

out discrimination in lending is futile and ultimately tyrannical.

Bankers know this, but given the current atmosphere in Washington and the culture, they are afraid to speak up. They have adopted a strategy of lying low, hoping to wait out the campaign against them. But this won't work. Statists want government to allocate credit instead of the market, because then government can more easily control the entire economy.

Under government intervention, politics becomes more important than profits—making us all poorer—and justice is violated when people who deserve loans do not get them because the uncreditworthy do.

Once again, the welfare state will reward the ne'er-do-wells at the expense of the financially responsible, decreasing the incentives to work and save, and subsidizing those who have gone on spending and debt sprees.

Instead of making the government look like America, the Clinton administration is making America look like the government. That may be change, but it is hardly progress. ■

Budget Lies

by L.H.R., Jr.

Bill Clinton has bamboozled the public with his economic plan, but you have to be a "policy wonk" to figure it out.

Consider, for example, his promise to cut the federal payroll by 100,000. That's less than 4%, but it would be a good start—except that it's in *autho-*

rized employment as versus actual employment.

Government agencies rarely employ as many people as Congress authorizes them to. That's partly because they use these funds to live it up, and partly because they are inefficient even in hiring.

Under Clinton's plan, for example, the National Archives would have to cut its authorized staff by 110. But while the agency can hire 2,750 people, it actually has only 2,640. In other words, the 110-bureaucrat cut is a phantom.

The same is true of the fabled cuts in the White House staff: they won't go into effect until next year, which—given the nature of government—means never. And right now, the president is hiring an additional 50 "temporary" aides, who—also given the nature of government—will undoubtedly still be there in 1996.

Then there are the cuts in entitlement spending. The biggest is in Social Security benefits, which Clinton lists as \$21.4 billion. But the cut comes about from increasing taxes on Social Security recipients. (This was left off the official list of new taxes by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, so Clinton's package wouldn't be labeled correctly as the largest tax increase in history.)

Many other tax increases are buried in Clinton's list of spending cuts. They include higher FDA user fees (\$1 billion), heftier "laboratory rates," (\$3 billion), increased U.S. Customs processing fees (\$1.25 billion), and bigger insurance fees for banks (\$1 billion). All these represent

instances of the government forcing companies and individuals to do its will, and then charging them for it.

Worst of all is the \$1 billion Clinton says he can get from harsher tax audits, the first time blood-from-a-stone has been called a spending cut.

Clinton promised us "cuts, not gimmicks, in government spending." But that should mean the leviathan on a diet, not midnight visits by the tax police.

Clinton's "public investment" is no more honest, including as it does such New Deal gimmicks as planting more trees. Trees are nice, but how does the government—as versus landowners and tree farmers—know the optimum number of trees? Government trees that can never be used hardly make us richer. He also wants to give \$2.5 billion to big city mayors for more welfare, and spend \$1 billion on no-show summer jobs for—among others—gang members.

Overall spending, despite the rhetoric, is going up: the Commerce Department, headed by big-business lobbyist Ron Brown, gets a \$358 million increase. The tyrannical EPA gets another \$1 billion. The failed baby-sitting service called Head Start gets an extra \$500 million. HUD gets another \$3 billion. The Department of the Interior gets a half billion more.

The Justice Department gets an extra \$2 billion, much of it for therapy, while less will be spent on prisons. Maybe the shrinks can start on the criminals as they mug us, in place of sending them to jail. Union

skill Robert Reich's Department of Labor gets a \$3.5 billion increase, but all we hear about is the temporary \$95,000 cut in his dining room. Finally, NASA gets its space station, a colossal waste unless we can get the administration to convene the next New Age cabinet meeting up there, with one-way rockets.

None of this, and I've only scratched the surface of the scam, will cut the deficit. We will get, no matter how well they live in Washington, D.C., only further economic decline. We're in trouble now because government at all levels takes almost 50% of the national income. Clinton wants to push that over the half-way mark, on the way to Sweden.

Clinton tells us we must cut the deficit because it crowds out private investment. Sure, so why then seize private investment through higher corporate and income taxes?

We're all supposed to be placated because these higher taxes will punish the rich. Envy—the urge to destroy those above us—is one of the most vicious emotions.

Combine it with the desire to impose one's will on the populace, and we will have a presidential "bully pulpit" in another sense.

As to the notion that it is "patriotic" to roll over and let

the government take our wallets, isn't that the sort of argument George III—Slick Georgie as they called him—would have made? Our response should be that of the Founding Fathers. ■

M.E. Bradford

by L.H.R., Jr.

Mel Bradford (1934-1993) was a giant. With his formal hat, his soft Southern voice, and his old-fashioned manners, he seemed a man out of a better age.

In any period of our history, this great literary critic and historian would have been a distinguished figure. But for our

dumb-downed time, when the wisdom of the ages carries as much currency as a tv sitcom, he was indispensable.

Against the liberals, Mel saw that our nation was more than a mere abstraction. America is rooted in time and place. To disregard that, and to forget who we are, would lead, he believed, to the death of the Republic. He therefore battled

multiculturalism and deconstructionism, while upholding the values of the Southern Agrarians and the Founding Fathers.

He called on us to learn from these great figures, as well as

from the Old Right, "courageous men who risked the influence of their careers and ignored the fashion of their time." Their conservatism, he wrote, "was a natural reflex of their achievement of a coherent view of the world forged out of their mastery of a particular discipline."

That description fits, of course, Mel himself, who because of the unfashionable nature of his ideas in a left-wing academia, never had many of the things of this world. Yet this did not dim his scholarship, nor his delight in battle.

Are such scholar-warriors necessary? He wrote: "The deep-rooted conservative instincts of the American people, in all of their multiplicity, needed an apology, a rationale, a teaching (or set of doctrines) if they [are] to survive the argument from authority pressed upon them by an almost uniformly liberal cognoscenti." It was to this task that he devoted his life.

Mel—the author of eight books and editor of three—believed in the power of knowledge, history, and ideas. He knew that ultimately, civilization can only be saved from collectivism and the rampant state by the courage and intellectual power of a few men. He studied these men, and their contributions to literature, political philosophy, and political economy, and he exemplified them.

His thought was a near-perfect synthesis of the best in American conservatism. He saw private property as a sacred institution, to be protected from state intervention as well as

Against the liberals, Mel saw that our nation was more than a mere abstraction.