Motion maintains the tone of an overworked psychotherapist dealing with a hidebound depressive who, exasperatingly, keeps failing to respond to the latest modern treatments. . . . The mood of the book is one of . . . mounting impatience.

It sometimes seems that the basis of the vexation is that Larkin was born in 1922, rather than more recently. Not only is he not well adjusted; *he doesn't want to do anything about it*. There are no serious shots at self-improvement, at personal growth. . . .

Larkin the man is separated from us, historically, by changes in the self. For his generation, you were what you were, and that was that. It made you unswervable and adamant. My father [Kingsley Amis] has this quality. I don't. None of us do. There are too many forces at work on us. — Martin Amis, *The New Yorker*

People don't trust him [Clinton]. He comes into office saying he's a populist, and the first thing he does is support gay rights. — Alan Baron, Democratic strategist, *Wall St. Journal*

We've seen this before. If we wanted a second-rate Yalie who lied about taxes to cover up mismanagement of the economy, we had one already. — Kevin Phillips, *Wall St. Journal*

These other ex-Bushies—Dick Cheney, Lamar Alexander, Lynn Martin. What do these people bring to the spice table? It's sort of like, what demand was there for Herbert Hoover's cabinet? — Kevin Phillips, *Wall St. Journal*

What the country requires, she [Hillary Clinton] concludes, is a new "conversation," indeed "millions of conversations." . . . "Millions of conversations," of course is the most cherished fantasy of Clintonism. This is a talkative presidency. . . . Often he seems to think that he has acted when he has merely spoken. . . . Mrs. Clinton's "conversation" is . . . a metaphor for the activity of the mind . . . known as anti-foundationalism . . . or pragmatism, according to which truth is nothing more than consensus, which is to say, a communal thing. The old aspiration to objectivity, which was an exercise in exclusion, has been usurped by a new aspiration to solidarity, which is an exercise in inclusion; and where once there were rational deliberations that led to an end, there are now emotional conversations that lead everywhere, and never end. . . .

Conversation seems so much more tolerant than ratiocination. It is so respectful, so *nice*. Alas. . . there is no point in looking for consensus where there is no consensus. . . . Better, surely, a sharpening of distinctions and a war of ideas, followed by what used to be known as leadership. — Leon Wieseltier, *The New Republic*