

and acquit if they felt the law was an affront to the Constitution or their conscience. "The judge instructed people not to read it, to throw it away or bring it to him unread," Knight says.

"They said after the fact that they didn't feel I was guilty," Knight reports, "that the law was too broad. [Juror] Chuck Wahn said that in a broadcast interview. He was almost in tears. But it doesn't help me any... It would have been nice if I had a juror or two with some guts. The jurors in the William Penn case (London, 1670) were tortured by the judge, and they still refused to convict."

"The jurors are quoted in the newspaper down here as saying we thought Chuck Knight was a nice guy, but there just wasn't any choice, the judge said you have to ignore your hearts and enforce the law," explained defense attorney Abrams in a telephone interview two days after the verdict.

"Aren't they just speeding up Darwinism?" I asked attorney Abrams of the government's prosecutions of these highly-visible militia units. By shutting down the goofier guys who parade around in public in camouflage fatigues, aren't they just teaching those who profoundly fear and distrust the government how to be more secretive, more professional...and simultaneously walling them off from the influence of more moderate voices?

"But that's what they want to do," the self-described liberal Democrat replied. "It is to the government's advantage to make more and badder militias, because the worse they are, the more agencies like the ATF can come out and say, 'We are the first line of defense, we are saving the nation from ruin, we need money from Congress.'"

"We're in a terrible state as a nation in that we have no enemies. So what better enemy to create than ugly guys in ugly clothes, redneck racists running around killing people with stinking bags of fertilizer?..."

"You put these guys from New York out here where the real disaffection is, and they'll be shocked first of all at the depth of it. I'm shocked at the depth of the disaffection, but also at the way it permeates all layers of society..."

"I really do think the government wants to encourage the militias, which is why you get agents provocateurs like (John 'Doc') Schultz," alias Private Investigator Scott Jason Wells. He is a former Colorado State Trooper who infiltrated the Vipers on his own initiative after taking a job at the Phoenix gun store they frequented. He then shopped his "undercover" services for months to numerous agencies before attracting the attention of the Arizona Department of Game & Fish, and then the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. He eventually received \$12,000 for his "services."

When Schultz had proposed to the rest of the group that they rob banks, and Chuck Knight replied "That's the last thing we'd ever do." Schultz's testimony for the government "was that they were just prioritizing." Abrams laughs. "I thought when he said that we were home free, if anything would show the absurdity of the case that would be it. I asked, 'What was the second-to-last thing they were going to do?' but the question was thrown out."

By focusing the nation's fears on these new bogey-men, "It certainly takes attention away from Bill Clinton and his sexual proclivities, so Chuck Knight's a very important matter," attorney Abrams explains. "One little air conditioner repairman in Phoenix Arizona rises to a very important position."

I asked former federal prosecutor Abrams if he was ready to join a militia, himself. "I'm going to keep practicing with my Winchester Model '94 in 30-30, and my Glock 23, and keep buying as much ammunition as I can possibly afford.... I think we have to

stand up and thumb our noses at the tyrannies of government, and not be like this jury and say 'We didn't want to convict him, but we had to; we didn't have any choice.' I'm just really appalled at the ability of the American people to just turn over authority to the central government...." **RRR**

Vin Suprynowicz is the assistant editorial page editor of the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Readers may contact him at [vin@lvrj.com](mailto:vin@lvrj.com). The web site for the Suprynowicz column is <http://www.nguworld.com/vindex/>

## BILL TALKS ABOUT RACE

Michael Levin

**H**arder than writing about political statements on race is reading them in the first place. With very few exceptions they are hackneyed, unctuous bilge. Worse: by recycling and thereby reinforcing old errors and deceptions, they postpone engagement with real difficulties that much longer.

One does not expect much from President Bill, but his widely-heralded "major address on race" to the graduating class of the U. of California, San Diego, was abysmal even by his standards. Basically a rehash of leftist canards and nostrums, it managed to be entirely predictable and profoundly disappointing, even disturbing, at the same time.

To begin with, Clinton's rhetoric was markedly anti-white. Naturally, he refused to give whites any credit for the countless laws, judicial decisions, and private initiatives of the past fifty years meant to help blacks at white expense: school integration, the overthrow of freedom of association in the

name of civil rights, racial quotas, government set-asides, antimajoritarian "voting rights," thousands of scholarships and training programs—this catalogue was somehow overlooked. Equally naturally, Clinton lauded black "heroes of the civil rights movement" as if they had vanquished whole armies of hostile whites solely by their own efforts. In truth, of course, the "civil rights revolution" was done for blacks by a sympathetic white elite, most especially a white federal government. Blacks would have gotten precisely nowhere had whites genuinely wanted to "oppress" them.

And, of course, American history à la Clinton became a tale of white hypocrisy and malfeasance: We were born with the Declaration of Independence, which asserted that we were all created equal, and a Constitution that enshrined slavery. We fought a bloody civil war to abolish slavery and preserve the union [and just who did the fighting and bleeding?], but we remained a house divided and unequal by law for another century. We advanced across the continent in the name of freedom, yet in so doing we pushed Native Americans off their land, often crushing their culture and their livelihood. Our Statue of Liberty welcomes poor, tired, huddled masses of immigrants to our borders, but each new wave has felt the sting of discrimination.

Sadly, "evidence of bigotry" continues to this day, seemingly all due to whites, from "desecration of houses of worship" to "demeaning talk in corporate suites."

This sort of rewriting of the past is so standard it scarcely counts; Clinton's anti-white animus, as I say, went deeper. Consider how he formulated the cliché that every barrel contains a few bad apples. Concerning blacks he said primly: "If a black American commits a crime, condemn the act. But remember that most African-

**Wanting a nonjudgmental atmosphere in which whites can admit their sickness is all part of Clinton's unrelieved negativism toward whites.**

Americans are hard-working, law-abiding citizens." As for Hispanics, "the vast majority are responsible citizens" even if "a Latino gang member deals drugs." Contrast this with his more emotionally charged admonition about whites: "If white teenagers beat a young African-American almost to death just because of his race, for God's sake, condemn the act. But remember, the overwhelming majority of white people will find it just as hateful."

Let's deconstruct. The black "crime" is wholly unspecified, as is the race of its victim (and drug-dealing has no victim); the white crime is described in detail and tendentiously made anti-black. The average black or Hispanic is hard-working, law-abiding and responsible, whereas Clinton found it inexpedient, or could not bring himself, to characterize whites in any positive way; the best he could manage about them is that they are properly appalled by the misbehavior of other whites!

Incidentally, Clinton was being disingenuous at best about black law-abidingness; right now about 1/3 of all black males run afoul of the criminal justice system at some time in their lives, and in large cities with large black populations more than half of all black males will at some point be arrested for committing a violent crime.

Many people see a concession to whites in Clinton's remark that the conversation he proposes "seems to threaten them" and "must not exclude

them." Toward the end of his speech he championed "honest dialogue" and urged everyone "to get past defensiveness and fear and political correctness and other barriers to honesty."

Granted that acknowledgment of the reality of pressures to be politically correct is a remarkable admission from anyone on the left, I still detect no concessiveness here. Clinton, as I read him, is worried that fear of being censured for their malodorous beliefs will keep whites from expressing them openly, and if they don't say what they really think they will never be able to face how vile it is. Just as the first, necessary, step in curing a drunk or drug addict is that he admit his problem, the first step in curing whites of racism is getting them to 'fess up. Wanting a nonjudgmental atmosphere in which whites can admit their sickness is all part of Clinton's unrelieved negativism toward whites.

I'm not joking about the analogy with drunkenness; Clinton did sometimes lapse into therapeutic psychobabble, as when he reported appointing a panel "to help educate Americans about the facts surrounding issues of race, to promote a dialogue in every community in the land to confront and work through these issues." Now, one would think that dialoguing and working through are far less important than the facts about race themselves, on which the possibility and desirability of racial reconciliation hinge. Here Clinton was especially skimpy. The sorry history of white wrongdoing is presumably one such fact, but that aside Clinton mentioned just one other: "There are no children," he said, "who, because of their ethnic or racial background, who [sic] cannot meet the highest academic standards."

This is not a lie, exactly, since lying implies knowledge of the truth plus a desire to deceive, and I doubt that Clinton cares what the truth is or whether anyone actually believes him. But it is a falsehood, of the greatest

consequence. For if black and Hispanic children are just as educable as white—although, Clinton added in a puzzling caveat, they do need “well-trained teachers,” “well-equipped classrooms,” and “reasoned reforms,” stage-setting somehow unnecessary for whites or Asians—why their sub-par academic performance? Why are blacks so poor, and why, as Clinton noted obliquely, is the “spark of enterprise” so lacking in the “inner cities”? Obviously because whites have denied them the opportunity to show what they can do. And insuring that they have this opportunity is the point of “affirmative action,” that one topic that lifted Clinton from a fog of vagueness into clear mendacity.

Clinton introduced this topic by pointedly admitting that affirmative action “has not been perfect,” quickly followed by the assurance that, “when used in the right way, it has worked.” In one sense, of course, this is true. If by “working” one means the replacement of whites by blacks, then indeed affirmative action cannot help but be successful; reserve 15% of the positions in a law school class of 500 for blacks, and presto your entering class will include 75 blacks. It doesn’t matter that 75 whites with superior academic records have been turned away; the practice has “worked.” And Clinton boldly accepted this definition, noting that there are more African-American...lawyers and judges, scientists and engineers than ever before.” True enough; how could it be otherwise?

Clinton used this “success” as an occasion to warn against “resegregating” higher education, and challenge critics of affirmative action to “come up with an alternative” to prevent this from happening.

This bit of verbal chicanery is known in logic as the fallacy of the complex question. Clinton has assumed that there is something wrong with reducing the proportion of blacks and Hispanics in higher edu-

cation to the levels of pre-affirmative action days, so the proper response is not to come up with new ways to shoehorn in unqualified minorities, but to dispute this assumption itself. A recent study in the *National Law Journal* showed that, were blacks asked to meet the standards expected of whites, only about one-tenth of the blacks currently in law school would be there. What this indicates to an objective observer, quite simply, is that most blacks now in law school should not be there, and that resegregation on the basis of merit would be welcome.

Clinton tried the usual bluff to blunt this inference: “I believe a student body that reflects...diversity...has independent educational value.” The *bien-pensants* repeat this like a mantra nowadays, but it is simply not true. When I was a graduate student in philosophy before quotas came along, the full range of opinion in my discipline could be found among us white males. We had intellectual diversity, which is all that matters. So far as I can see, the recruitment of underqualified blacks and Hispanics has added only truculence to the academic world, not new ideas.

As Charles Krauthammer has also observed, the most obnoxious passages in Clinton’s speech dealt with the motives of his opponents. To begin with, he felt it necessary to issue an assurance: “Let me say, I know that the people of California voted to repeal affirmative action without any ill motive.” This too sounds concessive, until you realize that the whole point of saying what should go without saying is to call it into question. Suppose Clinton had said “I know that everyone in my audience is sober,” or “I am quite sure that every

black on the platform with me today is legitimate.” By expressing confidence in the good intentions of Californians Clinton suggested that confidence needed to be expressed, that opposition to affirmative action creates some presumption of bad faith, that he is giving Californians the benefit of a doubt he has created.

And what, according to Clinton, was the motive of Californians? It was “a conviction that discrimination and isolation are no longer barriers to achievement.” No, it was the conviction that quotas are unfair, that they make today’s whites pay for past misdeeds that they are not responsible for and may never have happened, that the longer quotas exist the more blacks will regard special privilege as a birthright, further rending the social fabric. Opponents of quotas are not naifs, however convenient it is to portray them so.

**Were blacks asked to meet the standards expected of whites, only about one-tenth of the blacks currently in law school would be there.**

In oversimplifying his critics’ motives, Clinton committed another textbook fallacy, the “straw man”: create the impression you have refuted a position by attacking a caricature of it. This was not the only time he did so. He had the nerve to say “There are those who argue that scores on standardized tests should be the sole measure of qualification for admissions to colleges and universities.” In fact, nobody says this.

As everyone knows, the primary criterion for admission is and should be high school grades. Standardized test scores are useful secondary indicators of ability, and are particularly useful in controlling for variations in grading standards among different schools. The only trouble with them, for liberals, is that blacks do worse on them than do whites (and, inexplicably, Asians), and that this discrepancy



just underlines the grade inflation in majority-minority schools, where sheer attendance in a math or English class often suffices for a B or an A. Liberals like Clinton who want to do away with standardized tests help the argument along by the fib that these tests are dangerously influential.

(Another fib, although apparently too brazen for Bill to trot out: that objective tests predict nothing. The latest supposed evidence for this is the failure of the SAT scores of incoming Harvard students to correlate with their subsequent grades. The fallacy here is that all Harvard students have extremely high SATs, so the tiny variations among them mean nothing. It is as if liberals argued that height has nothing to do with success in basketball success because 6'11" NBA centers score as often as centers who are 7'1". So they do, but this does not mean a man 5'5" has a good chance of outshooting Patrick Ewing.)

The true tale of Clinton's initiative is told by the composition of his "Advisory Board." Only three of its nine members are white, and they are certified liberals; an ex-governor of New Jersey who was a U.S. delegate to the Women's Rights Conference in Beijing, an ex-governor of Mississippi said by an official White House hand-out to have "fought for equal opportunity for all citizens and better relations between the races," and a director of a foundation that issues "grants to support community agencies in South Central Los Angeles." The "persons of color" seem to be no better; one of them, Suzan [sic] Cook, recently reminisced in the *New York Times* about an occasion in 1965 when the mother of a white friend did not want her daughter to play with Miss Cook, and how this showed her the need to "break down barriers." The chairman of the committee is John Hope Franklin, who has made a long career of chronicling slavery. In other words, the mixture very much as before.

The most depressing aspect of Clinton's rewarming of liberal pap is the opportunity he blew. The Cold War is over. Communism no longer inspires anyone but the professoriate in American and English universities. By far the most consequential issue facing America in 1997 is race. But new, or at least seldom heard, ideas are needed; we will get precisely nowhere by continuing to attribute the friction between the races to "racism," to be resolved by "coming together" for "conversations" about the glories of an ill-defined "diversity." By using up the public's short attention span with just such tired bushwa, Clinton has delayed a proper reckoning by several more years, during which time things can only get worse. **RRR**

## THATCHER AND TEUTONOPHOBIA

Paul Gottfried

**H**aving just returned from a visit to England and from extended conversations with conservative journalists and political leaders there, allow me to offer some of my impressions. From my visit, and particularly, from one informative luncheon with the editors of the British *Spectator*, it became clear that views long held by American paleos in regard to British elites should be reexamined. Not that those views are entirely unfounded. Listening to Margaret Thatcher or reading the Heritage Foundation's resident Thatcherite Stuart Butler or British journalist-historian Paul Johnson, one notes certain unseemly obsessions, and these may explain why Murray Rothbard was always on

### Whipping up dislike of Germans is old hat for British elites.

guard for hidden motives behind talk of a "special relationship" between the English-speaking democracies.

Most particularly one picks up from these sources a hatred of Germans, one that could be seen especially in Thatcher's press interviews and oratory from the late eighties on. Like Butler, Thatcher urged the U.S. government to put pressure on West Germany's Chancellor Helmut Kohl after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Butler and Thatcher feared that a reunified Germany would pose a threat to England's interests on the continent. In Thatcher's case, however, the opposition was surprisingly shrill and characterized by references to a wicked German nation.

In 1992, Thatcher let it be known that a reunified Germany was "one of the great failures of my life." She thereafter opposed England's joining of the European Union on the same grounds: that it was a preliminary step in a German plan to conquer Europe and thereby to complete the work of Bismarck and the Kaiser as well as of Hitler. And Thatcher, like her friends at the *Wall Street Journal* and *Heritage*, spoke out for the continuation of an American-led Nato. This too was held to be necessary because of the continuation of the German authoritarian personality and German economic hegemony, a combo Thatcher claimed was making her own country frantic.

Broad hints were also given that the Russians and other Eastern Europeans could not really be trusted to become "democratic." Like the Germans, they had authoritarian and anti-Semitic histories, and therefore the U.S. should play supercop across the Atlantic, by sitting on the Krauts and hemming in the Ruskies. Among British publications the *Economist*