

Real Conservatives Don't Start Wars

Bill Kauffman

Back in the days when hippies roamed the earth, kids used to enjoy taunting their parents by speculating on the reception Jesus Christ would receive if he were to walk through the door of the local church. The joke was that the congregation would give him the heave-ho, long hair, sandals, and all, then return to their Christian worship.

Readers of a respected journal of foreign affairs were recently treated to a similar irony, albeit of a more temporal nature, courtesy of the provocative young foreign-policy analyst Christopher Layne. In the winter issue of the quarterly *Foreign Policy*, Layne strove valiantly to resurrect the noble but neglected conservative foreign policy of Ohio's Mr. Republican, Senator Robert Taft. Today's conservatives were none too pleased with this Second Coming, either.

Throughout the 1940s and early '50s, Taft led the opposition to the Cold War policies of the liberal Democrats. Taft and his conservative allies feared that the extensive foreign commitments America was making would strain our budget, imperil our liberties, and earn us the enmity of people around the world.

For their efforts these postwar conservatives were reviled and red-baited by eminent publications from *The New Republic* to the *New York Times*. Most all of these gallant old boys are dead now. Their collective epitaph, in light of J. Edgar Hoover, the Iranian hostages, and a \$200-billion budget deficit, should be a giant "WE TOLD YOU SO."

Layne tags Taft and his comrades "real conservatives" and contrasts them with the Reagan administration's neo-conservatives. Real conservatives, explains Layne, believe that the primary purpose of our national defense should be to defend this nation and its vital interests. Ever mindful of the need for prudence in government expenditure, real conservatives desire to shift the cost

of defending Europe and Japan from the hapless American taxpayer to the Europeans and the Japanese. And real conservatives, understanding that "vital American interests are not engaged in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, and similar Third World hotspots," do not wish to entangle the United States in those peripheral conflicts.

Opposed to the real conservatives are the neoconservatives who run American foreign policy in the age of Reagan. Neoconservatives believe that the purpose of US foreign policy is to wage a global war on communism. They are therefore willing to spend money hand over fist propping up anticommunist governments and insurgents and subsidizing the defenses of our NATO allies. America, in their view, is an imperial power with an almost limitless set of foreign obligations. The neoconservatives regard old-fashioned conservatism, with its caution and concern for preserving traditional American values, as a quaint but disturbing antique.

Nevertheless, Layne's essay hit a raw nerve among today's conservatives. Two of the right wing's leading lights—columnist cum TV pontificator George Will and *New Republic* chin-puller Charles Krauthammer—moved quickly to snuff out this flame of heterodoxy.

Reaganite Will dismisses Layne as being "stuck in the 1940s." Interference in Third World affairs is necessary, Will argues, to roll back the Soviet Empire. If anything, US foreign policy has been "too passive." It's not unfair to note that during America's futile crusade in Vietnam, Will served his country in the musty corners of graduate-school libraries.

Hawkish Democrat Krauthammer scarcely knows what to make of Layne's "extreme" isolationism. The United States is a superpower, he sagely observes. If all we care about is national security, then we require only "a

minimal deterrent arsenal, a small navy, a border patrol, and hardly any foreign policy at all." This prospect strikes Krauthammer as ridiculous and undeserving of further comment. After all, what self-respecting superpower would mind its own business when there's a global crusade to be waged?

In fact, however, a foreign policy based on Layne's real conservatism offers us a peaceful and prosperous future. For starters, it'd take a huge chunk out of the enormous Reagan deficit. Approximately half of our \$300-billion-plus defense budget goes toward defending Europe and Japan, which are certainly capable of building up their defenses to the point necessary to deter a Russian attack. A real conservative approach to defense would keep American dollars where they belong—in the hands of the folks who earn them.

It would also put to rest the nagging fear that American blood will be spilled in far-off lands in which we have no proper interest. If the Russians wish to don the imperialist mantle, let them: Imperialism is foreign to the American character; it corrupts us and enables the central government to build up its power at the expense of the liberties of the people. And it leads, ultimately, to the grisly sight of young American boys, stacked in military planes, coming home to parents and girlfriends in body bags.

Opposing US interventionism from the right is a lonely business these days. Most of one's allies are likely to be pious, posturing leftists of the sort who throw wine and cheese parties for visiting Sandinistas. Not very pleasant company. But conservatives who are reluctant to challenge the wasteful and dangerous policies the Reagan administration is pursuing abroad are advised to remember the defiant words of the great Confederate statesman Alexander Stephens: "Times change and men often change with them, but principles never!"

Don't say Congress can't get serious about cutting the obscenely bloated budget. Last year our esteemed reps passed a budget amendment cutting the Library of Congress's appropriation by the exact amount it costs to produce a touchie-feelie version of *Playboy*—in Braille. The American Council for the Blind and Playboy Enterprises have filed suit over the matter. In their puritanical zeal, Congress made no attempt to deprive sighted library patrons of *Playboy*. And the Braille edition (naturally) includes no pictures, advertisements, or cartoons. If beauty is in the eye of the beholder, how about silly censorship?

Some New York State dairies have been milking the public for years, thanks to a monopoly-loving agriculture commissioner exploiting an antiquated law passed during the Depression. (Lots of other states have similar laws.) New Yorkers end up paying what amounts to a 20-percent tariff on milk processed in their state. When a New Jersey-based processor was finally allowed to compete in Staten Island on a trial basis, it pushed the retail price of milk down by 40 cents a gallon. The catch is that a milk dealer must obtain a state license to operate in any local market. The agriculture commissioner has to grant the permit unless it would "lead to destructive competition in a market already adequately served." It's the monopoly-protecting bureaucrat's favorite loophole. And sure enough, the New Jersey competitor's application to expand beyond Staten Island has been stalled for six years. In the meantime, New York consumers are a great cash cow for established Empire State dairies.

The Historical Architectural Review Board of Allentown, Pennsylvania, won't let a couple install bars on the lower halves of two front windows even though their home was burglarized twice in the past two years. The bars would be "inappropriate in the downtown historic district," HARB Chairman Edward D. Reibman told the couple. "There are no architectural precedents for bars on this type of property. We had to look at it from a historical perspective." For the



homeowners, that means a "window of opportunity" for thieves. But hey, that's a private-property "perspective."

Your tax dollars at work: What exactly does the US Government Office of Oversight do? A San Francisco man spotted the number for the agency in his phone book and decided to find out. After about a dozen rings, a government clerk answered. "Actually, we don't do anything," she honestly confessed. "There has been an oversight in the Department of Oversight. We've been abolished."

Why on earth would Mary Kay Cosmetics ship a few hundred packages of its goods daily from Dallas to Louisiana, only to have them shipped back to Texas via United Parcel Service to its sales force around the state? Simple. UPS is more efficient and reliable than the authorized carriers within Texas, but for 20 years UPS has been prohibited from providing delivery service between points in Texas. Local carriers say the huge shipping company would cut deeply into their business. Up until this year, the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates such things,

bought the argument and used its muscle to protect the Texas carriers from market forces. But the battle isn't over yet. The carriers have vowed a court fight to keep the familiar brown delivery trucks from delivering the goods between Texas cities.

In order to beat the bureaucrats' efforts to send her two friends to a nursing home, a 51-year-old Wayne, New York, woman married a legless 72-year-old man and plans to adopt a blind 81-year-old man. The marriage of Jane MacIntosh and John Coughlin, whose legs were amputated years ago because of frostbite, prevents county social workers from forcing him into a nursing home. The couple plans to adopt Theodore Collins so he can continue to live in the house they've all shared for years. The county claimed Ms. MacIntosh was violating regulations that require licenses for homes where personal care is provided to nonrelatives. Neither she nor Coughlin receive welfare. "I'm kind of happy that we beat the system with a shotgun wedding," says the blushing bride. "It's not a romantic thing, but we've been friends for years."

—Mark Edward Crane

Nurses Begin Calling Their Own Shots

Nurses who are sick of being number two in the medical profession are beginning to do what disgruntled employees in other professions have long done: they're going into business for themselves. It's one more sign of increasing competition in the medical marketplace.

The combination of great responsibility with little autonomy or recognition has prompted some nurses to quit their profession entirely. But the *Wall Street Journal* recently reported on some of the nurses who've stayed and set up independent practices and nurse-managed clinics—without doctors.

The services these nurses are offering differ from, and complement, traditional doctors' services. Leaving aside the treatment of sick or injured people who need immediate attention, nurses can watch over peoples' long-term health. They can per-

form routine, preventive examinations and monitor diseases and other medical conditions.

Because they work for themselves, independent nurses have the control often lacking in a traditional doctor-nurse medical practice. They work their own hours, set their own fees, and develop continuing relationships with their own patients.

Jean Sweeney-Dunn and Edith Reidy run an independent nursing practice in Elmira, New York. They make house calls on elderly patients who would otherwise use hospital emergency rooms for nonemergency care. Sweeney-Dunn and Reidy aren't allowed, by state medical-licensing laws, to prescribe medicine; but they can perform routine exams and tests, treat medication problems such as bad side effects, counsel patients in self-care, and make referrals. For a standard house call they charge \$25.

Nurse-controlled nursing isn't limited to nurses with their own private practices; it's also found in various

nurse-managed clinics and centers. For example, nurses are in charge at the Bronx Perinatal Consortium, a health center for women in Orange County, New York. Nurse-managed nursing is also prevalent in midwifery clinics, such as the Childbearing Center in New York City. Cathryne Welch, executive director of the Foundation of the New York State Nurses Association, says that "there's far more activity like this going on in this country than anyone has a handle on."

And what do doctors have to say about nurses managing themselves? Many are predictably nervous about the competition that independent nursing poses to their state-backed monopoly on medical care. But some doctors like the idea of nurses taking more control. As the *Wall Street Journal* put it, "Their practices are busy with crises, and they don't have time to make house calls." Perhaps independent nursing is just what the doctor ordered.

1980s innovation, devised to take advantage of a loophole in federal banking regulation. Federal law defines a bank as an institution that both takes checking deposits and makes commercial loans; limited-service banks offer just one of these services. Thus they avoid federal bans on interstate banking (by banks) and the mixing of banking and commercial activities (by commercial enterprises).

More than 100 firms, most notably Sears, Roebuck & Co., have entered the nascent limited-service banking business. Sears has done so with great gusto; using the flexibility provided by its nonbank status, the Sears Financial Network has issued a new credit card, Discover. Discover holders can get cash at over 6,000 locations, maintain a savings deposit account, and even contribute to an IRA.

The specter of competition and alternative means of banking breaking out all over was too much for the Federal Reserve Board, which in 1983 sought to bring limited-service banks under its jurisdiction. Dimension Financial Corp. of Denver fought back, setting the stage for the High Court's recent decision, in which the court admonished the Fed to confine its regulation to that explicitly authorized in federal banking laws.

Reaction from the Fed and its allies to the court's unanimous ruling was immediate. Predicted Fed Vice-Chairman Preston Martin: "We'll have to cope with a wave of openings of nonbank banks that will be hard to reach by regulation." House Banking Committee member Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.) was also meta-

Nonbank Banks Best Nonsense Bank

It couldn't happen to a nicer bunch of guys. By an 8-0 margin, the US Supreme Court has dealt a serious blow to the Federal Reserve Board's campaign to limit the expansion of "nonbank banks" and thus competition in the banking markets. The Fed is furious, the banks elated, and the ultimate beneficiaries of the court's wisdom will be consumers.

"Nonbank banking," or limited-service banking, is a



"THE NURSE WILL SEE YOU NOW"