

**RUSSIA'S PARLIAMENTARY** elections, held December 7, produced a wave of alarmed reactions in the Western press that betray the ignorance and hypocrisy of Western elite thinking regarding Russia and the West's—particularly Washington's—relations with Moscow.

The Kremlin-backed United Russia party carried the day, winning nearly 38 percent of the vote, while other Kremlin-backed—or created—parties (the Liberal Democratic Party of “ultranationalist” Vladimir Zhirinovsky and the “left nationalist” Rodina bloc) took another 20 percent. The Communists (KPRF), who had made the grave error of accepting financing from imprisoned oligarch Mikhail Khodorkovsky, and the two pro-Western “liberal” parties—Yabloko and the Union of Right Forces (SPS), which had also defended “Khodor” (whose Yukos oil firm is under attack by the general prosecutor's office)—were undermined by their own incompetent campaigns as well as the authorities' skillful use of “administrative resources” (including, probably, election fraud) to ensure the desired election results. The KPRF received about 13 percent of the vote, while neither Yabloko nor SPS crossed the five-percent threshold for representation in the Russian parliament.

The *Washington Post* whined that Vladimir Putin's Kremlin was undermining the progress Boris Yeltsin had supposedly made in moving Russia toward “Western norms and human rights.” Putin, it seems, was intent on “suppressing” a “more liberal and democratic” Russia that the *Post* thinks existed under Yeltsin. The United States, according to the *Post*, should support programs designed to “foster . . . an independent civil society and free media” in Russia. Others claimed the election results showed the triumph of authoritarian “Putinism” in the Land of the Firebird: Pentagon advisor Richard Perle and Republican Sen. John McCain, among others, have called for Russia to be kicked out of the Group of Eight in view of what McCain called a “creeping coup” against democracy and “market capitalism” in Russia (a reference to Khodorkovsky's arrest). Most critics were also alarmed by the successful exploitation of nationalist themes during the campaign.

The election results were, indeed, a

triumph for what Russians have called “managed democracy.” It is also true, however, that Kremlin “political technologists” began cooking up a plan for managing what passed for democracy under Yeltsin, a period that saw a legally elected parliament shelled into submission by “Czar Boris” in 1993. As Yeltsin's retirement approached in the late 90's, the “family,” Yeltsin's entourage, began testing plans for staging a “controlled reaction” that would harness and channel the country's yearning for order as well as the growing nationalist mood in ways that would stabilize the postcommunist system (“the oligarchy”) and guarantee the safety of key family members. Following the success of populist retired Gen. Aleksandr Lebed in the 1996 elections (he won 15 percent of the vote, siphoning voters away from Yeltsin's KPRF rival), the family began a search for a reliable Yeltsin successor in the military and security agencies; Yeltsin stressed “patriotic” themes, especially in foreign policy; and the Kremlin made plans to manipulate the anti-oligarch mood.

These plans were fulfilled when ex-KGB officer Putin, whom Yeltsin appointed prime minister in 1999, was elected president in 2000. Thereafter, the Kremlin backed legislation protecting Yeltsin and his relatives. Eventually, particularly obnoxious oligarchs Vladimir Gusinsky and Boris Berezovsky, who had fallen out with the family, were driven from Russia, and their assets were largely redistributed to more reliable Kremlin partners. Both moves proved wildly popular with the Russian public and helped bolster Putin's poll numbers. The “controlled reaction” scenario had worked like a charm—which is why the Kremlin made use of it again during the recent campaign, with Khodorkovsky serving as the oligarch victim and the Kremlin-backed parties adopting an anti-oligarch campaign line.

Thus, it is more correct to say that the recent elections signal the triumph of Yeltsinism rather than that of Putinism. And the West has again shown its penchant for hypocrisy and utter ignorance of foreign cultures. While Yeltsin was making the right “democratic” noises and literally blasting the “red-brown” coalition of Communists and nationalists who opposed his “shock therapy” economic pro-

gram—even as Western, especially U.S., “consultants” and Yeltsin's cronies lined their pockets—the usual Western media suspects were singing his praises. Sensible alternatives to Yeltsinism offered by patriotic Russians were ignored. Had those alternative programs—more gradualist in nature and more in keeping with Russian sensibilities—been implemented, Russia may not have been a democracy or a model of free-market economics in the West's eyes, but she might have been a better place.

In a note appearing recently on *Johnson's Russia List* ([www.cdi.org/russia/johnson](http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson)), Sharon Tennison, who has conducted research on Russian voter preferences, had some commonsense advice for Western elites: “It's both arrogant and dangerous for the West to stand back and continually cast stones . . . at Russia . . . We can't change them. Our taunts can only belittle, irritate and distance them . . . It's too dangerous to go there again. We need to stop it now, in the early stages, and find more constructive ways to deal with the reality that exists.” If such advice had been heeded in the 1990's, Russia, and Russia-U.S. relations, might be better off.

—Wayne Allensworth

**THE STEEL TARIFF** may become a major issue in this year's presidential campaign, placing Howard Dean in the odd position (for a Democratic candidate, at least) of attacking President Bush for caving in to a decision of an international body—in this case, the World Trade Organization. But then, over its 21-month life, this tariff has made for some rather strange bedfellows.

For instance, many libertarians—not usually fans of the WTO, which they generally regard as restricting free trade rather than facilitating it—applauded the trade agency's action, even though it trampled on U.S. sovereignty by striking down a constitutionally enacted tax. The Constitution is a document to be revered—except, it seems, when it allows things that violate libertarian principles.

The protectionist right, of course, took the opposite view, praising Bush when he imposed the tariff on European, Asian, and South American steel in March 2002 and damning the administration for back-

ing down in December in the wake of threats by the European Union to impose retaliatory sanctions on American products if Bush chose not to abide by the WTO's decision. While right on the sovereignty question—the very fact that an international agency demanded the tariff be removed was almost reason enough to retain it—these commentators are as dogmatic as the libertarians, endorsing protectionism on principle without considering the consequences of any particular tariff in the light of the national interest.

In this case, those consequences have been nearly disastrous for the small manufacturers of America, upon whom—for a little while longer, at least, until the libertarians have their way—the U.S. economy still rests.

Back in the 1980's, when Ronald Reagan imposed tariffs on steel from Asian countries that were dumping below cost into the American market, U.S. firms still produced most of the steel necessary to meet domestic demand. With the Cold War still raging, the tariffs served not only the interests of the American economy but of national security. Today, the national-security interests are no less great, but, in the wake of the Bush I-Clinton-Bush II NAFTA-GATT free-trade push, domestic manufacturers no longer come close to meeting the demands of U.S. businesses for steel. Small manufacturers, such as those struggling to survive here in Rockford, have been forced to rely on imported steel—not to lower the costs of production but simply to meet demand. It is not an exaggeration to say that no small business owner here in Rockford would choose to import steel if he could rely on domestic steel instead, even at a slightly higher price. Unlike the CEO's of multinational corporations, who can't see beyond the next quarterly profit and loss statement, or politicians, who are simply focused on the next election, most owners of small manufacturing firms understand that the health of the American economy—and the health of their local economies—depends upon a certain degree of self-sufficiency. The domestic supply, however, simply isn't enough. Thus, the Bush tariff has increased their companies' costs and decreased their ability to compete—not just in the “global marketplace” but in the domestic market.

It didn't have to be that way. Unlike previous tariffs, which imposed surcharges on both raw materials and finished

products made from those materials, the Bush tariff—the result of intense lobbying by large, politically connected steel corporations, not small manufacturing concerns—left the price of finished products untouched. Thus, companies such as Rockford Acromatic—a producer of after-market automobile parts—found that Chinese companies could often export finished goods to the United States more cheaply than U.S. companies could purchase imported steel to make competing products. The result has been accelerated job losses and factory closings here in the industrial Midwest over the past 21 months.

President Bush's political advisors had clearly hoped that the tariff would shore up electoral support in Rust Belt states this November. In one final irony, however, the WTO may actually have done Bush a favor by providing him an easy way out of this disastrous policy. While the Republicans may lose some campaign contributions from Big Steel, Bush may regain the support of traditionally Republican small manufacturers and their employees, some of whom had begun to look for another standard-bearer.

—Scott P. Richert

**CARL F.H. HENRY, R.I.P.** The greatest intellectual leader of the evangelical movement of the 20th century quietly passed away in his sleep at a retirement home in Watertown, Wisconsin, on December 7, at the age of 90. A scholar with the heart of an evangelist, Dr. Henry represented all of the strengths of the new evangelicalism, while exhibiting few of its flaws.

Often called “the thinking man's Billy Graham,” Dr. Henry, along with Harold Ockenga and Graham (his friend from Wheaton College), was one of the architects of the neo-evangelical movement of the 1940's. The three concluded that fundamentalism had become too sectarian and anti-intellectual to be able to speak the truth of the Gospel to the neopagan culture that had emerged in the United States following World War II.

Ockenga coined the term *neo-evangelicals* to describe Protestants who remained committed to the fundamentals of Protestant Christianity but repudiated the cultural isolationism of the fundamentalists. Using the platform of the mass “crusade”—and, later, the powerful medium of television—Billy Graham quickly became the movement's figure-

head. Dr. Henry, however, was its chief intellectual force, writing *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (1947), in which he called for a repudiation of extreme separatism among those who cherish the Gospel.

This was not a mere call to niceness, however. Fundamentalism, charged Henry, was bereft of a cogent theology and intellectually unprepared to do battle with the forces of modernity. Holing up in Bible colleges and engaging in increasingly vituperative polemics over relatively less significant doctrinal matters had stultified fundamentalists' witness before a watching world. Furthermore, he argued, their dispensational theology (which held, among other things, that, in these, the “last days,” the Church's primary mission was to guard against apostasy, not to seek unity) not only fostered fundamentalists' separatist mentality but prohibited them from engaging in any meaningful social action. This “Christ against culture” mentality (as H. Richard Niebuhr would later term it), in turn, helped to engender hostility toward the Gospel, contributing to the rapid decay of Western civilization on these shores and fulfilling the fundamentalists' own prophecy of latter-day chaos. The neo-evangelicals, Henry recalled in a 1996 interview with *Christianity Today*, needed to bear “the costly burden of creating an evangelical scholarship in a world that's in rebellion.”

Dr. Henry's life was devoted to just that. Chief among his enterprises was the production of his six-volume *God, Revelation, and Authority*, in which he painstakingly outlined all of the challenges toward biblical inerrancy and authority set forth by liberal and neo-orthodox theologians—and refuted them. Unlike the fundamentalists, who advocated the barest knowledge of Barth or Tillich, Dr. Henry insisted on intimate knowledge of the spectrum of modernist theology in order that, by contrast, the propositional claims of historic Christianity might be shown to be rational and sound.

Henry aided Ockenga in the founding of Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California, as a place for inculcating in young evangelical seminarians a deep knowledge of biblical theology. At Graham's request, he left his post at Fuller to serve as the founding editor of *Christianity Today*, which became the standard-bearer for the new evangelicalism and provided an alternative to the liberal *Christian Century*. After leaving CT in 1968, he continued to write, lecture,

and preach the Gospel, teaching courses at Fuller, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and Gordon-Conwell.

Dr. Henry's erudition and wit were perhaps best illustrated at a program honoring Karl Barth. When Dr. Henry publicly introduced himself as the editor of *Christianity Today*, Barth cracked, "*Christianity Today*, or *Christianity Yesterday*?" Henry replied, "Yesterday, today, and forever."

Sadly, Dr. Henry lived to see evangelicalism develop its own uneasy conscience, as it moved from engaging the dying American culture to embracing it. Essentially a pandenominational movement, evangelicalism has struggled to establish sturdy theological moorings and, even now, cannot decide whether to allow the advocates of the new "openness theology" within its ranks. (Last October, the Evangelical Theological Society voted—though not without protest—to allow Clark Pinnock, who teaches that God cannot know the future and is bound, to some extent, by the constraints of time, to retain membership.) And some of the seminaries in which Dr. Henry invested so much of his life have become theological smorgasbords offering everything from Greek grammar to the slick marketing techniques of Bill Hybels and Rick Warren's *Purpose Driven Church*.

The day before Dr. Henry died, Fuller Theological Seminary was featured in the *Los Angeles Times* because of its new project, funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, to promote mutual understanding with Muslims, which includes restrictions on making "offensive statements" about Islam and prohibits anyone working on the project from proselytizing the followers of Muhammad. According to the *Times*, "the project proposes . . . to convene two national conferences of Christian and Muslim scholars to develop parallel peacemaking practices based on the Koran and other Islamic sources." Sometimes, as Dr. Henry said decades ago, "it is the theologians who need to be evangelized."

—Aaron D. Wolf

## EPICYCLES:

- Whose Pedophilia?: **Michael Jackson**, the Gloved One, who lives at a ranch called Neverland, calls himself the King of Pop, claims he has a disease that is making him white (to match the face that plastic surgeons created for him), and once suffered severe burns when his

heavily oiled hair burst into flames, continues to dominate the headlines. Now, Mr. Jackson, 45, has been charged with seven counts of child molestation by a boy who appeared alongside him in a 2003 television special. Jackson has beat such charges before, claiming, as he is now, that the alleged victim is simply trying to extort money from him. He is not exactly a hard target, considering he continues to call his practice of "sharing his bed" (in a "nonsexual way") with children (not his own) a "beautiful, very loving thing."

The charges against Jackson do not amount to what we might call full sodomy but allege that Jackson engaged in inappropriate touching of the boy after plying him with wine and performed lewd acts in the boy's presence on several occasions. As his behavior and appearance have become more and more bizarre over the last decade, the King of Pop's fan base has steadily decreased (though he continues to sell records in the hundreds of thousands), so it is not surprising that many in the court of public opinion are inclined to believe that he is guilty. Still, Johnnie Cochran, one of Jackson's legal advisors, may wish to send yet another message to yet another oppressive white police force, as he did during the O.J. "still looking for the real killer" Simpson trial. Only time will tell if, before the verdict is read, members of the jury will flash the Black Power fist to Jackson as they did before The Juice.

All things considered, charges against Jackson are no surprise. What is interesting, however, is the American public's reaction. This is the same public that made an international celebrity of a man whose signature move and all-but-patented trademark is to grab his crotch while gyrating and thrusting onstage. And way back in 1984, when Jackson was first rocketing to superstardom with *Thriller*, his lyrics were full of both sexual innuendo and overt sexual references ("in the night / hit the lovin' spot / I'll give you all that I've got"). The American public has not

only approved this androgynous character but bought millions and millions of his records for their own children, allowing them to be part of the screaming throng of worshipers that greets him at airports and hotels. Sure, they might grimace at the reading of the current charges against him, but who bought all of those concert tickets for their children to watch a man touch himself, while singing that "the kid is not my son," though his mother and I did "dance on the floor"? Isn't exposing children to pornography an act of pedophilia?

**OBITER DICTA:** We receive many fine letters to the editor, some of which are responses to our writers' replies in *Polemics & Exchanges*. According to our editorial policy, we do not run these in the magazine. However, we are creating a new section on **ChroniclesMagazine.org** devoted to *Polemics & Exchanges*, which will allow you to respond to replies to letters to the editor, allowing for further dialogue and debate. Check out the website today and register your opinion.

Our poet this month is **B.R. Strahan**, who teaches poetry at Georgetown University. The publisher of *Visions-International*, Mr. Strahan has had over 500 poems published in such journals as *America*, *Christian Century*, *Cross Currents*, the *Seattle Review*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, *First Things*, and the *Hollins Critic*. His latest book, *The Conjuror's Gallery*, was released in 2001 by Crosscultural Communications.

Our interior art is provided by our art director, **H. Ward Sterett** of Roscoe, Illinois. Mr. Sterett received his B.F.A. from the University of Colorado and his M.F.A. from Northern Illinois University, and he attended the L'Abri Fellowship, where he studied the effect of Christianity on art. He currently works as a sculptor, painter, and printmaker in Roscoe.

Our cover photo was graciously provided by the Open Society Institute.

Become a correspondence student of the TRI Academy!

## The History and Literature of the Ancient World

Audiotapes: \$200.00 per semester; \$375.00 per year

CD's: \$225.00 per semester; \$425.00 per year

For more information, call Jan Kooistra at (815) 964-5811.



## Charity Begins at Church

December can be a difficult month for American Christians, forced to look on passively as their sacred holy days are turned into a generic “holiday season.” The First Sunday in Advent has been replaced by “Black Friday,” the day on which retailers begin to turn a profit on holiday sales; and the end of the season (formerly St. Stephen’s Day, the Second Day of Christmas) is now “Returns Day,” when consumers swap presents given in love for what they really want.

Everywhere we turn, during Happy Holidays, we are battered by aggressive pitchmen dressed up like Santa and ringing bells for charities other than our churches or showing pictures of starving African children who are being rescued by OXFAM or Save the Children or the even less credible charities whose main effect has been to make matters worse in Third World countries while providing handsome incomes for the global bell-ringers who run them. (Some of the scams were well documented in Graham Hancock’s *Lords of Poverty*.)

Quite apart from the money they waste and the mischief they work upon the world’s poor, nongovernmental organizations (NGO’s) are an international political force that usurps some of the functions of government. They have also been, since at least the days of the Spanish Civil War, political in the more trivial sense of partisan. NGO’s, including those that claim to be Christian, are predominantly leftist and have lavished their charity on, for example, the Spanish Communists and anarchists who murdered priests and raped nuns, while denying aid to their victims. During the Bosnian-Krajina conflict, the Red Cross outdid itself in giving one-sided help to the Muslims, while virtually ignoring the Christian Croats and Serbs.

The political activities of NGO’s are only one symptom of a deeper malaise afflicting Western nations over the past several years: the subversion of the state. The internal forces undermining the state and diminishing the effectiveness of its government are many: There are ethnic *revanchiste* groups demanding that American institutions accommodate themselves to the culture and his-

tory of Mexicans and Africans, Muslims and Jews, and, in the extreme case, actual surrender of substantial amounts of territory; there are sexual and erotic minorities demanding recognition for the right of women to play football, “marry” other women, and have “gender”-neutral bathrooms in public buildings—it’s *so hard to make up one’s mind*, they say. The rainbow coalition of the exotic and perverse plays a minor role, however, compared with the lobbying activities of big money, big labor, and the thousand-and-one other causes whose bribes have blocked the arteries of congressional reform for decades.

Of the foreign threats, the most obvious is the vast network of international agencies that forms a quasiglobal government, from the World Bank, IMF, and WTO to the Hague Tribunal and the labyrinth of U.N. offices monitoring the endless treaties and agreements signed by politicians who are always eager to give away the American store if there is something in it for themselves. There are also hundreds of pressure groups and misnamed charities, however, that lobby the United Nations and disrupt the economic and moral lives of people around the globe. The most infamous, perhaps, is George Soros’ Open Society Foundation, which is dedicated to the eradication of the last vestiges of Christian Faith and morals on the planet.

The nation-state, for all its flaws and despite the many evils done in its name, is an instrument for human good that is worth defending. It is, however, only an instrument, not the good itself, and an imperfect one at that. The state exists, in one important sense, to divert male aggression into socially useful channels, turning schoolyard bullies into warriors and the irritating classroom debater into a statesman. Essentially male, the state has never done a good job of taking care of the sick and the poor or of educating children. Yes, when ambitious men turn their hands to these matters, they appear to make brilliant progress at first—setting up agencies, accomplishing goals, projecting five-year plans—but, in the end, the welfare and education of citizens become subordinate to the inter-

ests of ambitious men. This is one of the reasons why most of the tax dollars spent on health, education, and welfare ends up in the pockets of the middle-class bureaucrats and politicians who govern and manage the system.

It was a delusion of classical liberals that a society could function by relying on the laws of the free market and individual competition. Along the way, they eliminated the sense of *noblesse oblige* that induced traditional aristocracies to accept responsibility for the poor, and they devastated the Church, which had, for many centuries, played a central role in regulating morality, caring for the poor and the sick, and educating children. When liberalism died, sometime before World War I, no one thought of looking back across the ruins of the 18th and 19th centuries for some clues as to how to remedy the destruction. Instead, the reformers turned inevitably to Marx, whose followers (Lenin and Stalin, Franklin Roosevelt and the Kennedys) completed the social destruction begun by the liberals.

The only resistance came from the defeated liberals who proclaimed (in the words of Albert J. Nock) “Our enemy, the state”; the enemy, however, has never been the state *per se* but the modern Jacobin-Marxist state. Economic freedom and social responsibility are not, in reality, incompatible: They are the indispensable poles of any human social order. Today, unfortunately, as the state continues to arrogate more and more of the social authority it cannot justly or effectively manage, it is surrendering some of the very responsibilities that justify its existence: the defense of the country; the conduct of foreign policy; the regulation of markets in the interest of fair competition and the national interest.

Economic regulation is increasingly put in the hands of international agencies, and what is left is controlled by the pawns of multinational interests whose relationship to the American people is that of parasite to host. Even worse, control over our foreign and defense policies has been captured by special ethnic and economic interests. Big Oil is pushing for the conquest of the Caspian Sea basin; domestic big business wants to pun-