

and then use the bones in creating sculpture. Three students have rebelled, one explaining that "it would be like a pet, and to take your pet and have it killed is not a comfortable thing for me." Miss Leah Zuch, the execu-

tive director of the Cambridge Committee for Responsible Research, an animal rights group, adjudged the project "disgusting." "That's an awful way to think of art," she said. No one knows on whose side the local pro-

abortion groups might have sided. •Finally, there is good news for readers of *The American Spectator* and for those who hang out in our nation's libraries. After many years of modestly suggesting that the *Readers' Guide to*

Periodical Literature was remiss in not including this great journal in its list of periodicals, it has agreed to include us beginning in March. The life of the mind grows stronger.

—RET

CORRESPONDENCE

Elie Kedourie Replies

As Mark M. Jilka rightly says (Correspondence, *TAS*, January 1988) in response to my October article "Cruising for a Bruising: The U.S. in the Gulf": "one of the reasons for the U.S. failure in Lebanon in 1982 was the fact that the military was given a poor framework to work in." My fear is that this is also the case in the Gulf today. As Mr. Jilka will appreciate, what constitutes a sufficient military force is to be judged in relation to the policy objective. It is not at all clear what the U.S. policy is in the Gulf today. Is it the defeat of Iran? In such a case, are the forces in the Gulf able to mount an invasion of Iran? Or is it to maintain the freedom of the seas? If so, then one has to say that preventing Iranian attacks on shipping is not enough to achieve that objective. As everyone knows, Iraqi attacks on shipping go on continuously and have gone on for a number of years. Nothing was done and nothing is being done to stop them. Is the objective to persuade or compel Iran to end its war with Iraq? It is not clear that this objective, if accomplished, would necessarily advance U.S. interests. It is these obscurities which have led me to express doubts and fears in my article. As the weeks pass, the doubts are by no means diminished.

Kudos

I have just finished reading your Special Anniversary issue of December 1987. I shall re-read it at a future date at a more leisurely pace to make sure I didn't miss anything. However, I must report that your publication has done little to promote harmony in my household. Your publication arrived at a time when my wife decided to discuss several matters of great interest. Unfortunately I became engrossed in reading your home-wrecker and my attempts to convey rapt attention to my wife's comments met with little success. If it weren't for the preceding forty years of happy marriage, ours would have been doomed!

—George Savage
Aledo, Texas

Allow me to add my voice to the chorus of congratulations you will be receiving on your 20th Anniversary issue.

The quality of your staff, contributors, and those whom you draw into your orbit is simply amazing. You have produced a memorable, fascinating, and thoroughly satisfying number that I have just finished reading with delight from cover to cover and to which I shall certainly return more than once. I was particularly touched by Stephen Harris's letter which I read with swimming sobs. Anyone who writes like that is a great soul.

I have now lived four times twenty years and can scarcely hope to share in your next anniversary, but I can say that *TAS* is one of the things that make life still worth living. —Alvin Laidley
Carmichaels, Pennsylvania

Your Special Anniversary issue is a huge success, the best of holiday reading. I send special praise for Tom Bethell's "I Hate to Spoil the Party" and your symposium, "Astonishing Moments." In the latter, the observations were so good that it seems unnecessary to name the best, but I was grateful in particular for Taki, James Q. Wilson, Arch Puddington, and R. Randolph Richardson, whose final paragraph is a masterpiece of scholarly perception.

If other readers are as enthusiastic as I am about the "Most Astonishing Developments of the Last Twenty Years" by twenty-eight distinguished observers, you will doubtless hear from many undistinguished observers with their own views on the subject. . . .

—Hazel Sample Guyol
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

Fred Barnes's article "A World Apart" was a bull's eye. I have noticed over the years that more and more members of Congress have deserted their local teams back home and become staunch Washington Redskin fans. I hadn't paid much attention to the Redskins since the Bears beat them 73-0, but lately I have been rooting for them to lose.

—W. J. Provance
Oceanside, California

The most astonishing thing about your "Astonishing Moments" in December was that not one of the contributors so much as mentioned what unquestionably should be regarded as the single greatest achievement of the human

race: landing a man on the moon, on July 20, 1969. That is the most astonishing single event of the past twenty years. Perhaps the most astonishing development of the last two decades is America's retreat from that pinnacle of achievement. Its omission by your contributors (the selection in its stead of Bill Buckley's—Jonestown—being by contrast the most pathetic) is tragic testimony of that retreat.

—Jack Wheeler, Director
Freedom Research Foundation
La Jolla, California

Early in a television series dealing with the subject of civilization the late Kenneth Clark stood before a magnificent Gothic structure, pointed toward it, and informed his audience that while he could not define "civilization" he knew it when he saw it: "And I'm looking at it now," he added.

Of course there are those whose cultural instincts are so dulled that they could stand contemplating Lord Clark's cathedral for a millennium and see nothing but piled stone. Just as there are those whose instincts in such matters are etiolated to the extent that they can be subjected to the manifestation of civilization's opposite, barbarism, in the form of rock music and not recognize it for the fundamental, irremissible rot that it is. Allan Bloom's chapter on "music" in his exquisite unmasking of the Unreal City we all live in, *The Closing of the American Mind*, has caused more than a few by their reaction to it to reveal such a retrogressive incapacity. And Terry Teachout in the December issue of *TAS* is the latest I've noticed to so flash open his intellectual trenchcoat, as it were, only to expose an embarrassment of cloddish stultification. Not surprising, and typically, he fails to make the least effort to meet Bloom's argument; lacking the minimal courage to avoid vulgar euphemism, he simply satisfies himself with a witless solecism: "In your ear, Allan Bloom."

It is clear that Mr. Teachout is suffering under the false impression that Bloom is hypothesizing the removal or disappearance of the particular fix for trousered apes in question, and apparently the thought alarms him greatly. Terry may relax: what Bloom is

merely saying is that extensive exposure to rock will result in permanent deafness to what he calls the "great tradition." There is another source for anxiety, however. The pertinent accumulating medical evidence indicates that the result will be deafness, period—to all sound: the barbaric rattle of pebbles under the receding wave as well as the great non-returning song of civilization.

So if nervous Terry Teachout, intrepid guardian of the conservative ethos, is correct—if his prediction is borne out and the gray boomers stay home for a TV jolt—the emerging image is quite delicious to consider. We may anticipate multitudes of pathetic rock-addled deaf-mute nostalgics freaking out under tubelight to the mindless throb of . . . s-u-b-t-i-t-l-e-s! Oh consummation devoutly to be wished! The return of civilized silence. —Neil G. Barclay
Salt Lake City, Utah

I thoroughly enjoyed the "I Remember Bloomington" section in the December Anniversary issue of *TAS*. Seeking an escape from my youth in Mayor Daley's embattled and corrupt Chicago, I found refuge in the small-town innocence of Bloomington and the naturally beautiful surrounding countryside of Monroe and Brown Counties (a five-minute motorcycle ride from campus) from 1965-1976. While *TAS* was beginning in 1967 I was a liberal idealist who helped circulate our own newspaper "The Spectator" to help activate politically indifferent students on campus. At that time the conservative publication "The Alternative" was a joke on campus, as were the Young Republicans or the Young Americans for Freedom who would meet in an isolated room in the Student Union with little or no effect on the student population of Hoosiers.

After I returned to the "real world" my religious commitment as well as the basic conservative ideals of my youth "returned" as well. I have been an educator teaching about The American Constitution and the ideals which motivated the Founding Fathers. My memories of my years in Bloomington are rich and warm; there were none in your article that I had not related to
(continued on page 47)

EDITORIALS



WITH RON AND GORBO

by R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.

On December 9, with a heroic portrait of irascible old Andrew Jackson gazing down on him in the Oval Office, a benevolent President, mellowing through the last months of the longest presidency since Ike's, expounded to four journalists on his benign view of the world. I have heard him purr like this before. Then as now his subject was world peace.

Back in 1984, Ronald Reagan met with several of us in the White House library. He was tired from the campaign trail, and he stumbled ineloquently over several burning issues of the hour, but on one issue his utterances were explicit and even vivid: his hope for an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union. His interest in this sort of thing is not sudden.

Now he has his agreement. Twenty-four hours before our latest interview he signed a pact with Mikhail Gor-

bachev to eliminate all intermediate-range nuclear missiles from Europe. Seated in the Oval Office he looks the part of a leading man. His 76 years are not evident. He is fit and alert. His shoulders and chest rise like those of a man who either trains with weights or has found the elixir once sought by Ponce de Leon. He is in good color, albeit his unfortunate nose has suffered from cancers and scalpels. Though red-rimmed, his eyes twinkled as he went through a range of emotions: joviality, confusion over his critics, pique over right-wing impudence, magnanimity—but, trust me, none of that adolescent euphoria that the Washington press corps keeps looking for. Rather his mood is benign.

What brought this renowned hawk to negotiations with Mr. Gorbachev were three perceptions. Mr. Reagan has long perceived Mutual Assured Destruction in response to Soviet aggression as an immensely dangerous strategy. He perceives Gorbachev as a unique Soviet leader. And some time

ago he perceived that his policy of military buildup and tenacity at the bargaining table had brought the hour for an agreement at hand. In 1983 over the opposition of various species of anti-nuclear activist the United States brought intermediate-range missiles to Europe, responding to the Soviets' unprovoked deployment of their SS-20. Then, by 1987, Mr. Reagan saw that it was possible to return Europe to the status quo before deployment.

The President's alarm over MAD, of course, was what initially inspired him to pursue a space-based defense—"Star Wars." He has been reiterating his alarm for years, and in our interview he termed the MAD strategy "uncivilized." He hopes the present INF treaty will be instrumental in moving the United States away from MAD, though he recognizes that the present imbalance in conventional forces in Europe must be eliminated and he still is avid for Star Wars.

Equally important in the President's decision to meet and conclude this agreement with the Soviets is his sense that Gorbachev is different from past Soviet leaders. Of the four Soviet

leaders who have ruled during the Reagan presidency, "this is the first Soviet leader that has openly discussed . . . that there are flaws in their economic system"—and with ill-concealed pride Mr. Reagan mused that *glasnost* might "partially confirm some of the things that I said before about their system." Moreover, Mr. Reagan thinks it significant that "in the past, Soviet leaders have openly expressed their acceptance of the Marxian theory of the one world communist state." Gorbachev, the President went on to say, "has never said that." And in 1988 Mr. Gorbachev will allow Russians "to observe the millennium—the thousandth anniversary of the baptizing of a Christian in . . . Russia."

Finally he feels that his policy of "strength and realism" has been vindicated. So maybe it is appropriate that Old Hickory gazes down on him in the Oval Office. President Reagan believes that he has been tough and that he has prevailed. But as our interview trailed off into suspicions uttered about his motivations, he worried aloud that the record of his foreign policy as well as his domestic achievements would be lost to history owing to an "inaccurate" press. His apprehension is legitimate. □

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



A MESSAGE FROM MIRANDA

If Congressman Henry Hyde was mad before, imagine his anger now. He was exasperated over Congress's passage of an arrantly unconstitutional legislative sausage that would attempt to prohibit the President from encouraging other countries to assist the contras in their war against the Sandinistas. Now it has been divulged that the Sandinistas plan a 600,000-man army in sleepy Central America. The Nicaraguan minister of defense, Mr. Humberto Ortega Saavedra himself, has confirmed it; and Congressman Hyde believes that it is unwholesome to American security for the Sandinistas to transform Nicaragua into another Cuba—not a Cuba walled in by inhospitable seas, but a Cuba

bordered by poorly defended nations vulnerable to Nicaragua's agents and armies.

While our Congress conjures with ever more legislation to render our government inconsequential outside the borders of this great Republic, Nicaragua is actively projecting force among our neighbors. Though bankrupt, Communist Nicaragua has been supplying military equipment to Communist insurgents in El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. All of this is, of course, in contravention of the Arias regional peace accord signed by the Sandinistas last August.

Some years ago, when Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan was our ambassador to the United Nations he spoke