

America." Jack Kemp argues we "must rally together for Wilson... or face disastrous consequences in 1996 and beyond."

Many conservatives disengaged in 1992 with George Bush. Mr. Bush's leadership was lacking and his campaign was badly managed, but it did not help for conservatives to play sour grapes and watch millions of conservatives drift into the Perot column. That kind of experimentation was insidious.

Now we see ambitious Clinton programs that just three years ago would have been unthinkable. Health nationalization might be stalled, but hundreds of other liberal programs, rammed through Congress, are now law. The federal government continues to intrude into personal lives on a greater scale than ever. Conservatives will vote for Wilson because there is no practical alternative. Let's review the major issues and talk about Kathleen Brown.

- **Death Penalty** — The death penalty aptly defines Brown's candidacy and provides the brightest contrast between Brown and Wilson. She reverently recalls a time when her father, as governor, commuted 26 death sentences. She originally opposed "One Strike, You're Out" legislation and has "problems" with three strikes reforms. Her anti-crime agenda embraces therapy, not punishment.

- **Illegal Aliens** — Brown opposed elimination of taxpayer-funded services for illegal aliens, opposed constitutional changes regarding citizenship (and the benefits it brings) automatically conferred on children of illegal aliens born in this country, and just announced her passionate opposition to Proposition 187 despite huge popular support even among Latinos.

- **Taxes** — She is not much better on taxes, constantly attacking Proposition 13 and trying to revise it. She supports increased taxes on property, income, and sales. Brown and a Democrat Legislature would accelerate taxing beyond our imagination.

- **Free Trade** — Brown's waffling became embarrassingly clear during the NAFTA debate. Obviously pandering to labor unions, she flip-flopped and opposed NAFTA days before the vote by Congress. Along with Kathleen and her brother Jerry, only two governors opposed NAFTA.

- **Wacky Environmentalism** — Brown consistently supported Tom Hayden's "Big Green" initiative and embraces extreme environmental regulations that place animal rights above human rights.

- **Judges** — Since the Democrats lost the governor's office a dozen years ago, we have seen a 180-degree reform of the judiciary. Judges now tend to support property rights, are pro-death penalty and pro-criminal prosecution. A majority of the California Supreme Court, of California Courts of Appeal jus-


tices, and superior and municipal court judges are much more conservative. Probably no single gubernatorial power is more important than the right to appoint judges. Brown would bring back the bleeding heart, pro-criminal, ACLU lawyer types into

power with a vengeance. Have you noticed Clinton's judicial appointments? Instead of dealing with one Rose Bird, there would be scores if not hundreds of similar judges under her tutelage.

- **Political Appointments** — Conservatives may not be happy with regulatory agencies, but under Wilson at least 50 percent of political commission appointments were eliminated. Under Brown, regulation would grow and political spoils would mushroom.

The question is not to weigh the benefits and costs of Wilson alone. We know his record. It is not perfect, but it is predictable. Weigh a Brown administration against a Wilson one. The vigor of the leftist policies pushed by Clinton surprised me — I never dreamed he would try to nationalize health care. Frankly, conservatives cannot begin to imagine the nightmares Brown could bring to California with the next eight years of our lives.

Shawn Steel is secretary of the California Lincoln Clubs and finance chairman of the Dana Robrabacher for Congress Committee.



**Many conservatives
disengaged in 1992. Mr.
Bush's leadership was
lacking...but it did not help
for conservatives to play
sour grapes and watch
millions of conservatives
drift into the Perot column.**

— Shawn Steel

DAVID HOROWITZ

Should conservatives vote for Pete Wilson? Which is worse: An anti-conservative governor who is also leader of our own party or surren-

dering the state's top office to the socialist opposition? It's an old argument — I don't know the answer. I only know how to fight to win. I will fight for conservative principles with Wilson in office and fight to keep the Democrats out of office.

David Horowitz is president of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture.

JOSEPH FARAH

There's an old saying: "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." That about summarizes why Governor Pete Wilson will not get my vote for re-election this November. He has fooled the California electorate too many times by occasionally (usually around election time) masquerading as something he's not — a conservative.

Lots of people — good, honest, well-meaning conservatives

— got hoodwinked into voting for Wilson in 1990. Remember the line four years ago? We were told we needed to hold our noses and vote for Wilson because only a Republican governor could ensure a fair reapportionment of congressional districts. Today, the attempted extortion of our votes is solely based on fear-mongering about how bad Kathleen Brown will be if she's elected.

Could she really be that bad? Probably. But it's doubtful she could be much worse than Pete Wilson. It's doubtful anyone could be. And, at least, with Kathleen and Willie Brown running the show, there won't be any doubt about who is responsible when things inevitably get worse. That's an important consideration. Voters need to understand the bankruptcy of liberalism and hold accountable those responsible for implementing it. Politicians like Wilson only serve to confuse the issue and give Republicans a bad name.

It's funny, though, at the same time Wilson is predicting doom and gloom if Kathleen Brown gets her hands on real power, he's also been complaining publicly that she has been staking out positions just like his.

Wake up, Pete! The reality is that Kathleen Brown has been running a fairly conventional liberal campaign — so conventional and so liberal that she has blown a once seemingly insurmountable 25-point lead in the polls. If she had done what most observers expected her to do, run to the right of Wilson (and, Lord knows, there was plenty of room over there), chances are she would be coasting to victory. So, governor, if Kathleen Brown's positions on the issues mimic your own, there's a reason for that. You're a liberal, too!

Am I exaggerating? Just check out Wilson's own record over the last four years:

- He pushed through the largest tax increase in the history of any state in 1991.
- He supported the shift of \$2.3 billion in local property tax money to the state in 1993.
- Even though he vetoed the domestic partners bill, he earlier signed major legislation offering special legal protections for people based on their sexual lifestyles.
- He dramatically increased funding for the Office of Family Planning, the state's own little piggy bank for Planned Parenthood and other population-control extremists.
- He teamed up with Willie Brown in support of the permanent sales tax increase, tricking the public into believing they were supporting law enforcement.
- He has placed far-out, tree-hugging nature-worshippers

in key regulatory roles, chasing old businesses out of state and shutting down job-creating entrepreneurs before they ever get started.

- He has signed anti-gun legislation, asset forfeiture laws, higher property taxes, higher corporate taxes, higher gasoline taxes, higher estate taxes, new snack taxes, new newspaper taxes and higher motor vehicle registration fees. He has also supported massive bond measures.

Now would things have been any better if Dianne Feinstein had been elected governor in 1990? Remarkably, as awful as Feinstein is, the answer is probably yes. Why?

Had a Democrat been occupying the governor's seat for the last four years, it is safe to assume that the Republican minority in the Legislature would have galvanized its opposition to pork-laden state budgets. Instead, Wilson has consistently undercut Republicans in the Assembly and Senate by supporting unconscionable state budget increases during California's worst recession ever. That's one reason why even Kathleen Brown would be preferable to another term of Wilson.

So, am I advocating a vote for Brown? No way. That would only be validating the bad choices the two major parties have given us. Instead, I plan to vote for the Libertarian Party candidate, Richard Rider, and urge all conservatives — Democrats or Republicans — to do the same.

Rider is not some nut. He's not a fringe character. To prove the point, before the primary election, he selflessly

urged his own supporters to vote for conservative Republican Ron Unz, even though Rider himself was on the ballot. A stockbroker and financial planner with a degree in economics, Rider is a retired Navy Reserve Supply Corps commander and Vietnam veteran.

Unlike most Libertarian candidates before him, he's running full-time and has even embarked on a modest television ad campaign. In other words, he could be the straw that breaks Wilson's back.

And there's another very good reason why conservatives should be looking for just such an opportunity. Should Wilson be re-elected, he becomes the odds-on favorite for the Republican presidential nomination in 1996. Scary? Hard to believe?

Yes, it is for those of us who have lived in California under the leadership of this unprincipled, egotistical, amoral Clintonsque character for the past four years. But, remember, the field will be crowded, and many in the Wilson camp



**It's funny... at the same
time Wilson is predicting
doom and gloom if Kathleen
Brown gets her hands on
real power, he's also been
complaining publicly that she
has been staking out
positions just like his.**

— Joseph Farah

are already eagerly planning to do for the nation what they have done for California.

God forbid!

Joseph Farah is editor and publisher of Inside California, the monthly state political newsletter, and Dispatches, the bi-weekly cultural and media watchdog publication.

HOWARD KLEIN

Pete Wilson is not my type of Republican. My charter membership on the "UNZseat Pete" team is testimony to my sentiments. I need not provide a bill of particulars of my grievances against our governor. Read the other contributions to this piece, and you'll know where I, like other conservatives, part company with him.

Many conservatives will, nevertheless, vote for Mr. Wilson, for one of two reasons: loyalty to the Republican Party, or resignation to the perceived need to vote in this election (as in all too many others) for the lesser of two evils.

Nevertheless, a sizable number of committed conservatives may still consider a vote for Mr. Wilson betrayal of their ideals, and deem a Wilson victory a soporific for the Republican Party.

While such sentiments are understandable (even laudable), I would ask those who hold them to consider another reason for a pro-Wilson vote, a reason that can be summed up in two words: Rose Bird.

The most recent Democrat to occupy the governor's seat wreaked pure havoc with our state's judiciary, appointing judges primarily on the basis of their commitment to liberal orthodoxy and, secondarily, on the basis of fulfilling an ill-defined (and ill-conceived) formula for "diversity."

The result was a judiciary heavily infiltrated by ideologically-driven mediocrities, led by Chief Justice Rose Bird and her fellow Jerry Brown appointees who turned the Supreme Court into a legislature of last resort. It took a very expensive campaign (using funds that could have been used to gain legislative seats) to remove the Bird faction from the Supreme Court.

And yet, even a dozen years after Kathleen Brown's brother appointed his last judge, his legacy survives in the form of warped precedent, and a substantial remnant of liberal fifth columnists within the judicial ranks.

Kathleen Brown has tried to distance herself from her brother. But it is more than likely that her judicial appoint-

ments will resume the pattern he set. There is a huge, pent-up demand among her backers for the appointment of liberal Democrat judges, after 12 years of being shut out of the judiciary. It would take a superhuman effort for Kathleen Brown,

as governor, to resist such pressures. In addition, Ms. Brown has displayed an alarming affinity for the ideology of "diversity." As a devotee of this noxious nostrum she is likely to redouble her brother's efforts to appoint judges on the basis of such extraneous criteria as ancestry, gender, and sexual proclivity.

Pete Wilson, on the other hand, has continued the practice of his immediate predecessor, George Deukmejian, of appointing judges on the basis of talent, experience, and commitment to judicial restraint.

The result is a competent, non-politicized judiciary that is slowly but surely undoing at least the more extreme results of the Bird era's judicial activism.

The judiciary has become an ideological battleground, involving issues that sharply divide Left and Right, such as the scope of property rights; the apportionment of accountability for criminal behavior between the criminal and society; the scope of governmental power to alter private contracts; and whether, and to what extent, fault, rather than ability to pay, should remain the primary basis for tort liability. Judicial decisions involving these (and other) issues have effects and repercussions that are often profound, wide-reaching, and enduring.

By consistently appointing judges who have a thorough knowledge of the law, a balanced view of the legal issues, and a proper perspective of the role of the judiciary, Pete Wilson has had, and should continue to have, an impact that

can only be applauded by conservatives.

Judicial restraint, respect for individual rights (particularly property rights), the integrity of contracts, and the proper apportionment of fault and responsibility in civil and criminal cases, are all vital conservative principles.

Replacing Pete Wilson with Kathleen Brown would inevitably bring about a severe erosion of these principles. If we, as conservatives, help bring such an outcome about, we (and our children) will live to regret it.

Howard Klein, a California Republican Party Central Committee member, served as legal counsel to the Unz for Governor and the Herschensohn for Senate campaigns.



**The most recent Democrat
to occupy the governor's
seat wreaked pure havoc
with our state's judiciary
appointing judges primarily
on the basis of their
commitment to liberal
orthodoxy, and to fulfill an
ill-defined formula for
"diversity."**

— Howard Klein