



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 26, NO. 2

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

SEPTEMBER 1992

## Comparing the Two Party Platforms

A reading of the Democratic and Republican Party Platforms should convince most people that there is a fundamental difference between them. In goals, values, and approach to the institutions of family and government, the two parties are headed in opposite directions.

The Democrats pretend they are trying hard to abandon what they call "the old notion that there's a [government] program for every problem," but like a confirmed alcoholic who says he's going to take just one more drink, their Platform promises ever more costly programs that will surely require higher taxes.

The Republican Platform comes down foursquare on the tax issue: "We will oppose any attempt to increase taxes." The Democrats' code word for tax increases is "investment" — they want to "invest" in more government regulations, more government research, more government education, more government infrastructure, more government babysitting, and more government projects of all kinds.

The Republicans are specific about taxes. "The most dramatic change in the tax code in our lifetime," the Platform explains, "is one that has never been explicitly enacted by Congress or reported as a specific news event. It is the gradual, year by year, erosion of the personal exemption, until it was indexed by a Republican Administration in 1986." Republicans doubled this exemption to \$2000, and the Platform promises: "We are committed to fully restoring the inflation-adjusted value of the personal exemption."

The Republicans recognize the serious national problem that "our current educational system is not educating our children." The Republican solution is: "Parents have the right to choose the best school for their children," and the Platform offers a "GI Bill for Children" to provide \$1,000 scholarships to enable children to attend the school of their choice.

Respecting parental authority, the Republican Platform states that parents "should have the right not only to

participate in their child's education, but to choose for their children among the broadest array of educational choices, without regard to their income," including homeschooling. The Republican Platform even demands that "schools should teach right from wrong." The Democratic Platform is vehement against school choice: "We oppose the Bush Administration's efforts to bankrupt the public school system through private school vouchers."

The Democratic Platform continues appealing to the special-interest pressure groups which for 20 years have had a stranglehold on the national Democratic Party. The Platform reaffirms the discredited concept of "affirmative action," and for the first time would extend "civil rights protection for gay men and lesbians and an end to Defense Department discrimination."

The Republican Platform counters, "We oppose efforts by the Democrat Party to include sexual preference as a protected minority receiving preferential status under civil rights statutes at the federal, state, and local level. We oppose any legislation or law which legally recognizes same-sex marriages and allows such couples to adopt children or provide foster care."

The Democratic Platform comes out unequivocally for "Choice. Democrats stand behind the right of every woman to choose, consistent with *Roe v. Wade*, regardless of ability to pay, and support a national law to protect that right." Funny thing, the Platform fails to mention exactly what women will be choosing (but it certainly won't be the school their children attend).

The Republicans adopted the same Platform language on abortion that they won on in 1984 and 1988: "We believe the unborn child has a fundamental individual right to life which cannot be infringed."

The two parties are poles apart on the controversial National Endowment for the Arts. The Democrats call it "firmly rooted in the First Amendment's freedom of expression guarantee," whereas the Republicans condemn "the use of public funds to subsidize obscenity and

blasphemy masquerading as art."

On Family Values, the Republican Platform states, "Because divorce, desertion, and illegitimacy account for almost all the increase in child poverty over the last 20 years, we put the highest priority upon enforcement of family rights and responsibilities." It asserts that "today's liberal Democrats are hostile toward any institution government cannot control, like private childcare or religious schools."

The Republican Platform stands firm in support of Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which now has a new mission. "SDI is now designed to provide the U.S. and our allies with global defenses against limited ballistic missile attacks" and serves as our "shield against technoterrorism." The Democrats, looking to the past, still claim that "a Comprehensive Test Ban" is the way to stop nuclear weapons.

The Democratic Platform is full of defeatist rhetoric — a "cry of frustration," "the American dream of expanding opportunity has faded," we are "still falling behind," "people are torn by divisions," "anguish and anger," and we're in "a long-term slide." The Republicans, taking their cue from ever-optimistic Ronald Reagan, are determined to "choose hope over fear."

## Has the Democratic Party Changed?

Presidential candidate Bill Clinton says he wants change. The word "change" is in his every other sentence, which may be the biggest legacy of Ross Perot's foray into national politics. But, as Barbara Jordan intoned: "change from what, to what?" Only the rhetoric has changed, certainly not the substance of what the Democrats are all about.

The largest single bloc of votes at the Democratic National Convention was not the New York or California delegation, but the teachers unions. The National Education Association (NEA) had nearly 400 delegates at the Democratic National Convention and, combined with the American Federation of Teachers, the teachers unions had nearly 500 delegates. That is more power than Mario Cuomo wielded.

The speakers all emoted about the poor, about having compassion, and about the American dream of starting poor in a rural southern town and making it to the top. But the top of what? Other than a few Hollywood celebrities, you would be hard pressed to find a delegate or speaker at the Democratic Convention who had made a career in the private sector.

The one thing almost all the Democratic Convention delegates had in common was their membership in the highly-paid (and very profitable) "non-profit" sector, where their paychecks come directly or indirectly from raiding taxpayers' pockets. This includes government officials and employees, the education establishment, and the public-interest and social-service groups that call themselves

"non-profit" but actually profit handsomely from government programs.

Nearly two-thirds of the delegates at the Democratic National Convention reported family incomes of more than \$50,000 a year, three-fourths were college graduates, and 44 percent had post-graduate degrees. These people have figured out that their cushy lifestyle depends on maintaining the big-spending programs of the Democrats, but that electing Democrats to office depends on pretending to be "moderate" and adopting the rhetoric of Republicans.

So we heard speech after speech built on the same vocabulary: family, values, middle class, compassion, investment, fairness, greed, and vision. But those words in Clinton's mouth don't have the same definitions as they do when Bush and Quayle use them. To the Democrats, the word "family" excludes the unborn baby, the word "values" doesn't include marital fidelity, "compassion" means starting a new government program (not private charity), "investment" and "fairness" are code words for tax increases, "greed" refers to pay raises and perks for achievers in the private sector (but not to pay raises and perks for politicians and others paid by tax dollars), and "vision" means expecting Big Government to solve all our problems. The word profit is not in their vocabulary.

On his way to New York to be nominated, Clinton made an unscheduled drop-in at the Capital Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C. to thank the NEA Political Action Council for its endorsement and to invite NEA president Keith Geiger to stay in the Lincoln Room at the Clinton White House next year. A couple of days later, the 8,500 delegates to the NEA Convention endorsed Clinton by a record-breaking majority of 88 percent.

It's no coincidence that the Democratic Party Platform reads like a carbon copy of the resolutions passed the preceding week at the NEA convention: more expensive government programs of all kinds (of course, financed by higher taxes), diverting savings from cuts in the defense budget to new domestic spending such as "a national public works" program, national health care (a.k.a. socialized medicine), statehood for the District of Columbia (so Jesse Jackson can be a U.S. Senator), opposition to education choice, tax-funded abortion, gay rights, federal daycare (babysitting), and support for the irresponsible National Endowment for the Arts.

Clinton roused the Convention to feverish applause by asserting that government has been "hijacked" by the "privileged," and by repeating the refrain that he is "sick and tired" of it. The truth is that government has been hijacked by the Democratic liberals who have controlled Congress for the last 38 years, and we are sick and tired of it. The Democratic Party is trying so hard to clean up its act that it hid George Mitchell and Tom Foley from sight at the convention. But underneath the new image is the same old bunch of liberal and feminist activists.

## Bill Clinton's New Covenant

Bill Clinton's New Covenant is a different kettle of fish from Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, John F. Kennedy's New Frontier, and Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society. Whereas those previous slogans seemed to open a vista toward a better future, the dictionary defines covenant as a formal agreement between persons to do specified things.

Indeed, Clinton himself defined it as "a solemn commitment between the people and their government based on what all of us must give." It appears that the specified thing that the American people are supposed to give is \$150 billion in higher taxes.

Clinton's acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention was a very personal plea for national support. The only one he mentioned besides his mother and grandfather was his history professor at Georgetown University's Foreign Service School, the late Carroll Quigley, whom Clinton credited with helping to form his political outlook.

The singling out of Dr. Quigley was curious. He was a liberal academic with a very identifiable world view. The Foreign Service School's dean called Quigley "brilliant, charming and arrogant," and he demonstrated this by regularly flunking a third of the students in his class. A former student said that "one of the best-known ploys for a better grade from Quigley was to remind him — often — of one's activity in the Young Democrats." The student added that most of his peers, including the liberals, admitted that Quigley was "most in love with himself, his opinions and his 'position' in the Establishment."

Beyond the circle of Georgetown students who were required to take his history course, Quigley is known principally for his 1,338-page tome called *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Times* published in 1966. Those willing to wade through those tedious pages will be rewarded by a description of the powerful movers and shakers of our society.

Quigley wrote approvingly of the power, influence and activities of what he called "the network" that tries to rule the Western world. He boasted: "I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for 20 years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960s, to examine its papers and secret records." Quigley asserted that he was personally acquainted with the dynastic families of the super-rich, and he traced their immense power and influence. For the most part, he was a fan of their goals and policies and said that his chief difference with the "network" was that "it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

The "Hope" in his book's title represented the collectivist one-world society that will exist when the "network" achieves its goal of consolidating its rule. All

who resist this man-made millennium represent the "Tragedy," and Quigley asserted that it was too late for ordinary people to fight it.

It should be remembered that this book was written from the perspective of 1966. That was shortly after Big Media had smashed the candidacy of Barry Goldwater in 1964 with a smear campaign unprecedented for its virulence, and long before Ronald Reagan proved that grassroots conservatives could be victorious over the liberal Establishment.

*Tragedy and Hope* identified the members of the "network" as the "international bankers," men who are "cosmopolitan and international . . . close to governments and particularly concerned with questions of government debts . . . equally devoted to secrecy and the secret use of financial influence in political life."

The network always prefers Big Government, big federal spending, and the stability of a planned society rather than the uncertainties of the free market. One example of the power of the network is the way it has forced the American taxpayers to spend some \$10 billion a year on foreign giveaways every year since World War II. Quigley described the Council on Foreign Relations as one of several "front" organizations set up by the network for the purpose of advancing its internationalist schemes. Quigley was mightily impressed by the power and influence of Cecil Rhodes and his legacy, which "although not widely recognized, can hardly be exaggerated."

Quigley described the conflict between grassroots Americans and the big financial interests as "the Midwest of Tom Sawyer against the cosmopolitan East."

Bill Clinton may look like just a poor midwestern guy from Hope, Arkansas, but he is no Tom Sawyer. He learned a lot from his mentor about how things happen in America. When he became a Rhodes Scholar, he tied in with the power centers and learned how to tap into the country's financial moguls.

If Bill Clinton is elected President, will the man from Hope, Arkansas make the "Hope" from Carroll Quigley's book our national goals and policies?

## Gore Calls Us To a New Religion

Is your old-time religion getting a little stale? Do you feel in need of some spiritual revitalization? If you are interested, then V. P. wannabee Al Gore may be just the prophet you've been waiting for. In his much ballyhooed new book, *Earth in the Balance*, Gore attempts nothing less than the construction of a new religion out of his pet cause — the environment.

We're not just talking about saving the environment, which he calls "the central organizing principle of civilization." (Think about that for a moment. Organized where, and by whom?) Al Gore's agenda is really much grander than that. He cuts right to the heart of the matter in his chapter on spiritual environmentalism.

"The jury is still out," he says, "on whether God chose an appropriate technology" when he put man in charge of the earth. One wonders who is serving on this jury, and what kind of a sentence God will get if He is found guilty. Maybe some Democrats do support the death penalty.

The main problem, according to Gore, is that we are victims of modern technology. Powerless to withstand the assault from greedy businessmen and advertisers, we lie helpless, inert, unable even to notice "the forgotten human fodder chewed up by the cogs of industrial civilization."

Of course, once you have the cogs in place, it's a short step to "an elaborate edifice of clockwork efficiency capable of nightmarish cruelty on an industrial scale. Hitler and Stalin . . . might have been inconceivable" without the modern industrial mindset. Gore really deserves the gold medal in the long jump for that leap of logic. Gore seems terribly bothered by what he sees as the artificiality of modern life. "Our economy is called post-industrial; our architecture is called post-modern; our geopolitics are labeled post-Cold War. We know what we are not, but we don't seem to know what we are."

Now, we can all aspire to be God, or at least we can be part of the divinity of nature. With control of the federal spending power and an army of bureaucrats, Gore would be able to implement his vision of a brave new world where the elitists will regulate our standard of living and restrain our consumption habits in order to offer sacrifice to environmental deities.

In ancient societies, people worshiped the earth and the elements of nature. Humans were helpless before the whims of the deified sun and moon. Only by constant sacrifices to the gods could the ancients hope to affect their own destiny. Pantheism sought to locate divinity in every person, rock, bush, and bug. That was before the development of modern religions with what Gore complains is their "distinctly masculine orientation." Gore surely knows the buzz words to get the feminists to board his environmental train. They will like his new religion so much that they may even forgive him for having a homemaker wife and four children.

The jury will report its verdict this November. Gore must be hoping that some voters will read his book, and also hoping that others won't. Maybe I'm being too harsh. After all, as Gore states, ". . . the environmental crisis seems completely beyond our understanding and outside of what we call common sense." Amen to that.

## Media Questions at the Convention

The decision by the three major TV networks not to give gavel-to-gavel coverage of the Democratic and Republican national nominating conventions enabled the media to exercise significant control over the message by the questions they asked the delegates. Here are some of the questions most frequently asked by the media during the Republican National Convention in Houston, most of

which were an attempt to shove Republicans into a political corner.

*"Isn't this a very divisive Convention, hopelessly divided by the abortion issue into warring factions?"* On the contrary, it was one of the most harmonious Republican National Conventions in recent memory (and, incidentally, much more harmonious than the recent Democratic Convention).

*"Why are conservatives trying to exclude moderates from the Republican 'tent'?"* The Republican Party is not a closed fraternity into which people have to be initiated; Republicans invite everyone to vote for George Bush for the reason of your choice. For example, many people who are not conservative will vote for Bush just because the trial lawyers have lined up behind Clinton. That's called coalition politics.

*"Isn't it reprehensible of Republicans to attack Bill Clinton's wife?"* Hillary is not criticized in her role as Bill's wife, but as a top Clinton adviser who can be expected to pass on Bill's nominations to the Federal courts. She specifically injected herself into the campaign by saying, "If you vote for my husband, you get me; it's a two-for-one, blue plate special." Besides, Hillary is supposed to be the epitome of the independent and successful career woman, and now that she has come under criticism, she retreats into a "I'm just a poor little housewife" pose. She can't have it both ways.

*"Isn't the Platform adopted by the Convention the most extremely conservative ever adopted, and too 'narrow' for the voters to accept?"* There are only marginal differences between the 1992 Platform and those of 1984 and 1988, which resulted in landslide Republican victories.

*"Do the pro-lifers think they can win a floor fight?"* was the most frequent question asked during the week before the Convention, since the media were salivating at the prospect of a bloody battle. Although the pro-choicers needed only six state delegations to create a floor fight, they could muster just two — out of 50!

*"Isn't it a mistake to have a pro-life plank in the Platform because the polls say that '71 percent of Republicans are pro-choice'?"* What happened to the alleged "71 percent"? The Platform Committee voted 84-to-16 to readopt the same pro-life plank that was in the 1984 and 1988 Platforms, and that Platform was adopted by the full Convention on a voice vote in which the "No" votes were scarcely audible.

*[Last month's PSR should have been designated Vol. 26, No. 1.]*

## The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.