

high intelligence or strong will, is not something anyone earns, anymore than slums, stupidity, or laziness. That some people have things other do not, regardless of perceived "merit," is a fact of life. The attempt to level such opportunities only enhances envy and socialism.

Besides, inherited property, and the privileges that come with it, is not always permanent. As in the Biblical parable, some sons squander their inheritance. In the market economy, this property eventually gets into the hands of people who value it more, and will increase it. But when the state confiscates the property, the money is always dissipated.

In the coming war over inheritance, who will defend the "rich," i.e., anyone who—after the multitude of life taxes—has anything left and seeks to pass it on? For the envious, it is enough to say that only the "better-off" benefit from present policy. And certainly, if this idea is carried off, there will be fewer of them for liberal Democrats to worry about.

Ultimately, the attack on inheritance is part of a broader attack on private property, driven by the horrible notion of "economic equality." As Spanish political philosopher G.F. de la Mora argued, the attempt to impose economic equality "discourages self-improvement and productivity, destroys personality, substitutes arithmetic for justice, mutilates liberty, reduces creativity, alienates morality, decapitates the formation of the best, contradicts equality before the law, and to a certain degree, political equality."

To put it another way, the common purse snatcher is a scoundrel, but grave robbing has always been considered far worse. It is hardly surprising that our political masters, who should be used as dumb bombs in the next attack on Iraq, would want to enact the fiscal equivalent of grave robbing. While we are still around to do something about it, we should let them know what we think about the plundering of our children's inheritance. ■

SBA and the Gays

by L.H.R., Jr.

Two days before the celebrated gay-lesbo march on Washington, a gathering took place at Small Business Administration headquarters, which tells us much about the irrationality of government intervention as well as the real goals of the homosexual lobby.

With the blessing (if you'll excuse the expression) of its management, the SBA's homosexual employees held an office party in honor of the gay march. And chief counsel Doris Freedman told them to march right up to the loan window, for the agency would now be stamping Yes! on sexually diverse loan applications. As gay SBA official Don Kraft said, "the door is open." And so is the taxpayer's wallet.

The SBA gives lush grants and low-interest loans to politically connected small businesses. The other 99.5% get their reve-

nue from the market. But by putting politics rather than economics in charge, the SBA makes most of us poorer (except the recipients of its largess). This is not counting the many loans that go belly-up, nor the other funds lost through the agency's storied fraud and mismanagement.

SBA's Kraft says the agency should make gay loans because "we have programs that help other groups." That's true. The SBA extends its welfare to blacks, Hispanics, women, the disabled, etc. But rather than expand this damaging victimhood, we should roll it back.

Even if we don't, how will the SBA know for sure? Not all gays look like the characters who chanted that they were "here" and "queer" during the march. This action subsidizes open gays as versus closeted ones, which may be part of the purpose. In addition, if someone is declined for a "straight" payoff, can he re-apply for a "gay" one?

Besides, isn't there something haywire about a victim group that defines itself solely in terms of its sexual activities? What's next, civil rights for self-abusers? Besides, the median household income of gays is 42% higher than that of heterosexuals. Along with their high incomes, gays have few if any family responsibilities, and when they start businesses, they have a ready customer base of other gays, many of whom prefer to patronize their fellows.

The real problem is not the SBA's funding of gays, however, it is the entire concept of government subsidies for business. If

Bill Clinton were actually looking for ways to cut the budget, rather than to expand it, SBA would be a great place to start. He could follow the lead of David Stockman, Ronald Reagan's first budget director, who had marked it for abolition.

Thanks to a propaganda campaign by liberal Republicans and Democrats in Congress, Stockman failed, although he did manage to cut the budget in half. But then, as with so many other agencies, George Bush gave the SBA a new lease on life, and our incomes. Its budget is now half a billion, and self-identified gays want a piece of the action.

The gay lobby says its members merely want their rights respected. But as the SBA saga shows, they also want heterosexual tax dollars to support their private interests. To add insult to injury, they also want to strip private individuals and businesses of their rights.

When the gay lobby speaks of housing rights, for example, it wants to deny landlords the freedom to rent to the customers of their choice. And if we ever get a gay civil rights bill imposed on us, businessmen would face disastrous lawsuits if they fired or failed to promote a gay, whether he was doing the job or not. As with other victim groups, the normal

standards of proof will not apply. The businessman will have to prove his innocence in a virtual star chamber.

This game is not, of course, new. First, a group claims victimhood status; second, it demands "equal rights" as compensation for a millennium of slights; third, it uses those rights, which are actually privileges, to oppress property holders.

In addition, there's a double standard. If a Republican SBA had held a similar reception for a group that is discriminated against, say, Christians opposed to abortion, and said they would now get preferential treatment, the yelps would have been deafening. But here's the twist: the opposition would have come from conservatives as well as liberals, because principled conservatives are philosophically opposed to government handouts.

Liberals, on the other hand, think that politics is handouts. That's why the Clinton administration has honeycombed federal agencies with gay activists.

Thus we see the coming together of three terrible forces in modern politics: federal agencies, special interest groups, and an economically and culturally destructive political agenda. The losers, as usual, are the majority,

who are forced to pay. ■

"Where Do I Point the Hose?"

by L.H.R., Jr.

Just one year after going into effect, the Americans with Disabilities Act is a regulatory menace of historic proportions. More than 9,000 lawsuits have been filed against businesses and communities, with tens of thousands more to come. The Clinton administration wants to expand the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission just to process the paperwork.

Yet most ADA cases never go to court. The mere threat has enabled plaintiffs to win an astounding number of settlements, some of them unusual. For example, a fire department was forced to rehire a firefighter who had gone blind, and to give him back pay and damages. ("Hey, where do I point the hose?")

Little League Baseball had to allow a man in a wheelchair to coach at third base, despite the danger to any boy who might hit him. A public skating rink has to allow a girl in a steel walker to skate, without consideration to the danger to regular skaters. And a private school had to install ramps and new restrooms for one wheelchair relative of one student to attend one ceremony.

The America West Arena of Phoenix, Arizona, had to build 14 wheelchair sections "in all price ranges and viewing angles," a "dog park" for

**If we ever
get a gay
civil rights
bill, busi-
nessmen
will face
disastrous
lawsuits.**