

paleo direction.

There's good reason to believe those forces are upon us now. Suddenly, thanks to both Pat and Steve, all sorts of issues are no longer taboo: the decline in the standard of living, the New World Order, the crimes of Goldman Sachs, the costs of immigration, the evil of the Republican Party establishment, the depredations of the tax police, the glories of the gold standard, and much more. Moreover, all the movements that gave rise to the Republican House takeover in 1994 are still with us, and growing.

No, we are not stranded in Dolesville. Despite the establishment's bravado, it is as weak as it's been in many years. The government and the media have lost nearly all credibility, the neo-cons are scattered, the left is out of it, and the paleos are on the march. We'll look back at these primaries—despite their maddening conclusion—as an essential step in that process. ▣

---

## The Liberal Attack on Middle-Class Birthrates

by Michael Levin

**T**he commonplace that political labels have become useless is emphatically true of "liberalism." A "liberal," according to the

dictionary, favors "freedom of action, especially with respect of personal belief or expression" and is "open-minded or tolerant...not bound by conventional ideas." But how do high taxes and government regulation promote freedom of action, or speech codes open-mindedness?

A good rule of thumb for puzzling out unclear words is to ignore their official definitions and heed what they are actually applied to. In particular, if you want to understand liberalism, list positions typically held by people who call themselves liberals, and see what unites these positions.

Without pretending to completeness, it is safe to say that liberals favor: use of tax revenues to support the poor; preference for nonwhites over whites in em-

ployment; enforced school integration; expanding the rights of criminals; social acceptance of and civil rights for homosexuals; abortion; abolition of sex roles; placing human interests behind those of plants and animals; and government rectification of "market failure." What thread is common?

The first six concerns do involve freedom of a sort, at least for the hapless, nonwhite, criminal, homosexual, and abortion-minded. Liberals seek to enhance the *power* of these individuals, their ability to do what they want, so that the poor can enjoy more goods and services, more homosexuals and blacks can get jobs, black children can attend school with whites, criminals can avoid punishment, and women can get abortions.

However, this particular kind of freedom, sometimes called "positive," is apt to collide with the "negative" freedom (or immunities)

of others—of wage earners to keep their money, of employers to hire whom they please, of ordinary citizens to form voluntary associations and conduct their affairs in safety, of unborn children not to be killed.

As for the last three liberal positions—environmentalism, hostility to sex roles, and mistrust of the market—they are irrelevant or positively inimical to "freedom of action." So the commitment of liberals to liberty is at best equivocal.

What does unite the articles of liberalism, I believe, is antagonism to the fertility of the (overwhelmingly white) middle class. They all make it harder for white middle-class married couples to have babies. This is most clear in the case of liberal tenets that require transfer of resources from such couples to the lower class, people with illegitimate children, people unlikely to have any children at all, or spotted owls.

Fewer resources make offspring a chancier proposition for the middle class, reducing what biologists delicately call mating behavior. For their part, abortion destroys offspring directly while annulling months of reproductive investment, and feminism opposes the very institution of "traditional" motherhood. Since abortion and other feminist notions are most appealing to middle-class and elite women, their fertility is most affected.

A demographic description of liberalism sounds strange, but it fits everyday experience. Whites are having fewer children than anyone else. Statistically, middle- and upper-class white women in the U.S. have fewer than 1.7 babies, far below the replacement rate, while fertility for the rest of the population exceeds 2.3 babies per woman. Why? Well, ask any middle-class couple that has managed to stay married why they do not have more children, and you will probably be told how costly children are. Children can't normally be insupportable or the human race wouldn't be

**Middle-class welfare isn't consistent with traditional values, since the welfare state fatally undermines them.**

here, so the problem must be local. Children have gotten more expensive lately.

One stunningly obvious reason for this is the enormous transfer of wealth from the productive to the unproductive. Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Food Stamps, Head Start, rental "assistance," and similar direct subsidies now consume more than 5% of the gross national product, a figure which at least doubles when the access of the unproductive to schools, hospitals, roads, airports, and other public facilities is added.

Productive individuals would find children more affordable were they allowed to keep more of their earnings, but welfare puts their earnings at the disposal of non-producers, who have children they could not afford on their own. The transfer of resources through welfare affects reproduction, since one way or another most resources are directed to reproduction.

A further liberal contraceptive, seldom acknowledged but very real, is forced integration of the public schools. The white middle class fund public education with their taxes, but outside of the suburbs are deeply reluctant to utilize it. When the proportion of blacks at a school passes a critical point, violence accelerates and academic achievement plummets. Placing a child in such a place is unthinkable for many parents, leaving private school the only alternative. But private schools, having to compete with public schools and their fees being non-deductible, are expensive—a further pressure against having children.

Racial preferences is another inhibitor, transferring to blacks and

females hundreds of thousands of jobs and positions and their attendant resources that would otherwise have gone to white males. Of course, a white male who loses one job to affirmative action may find another, but it will be less desirable; he has suffered a net loss in resources, and therefore a loss in reproductive potential, which accrues to someone else.

That someone else is typically nonwhite, but the white reproductive potential is not restored if the job goes to a white woman—even the wife of the man who lost it—since full-time working women are far less likely to have children than non-working wives of working men. 55% of female executives in the U.S. are barren. The simple arithmetic of human reproduction—almost a year to carry a baby, a minimum of three years of constant attention after birth—make it almost impossible for a woman intending to work full time to bear more than two children.

**A major anti-natal force has been the massive entry of middle-class married women into the workforce.**

In fact, a major anti-natal force has been the massive entry of middle-class married women into the workforce, about which feminism-liberalism has spoken with a sharply forked tongue. Feminists first hailed paid labor as vital for female autonomy, but soon after—to distance themselves from the stress felt by working women—attributed the working mother to "economic necessity."

It is hard to say how influential feminism has actually been, but feminists clearly would like women to adopt habits that exclude married motherhood. The idea underlying all feminist rhetoric—"traditional mores oppress," "sex differences are ar-

tifacts," etc.—is that women should be as interested in extrafamilial pursuits as men are.

But if men pursue careers while their wives care for the children, and women pursue careers while...who, exactly?...cares for the children, there will be no one to care for the children, and in time no children to care for. The very idea that encouraging men but not women to attend college is a "double standard" that exerts anti-natal pressure, since the four college years are the most nubile years for women. Since brighter middle-class girls are the ones most apt to attend college, they are the ones whose fertility is reduced. Sweden, which has most fully adopted sexual egalitarianism, has the lowest birthrate in Europe.■

## On "Being Jewish"

by Paul Gottfried

**A** lead essay by Philip Weiss in *New York* magazine, "Being Jewish," has evoked considerable excitement in paleo circles, and friends have flooded me with copies of this piece together with requests for my comments. Characteristic of Weiss's main argument is the passage on the magazine cover: "As anti-Semitism fades and Jews assume ever greater prominence throughout the Establishment, it's time for Jewish Americans to let go of the idea that they are outsiders."

Weiss cites the obvious evidence of American Jewish economic and professional success, e.g., Jewish over-representation in the arts and sciences and among the Fortune 500, and he reasonably concludes that any problem of exclusion which faced Jews in the past no longer exists. What bedevils American Jewry,