

## LETTERS

Senator Robert W. Kasten, Jr., John C. Whitehead,  
Robert F. Burford, William R. Hawkins,  
Lee Congdon, Bill Kauffman, Peter Cachion,  
Frederick C. Thayer, Frederick N. Andre

### Freedom's Global Surge

Dear Sir:

Alvin Rabushka's "Great Leap Forward" (Summer 1987) provides several exciting examples of the power of free market/limited government ideas in spurring economic growth, creating economic opportunity, and raising the standard of living in the Third World.

Statism is on the retreat. However, the battle is far from over. Now, more than ever, it is time for us to roll up our sleeves and actively promote free market/limited government, not only in the Third World, but in the Industrialized World, because it is in our direct economic interest.

As the world economy has become more integrated, the United States, like all other nations, has lost some control over its domestic economy. The growing importance of trade and the tight linkage of international monetary policies means no country can sustain economic growth without a strong world economy. Economic growth in other nations helps determine rates of economic growth, employment, and living standards in the United States.

As Rabushka points out, higher economic growth in other countries can only occur with strong property rights, deregulation, and monetary stabilization, reduced government expenditures, and, above all, reduced marginal tax rates.

How can the U.S. government directly and/or indirectly encourage free-market capitalism in the rest of

the world? First of all, Congress must continue to insist that further loans by international lending institutions to Third World countries be tied to the adoption of growth-oriented policies. As the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, which determines U.S. funding levels for several international lending institutions, I sought to change the economically disastrous conditionality agreements by which these institutions tied further assistance. As Rabushka points out, the lending community has begun to shift its emphasis from state-directed and state-controlled development policies to growth-oriented policies.

Second, the administration must take a more active role in promoting world economic growth. Treasury Secretary James Baker has taken large strides in moving the Treasury Department in this direction. But Treasury could—and should—do much more. Treasury should encourage countries to adopt supply-side tax reforms by aggressively making the intellectual case for lower marginal tax rates on individual efforts and enterprise. Treasury should also make the empirical case for the Laffer Curve because many Third World countries are mistakenly reluctant to cut tax rates for fear of losing tax revenues. And the State Department should put pro-growth economics at the forefront of U.S. foreign policy. Much of today's global unrest can be traced to economic causes.

Finally, the United States must

continue to lead by example. Unfortunately, the Democratic-controlled Congress wants to move the country in the opposite direction towards higher tax rates, higher public spending, sweeping protectionism, and increased intervention in the private sector with measures such as an increased minimum wage, plant closing legislation, and mandated benefits. Indeed, it is vitally important for conservatives to protect and consolidate the economic achievements under the Reagan administration.

Senator Robert W. Kasten, Jr.  
State of Wisconsin

Dear Sir:

As Mr. Rabushka observes, there is a welcome worldwide trend away from state-directed economies toward market-oriented ones. The leaders of many Third World countries have begun to recognize that market-oriented economies offer the best potential for stimulating long-term economic growth. Even the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe seem to be getting the message that an economy tightly controlled from the top simply doesn't work.

On the political side, we see an unprecedented spread of democracy and the rule of law—in South America, Central America, and in the Philippines. Political liberalization in Taiwan and South Korea also demonstrates that the real revolutionary idea around the world today is freedom.

Our economic and political system has been a beacon to the world. But, more importantly, our active

engagement abroad as a leading force for peace, progress, and human dignity, as well as our commitment in the post-World War II period to positive international leadership have helped to generate and nurture the twin revolutions of free-market economics and political liberty.

But the good news must be tempered by the bad. There are obstacles that could, if given full play, prevent America from enjoying the full fruits of these twin revolutions that we have so long encouraged. These obstacles are not exclusively erected by our adversaries; many come from within. They constitute, in effect, an inadvertent withdrawal precisely at the moment when we should be most actively engaged with a world moving toward our political and economic vision.

We must, for example, be mindful of what can happen if we allow protectionism to win out. The same urge to withdraw behind trade barriers that wrought havoc for America and the world during the 1920s is strong in our nation today. When we should be striving for a more competitive America in the world economy, many are counseling us to shun that challenge and to erect barricades against the very nations we have spent 40 years urging to engage in the free market system.

Moreover, in the name of fiscal responsibility, we are diminishing our ability to defend our global interests. We have endured three successive years of drastic cuts in that 2 percent of the total federal budget that supports all of our efforts to protect our security interests, to promote global economic prosperity, and to conduct the fight against terrorism and narcotics trafficking. In 1985, the foreign affairs budget was about \$23 billion; by 1986, it was down to about \$19 billion; and this year, it is about \$17.5 billion. Next year we face another substantial reduction of perhaps another billion dollars. Because of these reductions, we are being forced to disengage from a dynamic international role at the worst possible time.

America has a winning hand. There is a surge toward economic and political freedom in the world

that we have been nurturing for 40 years. We should not discard that hand because of ill-conceived notions of protectionism or the failure to devote adequate resources to our foreign affairs. The stakes are too high.

John C. Whitehead  
Deputy Secretary of State  
Washington, DC

## Chain Gang

Dear Sir:

John Baden's "Crimes Against Nature" (Winter 1987) conveyed several misleading messages regarding the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

Mr. Baden implies that BLM currently destroys a large percentage of the public lands through a procedure known as chaining, when in fact the practice is very limited. Today this range-clearing process is used only when it will improve the forage for all land users by adding ecological diversity. Other benefits include improved watershed stability and precipitation infiltration rates, and reduced soil erosion.

Areas chained are generally mono-cultures of pinyon/juniper rather than the diverse habitat described by Baden. Chaining does not remove all of the pinyon/juniper; some remain for aesthetic purposes and as cover and escape routes for wildlife. After chaining, the areas are seeded with a mixture of species that provide a diversity of forage for not just domestic livestock but for a variety of wildlife.

As for Baden's implication that these BLM operations "hurt many Native Americans" who gather pinyon pine nuts as a source of winter food, chaining is performed only in areas that are not significant Native American collection and archaeological sites. Likewise, only after detailed environmental and cost-benefit analyses have been completed does action proceed.

As to his final and quite preposterous charges that "BLM has no incentive to keep costs down, or even to maximize revenues from grazing

fees" and that "BLM builds its budget by winning political support from ranchers who then lobby for BLM expenditures," John Baden still has not grasped that BLM is a multiple-use agency, with livestock grazing being only one of many programs that we administer on public lands.

Robert F. Burford  
Director  
Bureau of Land Management  
Department of Interior  
Washington, DC

## Old Right Stuff

Dear Sir:

Paul Gottfried's "Toward a New Fusionism" (Fall 1987) was more than just a critique of the philosophical disputes within conservative circles. It was a record of Gresham's Law at work in a democracy. In economics, Gresham's Law states that "cheap money drives out dear"; applied to politics it means "simple ideas drive out intricate."

As campus "counterrevolutionaries" 20 years ago, my comrades and I confronted the same general issues as today: the welfare state, Communist expansion, and a collapsing moral order. But we read and took seriously not only the Old Conservative intellectuals, but the centuries of political thought and history they drew on. It was a full course. But today the broth that nourished the Right when it was a cadre, has been watered down to succor the masses. And a considerable amount of sugar has been added to increase its appeal. Empty calories.

Consider Gottfried's observation that conservatives now exhibit a "cynicism about the state" resulting in a new libertarian-populist fusion. There is nothing new about conservative cynicism about the trend of democracy. Thucydides predates Burke. But this alone does not explain a movement away from strong government. Libertarianism has gained because it is the most simplistic response to the welfare state. Blanket condemnation of government avoids the complicated task of drawing distinctions between good and bad policies; or even attempting

to define in a nihilistic era "good" and "bad" so that the first can be advanced and the second suppressed. It is easier to blast generic "bureaucrats" and transfer to the "invisible hand" the responsibility to think and act. But a nation in decline is surely doomed if its conservatives opt for anarchy rather than restoration.

The displacement of political theory by economics is a major cause of this problem. That Right and Left

then condemned by supply-siders!

Gottfried correctly asserts that "tolerance is in short supply" among conservatives. Simplistic ideas appeal to the emotions rather than the intellect. Thus debates are emotional rather than analytical, often heated and bitter. Meetings degenerate into name calling and conservative journals close their pages to "heretical" views. Specific policies, which are supposed to be means to an end, become the end themselves. Such in-

ists who are often shrill and always populist, or with neoconservatives who lobby for "global democracy" and a pared-down welfare state. In a "conservative" era, they are the forgotten men and women.

Perhaps because I am an Anglican, I favor a conservative coalition that is as inclusive as possible. After all, adherents of the New Right have spearheaded the opposition to abortion on demand and neoconservatives have done much not only to awaken Americans to the present international danger, but also to expose the sordid reality of the 1960s. And if most forms of socialism are anything but humane, the guild socialism of G. D. H. Cole and Karl Polanyi, the distributism of G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc, and the Southern agrarianism of Donald Davidson and Andrew Lytle serve at least to remind us that unbridled capitalism inflames appetites and, by making the market the ultimate arbiter in so many areas, promotes a vulgar and debasing mass culture. For his part, Gottfried points to liberalism's praiseworthy contributions, especially its critique of the managerial class and emphasis on the dignity of persons. Certainly a conservative vision of community must exclude any unity that would destroy that dignity.

But having affirmed my general support for a broadly based Right, I think nevertheless that old school conservatives would do well to speak less of "fusion" and more of "limited cooperation." Gottfried has warned repeatedly against *any* compromise with neoconservatives, but he knows, too, that liberals and libertarians also exhibit characteristics inimical to conservatism. They possess, for example, little sense of original sin, whether understood in theological or metaphorical terms; hence, they display excessive confidence in the virtue of unrestrained action. "The effect of liberty to individuals," Burke famously observed, "is that they may do what they please: We ought to see what it will please them to do, before we risk congratulations, which may be soon turned into complaints." A caveat should also be entered against the enthusiasm for sociobiology that, as

## When the inevitable downturn occurs, will conservatives be identified with any values that transcend the Dow Jones so that the public will remain loyal?

—William R. Hawkins

both stoop to buy votes is to be expected. The danger is that the Right has nothing else to offer. The Reagan administration has trumpeted the "opportunity society" and has floated on a wave of easy consumption financed by rising government spending, consumer debt, and trade deficits. But this national lifestyle cannot be sustained. Even without recent excesses, no one has discovered a way to repeal the business cycle. When the inevitable downturn occurs, will conservatives be identified with any values that transcend the Dow Jones so that the public will remain loyal?

And even within economics, the Right has opted for the most simplistic theory: supply-side economics. Cut personal taxes and everything will take care of itself. Propagated by journalists and politicians, it drove more substantial and versatile schools of conservative economic thought out of public view. The welfare state, stagnant productivity, a collapsing dollar, budget and trade deficits all proved beyond its scope. And despite myriad reforms, the tax burden has only been redistributed not reduced. The solid achievement of slowing inflation was accomplished by monetary policy—and

flexibility makes policy unrealistic in a dynamic world.

Conservatism by nature seeks a balance between freedom and order within a strong and prosperous nation-state. It must be able to shift its weight one way, then another depending on the threat. In a democracy, complex ideas have to be translated into simple slogans to win votes; but the mistake the Right has made in the 1980s has been to substitute slogans for thought. It has thus failed to use its power constructively.

William R. Hawkins  
The South Foundation  
U.S. Business and Industrial  
Council  
Knoxville, TN

Dear Sir:

While the estimable Paul Gottfried urges traditional conservatives to forge an alliance with libertarians, Dale Vree, editor of the *New Oxford Review* recommends that they make common cause with "humane socialists." Such proposals testify to the Old Right's current isolation. Largely dismissed by the media and ignored by funding organizations, its members have not had an easy time working with New Right-

Gottfried observes, some traditionalists now evince. However much neo-Darwinians such as Edward O. Wilson may infuriate leftists who think "male" and "female" are merely conventional designations, they blur the qualitative distinction between human beings and other members of the animal kingdom.

Without some sort of merger, traditional conservatives—among whom I count myself—may fail to secure a place for themselves in the sun, but a victory that concedes too much is not worth the winning. In the end, they must be content to be judged by the individual lives they touch and the historic witness they bear.

Lee Congdon  
Professor of History  
James Madison University  
Harrisonburg, VA

Dear Sir:

Paul Gottfried's superb essay on the traditionalist right was a welcome contrast to *Policy Review's* usual privatizing Amtrak anthologies.

Especially on-target was his exploration, with due caution, of an Old Right-libertarian political alliance. (Despite my affiliation, I'm less a libertarian than a Jeffersonian decentralist and lonely regionalist of beautiful and forgotten upper York State.)

Kirk's frequent "chirping sectaries" charge hits the mark if the libertarians consist only of the loony disciples of Ayn Rand and the panting slaves of conspicuous consumption and industrial/finance capitalism. I'd gladly give that strawman a hard right to the chin. But by defining libertarians so capriciously, Kirk excludes countless figures (even his old pal John Randolph) who, for many and varied reasons, believed that liberty was the highest political virtue.

A strictly political definition of "libertarian" ropes in an exciting, motley collection of folks whose political agenda neatly dovetails with that of the Old Conservatives. How about people like Edward Abbey, Dorothy Day, and Karl Hess on the decentralist libertarian left? And Vermonter John McClaughry and

*Chronicles* editor Thomas Fleming on the Tertium Quid right? A few members of the nascent Green movement are allies in the decentralist/voluntary communitarian quest as well, though I suppose patriarchy might be a stumbling block. (Or is there a Goddess faction at the Intercollegiate Studies Institute?)

My standard for judging alliances is "Would John Taylor of Caroline have felt comfortable with 'em?" and my guess is yes on the traditional right, yes on the libertarians, yes on agrarians and authentic rural populists (from Wendell Berry to Wayne Cryts of the AAM), and yes, even, on some of the Greens and hippies.

Mr. Gottfried's remarks about the neoconservatives were trenchant and much appreciated. Neoconservatives' dour, humorless proclamations ("An Open Letter to Milan Kundera," etc.) and failure to acknowledge pre-World War II America are bad enough. But the neocons' most pernicious act has been to shift the American Right's collective attention away from domestic reform and the preservation of society against the encroachments of the state and toward suicidal embrace of empire, a siren that must always be the enemy of regionalism, decentralism, family, community. I'd like to see the Kirk-Bradford Old Right renounce what the isolationists had the guts to call imperialism and reclaim the prudent, Robert Taftish approach to foreign policy that most Americans instinctively share.

Bill Kauffman  
Washington Editor  
*Reason*

### Alarmism on Defense

Dear Sir:

Representative Jim Courter has written a gravely flawed article ("The Gathering Storm," Fall 1987), rife with factual errors, exaggerations, unsupported assertions, all of which diminish grievously the force of his argument. In a time when sober, hardheaded analysis of security threats to our nation is needed as never before, those who hope to

promote a strong national defense—especially Republican congressmen!—must present as accurate and as measured a brief as possible.

Mr. Courter's article is neither measured nor accurate. For example:

- "Japan . . . destroyed the Russian navy in 1895. . . ." Actually, it was 1905. On to France 1940, where "French and Allied forces were enveloped and smashed": It was the Russians in 1941 who were encircled and smashed, not the French and British, who were defeated after a strategic penetration that split, rather than enveloped, the Allied forces. Carelessness with details of military history, so often found in the writings of liberal military reformers, is all the more distressing coming from Mr. Courter, whose writings on SDI have been marvels of precision and persuasiveness.

- On force disparity on the NATO/Warsaw Pact front: I'm sure both sides' military commanders would be very surprised to learn that NATO's "280 anti-tank guns" and "1,800 anti-tank missiles" face the Pact's 1,550 guns and 3,500 missiles. Mr. Courter's researcher deserves the same treatment the Politburo metes out to generals who fail to shoot down intruding Cessnas. These figures are not even in the ballpark.

- On SSBNs: "At sea, surprise would mean sudden attack upon U.S. naval assets, especially missile-bearing submarines." No reputable defense analyst believes that our SSBNs, our only survivable deterrent, could be wiped out now by a surprise attack. I think words such as "irresponsible" and "alarmist" are not too strong in this case.

- There is much (pointless) handwringing about the decline in numbers and total megatonnage of our nuclear stockpile, but no mention of the fact that the United States today still possesses more nuclear warheads than does the Soviet Union.

I noticed numerous other errors or dubious assertions in Mr. Courter's article (e.g., Japan is virtually defenseless; homeland Canada is vulnerable to Soviet invasion; we will run out of minerals within the first



few weeks of war), but what is really regrettable about this article is its tone.

With liberals everywhere stereotyping conservative pro-defense arguments as fevered and alarmist, Mr. Courter has played right into their hands: He has the Russians all set to invade Europe, launch a preemptive nuclear strike at the U.S., and sweep the U.S. Navy into oblivion in the war's first 10 minutes; he sees *Spetsnaz* agents lurking behind every bush and David Stockman fiendishly plotting to sell all our vital minerals. Obviously, Jim Courter wanted to fire a resounding salvo for a stronger defense policy, but he has succeeded only in shooting himself, and other pro-defense conservatives, in the foot.

Peter Cachion  
Manhattan Institute for  
Policy Research  
New York, NY

*Rep. Courter replies:*

I regret your disappointment with my article, "The Gathering Storm." It was intended as strong criticism of the "conventional wisdoms" and that is what it proved to be. The article is not "alarmist," but certainly the trends it describes are alarming.

You say the article is "rife" with factual errors and other problems; naturally, I would want these pointed out. But you identify exactly three errors amidst what must be hundreds of facts. Of the three, only the last can be said to have any bearing on the thesis of the article.

1) Indeed the Japanese-Russian naval engagement was in 1905; my drafts gave that date, but the magazine's typesetter substituted 1895, and we missed this on the proofs. 2) True, the Allied forces in WWII were first split; *then* most of the French army *was* enveloped and much of the northern Allied forces *was* smashed. I wish I had merely written "defeated," because then I might have interested you in the fact that the Allies were defeated by a smaller force, while today we face a far larger one. 3) Anti-tank gun and anti-tank missile figures: error acknowledged.

Your interpretation of my passage

on submarines comes very close to demonstrating the "carelessness" and "exaggeration" to which you are properly opposed. I never wrote that our missile-bearing subs would be "wiped out." I wrote that they would be targets in a surprise attack, which is most certainly true, since along with aircraft carriers, missile subs *are* the primary targets of Soviet attack subs. I then say that we still have a technological edge in quietness, and that our subs are "the least vulnerable leg" of the triad.

The megatonnage of our nuclear stockpile was mentioned because Americans assume it is increasing, while in fact it has markedly decreased. You think I should have mentioned that we still possess more warheads than the Soviets; I might also have mentioned the large Soviet advantage in megatonnage.

I respectfully suggest that your dismissal of the issue of the strategic minerals stockpile is no substitute for an argument. If you know how to "surge" production with a stockpile that was inadequate in 1980 and that has since been depleted by almost half, please tell me. Similarly, if you think Japan and Canada are secure against potential Soviet attack should war begin, please make the case.

Most of the arguments I made, and almost all of those central to the thesis, you leave untouched. Apparently you have no objections to the tale told by the figures on Soviet procurement, for example. So I would like to ask: if the Soviets are obviously well beyond building for defense, what *are* they building for?

## The Deregulation Mess

Dear Sir:

I agree with Murray Weidenbaum ("Liberation Economics," Summer 1987); the *economic* deregulation of such industries as transportation, telecommunications, and financial marketing was a bipartisan effort. He, Ralph Nader, Presidents Ford and Carter, and Senator Kennedy (Weidenbaum's list) worked very hard together to "help" consumers. They created a first-class mess. First,

however, a correction to Mr. Weidenbaum's cavalier treatment of *social* regulation.

While "liberals" and "conservatives" agreed on economic deregulation, the "liberals" maintained a commitment to safety, health, and environmental regulation, thereby contradicting themselves. The greater the intensity of competition, the more producers feel compelled to cheat, a lesson that Nader and others have yet to learn. But Mr. Weidenbaum cannot treat safety rules as "nitpicking" at a time when the pressures of competition have caused a huge decline in industrial safety that frightens a weak Occupational Safety and Health Administration and leads the *New York Times* to recall Upton Sinclair's turn-of-the-century label of "jungle."

Mr. Weidenbaum correctly notes that academic "purveyors of ideas" were the prime movers in economic deregulation. Ironically, these tenured professors appreciate the benefits of "protectionism" in the education industry while preaching the joys of the all-out competition they have managed to avoid. Using their logic, students taught by low-salaried neophyte professors would be as well off as passengers flown by low-salaried inexperienced pilots. At best, the "purveyors" are hypocrites.

The "purveyors" have long ignored at least two historical factors that contradict their pet theories. 1) Beginning with the railroads, economic regulation usually has been adopted only *after* the failure of unregulated competition. The common procedure has been to grant franchises to existing firms ("grandfathering"), thereby ensuring that the cause of the problem (competition) will not be removed. From a public utility perspective, most of the "regulated" industries *never* were regulated, and *always* suffered from the overcapacity of excessive competition. Combining economic regulation and competition make regulatory processes grossly inefficient and expensive, keeping prices too high. 2) A number of industries were regulated in the 1930s, when many liberals and conservatives agreed that unregulated competition had caused the Great Depression,

just as it had caused the crash of the 1890s, Herbert Hoover (in 1931) and Franklin Roosevelt (1933) both said so while making policy proposals. Their contemporary descendants refuse to admit that competition can ever be a problem, but the 1931 Hoover would laugh at Weidenbaum, and the Roosevelt of 1933-35 would ridicule Nader. The "purveyors" keep these matters out of their textbooks, presumably to guard against challenges to "liberation economics."

As for just some of Mr. Weidenbaum's claims:

- Yes, the deregulation of depositor interest rates and the expansion of interstate banking have helped push up depositor rates. But bank managers under pressure to capture deposits feel they must "launder" the huge cash deposits of drug dealers by "forgetting" to report them. While this helps drug consumers, it is criminal negligence. Meanwhile, high depositor rates cause higher rates for borrowers, including government. Deregulation (not government deficits) keeps *real* interest rates high because the supply of money is regulated (limited).

- Yes, trucking rates are down, but high accident rates for trucks and wholesale safety violations have become the norm, not to mention the widespread use of "super-trucks" that tear up the highways. Mr. Weidenbaum's home-town newspaper runs outstanding articles on this menace, but the "purveyors" cannot understand why a trucker who must make payments on the rig (but can't afford insurance) drives 20 nonstop hours and pops pills. Rates are too low.

- Yes, long-distance phone rates are down, but standard fares are way up, and average fares actually paid have about the same relation to the price index as before. Meanwhile, the airline mess makes daily headlines. The congestion that clogs big airports and delays flights is a by-product of deregulation and the overuse of "hub/spoking," forces passengers to take connecting flights instead of nonstops. The National Transportation Safety Board warned that we are poised on the edge of disaster. Major airlines are being

fined record amounts for wholesale safety violations (up to \$9 million per airline).

Those who are not obsessed by the economic principle that supply cannot chronically exceed demand realize that the world's major industrial problem is overcapacity or "glut," which reaches 30-50 percent in many industries. "Deregulation" or "free trade" cannot solve this problem and its corollaries (Third World industrial debts). Hoover and FDR proposed cartel-like industrial planning, and a global version is needed now. We can either begin to "divide the world's business" in systematic and nonideological ways ("Yugos" are a part of the auto industry), or stand ready to repeat the sequences of overcapacity, depression, trade wars, and imperialism that culminated in two world wars. The "purveyors" cannot help; I vote for Hoover and Roosevelt.

Frederick C. Thayer

Professor

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, PA

Dear Sir:

To Murray Weidenbaum's comprehensive article, I would add the following observations:

- 1) Much cost-increasing regulation of motor carriage still exists at the state level for intrastate traffic. For example, in the highly regulated Texas intrastate trucking market, it costs more to ship a container load of blue jeans from El Paso to Dallas than from Taiwan to Dallas.

- 2) Mr. Weidenbaum briefly noted that "the ICC presence was retained" in the trucking area. This "presence" is significant because it can allow a future pro-regulation Interstate Commerce Commission to puff up the now dormant regulatory shell. While it would be politically difficult for the agency to attempt to undo all the truck entry that has taken place, the agency could bow to industry pressure by imposing a floor on rates, as it did prior to the 1980 regulation.

Frederick N. Andre

Commissioner

Interstate Commerce Commission

Washington, D.C.

*Murray Weidenbaum replies:*

I welcome Commissioner Andre's response to my article. It gives me the opportunity to express my admiration for his key role in the continuing battle to reduce the burden of regulation.

Professor Thayer's letter is another matter. It is difficult to take seriously one who contends that "unregulated competition" caused the Great Depression and who concludes that the need of these times is "cartel-like industrial planning" on a global scale. Does anyone really believe that the failure to enact comprehensive federal regulation of radio broadcasting prior to 1934 was a contributor to the poor performance of the American economy during that decade?

Thayer also manages to thoroughly garble my point about OSHA eliminating some nitpicking regulations. First of all, the term "nitpicking" was used by the Carter administration itself in describing its effort to rid us of such silly rules as what color to paint exit lights. Only a careless reader would jump to the erroneous conclusions that I consider all social regulation to be nitpicking. In my article, I favorably mention the effort to relate the costs of these regulations to their benefits, hardly a "cavalier" approach.

Although he does not bore us with details, Thayer contends that deregulation has yielded a "mess." I assume he does not have in mind the low air fares that have attracted so many additional travelers to what is still the safest mode of transportation—or the fact that at least 120 more small towns enjoy air service today than prior to deregulation—or that most of those tiring flights with three or more intermediate stops have been eliminated—or that empty back hauls have been consigned to the history of interstate trucking—or that small depositors are finally receiving a competitive market rate of interest on their savings—or that cross-subsidization is being eliminated in the telephone business.

Finally, I plead not guilty to the charge that I expect deregulation to cure the problem of Third World debt—or my incipient baldness. 🐘

# Today's burning issues, and these books define them best

Take two FREE.  
Or, if you find three that interest you, take ALL THREE free.  
Values to \$58.85

## THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN MIND

HOW HIGHER EDUCATION HAS FAILED DEMOCRACY AND IMPOVERISHED THE SOULS OF TODAY'S STUDENTS

### ALLAN BLOOM

FOREWORD BY SAUL BELLOW

### #1 BESTSELLER

**2891 THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN MIND** — *Allan Bloom*. The surprise bestseller — because it casts piercing light on our moral and intellectual crises. "Extraordinary." —*Wall St. Journal*. "That rarest of documents, a genuinely profound book." —*NY Times*. "The most provocative look at America in recent memory." —*Insight*. "The book of the year." —*Washington Times*. \$18.95

Kremlin. "Temperate, meticulously researched ... races along like a good thriller. Unfortunately, the stories are fact, not fiction." —*Kirkus Reviews*. \$14.95

**2837 MEN AND MARRIAGE** — *George Gilder*. The grim effects of sexual liberalism. "I can't imagine anyone, short of a bigot, who will not enjoy reading Gilder on the nature of the fundamental role of women in society. Women really are ... different from men, and the failure of some social reformers to recognize those facts can lead to disaster." —*Ashley Montagu, Chicago Sun-Times*. \$15.95

**2869 THE SECRET WAR IN CENTRAL AMERICA: Sandinista Assault on World Order** — *John Norton Moore*. "Breaks through the double talk and exposes the true nature of Soviet-subsidized aggression by Cuba and Nicaragua." —*Elliott Abrams, Asst. Secretary of State*. "Most thoroughly documented book on the subject ... mandatory reading." —*R. Bruce McCollm, Organization of American States*. \$17.95

**2796 EDUCATING FOR DISASTER** — *Thomas B. Smith*. Ex-professor demonstrates how "peace" groups are taking over schools and churches. "Brilliantly compressed ... unique and invaluable." —*Washington Times*. \$14.95

**2810 THE MEDIA ELITE** — *S. R. Lichter/S. Rothman/L. S. Lichter*. Three social scientists survey top media people, prove their liberal bias from their own answers. "No one who reads this book will doubt that Americans have been presented with a one-sided picture of the world." —*Human Events*. \$19.95

**2823 AGAINST ALL HOPE** — *Armando Valladares*. He survived 22 years of Castro's brutality to write "the most compelling prison memoir since Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*." —*Jeane Kirkpatrick*. "The book of the year." —*George Will, Newsweek*. \$18.95

**2505 CRIME FREE** — *Michael Castleman*. Best book on how to protect yourself. "How to avoid being the victim ... invaluable for the individual, community group or small-business owner." —*American Library Assn. Booklist*. \$16.95

**2861 MEXICO: Chaos on Our Doorstep** — *Sol Sanders*. "Sander's important book certainly does much to focus attention on what may accurately be described as a catastrophe just waiting to happen." —*National Review*. "The book is not only highly readable, it is a must." —*John Gavin, ex-ambassador to Mexico*. \$18.95

**2855 THE AIDS COVER-UP?** — *Gene Antonio*. "Safe sex" — or media hype? Is "blood terrorism" coming? Is AIDS a genuine plague? Or tomorrow's plague? The facts, mostly from medical journals the media ignore. \$19.95

**2898 BEYOND OUR MEANS** — *Alfred L. Malabre Jr.* *Wall St. Journal* economics editor says "we've been living beyond our means." Worse: "No amount of governmental, or for that matter private, maneuvering will avert a very nasty time ahead." Writes Adam Smith in the *New York Times*: "A sober account of our fiscal and monetary sins that ... may be the scariest tract since Jonathan Edwards. I couldn't put it down ... a real page-turner." \$17.95

**2825 HIGH-TECH ESPIONAGE** — *Jay Tuck*. How the KGB steals our secrets and gets them to the

How to get 2 or 3 of these important books FREE

## CONSERVATIVE BOOK CLUB

15 Oakland Avenue • Harrison, NY 10528

### How the Club Works

Every 4 weeks (13 times a year) you get a free copy of the Club Bulletin which offers you the Featured Selection plus a good choice of Alternates — all of interest to conservatives. ★ If you want the Featured Selection, do nothing; it will come automatically. ★ If you don't want the Featured Selection, or you do want an Alternate, indicate your wishes on the handy card enclosed with your Bulletin and return it by the deadline date. ★ The majority of Club books will be offered at 20-50% discounts, plus a charge for shipping and handling. ★ As soon as you buy and pay for the number of books you agreed to buy at regular Club prices, your membership may be ended at any time, either by you or by the Club. ★ If you ever receive a Featured Selection without having had 10 days to decide if you want it, you may return it at Club expense for full credit. ★ Good service. No computers! ★ The Club will offer regular Superbargains, mostly at 70-90% discounts plus shipping and handling. Superbargains do NOT count toward fulfilling your Club obligation, but do enable you to buy fine books at giveaway prices. ★ Only one membership per household.

### Please check the option you prefer

- ☐ Please accept my membership in the Club and send, free and postpaid, the 2 books whose numbers I have written in the boxes below:



I agree to buy 3 additional books at regular Club prices over the next 18 months. I also agree to the Club rules spelled out in this coupon.

- ☐ Please accept my membership in the Club and send, free and postpaid, the 3 books whose numbers I have written in the boxes below:




I agree to buy 4 additional books at regular Club prices over the next 2 years. I also agree to the Club rules spelled out in this coupon.

PR - 2

Name

Address

City  State  Zip

# We Don't Just Report The News. We Make News.

## On SDI:

Bob, you've talked about support for SDI, but you wrote in *POLICY REVIEW* that you would use it as a negotiating chip. *Representative Jack Kemp to Senator Bob Dole, NBC Presidential Debate*

## On Marcos:

The Director of Central Intelligence, William J. Casey, originally proposed to Ferdinand E. Marcos that he call the early presidential election that ultimately led to Mr. Marcos' exile, according to an article by Senator Laxalt in *POLICY REVIEW*. *New York Times*

## On Afghanistan:

The allegations made against the Afghan government in Michael Johns' [*POLICY REVIEW*] article . . . have been repeatedly made against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and her historic and trusted friend, the Soviet Union. *M. Sharif Yaquobi, Embassy of Afghanistan, Washington Times*

## On Angola:

Savimbi's strategy, as he outlines in *POLICY REVIEW*, is . . . "to raise the costs of the foreign occupation of Angola until the Cubans and the Soviets can no longer bear the burden." *Norman Podhoretz, Washington Post*

## On Israel:

Israel gains "convert" in Christian rightist—Helms. Jesse's alternative, spelled out in *POLICY REVIEW*, was for the United States to "face up to the fact that aid to Israel is essentially a defense cost." *Wolf Blitzer, New York Jewish Week*

## On Arms Control:

In *POLICY REVIEW*, Richard Pipes [stated that arms control] "negotiations have been a failure," Irving Kristol asserted the negotiations "have only benefited the Soviet Union," [and] Richard Perle stated . . . "I don't think the negotiations have helped us in the main." *George Ball, New York Review of Books*

## On the Conservative Movement:

*POLICY REVIEW* . . . is the organ of the Heritage Foundation—the brain center of the most extreme reaction. *Pravda*

## On Robertson:

Pat Robertson made the first extensive airing of his foreign policy views in an article in *POLICY REVIEW*. *Miami Herald*

## On Balancing the Budget:

[Compared with George Bush] Jack Kemp has been getting off a bit easy. Now he's surfaced with an article in *POLICY REVIEW* entitled "My Plan to Balance the Budget." *Michael Kinsley, Wall Street Journal*

## On Crime and Poverty:

In the days when decent people used to worry about the "roots of crime," a lot of us were convinced that one of the chief causes of crime was poverty. . . . James K. Stewart, writing in *POLICY REVIEW*, has turned the idea on its head. Crime, he says, causes poverty. *William Raspberry, Washington Post*

## On Rock Politics:

Charlton Heston told *POLICY REVIEW* magazine: "This may sound snobbish, but the intellectual level of rock musicians is not to be envied." *People Magazine*

## On Gas Prices:

[Once there were] widespread predictions that gasoline prices would rise to more than two dollars a gallon. *POLICY REVIEW* has published a large collection . . . of such predictions. It should be required reading. *Thomas Sowell*

## On Liberal Schizophrenia:

*POLICY REVIEW* . . . managing editor Dinesh D'Souza . . . scorches *THE NEW REPUBLIC* for "a squid-like cloud of rhetoric" on difficult social issues. "It's no use accusing *TNR* of schizophrenia—the editors take it as a compliment," he writes. *Washington Post*

## Policy Review

American conservatism's most quoted and influential magazine.



NAME \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE/ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Payment Enclosed ☐ Bill me ☐ VISA ☐ Master Card ☐ American Express

Card number \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Begin my subscription: ☐ Current issue ☐ Next issue ☐ one year \$15 ☐ two years \$28 ☐ three years \$38

The flagship publication of The Heritage Foundation.

Check payable to: Policy Review, 214 Massachusetts Ave, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20002. Add \$5.00 postage per year for foreign air-speeded delivery

Prices will be rising in the Spring issue. Subscribe now and save.



I've come to learn there are no new mistakes in arms control. We usually just keep on making the same old ones. Knowing those made in the past helps anyone follow our First Lady's advice on drugs: "Just say no!"

Kenneth L. Adelman

*Where We Succeeded, Where We  
Failed: Lessons from Reagan Officials  
for the Next Conservative Presidency*

