

EDITOR  
*Thomas Fleming*

EXECUTIVE EDITOR  
*Scott P. Richert*

SENIOR EDITOR, BOOKS  
*Chilton Williamson, Jr.*

ASSISTANT EDITOR  
*Aaron D. Wolf*

ART DIRECTOR  
*H. Ward Sterett*

DESIGNER  
*Melanie Anderson*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS  
*Katherine Dalton, George Garrett,  
Paul Gottfried, James O. Tate,  
Clyde Wilson*

CORRESPONDING EDITORS  
*Wayne Allensworth, Janet Scott Barlow,  
Bill Kauffman, Donald Livingston,  
Roger D. McGrath, William Mills,  
William Murchison, Andrei Navrozov*

POLITICAL EDITOR  
*Samuel Francis*

FILM EDITOR  
*George McCartney*

FOREIGN-AFFAIRS EDITOR  
*Srdja Trifkovic*

LEGAL-AFFAIRS EDITOR  
*Stephen B. Presser*

RELIGION EDITOR  
*Harold O.J. Brown*

CIRCULATION MANAGER  
*Cindy Link*

PUBLISHER  
*The Rockford Institute*

A publication of The Rockford Institute.  
Editorial and Advertising Offices:  
928 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103.  
Website: [www.chroniclesmagazine.org](http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org)  
Editorial Phone: (815) 964-5054.  
Advertising Phone: (815) 964-5813.  
Subscription Department: P.O. Box 800,  
Mount Morris, IL 61054. Call 1-800-877-5459.

Copyright © 2004 by The Rockford Institute.  
All rights reserved.

*Chronicles: A Magazine of American Culture*  
(ISSN 0887-5731) is published monthly for  
\$39.00 (foreign subscriptions add \$12 for  
surface delivery, \$48 for Air Mail) per year by  
The Rockford Institute, 928 North Main Street,  
Rockford, IL 61103-7061. Preferred periodical  
postage paid at Rockford, IL and additional  
mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address  
changes to *Chronicles*, P.O. Box 800, Mount  
Morris, IL 61054.

The views expressed in *Chronicles* are the  
authors' alone and do not necessarily reflect the  
views of The Rockford Institute or of its directors.  
Unsolicited manuscripts cannot be returned  
unless accompanied by a self-addressed stamped  
envelope.

**Chronicles**  
A MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN CULTURE

Vol. 28, No. 4 April 2004  
Printed in the United States of America

## POLEMICS & EXCHANGES

### On Soros

In "George Soros, Postmodern Villain" (*Views*, February), Srdja Trifkovic certainly offered an extensive, if somewhat random, account of activities undertaken by organizations affiliated with Soros. However, with all of the facts laid out, I cannot decide whether they amount to Soros' attempts "to destroy the remaining bastions of the family, sovereign nationhood, and Christian Faith" or his pursuit of what he believes will liberalize and democratize the societies of Eastern Europe. As an Eastern European, I would gladly pursue many of the policies mentioned in the article.

Also, I believe that the public debate about whether financial arbitrage is "invariably detrimental" has long ended. Financial "gamblers" such as Soros look to capitalize on market inefficiencies and exploit bad government policies—hardly "invariably detrimental" activities.

—Nemanja Mijic  
Boston, MA

### Dr. Trifkovic Replies:

If Mr. Mijic "would gladly pursue many of the policies mentioned in the article"—including the promotion of abortion in demographically moribund societies, relentless "gay" propaganda, the legalization of hard drugs, the imposition of Sharpstonite "affirmative action" for allegedly disadvantaged groups, the liquidation of traditional education in favor of its postmodern substitutes, and all that administered by the corrupt heirs of a deracinated Party *nomenklatura* of yore—he is reading the wrong magazine.

I did not lay out anywhere near "all of the facts" in the article, which provided a mere sampler from Mr. Soros' rich smorgasbord, and so I gladly take this opportunity to add just one more fact. In 1994, Mr. Soros—a militant atheist—launched his Project Death in America (PDIA) and provided \$15 million for its initial funding. PDIA supports physician-assisted suicide. (Soros' mother, a member of the pro-suicide Hemlock Society, killed herself, and Soros mentions unsympathetically that his languishing father clung to

life for far too long.) It works to create a network of doctors that will "reach into one-fourth of America's hospitals" and, in a turn of phrase chillingly worthy of Orwell, lead to "the creation of innovative models of care and the development of new curricula on dying."

I agree with Mr. Mijic that "financial arbitrage" is not necessarily detrimental, but he is wrong to suggest that Mr. Soros capitalizes on existing market inefficiencies and exploits "bad government policies." In the Third World, Soros artificially engineers "inefficiencies" to his profit and everyone else's grief. He typically begins by buying stocks in the local market and creating momentum. When small investors follow and push the paper values up, he cashes in, cuts and runs, and, in his wake, leaves a collapsed local market, ruined lives, and, often, political instability. Far from promoting free enterprise, he is targeting newly opened, fragile financial markets—Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Mexico—insufficiently seasoned in dealing with foreign investors, especially those with megafunds like his Quantum. His specialty is speculative investments that take advantage of the economic shifts he artificially induces.

In a *New Yorker* profile in 1995, Mr. Soros reflected on the parallels between himself and the God of the Old Testament and said that, as a child, he thought of himself as superhuman. Six decades later, this philanthropist-from-Hell apparently no longer merely thinks so. His yearning for man's God-like "freedom" is a psychosis that cannot stop short of the freedom to choose death over life. The sooner he makes that very personal choice, the better for the rest of us.

### On Trusting the GOP

I am pleased that Stephen Moore's Club for Growth Advocacy fought valiantly on the House floor last November against the abomination that was President Bush's Medicare prescription-drug bill—which has now become law, adding another \$395 billion to the mushrooming federal debt. (See "Night Moves," *Vital Signs*, February.) Likewise, Mr. Moore should be commended by all fiscal conservatives for acknowledging just how incorrigibly

profligate this Republican President and Congress are and how little the Karl Rove political operation values the independent judgment of legislators. The thugish floor managers for “Bush 43” doubtless feel no shame for their actions. Yet, I must sincerely ask Mr. Moore why he is unashamed to remain within the GOP. Why not break completely with this crowd? If not even 20 percent of Republican members in either the House or Senate were willing to oppose this reckless measure, then what is the value in having a Republican Party in the first place?

Defending the “heroes” of the drug-bill fight against primary challenges instigated by the White House, while laudable, is insufficient. Far better would be a strategy of running third-party challengers this November against the roughly 200 socialist Republicans who covered before the LBJ Republican residing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

—James Moses  
New York, NY

## Mr. Moore Replies:

James Moses asks: Why stay in the GOP in the wake of the GOP sellout on Medicare? My answer is that we need to try to rebuild the Republican Party rather than abandon it. We need to take on the Republican establishment when appropriate and find good primary challengers to liberal Republicans. The Republicans can be counted on to do the right thing when every other option has been exhausted. This is the party of Reagan, and we need to keep it focused on smaller government, lower taxes, and more personal responsibility. The alternative—the big-government Democrats—is unthinkable.

## On The Unsleeping Eye

There is no current American commentator from whom I would rather receive praise—and rebukes—than Philip Jenkins. I am therefore very glad that, in his review (“A Week of Thursdays,” February) he found readable my book *The Unsleeping Eye*, which, of course, was written well before I (or anyone else) could benefit from his own book *Images of Terror*. His evocation of Chesterton, in particular, is a point exceptionally well made.

Certainly a congenital believer, like myself, in Original Sin would not purport to be “the deepest-dyed libertarian,” so I hope I can reassure Dr. Jenkins on that score. My own convictions, for what they may be worth, are: First, Al Qaeda or no Al Qaeda, we are probably stuck with secret policing for as long as we have recognizably discrete nation-states, and maybe longer. Second, America was lucky to have J. Edgar Hoover around for so long, whatever regrettable abuses he committed at times, notably when his powers of judgment declined during his old age. And third, had the FBI not been comprehensively demoralized in the quarter-century after Hoover’s death—not only by nurturing the poisonous likes of Robert Hanssen—the catastrophe of September 11 either would not have occurred at all or would have been far less appalling in its effects.

—R.J. Stove  
Melbourne, Australia

## Dr. Jenkins Replies:

I sincerely apologize if I misrepresented Mr. Stove’s point of view. May I take this second chance to praise his excellent and thoughtful book?

## On Modern Evangelicalism

Having read Aaron D. Wolf’s piece on the late Carl F.H. Henry (*Cultural Revolutions*, February), I wonder: Isn’t it self-evident that, if a Christian remains separated amidst an increasingly depraved culture, he eventually becomes “extremely separated”? You call it fundamentalism; I call it biblical. When Paul reasoned with the philosophers in Athens, he did not intellectualize the Word of God.

I agree with *Chronicles’* assessment of our culture. I disagree, however, with the neo-evangelicals’ proposed “engagement” of it. Intellectually defending Christianity does not accomplish much of anything. We see where it has led—to such plain, outright worldliness in the Church that it is hard to tell the Christians from the pagans.

The purpose of the Church is not to guard against apostasy nor to foster unity but to advance the spiritual growth of the saints (see Ephesians 4). The reason She has failed in the first two is that She

has failed in the third. Intellectualizing has exacerbated the problem.

The problem is, and always has been, sin. If the heathen don’t get it about sin, they won’t get it if you intellectualize the Word of God, either.

I agree with Dr. Henry that many theologians need to be evangelized; most are unbelievers. Unfortunately, those who do not need saving need pastoring. I recommend that these “neo-evangelicals” perform the complex calculation of addition by subtraction: They should stop reading their own stupid and vainglorious treatises in order that they might actually understand the Word of God.

—Gary Manske  
Deep River, IA

## Mr. Wolf Replies:

Mr. Manske makes several good points, and his criticism that evangelicalism has failed to “engage” the (dying) culture is writ large on the “stages” of its megachurches every Sunday morning (or Saturday night). A healthy degree of separation, for which fundamentalism continues to stand, was key to the survival of the broad evangelical movement as well as that of ethnic Catholics, Scottish Presbyterians, and German Lutherans.

Part of the Church’s mission to build up the Bride of Christ involves taking the Gospel to unbelievers, however, and there is the rub. In the late 1940’s, Dr. Henry and his colleagues were right to assert that fundamentalism was so intensely focused on standards of moral purity that it didn’t take into account that those who are yet to be evangelized are still enslaved to sin. Unfortunately, they also advocated a leftist agenda in response to the problems of race, poverty, and “the liquor traffic” that, instead of winning an audience for the Gospel, only fostered sympathy for the Social Gospel, a confusion of the Kingdoms, and a thirst for centralized government among their heirs.

## On the Cover

Regarding the novel photographic cover of your February issue: It is highly ugly. Boo! Hiss! I hope you return to original art in the future.

—Mark Kennedy  
New Orleans, LA

# Presidential Campaign Should Change the Trade Debate

While the antiwar rhetoric that fueled the early days of the Democratic presidential primaries has not gone away, attacks on President Bush's dismal record of net job losses have now taken precedence.

Unfortunately, Rep. Dick Gephardt, the first to drop out of the race, was the only Democratic candidate with a record of opposing the "free trade" ideology, which is most responsible for the loss of 2.7 million manufacturing jobs in the United States and 300,000 "outsourced" service jobs since the 1997 global financial crisis. Frontrunner John Kerry, however, has voted for every bad trade agreement of the last decade, including NAFTA (1993), the creation of the WTO (1994), establishing permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with China (2000), and the granting of "fast track" negotiating authority to President Bush (2002).

North Carolina Sen. John Edwards was better positioned to take on trade policy, since imports and the movement of factories overseas have devastated the southeastern states as much as they have the Midwest. Edwards, however, had also backed open trade with China and "fast track" for Bush.

Both Edwards and Kerry supported the alternative to the Foreign Sales Corporation (FSC) tax break for exporters offered by Reps. Phil Crane (R-IL) and Charles Rangel (D-NY), which would have given a ten-percent tax break to domestic manufacturing. Neither candidate, however, offered any rebuke to the WTO for declaring America's duly enacted FSC legislation "illegal" or to the European Union for imposing sanctions on American exports under WTO auspices.

Both Kerry and Edwards have criticized China's currency manipulation and failure to keep promises she made before the PNTR vote to open her market. However, as of this writing, neither is a cosponsor of S. 1586, a bill that would impose countervailing duties on Chinese goods to offset Beijing's undervalued currency. S. 1586 has a dozen cosponsors, including Sens. Elizabeth Dole (R-NC) and Hillary Clinton (D-NY), which makes it the first major initiative that has garnered bipartisan mainstream support for the levying of tariffs.

Kerry has claimed that he "will fight to restore the jobs lost under Bush in the first 500 days of his administration." He proposes to create jobs by offering a new manufacturing-jobs credit, investing in new energy-efficient industries, increasing research and development, giving tax incentives to help industries upgrade, and training workers for new opportunities. One of his more interesting ideas is to encourage students in high-tech fields to work in manufacturing by repaying a portion of their student loans. He would also reduce the costs of health insurance and pensions to employers, which are financial barriers to adding full-time positions.

Kerry's program is clearly not enough to counteract the massive advantages that firms receive in other countries from poverty-level wages, lax safety and environmental regulations, government subsidies, and protected home markets. However, his emphasis on making U.S.-based firms more competitive opens the door to a fundamental shift in the terms of the debate. Though billed as an effort to put American firms on a "level playing field," its success depends on giving such firms an advantage. Only then can they win the trade battle and keep (even bring back) production capacity and commercial jobs. It is decidedly not "free trade" with its trust in the not-so-invisible hand of corporate planners and indifference to the "market" outcomes they contrive.

The Bush administration has shown signs that it, too, understands the difference. The negative reaction to Bush economic advisor Gregory Mankiw's claim that the outsourcing of jobs is just another aspect of "free trade" that has to be accepted seems to have set off alarm bells in the White House. A passive attitude on trade makes the President look weak and uncaring—attributes that defeated his father in 1992.

About a third of the voters in the Super Tuesday states said that the economy and jobs were the top issues in the election, far outpacing healthcare, taxes, and the war in Iraq. According to exit polls conducted for the Associated Press, about six in ten voters said they believed foreign trade was likely to take jobs away from their states, compared with only two in ten who said

that trade would add jobs. These opinions were remarkably similar across the country, with 72 percent in Ohio, 60 percent in Connecticut, and 65 percent in Georgia saying trade costs jobs.

Secretary of Commerce Don Evans has been touting the administration's plan to revive U.S. manufacturing by making it more competitive. Though he refers to the "level playing field" too often, he does express some concern for countering "unfair" foreign practices. Yet, unless some tangible progress is made, the administration is in big trouble. "Fair trade"—or "free trade"—is not enough to guarantee results. What is needed is *advantageous trade*.

In January, the Commerce Department issued its "comprehensive strategy to address the challenges to U.S. manufacturing." The plan included many of the same themes Kerry has been using: reducing the burdens placed on American firms by regulations, litigation, taxes, healthcare, and expensive energy while promoting innovation, protecting intellectual-property rights, and increasing the role of government in research and development. The plan also called for a new assistant secretary of commerce for manufacturing and services, a President's Manufacturing Council, and an Office of Industry Analysis, which could form the core of a strategic economic general staff for the international commercial battle.

The Clinton administration once proposed such a role for the National Economic Council but failed to follow through. The result has been a tripling of the trade deficit since 1997 and the loss of American jobs in fields targeted by foreign rivals.

Transnational corporations and foreign interests will lobby hard to prevent any policy changes that would curtail their further expansion into U.S. markets. In an election year, however, the American people have a chance to trump them at the polls. The most affluent and accessible market for U.S. industry is at home, where \$1.3 trillion is annually lost to overseas production. Public pressure could force Bush and Kerry to bid up what they would do to give a home-field advantage to American firms and workers. Such a contest would make this the most important election in a generation.