

of flattery to flush him back into the public eye. A Gallup poll revealed that 54 percent of the American people have a "favorable" opinion of Gorbachev—a ten point increase since last year. (Nikita Khrushchev never scored higher with Americans than 10 percent, in 1964.) Former Senator Gary Hart went public himself to call Gorbachev "a modern man," i.e., someone probably "more far-sighted and insightful than we are." The United States Senate voted 58 to 38 to restrict SDI testing, and New York Governor Mario Cuomo traveled to Leningrad and Moscow, compiled twenty-six hand-written pages of diary notes but left blank the sections he hoped to fill with impressions of the Soviet First Secretary. More generously still, the U.S. allowed one of its soldiers, on a military liaison mission in East Germany, to be shot at seven times by Soviet soldiers.

Sounds like he was a Soviet spy. •On September 22 the gorillas of the National Football League went on strike, and on September 6 it was announced that the late George Halas, Jr., the son of the Chicago Bears founder, had been a blocking dummy. Pathologists who disinterred Mr. Halas's body last month found it filled with sawdust. In other sports news, New York Yankee third baseman Mike Pagliarulo refused to pose for a picture with one Jane Fonda on the grounds that his uncle is a Marine sergeant. The incomparable Ivan Lendl—who, if he wishes to win more acclaim, American-style, might change his name to Johnny Lendell, suggests the *Wall Street Journal's* Frederick Klein—won the U.S. Tennis Open for a third time. Miss Martina Navratilova took the women's title, but the victory that matters came two weeks later in San Clemente, Cali-

fornia, where she won \$20,000 and a new car. "The car was an incentive for me because I have one in Fort Worth and I needed one in Aspen," she said. This is the kind of thinking that moved Miss Donna Hanson, the lay Catholic priestess who preached at Pope John Paul II in San Francisco, to call "consumerism in the United States" a source of as much pain for the Pope as "persecution in your beloved Poland [and] starvation in Ethiopia." Why was the Pope so badly treated in the U.S.? After all, he already has an American name. According to Professor Seymour Martin Lipset, "a major part of the problem was the pope himself. This is a pope who is not prepared to budge on anything, except to say, 'I'm the boss.' I think he turned a lot of people off by coming to America and saying that theological issues are non-negotiable, undiscussable."

•In Daria, Florida, Mr. Leo Polk, the most prolific blood donor in the history of the United States—over 320 pints in 60 years, by his calculations—died on empty at 79. Mr. Lorne Greene, the Canadian actor and dogfood master, died at 72 in Santa Monica, California. Mr. Bob Fosse, whose life was one continuous ugly dance, died on a Washington, D.C. street, and death also took 86-year-old Hollywood director-producer Mr. Mervyn LeRoy. In 1951 Mr. LeRoy committed the political crime of the century: he introduced Nancy Davis to Ronald Reagan. Mrs. Reagan was last seen in public on September 23 at the Old Angler's Inn outside Washington at a two-and-a-half hour private lunch with Mr. George Will. She ate an avocado shrimp salad, he swordfish with mustard sauce. They both sipped Perrier. —WP

CORRESPONDENCE

Moon Talk

Andrew Ferguson hits a bull's-eye ("Can Buy Me Love: The Mooning of Conservative Washington," *TAS*, September 1987). I covered a Unification Church rally the first summer I worked for *National Review*, and was, to put it mildly, weirded out. "Moon," I wrote then (*NR*, July 9, 1976), "is a shameless blasphemer; he says things about the United States that should not be said about any human creation—not to mention what he says about himself."

Conservatives have to be clear on this. We are in the business of defending the best of the West. On the religious plane, that includes Christianity in its sundry forms; Judaism; even the Deism of someone like Jefferson. It can't include a Korean preacher who thinks he's God, or close to it. The enemy of my enemy may be my friend. He is not therefore me.

It's only fair to add that I've gone on two junkets of the World Media Association, which were interesting and informative. There was never the slightest pressure to influence what I wrote afterwards. The Moonies who ran the show (Larry Moffitt was the chief impresario) were unfailingly hard-working and helpful. I believe Rev. Moon's theology is fantastic. But then, I think the same of Mary Baker Eddy's and Joseph Smith's. That wouldn't stop me from writing for the *Christian Science Monitor* or the *Deseret News*.

—Richard Brookhiser
Managing Editor
National Review
New York, New York

The article by Andrew Ferguson in the September *TAS* breaks with conservative silence on the Moon organization, its relationship with the *Washington Times*, and its financial support of several prominent conservative organizations. Ferguson's article reveals a peculiar reluctance on the part of many who accept Moon funds to explain why they do so, begging the questions: What do they seek to hide and what does Moon seek to gain?

Even those who do admit to Ferguson that they accept Moon funds profess ignorance of the source of the funding. Given the sordid history of Moon cult activities and Moon's conviction for tax evasion, this professed ignorance places squarely in issue whether fund recipients are acting responsibly, in a publicly accountable manner, by not clearly identifying the source of Moon funds before they accept them. On a less pragmatic level, questions are raised concerning whether recipients of Moon funds who publicly proclaim conservative values can avoid being viewed as hypocritical if they accept finances from enterprises controlled by one who seeks implementation of an agenda not merely alien to most conservatives' objectives but in opposition to them.

Ferguson deserves accolades for his First Amendment foray into the all-too-secretive world of Sun Myung Moon. It is a healthy press function, essential to preservation of our republic, to find factual answers to vexing questions about the exercise of power by semi-secret organizations in our society. This is particularly so when

representatives of the organizations have been known to engage in illegal practices.

More exploration is needed to answer the many questions raised by Ferguson's inquiry and to uncover the full scope of Moon's secretive operations. I hope other conservative journals will follow the *Spectator's* lead and will seek to render fully accountable all facets of Moon's operations.

—Jonathan W. Emord
Washington, D.C.

For-the-record: The members of the Unification Church I've met are honest, hard-working, God-fearing people. And I'd much rather associate with them, and have them as my friends, than I would your editor, Mr. Tyrrell, who has called the Bible "an old book full of foolishness."

And in his zeal to separate sheep from goats—to say who can and cannot be legitimate members of the conservative movement—Mr. Ferguson has revealed his own apostasy (is the conservative movement a cult?).

No, Mr. Ferguson, the conservative movement is *not* "a movement upon which, it is safe to say, the survival of freedom depends," as you write. What silly, stupid, arrogant nonsense, sir.

The future of freedom depends on and will be determined by God Almighty, by Jesus Christ—a power far higher than the conservative movement, Mr. Moon, and, yes—dare I say it—even Mr. Tyrrell.

—John Lofton, Columnist
Washington Times
Washington, D.C.

I can only suppose that other readers shared my bewilderment as we plowed through a succession of standard issue anti-Moon stories supplied by the former Moonies of the Cult Awareness Network. Was it a reprint from the *National Enquirer*? It was only after 150 column inches of copy that an explanation was given. Andrew Ferguson has been slighted by the *Washington Times*, and was retaliating courtesy of *The American Spectator*. Bizarre, but understandable. But I am very upset that he uses my organization, CAUSA, and my church, the Unification Church, as wadding for his loads. Furthermore, with appeals for funds from RET coming once every two issues, why are four valuable pages used for inside-the-Beltway pouting?

—William Lay
Vice-President
CAUSA International
New York, New York

I couldn't help feeling disappointed that Mr. Andrew Ferguson's article on Reverend Moon's "quest for legitimacy" was not more negative in tone. Okay, he was snide and he went through the motions of laying on the caustic lime undercoating traditional in Moon-Takes-Over-World articles, but his heart clearly wasn't in it. If I am going to be a member of an unfashionable religion, I expect press vilification commensurate with renegade beliefs. This isn't what I signed on for. Where's the bile?

Part of the reason for the kid gloves may be that for as long as anyone can (continued on page 48)

EDITORIALS



BORK, NOW MORE THAN EVER

Washington

Judge Robert H. Bork, President Reagan's nominee to replace Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr. on the Supreme Court, is going to be making heavy weather of it over the next few weeks as he is battered on the high seas of partisan politics. Nonetheless, according to my reading of the stars, he will be confirmed. Then, this great city will go into a boil over some other passing horror. That is the way things go in an era of changing political values, and the era of change will not end with the adjournment of the Reagan Administration.

About this particular fracas, there is something, however, that is decidedly unfair. A lone federal judge who has sided with his colleagues in 95 percent of their cases, not one of which has been overturned by the Supreme Court, is now inveighed against as a dinosaur of the *Tyrannosaurus rex* variety. His main defenders are conservative groups presumed to be partisan. Against him has been marshaled a prodigious array of interest groups most of whom are allowed the dispensation of claiming to be above partisanship and motivated solely by noble ideals such as population control, unfettered personal liberty, a well-educated Republic. They argue that the dinosaur imperils all these good things. In truth, the groups above alluded to—Planned Parenthood, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Education Association—have in recent decades fallen under the sway of liberal Democrats and of persons further left, as have most other organizations in the anti-Bork coalition. Their real complaint is that Judge Bork is not one of them.

Indeed he is not. His sagacious writings and his winning appearances on Capitol Hill reveal him as a conservative and a man of our times. His readings of the Constitution are quite as contemporary and as relevant as those of the man he will replace, Justice Powell. It is his critics, those deriding

him as an "extremist," who are relicts from another time, 1964 to be exact, when conservatism could with some justification be labeled extremist. Since then conservatives have taken their case persuasively to the people. One of their own has been inhabiting 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue since 1980, and the country has prospered in comparative tranquility at least when weighed against the 1970s and the ghastly 1960s.

Senator Kennedy's harangue against Judge Bork during the hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee sounded quaint, to say nothing of bigoted. The Senator apparently lives in an endless 1964 when conservatives were belabored as racists and reactionaries. Today it is Senator Kennedy who can be dismissed as a reactionary. He has forgotten nothing from the past and learned nothing from the conservative present. He and the other surprisingly vitriolic critics of Judge Bork who predict that his confirmation will conduce to an abrupt break with custom might recall that it is they who are the usual champions of abrupt change. Conservatives oppose such change, and there is nothing in the record of Judge Bork or of any of President Reagan's other conservative nominees to suggest that they will encourage any species of radicalism.

Judge Bork's moderation is manifest even in his fundamental judicial principle. He does not advocate the judicial activism that might justify his opponents' blood curdling yells but rather judicial restraint, which favors measured changes at best. Why has this so angered his critics? It is not because judicial restraint will reverse their policies instantaneously but because it will change one of the least noticed conventions of modern liberal politics.

Modern liberal politics has handed over the burden of reform to the courts. Bork would return it to elected representatives. Judicial restraint encourages law made by legislators, not by courts. It encourages democratic process. It returns the courts to their

proper role of adjudging the constitutionality of the legislators' work.

In recent decades liberal legislators have been pleased to allow the Supreme Court to do the controversial work of setting national standards in such areas as abortion, affirmative action, capital punishment, and school prayer, where no congressional majority could be mustered for their positions. Then with smiling faces they can wink their ap-

proval to their liberal constituents and when with aggrieved conservatives don the grease paint and commiserate. As our judges have become the makers of law, our Congress has become a colony of actors. In an era of judicial restraint, they are going to have to take responsibility for their acts and answer to the electorate. Times change. We move from judiocracy back to old-fashioned democracy. Things could be worse. □

by R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.

MARXIST HASHISH HANDLERS

New York

Now here is a delightful specimen of Americana for you. The *New York Times* reports that the Union of Radical Political Economics (U.R.P.E. and pronounced UR-PEA) has just held its annual summer conference. U.R.P.E. represents the nation's Marxist economists, and there on the business page of the *Times* the assembled Marxist economists are pictured, attired in work shirts and denims, their faces unshaven, their hair unkempt, all dressed as though they had just finished a day of heavy manual labor. Was it in good-natured jest that the *Times* placed this picture of Marxist economists exactly adjacent to the headline: "Dow Gains 23.60 Points; I.B.M. Up"?

Indeed, applying Marxist economics can be a heavy labor. That old crank who in the last century made such a pest of himself at the reading room of the British Museum never said anything true or useful about economics, or anything else for that matter. It is quite as misleading to speak of Marxist economics as it is to speak of chiropractic science. Dr. Marx's contribution to knowledge is not in the realm of economics but in the realm of warfare. He provided mankind with a compelling new rationale for killing one's neighbor. Since Dr. Marx's passing more people have been slaughtered in his name than in the names of any potentate or ayatollah ever heard of. Nonetheless, despite the fact that Marxism is as useful to an economist as his neighbor's toothbrush, the *Times*

reports that there are approximately 1,000 members of U.R.P.E., and that the group is growing ever more influential. That is a surprise. What is no surprise is that most of the Marxist economists are university professors or economists for state governments.

After all, how many universities or state governments operate at a profit? What would have been news would be if U.R.P.E. contained large numbers of economists from the world of private industry or banking. But to find Marxist economists counseling industry one has to travel to such industrial paradises as Albania, Bulgaria, and Vietnam—now one of the poorest nations on earth. Marxist economics does not eliminate poverty. It merely assists patriots in transforming their countries into prison camps. It provides a swell rationale for thwarting modern man's longing for freedom.

Remember Dr. Marx's great line from *The Communist Manifesto*, "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains"? Well, once again, he was wrong. Some years ago the *Wall Street Journal* exulted in apprising readers that America's poverty line was at that time about \$1,000 above the Soviet Union's median family income. All good U.R.P.E. members still believe that liberal democracies keep people in chains. Blue-collar workers and the poor are especial targets of their bizarre theories. That ought to worry workers and the impoverished. Next to the blue-collar workers of Communist countries

Adapted from RET's weekly Washington Post column syndicated by King Features.