

the two-party system has been to shatter that partition. Party leadership makes this possible by silencing opponents of the social democratic muddle.

Mr. Weissberg appears to recognize

this, but he hasn't explained why it is a good thing. Every schoolboy knows that politics is the art of compromise; if true, Washington is the cultural center of the world. An older tradition said politics

should seek higher ideals, like freedom, justice, and the common good. If it takes third parties to remind us of that, more political power to them.

CULTURAL REVOLUTIONS

THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS

were hailed as a great GOP victory long before the votes were cast, much less counted. For Mr. Clinton, the Republicans' victory came as a shock. The economy seems in good shape, employment figures are up, and even the Haitian fiasco turned out better than could have been expected. So what is the problem? And this is what none of Mr. Clinton's friends will tell him: the problem is you, Mr. President, you and that wife of yours and that set of Cabinet secretaries you promised would look like America but turned out to have been created by Todd Browning.

Between now and 1996, the President has only one option, if he wishes to seek reelection. First, he has to shake up his Cabinet and get rid of, at the very least, the more flagrant lesbians, the Don Juan being blackmailed by a former mistress, and the dwarf—Janet Reno is no Snow White and Robert Reich, for all his academic pretensions, is no Doc, unless you count honorary degrees. Second, and I think the President will have already reached this conclusion by himself, the First Lady has to be sent on an extended "good will" tour to check out the condition of tropical rain forests in Africa and Asia—South America may be too close. Finally, the President has to pull the plug on his own television coverage. This means no press conferences, no town meetings, no appearances on *America's Most Wanted*. Let him be filmed once a month, preferably in black and white, with a mountain of paper work on his desk, saying, "I'm sorry fellows, but Ross Perot was right. The United States is no chicken franchise; it's a big country, and I've got work to do."

Mr. Clinton is probably smart enough to figure out some of this, but he and his party are the captives of special interests that will not allow them to learn from their mistakes. The same is true of the GOP. What was at issue in the election? First there is the matter of the famous

"Contract with America." Most Americans do not actually know what the contract's provisions are, but they do believe that it has something to do with cutting expenditures, reducing the deficit, and decreasing the federal government's power to work mischief. Other more interesting provisions include a \$500 per child tax credit, a strengthening of parents' rights, and a restoration of national security by taking American troops out from under U.N. command.

Some of the terms of the contract are naive; others are stupid, but what matters is the underlying attitude: a restoration of American sovereignty in foreign affairs and within the country a recovery of the little sovereignties of home, community, and state. But even more important than this fundamental shift in emphasis is the odd idea that parties should keep their promises.

Apart from Bill Clinton and the Republican Contract, the biggest issue was immigration. Lawton Chiles stole the election from Jeb Bush by portraying himself as tough on immigration, and apparently 80 percent of Florida voters for whom immigration is important voted for Chiles. In California, Governor Pete Wilson—whom the experts had counted out long ago—tied his entire campaign to Proposition 187. In an act of incredible arrogance, Jack Kemp and William Bennett went all the way to California to campaign against the governor's campaign, and when both Wilson and Prop. 187 won handily, Kemp and Bennett were given their first taste of what life in the real United States is all about. Their reckless behavior was not only nasty, which is no news to their admirers, but stupid and politically naive. Score it *Chronicles* 2, Ncocons 0. As I predicted a year ago, if Governor Wilson could be reelected on immigration reform, he would be positioned for a try at the White House.

The immigration issue is just one part of a populist agenda. Some of the di-

verse elements are: conservative Christians worried about abortion and homosexuality (Bennett and his former assistant Bill Kristol were also dead wrong on these issues), the Second Amendment, and the Tenth Amendment rebellion simmering in the West, primarily over federal resource policies and unfunded mandates. As *Human Events* pointed out, GOP candidates in Montana and Wyoming pledged "to fight Bruce Babbitt's restrictive land-use policies."

The Republicans do have a grand opportunity, and if they are willing to listen to Pete Wilson and Pat Buchanan and give up on their dream of an "Empower America" rainbow coalition, then they have a chance of establishing something like a new regime, which is what the Democrats did in the 30's and 40's under Roosevelt and Truman and again in the 60's under Kennedy and Johnson. But if they are deluded into thinking that the American people have fallen in love with the party of multinational business—the party that is gung-ho for GATT and the cultural enrichment provided by Third World immigrants—then they are in for as sober a disillusioning as Mr. Clinton received in November.

—Thomas Fleming

THE BALKANS WAR seemed to be coming to an end in mid-December as we went to press. Trying to sort through the lies, misinformation, and distortions for the fragments of truth in the international press requires the patience of an archeologist and the imagination of a poet, but some things seem fairly certain. For several months the United States had been stepping up its assistance to the Bosnian Muslims. According to reports in the European press, American military and CIA advisors were coordinating liaison between Muslims and Croats and training the Muslims in tactics and weaponry; they had

already been giving intelligence and assistance with artillery spotting. More damning evidence surfaced recently of the United States supplying Chinese-made arms, including rocket-launchers. The headline in *The European* was blunt: "America Has 'Joined War' in Bosnia." The State Department denies nearly all the charges, but in the 1960's the United States also denied its role in Vietnam.

Things were looking bright for the Muslims, brighter than they had looked since the 1940's, when they helped to break up Yugoslavia and worked for the Nazis. Yugoslavia had been enforcing the blockade against their Serbian cousins with some effectiveness, although rumor has it that the Muslims were receiving weapons from NATO. They are certainly getting help from their Muslim friends throughout the world.

Emboldened by their NATO, particularly American allies, the Muslims decided it was time to end an apparent stalemate and to launch an invasion from their safe haven in Bihac. This was a risky move, since success could not only attract a Serb counterattack, but it also put Slobodan Milosevitch—the only man who can force the Bosnian Serbs to negotiate—in a difficult position. The Serbian president is, in fact, a moderate and under constant pressure from the nationalists in and out of government. The same pressures are being put on Boris Yeltsin by Russian nationalists, the Russian military, and the Russian Orthodox Church, to support their Slavic Orthodox brothers and assert traditional Russian hegemony in a strategic region.

Heedless of the consequences, the Muslims made their attack, and night after night the network anchormen gloated over their success. The story was always the same. On the screen comes the picture of a rocket and artillery barrage. "A familiar sight in Bosnia, but this time it is the Serbs who are on the receiving end." When some bright reporter thought to ask the Bosnian Serb commander, General Mladic, what his response would be to the Muslim advance, his laconic answer went: "If they want war, we'll give them war." A chilling statement from such a source.

It was easy to predict the international response. The Muslims reopen the war, and the Serbs are blamed for fighting back. NATO is given its first battle test in its almost 50-year history when

the U.N. authorizes air strikes. The raids do little to slow the Serb advance, and then, mysteriously, on Friday, a strike is called off on account of weather. But the weather is consistently bad at this time of year in the Balkans, and the planes have electronic guidance systems. Stranger still, after the raid is called off, U.N. and NATO officials give interviews declaring the war over. The Serbs have won.

What gives? Until that point, the forces of the New World Order had been threatening fire and sword against any Serb who stood up against them. Either NATO is a tiger without teeth, or else something happened we are not hearing about. If it is a question of U.N. hostages, then giving in is absolutely the worst thing to do. Even they can't be that stupid. Unconfirmed sources have told us that NATO did not call off Friday's raid, that six planes were shot down, and that one of the pilots is in Bosnian Serb hands. Who knows?

Whatever forced NATO and the United States to back down, the result is the same. In this strategic crossroads of the world, for which Greeks and Gauls, Romans and Turks, Russians and Germans have spent their lives and treasures, the United States for almost nothing had won the hearts and minds of the dominant ethnic group. Down to the breakup of Yugoslavia, the Serbs were passionately pro-American. Now, because of the stupidity, greed, and corruption of the American leadership, we have forfeited that friendship and brought the Serbs and Russians back together. I do not know what George Bush, who got us into the Balkans War, would have done, but no one could have done worse than Bill Clinton, alternately bullying and backing down. If the American people have longer memories than I think they have, this total fiasco should mean the end of NATO, the end of the United Nations as a political and military force, and the end of America's post-Cold War policy of humanitarian violence.

—Thomas Fleming

WHEN THE ELECTION returns showed Republicans in charge of Congress and Washington, D.C.'s Marion Barry with an insurmountable lead in the race for mayor, there was only one thing to do: uncork the Jack Daniels and celebrate. Statehood for D.C. went down the tubes.

In electing Barry again, the city's seething underclass was thumbing its nose not only at the rest of the country but also at Congress, which holds the keys to the United States Treasury that Barry has become so accustomed to looting. The election was also the District's referendum on the criminal justice system, the archenemy of many voters who cast their ballots for Barry because the maximum-security jail at Lorton, Virginia, is home to more than a few of their relatives.

But Barry's election, predictable as it was, paralleled the results in Arlington, Virginia. Arlington, too, thumbed its nose at the rest of the country, not even a month after two carjackers murdered Meredith Miller, the young Floridian who worked for Representative Leslie Byrne (Virginia). Arlington's proximity to the district by car or taxi or the Metro, the District's heavily subsidized and money-losing subway, makes it a perfect target for Washington's professional criminals. In this case, the criminals shot Meredith to death in Crystal City, located in South Arlington just across the Potomac from Washington, D.C. A few hours later, the cops caught one suspect tooling around the District in Meredith's car, the gun sitting in plain view on the front passenger seat. Meredith's murder was just one of many crimes perpetrated in Arlington by residents of Washington, D.C., which is why Arlington's election results are as interesting as the District's.

Readers of the *Arlington Courier* are treated to news about crime in the paper's "Police Reports" and "Court Reports," which record the county's arrests, robberies, larcenies, vandalisms, vehicle tamperings, and sentencings. On November 4, four of eight sentencings listed in the *Courier's* "Court Reports" showed a convict's address in the District. Indeed, in almost any given week, readers are bound to learn of at least one criminal from the District being sentenced in Arlington County's Circuit Court. The Commonwealth's attorney for Arlington puts the tally of crimes from Barry's subjects at 10 percent of the total.

And Barry has pledged even more. Just a week before the election, as the *Washington Post* reported, Barry, recognizing how many of his constituents have relatives in the slammer, promised inmates "more lenient parole laws . . . along with possible conjugal visits and

'gate money' so that no prisoners are released . . . with empty pockets." All this wouldn't be so bad for Arlington if its elected officials understood that one of the government's more important functions is to protect the life and liberty of the citizens in its jurisdiction. But Arlington's officials don't care about Barry or the crimes his subjects commit under their noses.

After Meredith Miller's savage murder, the *Courier* published an editorial denouncing the District because its crime spills over into Arlington and suggesting that the race for mayor might more appropriately be called a race for zookeeper. The reaction? A member of the county's governing board canceled his subscription to the paper. The editorial, he wrote, implied "that our neighbors in the District of Columbia are less than human" and was "mean-spirited at best and racist at worst." The rest of the board probably thought so too, but simply didn't say as much. Yet their silence spoke volumes. When Meredith Miller was shot in the chest, Arlington's police chief said nothing. The chairman of the County Board said nothing. The board's vice chairman and even its lone Republican, supposedly some sort of conservative, were mute. Evidently, Arlington's ruling class won't criticize the District or its mayor, and it doesn't take a genius to figure out why. More than three-quarters of the District's residents are black.

Then, of course, there's the Crack-head-in-Chief himself. Arlington's muk-a-muks won't rebuke him, no matter how many of his criminals run the county's streets, for one simple reason. Like Barry and the residents of the District, Arlington's voters are principally Democrats. Indeed, while the rest of the American electorate went solidly Republican, hoping for a change from the acquisitive, corrupt socialists who ran Congress, Democrats in Arlington won the election hands down. Senator Chuck Robb needed more than 50 percent of Northern Virginia's vote to defeat Oliver North. Arlington voters gave Robb 66 percent of the vote. A hard-nosed school reformer went down to defeat at the hands of Arlington's Democratic majority, which preferred a longtime school bureaucrat. And the incumbent chairman of the County Board defeated a Republican who advocated eliminating the personal property tax on automobiles. Yet the vice-chair-

man of Arlington's board thought Arlington's vote for the Democratic Party showed it was an "island of sanity in a world gone mad."

Actually, it's a sign that Arlington's residents care as much about crime and other issues that inspired the American electorate's anti-Democratic revolt as their governing board, and that Arlington County has been absorbed by the federal city. Its entire economy depends on its proximity to Uncle Sam. No wonder Arlington thumbed its nose at the rest of the country, just like Washington, D.C. Like the District, Arlington is no longer part of the real America, which brings us back to the dark irony of Meredith Miller's murder. Young Meredith might still be alive in the real America, but she died thanks to a judge in the District. The judge in question loosed a man later arrested as a suspect in the murder, Anthony Higgins, after Higgins wrote him a letter. "Sir, I have learned my lesson and I know [sic] longer wish to be a victim of society," Higgins pleaded.

When Mr. Barry promulgates his new parole program and his pals at Lorton head back home to see the folks, one wonders how many will stop in Arlington for a shooting or two and whether anyone in Arlington will even care.

—R. Cort Kirkwood

SUSAN SMITH, confessed murderess of her own children, tells us a great deal about what is going on in a society where too many children growing up in broken homes are exposed to violence and even murder.

What kind of mother would kill her own children? According to the press, the case of Susan Smith is horrible but "not unusual." Obviously, such murders are statistically very unusual, and they are usually committed by women who are mentally defective and morally degraded. Nonetheless, the press continues to describe Mrs. Smith as "one of us," a woman subject to a temptation we all face.

Because Smith laid down the red herring of a black abductor in order to mislead the police, a ruse that was exposed in a few days but which gave the press the opportunity to concentrate on the issue of racism, the Smith murders have been compared with the O.J. Simpson trial, but the really relevant parallel is Paul J. Hill, the Florida pro-life activist

who shot and killed an abortionist and his bodyguard and wounded the bodyguard's wife. Forbidden to pursue a defense of justifiable homicide, Hill has been convicted of murder and sentenced to death.



Both the Smith and Hill cases have aroused public anger, but the obvious connection has escaped the pundits' attention. Hill dramatized through illegal violence his outrage at a greater violence: the routinization of baby-killing, instituted by doctors who violate the Hippocratic oath, in the name of "women's right to choose." In the name of science, we now have fetal tissue research and more recently an establishment-certified push for human embryo research. Dr. Frankenstein no longer hides in the basement—he is government-funded.

But the Smith case is even more revealing of the truth we don't want to face, that it is women, not doctors, who are ultimately responsible for millions of abortions. This logic suggests that perhaps Hill should have adjusted his aim. Smith's snuffing of her children's lives should be viewed as a double retroactive abortion, though it was technically a double murder. She merely offed those kids in the wrong trimester—a distinction of degree, but not of kind. They were in the way. Raising children is hard. She felt bad. She may even have suffered premenstrual tension, which I am sure will be taken into consideration. We will hear about her feelings, and her feelings about her feelings as well.

I am waiting for the call from Gloria Steinem, from Anna Quindlen, from Ellen Goodman, and from Senator Kennedy, for justice for Susan Smith. Surely they have the courage of their convictions. Susan Smith, more than "Jane Roe," embodies not what we want to be, but what we are: a nation where the crematoria burn brightly, where there is justice based on constitutional principles, where pregnancy and even childbirth can be adjusted to "choice." After all, this is a democracy. We don't live in the Middle Ages, thank goodness. We don't believe in Joan of Arc, but we have our heroines. Somewhere—in Boston or New York or Los Angeles, but not in Union, South Carolina—there should be a statue of our anti-saint, Susan Smith.

—J.O. Tate

by Samuel Francis

Racial Politics

Whatever the new Republican majority does with the immense congressional power it seized in last November's elections, it will probably be unimportant compared to the force that started to emerge in the same elections and which the national leadership of the Republican Party, and even more the Democratic Party, tried to ignore, denounce, and destroy. The emergence of the Republican majority, of course, is important in terms of the conventional politics of the nation. Not only has it converted the remaining tenure of the Clinton administration into a two-year-long sequel to *Night of the Living Dead*, this time with the zombies lurching around in the Oval Office, but it also represents the end of the New Deal electoral coalition and a great leap forward in the political consciousness of the Middle American Revolution.

By themselves those two developments are enough to make the elections of 1994 a major event in American history. But the end of the coalition that formed the electoral foundation of 20th-century liberalism does not necessarily mean that a genuinely antiliberal coalition has permanently crystallized, nor does the Republican victory mean that the Republicans are authentic or adequate leaders of the revolution from which they have gained at least temporary congressional dominance.

Since its inception in the 19th century, the Republican Party has been wedded to the myth of Economic Man, which holds that the desire for material gain is the principal if not the only muscle that throbs in the human breast and that therefore all historical events can be explained in terms of economic motivation. Most Republicans are probably unaware that they share this myth with unemployed Russian Marxists and too-long-employed American professors, but the persistence of the myth in what passes for the Republican mind is evident in last year's "Contract with America," with all its budget-balancing, tax-cutting, welfare-reforming, economic-incentive proposals. It remains to be seen how many of the contract's actual promises

the Republican leadership was serious about, how much the leadership and the party will be able or willing to enact, and how much is even possible to implement, given what seem to be some glaring contradictions. But even if all of the contract sails through Congress, escapes the ignominious fate of a veto from the nation's First Zombie, and latches itself onto the American way of life as firmly as sitcoms and Social Security, it will do little to fill the tank of what is now rapidly becoming the principal motor of the Middle American Revolution.

That motor, the force that the established leadership of both parties sought to stop, is, in a word, race, and it is evident in the controversy over the most controversial issue in the November elections, California's Proposition 187. That proposition was far more controversial than Ollie North or the role of the religious right, and unlike them, it will remain with us, shaping the practical politics and the impractical political conversation of the nation, for decades to come.

Originally, Proposition 187 was merely a proposal to prohibit illegal aliens from obtaining public services, mainly welfare, public education, and non-emergency public health care. The racial note was introduced near the end of the campaign, by the thousands of Hispanics waving Mexican flags, who occupied public buildings, screamed at policemen and anyone else who attracted their attention, and threatened to burn down the cities and the state if Americans dared vote contrary to their passions. On at least one occasion, they beat up an elderly American who had the courage to sport the American flag in expressing his support of 187. The man was luckier than the flag he bore, which the mob burned. These were clear expressions of a militant nonwhite and anti-American racial consciousness, which the press invariably described as "peaceful." Just to show how peaceful they were, the National Guard and the Los Angeles Police Department were placed on full alert in the event that 187 actually passed.

In the event, of course, 187 passed by 59 percent to 41 percent, but it is in the

ethnic and racial breakdown of the vote that the meaning of the proposition for the emergence of racial consciousness is most evident. From exit polls conducted by the *Los Angeles Times* during the voting, it appears that 63 percent of white Californians supported 187, while 53 percent of blacks, 53 percent of Asians, and a whopping 77 percent of Hispanics opposed it. The racial division is obvious: nonwhites voted together in opposing a measure that was portrayed by its foes as racially driven, while whites, who still make up 81 percent of the California electorate, supported it by a landslide margin. The racial division is evident also in the breakdown of the national vote, in which 63 percent of white men supported the Republicans. As Thomas Edsall wrote in the *Washington Post* shortly after the election, the mass defection of white males to the GOP "violates a core concept at the heart of the Democratic Party as the party of working people. White men are those experiencing the largest wage declines, the brunt of defense cutbacks and the dramatic attenuation of corporate loyalty."

The racial meaning of the vote is hardly surprising. For years now, politically organized nonwhite minorities in the United States have openly boasted of their ethnic consciousness, developed nationally powerful lobby groups to represent their interests, and have effectively legitimized the belief that it is their right to think, feel, vote, and behave according to their racial identity while delegitimizing the same belief for whites. Many, perhaps most, whites have permitted this development and even encouraged it, though some more aggressively than others. But what the vote for 187 tells us about whites is that they are now starting to vote for their own interests as a group, in opposition to the interests of other groups. If that trend continues, and there is every reason to believe it will, what will logically follow is the emergence of an overtly racial politics in the United States of a kind that we have not seen before.

Of course, not all whites supported 187, and most prominent among those who attacked it were presidential perennial Jack Kemp and Bill "Mr. Virtue"