

government, not dismantles it. The prophet of this reform is Bill Clinton, not Bob Taft.

The Republican proposal does nothing to reverse the relentless march of welfarism. Means-tested programs will total \$350 billion this year, the highest level in history. If the welfare state were slashed to its 1980 levels, *in real terms*, it would require cuts of 71 cents on the welfare dollar. To take us back to Lyndon Johnson's time would require welfare cuts of 98 cents on the dollar.

The Republican leadership, and its neocon advice givers, aren't even considering this. They do not propose to cut programs. As Republicans have done for forty years, they are preparing to consolidate the other party's socialist advances.

There is only standard by which Republicans should be judged: does the budget go down or up? If the budget goes up, the Republicans have failed. If it goes down, in a big way, fine for now. Any Republican who votes for a budget higher than last year's deserves to be tossed out of office.

A balanced budget is great, but it will follow from cutting the government down to size. The leadership should focus on cutting spending and taxes, matching them dollar for dollar in a massive downward spiraling of Leviathan.

Here's a moderate proposal that barely keeps pace with public expectations: Republicans should announce their

refusal to pass any budget that doesn't cut \$300 billion immediately. That's not much; it would only take us back to the Bush presidency in terms of overall spending.

The media, the Clinton administration, and every special interest group from coast to coast would be insane with rage. That's how we'd know we're on the right track.

And we would begin to change the nature of the debate about the size of government. For the first time, the Democrats would be forced to defend each of these 79 programs. Most of them survive through lack of public exposure. If the programs were brought out into the open, the voters would laugh them into oblivion. Polls already show that two-thirds of the public doesn't think government should provide welfare at all. If Republicans cut \$300 billion, they would still be to the left of public opinion.

Some people deride even this moderate plan. "Don't take a kamikaze approach," William Kristol advised Republicans at an "Empower America" conference. That would "wipe out everything at once that took 60 years to build up." It's pitiful to see the so-called right defending the New Deal, the Great Society, and every other statist advance since 1934.

Mr. Kristol further told the *New York Times* that Republicans should "shed the minority mind-set" of "let's do everything we can all at once." Instead they should lay the

ground work for a Republican return to the White House.

This is excuse-making. For twelve years, the Republicans claimed they couldn't cut government because they didn't control Congress. Now we hear they can't cut government because they don't control the White House.

With a Republican president, will Mr. Kristol then say, Republicans need to control the judiciary too? When, oh when, will Republicans have to do what they say they are going to do? Or has power become an end in itself?

The problem with Democrats is their philosophy of government. The problem with Republicans is hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is a more serious sin, and carries with it a more serious punishment. ■

Unmandating the States

by L.H.R., Jr.

Curbing mandates is all the rage as Republicans prepare a legislative agenda for this month. The feds have kicked the states and localities around too long, and the GOP promises a quick legislative response to their complaints.

Unfunded mandates cost from \$200 to \$400 billion, depending how "mandate" is defined, and legislation to curb them has been floating around the Capitol for more than a year. Even Clinton has suggested a willingness

to go along.

It's a fine issue to test the new Republican leadership, for it goes to the heart of the federal form of government, in which states and localities are not supposed to be colonies of a central empire. But will Republicans repeal the mandates, tailor them back a bit, or make only cosmetic changes?

Ideally, Congress would say to the states and localities: if you can't afford to enforce present or future federal mandates, then forget them. But we are likely to get something very different, so taxpayers need to keep a close watch.

The feds have been forcing governors, state legislatures, mayors, and town councils to spend money they don't have since the 1970s. The states and localities then have to turn to their own taxpayers, who are rightly stingy since 40% of the national wealth is already consumed by public-sector taxing and spending.

Some of the laws that bear on the mandate issue include the Brady Bill, the Clean Water Act, and the Americans With Disabilities Act. They have this in common: they coerce states into enforcing laws they didn't support, they fulfill liberal wishes, and they were agitated for and passed by Democrats.

What better targets for Republican reprisal against Democrat big governmentism? While they're at it, the GOP can go after other liberal programs like the Clean Air Act,

the Safe Drinking Water Act, Asbestos Abatement regulations, and the Lead-Based Paint Abatement program.

When some politicians complain about mandates, they stress the "unfunded" part, in hopes of getting more federal money. Last session, for example, Dirk Kempthorne, Republican Senator from Idaho, proposed that the federal government pay the costs of state and local compliance—a proposal endorsed by a majority of Senators.

He meant well, but that's a frightening prospect. Funds at the state and local level would shift to another category of spending, and the federal budget would zoom. Net government spending and taxing would increase, which is the opposite of what we need. We shouldn't fund the mandates, just lessen or eliminate them.

For his part, Newt Gingrich promises to provide states and counties with more "spending flexibility," which means lightening up on the rules governing specifically how—but not whether—these laws are to be enforced. That change qualifies as cosmetic.

Partisans of states rights

**Partisans
of states
rights
have good
reason to
doubt the
sincerity
of Con-
gress.**

have good reason to doubt the sincerity of Congress. When grass-roots groups in California organized to end the "unfunded mandate" of welfare to illegal immigrants, all of Official Washington balked.

More recently, the Imperial Congress passed a mercantilist trade agreement that takes no account of America's unique federal system, in which states are supposed to be more than lines on a map. The foreign bureaucrats at the World Trade Organization care no more for the autonomy of Mississippi or Montana than they do for free trade itself.

If the Congress can't stand up to the demands of the subsidized corporate establishment, it is hardly likely to thwart the will of regulators, lawyers, social therapists, and gun grabbers. But the partisans of the centralized nation state had better wise up.

Laws like the Brady Bill and the Americans With Disabilities Act were prime catalysts for the electoral revolution of 1994. The first severely limits the right of self protection, and the second gives drunks and dopers the right to a lifetime job plus benefits.

As any gas station attendant will tell you, the Clean Air Act has meant higher gas prices and zooming repair bills. And when the local mayor raises property taxes, he's the first to point to the Clean Water Act or the lead-abatement scam as the culprit. Voters know this, and spoke against it last month.

In the choice between real and cosmetic change, more is at stake than political strategy. The rights of individuals and communities to be free of federal control is woven into the fabric of our history, and written on constitutional parchment.

Twenty-nine years passed between the "tariff of abomination" in 1832, and the "tariff of aggression" in 1861. But those "unfunded mandates" led to the bloodiest war in the nation's history. January 1995 is the time to act, before statehouses start to fly the Confederate flag for more than old-time's sake. ■

P.C. Watch

by L.H.R., Jr.

Racial Express

A black man was selected for pilot training by the U.S. Navy through affirmative action, but his "attitude" on the ground and ability in the air meant he had to leave, points out columnist Roy Wayne. He was then hired by Flying Tiger airlines's affirmative-action program, but let go be-

cause of his persistent hostility and incompetence. After Federal Express bought Flying Tiger, however, the pilot was hired by Fedex, because of the company's particularly aggressive affirmative-action guidelines. But his failings as a pilot combined with his extreme ill-will led to many reprimands, and eventually the company set a termination hearing for April 8, 1994.

On April 7, he was scheduled to fly a DC-10 as co-pilot out of Memphis. The pilot was a white man and the first officer a white woman. The black man planned to murder them both, he has since admitted, and then fly the fully fueled plane into Federal Express's national headquarters, with its thousands of employees, also hoping to ignite the hundreds of planes being refueled in the area at the time.

But the schedule was changed, and a new crew of three white men was assigned. The black man then asked to "deadhead," that is, to fly along for free. The black pilot came on board carrying a guitar case, and sat in one of the few seats behind the cockpit. As the plane passed through 18,000 feet, he opened the case and removed two sledge hammers, a spear gun, and a combat knife. He then entered the cockpit and smashed each man in the head with a sledge hammer, and aimed his spear gun at the captain, planning to kill all three and then carry out the rest of his plan.

One crew member was knocked out, and the remaining two were partially paralyzed, yet the pilot managed to throw the giant plane into a roll, pinning the black man against the ceiling. As the two men struggled with the large, well-built criminal, the co-pilot asked for an emergency return to Memphis, and put the plan on autopilot. It took 25 minutes for the two men to disarm the would-be mass murderer, who had a black belt in karate, and was willing to die so long as he took white people with him.

The pilot had his ear torn off, and when the plane landed, the black man tried to kill a paramedic and then escape via the emergency chute, but he was finally handcuffed.

Today, one of the white men is completely disabled. Another's head is oddly shaped, and he's unable to think clearly, and the reattachment of the pilot's ear was not entirely successful. These men are heroes, but you've never heard of them, and the massacre they prevented. If the culprit had been a white man, this would have been one of the most important stories of the year. Since he wasn't, the free press did its usual job of cover-up.

Papal Apologies?

Pope John Paul II has urged the Catholic Church to apologize, to "express profound regret for the weakness of so many of her sons and daughters who sullied her face."