

Washington for Lesbian, Gay and Bi Equal Rights and Liberation,” the Mellon Auditorium was host to the officially sanctioned “National S/M Leather Fetish Conference.” The 1993 Gay March was designed to show America that gays are in the mainstream of society—just like everybody else. The S/M event featured members of the hardcore dominant and submissive homosexual community. Interviews I conducted at the time with participants revealed men who viewed pain as pleasure and total domination as an ideal. The participants paraded around the Mellon Auditorium in dog collars, chains, and had piercing in every conceivable body part. Virtually nude men who were “submissive” were being led around on leashes by their “dominant” partners or “masters.”

This 1993 conference also featured a slide show presentation, showcasing an example of some of the “mainstream” aspects of the gay lifestyle. A series of graphic photos depicting various sexual acts were prominently displayed. One photo featured a man “fisting” another man. Participants at the event pondered the series of photos as though viewing priceless artwork.

The conference also featured sexually explicit magazines and paraphernalia to help fully experience the S/M lifestyle. One tract titled “The guide to safe S/M” cautioned that consuming fecal matter was a “high risk activity” for the transmission of the HIV virus, but maintained that urinating games were “low risk activities.” Several publications on display advocated pedophilia.

In order to procure a federal building for any type of event, a maze of paperwork must be filled out and strict regulations must be met. Despite the public nudity, illicit sexual activity, illegal drug use, and pornography at both of these homosexual events, law enforcement never intervened. Contrast this with the controversy that inevitably follows when someone attempts to erect a nativity scene in or outside of a public building.

The 1996 Cherry Jubilee weekend proves that the homosexual agenda is advancing in Washington. The use of two federal buildings for the weekend party shows how successful the homosexual lobby has been in “mainstreaming” its agenda. Voters, consumers, and stockholders should hold the government and corporations accountable when they underwrite events like Cherry Jubilee. The voters need to ask which side of the “Cul-

ture War” the Republican Party is on and what real change the so-called “GOP Revolution” has wrought. The GOP leadership on Capitol Hill needs to explain how an event which featured illicit sexual activity, public nudity, and illegal drug use was allowed to occur in a federal building.

Marc Morano is a freelance journalist based in Washington, D.C.

Ron Paul and the Two GOP's

by Thomas Woods, Jr.

This November may not turn out to be as dull and depressing as it once appeared. Ralph Nader's charmingly quixotic bid for the White House, based on getting the United States out of NAFTA, GATT, and Bosnia, will doubtless add some substance to the presidential contest, but the most exciting race this November will occur outside the presidential arena. In a recent political upset, former Congressman Ron Paul soundly defeated the influential and well-connected incumbent Greg Laughlin in the Republican congressional primary in Texas's 14th district.

William S. White, an early biographer of Senator Robert Taft, devoted a chapter to what he called “the two GOP's,” and the race between Paul and Laughlin placed this persistent division in stark relief. Paul, a medical doctor and a member of Congress from 1976 through 1984, is a man of the Old Right. A free trader, Paul opposes NAFTA and GATT as left-wing schemes that have more to do with entrenching supranational bureaucracy and undermining national sovereignty than with international trade. His position on foreign policy is one of strict nonintervention abroad. In domestic affairs, Paul is so opposed to wealth redistribution that he has consistently refused to vote for pork even for his own district. His record in Congress, in fact, earned him the highest National Taxpayers Union rating ever.

Laughlin's voting record also speaks for itself. Over the past few years, he has voted against the family tax credit and for the Clinton tax increases, the Brady bill, racial quotas, and Goals 2000. An organization called the Campaign for

U.N. Reform even named him a “global statesman,” an honor he presumably earned by voting to place American soldiers under foreign command, and through his faith in the internationalist trinity of NAFTA, GATT, and the Mexican bailout.

For traditionalists who cling to the belief that the GOP has their interests at heart, the Republican leadership's unanimous endorsement of Laughlin must have been particularly sobering. The guilty parties can scarcely claim ignorance of Laughlin's liberal past; shortly before the 1994 elections, Newt Gingrich observed that Laughlin, then a Democrat, “has a 78 percent voting record with Bill Clinton; that tells you where he stands.”

In June 1995, Laughlin changed his party affiliation but insisted that “I'm not changing my personality. I'm not changing my philosophy, not the way I vote nor the way I represent this district.” Yet in a contest pitting Laughlin against Paul, Gingrich and Texas Senator Phil Gramm endorsed Laughlin without hesitation. A disillusioned Paul called the endorsements “typical of our current political system to back down from principles.”

To the chastened and cynical conservative, however, the GOP establishment's decision was predictable, to say the least. When presented with a choice between a “global statesman” on the one hand, and a true man of the right with a proven record of opposing the welfare-warfare state, Republican heavies will take the Clintonite in a heartbeat. As the primary season demonstrated, these men hate and fear nothing more than the genuine article.

With his impressive record in the House and his name recognition among conservatives in Congress, Paul could easily become the *de facto* leader of the congressional right with a victory in November. While Clinton and Dole engage in the most soporific presidential contest in recent memory—no mean feat, that—the real political story will take place in the Lone Star State, in Ron Paul's race against Democratic nominee Charles “Lefty” Morris. If Speaker Gingrich hates the rebellious Republican freshmen now, wait until they find a leader.

Thomas Woods, Jr., is a doctoral candidate in history at Columbia University.

Who Are the Freemen?

by Jeffrey A. Tucker

Trapped in their Montana farm, trying to fend off the feds, the worst crime the “Freemen” are accused of is attempting “to compete with the Federal Reserve,” according to the *New York Times*. Imagine. These people thought that private parties could, on their own initiative, issue checks, print notes, and extend credit without monetary backing. They should have known that only a government-backed banking cartel can do that.

If this type of privatization continues unabated, street gangs will attempt to impersonate tax authorities by stealing property, looting families, and driving people to financial ruin. We can't have that. A government of this size and fragility must retain the exclusive right to engage in such actions as check kiting, counterfeiting, and large-scale theft. But I wonder why street gangs don't get similar treatment?

It is clear why Ralph Clark, the leader of the Freemen, had the notion that he could run a monetary system better than the government has. Mr. Clark is himself a victim of a federal money machine and the business cycle it generated some 15 years ago. It bankrupted him, and set in motion the surreal and tragic events that led to his present fame. He probably assumed his private financial system, however shaky, would work better than the one that has wrecked him.

This is Mr. Clark's second go-around with the media. In the early 1980's, before he was demonized as a thieving, right-wing wacko on the government's dole, he was trumpeted as a prime example of the beleaguered family farmer whom the government needs to immediately save. He was the subject of numerous moving profiles, including one in *Life* magazine and another by Geraldo on ABC's *20/20*. It was Mr. Clark's sad story that inspired the “Farm Aid” concerts starring Willie Nelson and John Cougar Mellencamp. Nobody cared

what his theology was back then.

In fact, neither portrayal gets it right. Better to think of him as a high-profile victim of the business cycle. During the fed-driven credit boom in the mid-1970's, when inflation was picking up speed but interest rates seemed under control, banks encouraged farmers and ranchers to expand their holdings using government-backed loans. In that inflationary atmosphere, debtors appeared to win out over savers. Racking up debt appeared to be a way to profit from monetary debauchery. The central bank was controlling the market signals, and the signal said borrow to the hilt.

In the first phase of such a fed-driven economic boom, an economy can make impressive gains in growth while interest rates and even price increases remain under control. When inflation does pick up, debtors do indeed do well, paying off their debts in cheaper dollars. But since the boom is artificial, and destined to turn into bust, it is important to get the timing right if you are going to play this game. At some point, interest rates will begin to incorporate an inflation premium, and then you are sunk.

So it was with Mr. Clark. In 1978, he borrowed heavily to add 7,000 acres to his land, and about one year later interest rates spiked up to 21 percent. With a normal profit, he might have gotten by, but in 1980 and 1981 he experienced a serious drought and then a hailstorm that destroyed what remained of his crops. A year later, the Farmers Home Administration called in his entire loan of \$825,000. Land that had been in his family since 1913 was on the verge of being taken away by his supposed benefactors, the federal government and its connected financial interests.

Mr. Clark thus became a national symbol of the declining fortunes of family farms. In reality, he was a living example of why you should not trust the federal government's banking methods. The Reagan administration, under pressure from the media campaign and busy making political tradeoffs to support a military-driven Keynesian economic boom, vastly expanded agricultural subsidies and imposed a moratorium on farm foreclosures. The relief and the cash came just in time for Mr. Clark and his family. He signed a ten-year contract in 1984 for the government to pay him \$48,000 per year to suspend production on steep slopes and eroding land.

With extra time on his hands, Mr.

Clark began to read into what makes the government's monetary system tick, and became self-educated on all sorts of matters, from taxes to contract law, and tapped into the “patriot” movement of government skeptics and dissidents. When the subsidies stopped, Mr. Clark found himself still buried in debt and in more trouble than ever. That's when he resorted to privatizing some of the fancy financial schemes he learned from federal policy. This involved issuing “perfected liens” on assets of federal agents or agencies charged with breaking contracts, which are then converted into “Certified Bank Drafts” and spent or held.

I do not understand this device any better than I understand the fed's own Mexican bailout or Robert Rubin's financial shell game that kept the government running after Congress cut off its money. If these actions are legal, I do not know why Mr. Clark's should not be. In fact, *Media Bypass* magazine says that the Treasury Department has accepted checks written on liens over the years, and has even issued refunds for overpayment. When you are \$5 trillion in debt, I suppose, you take what you can get.

If the Freemen are crazy, the people who run the government and its financial system are crazier still. The government began issuing paper money on top of liens and issuing endless checks as early as the New Deal, or possibly earlier. Lincoln financed his war against the South with the same technique. So have most governments in world history, but less with respectable cover than the Federal Reserve offers the United States government. The error the Freemen made was not to understand that Leviathan, especially when it is at war or deeply in debt, claims certain privileges.

As the government cracked down on this privatized Federal Reserve system, and surrounded his farm with federal agents, Mr. Clark hung a sign outside his house: “Freemen are NOT a part[of] the de facto corporate prostitute a/k/a the United States.” But if hanging a sign is all it takes to be independent, those words would be on everyone's front door. The key to government—which is why people find it so objectionable when it becomes too big—is that it is above the law it enforces against everyone else. That's why it can claim that the “township” of Justus where Mr. Clark lives does not even exist, that his wheat farm has already been repossessed and sold at an