



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 27, NO. 3

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

OCTOBER 1993

Shenanigans of the Clinton Administration

Congress Promotes Decadence Through the NEA

Few things show Congress's total decadence and disdain for the American people so well as the repeated votes to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). We're still waiting for some Congressman to answer, "the National Endowment for the Arts," when TV talk show hosts belligerently ask, "Well, what would you cut out of the federal budget?"

Rep. Philip M. Crane (R-IL) has repeatedly pointed out that there is no constitutional authority for Congress to give taxpayers' money to individual artists to advance their careers. But the NEA does exactly that, year after year.

In 1992, the NEA reviewed 17,677 applications for grants, from which 4,251 were anointed with taxpayers' cash. Government endorsement is used to promote the careers of those so-called artists at the expense of their competitors. The lucky recipients are usually those who know how to work the system by getting their pals on the peer review panels. Even if the grant procedure were not an outright scandal, it's obvious that the peculiar biases of those doling out the money play a dominant role in who gets the cash.

The NEA functions as a sort of Ministry of Culture from which the Art Commissar decides which art should be endorsed and subsidized and which should not. That doesn't sound very American, does it? Not only are many choices of the Art Commissar offensive to the American people, not only is the whole selection process inherently unfair and plagued with scandal, not only does the federal deficit demand major cuts throughout the budget, but art in America is probably the least needy category of all federal spending. NEA expenditures of \$178 million in 1992 were a drop in the bucket compared to the \$9.3 billion given to the arts by the private sector (from individuals, bequests, corporations, and foundations).

Art in America was alive and well long before Lyndon Johnson created this NEA monster as part of the Great Society, and art will do very well, indeed, if the NEA is

abolished. Private spending on art continues to climb, despite higher taxes.

The NEA's Latest Outrage

Senator Jesse Helms recently received an unsolicited letter from Anne-Imelda M. Radice, Ph.D., the former Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. She said she had just discovered that, on her watch last September, the NEA made a fellowship grant to a photographer named Joel-Peter Witkin who uses "shock quality of prurient subjects as a primary virtue." Dr. Radice was so embarrassed about this grant that she apparently wanted to get her apology on record before the scandal erupted on the Senate floor. Witkin's work (it can't be called art) is nauseating enough to make even liberals concede that there must be a culture war going on in America.

In her defense, Dr. Radice stated that she didn't know how Witkin was going to spend the federal grant funds. She confessed that, under regular procedure, Witkin was under no obligation to tell the NEA ahead of time. However, that's no excuse. Witkin's \$20,000 grant in 1992 was his fourth grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

In a book of his photographs published in 1985, Witkin wrote an afterword in which he issued a plea for models to contact him about having their pictures taken. He didn't want just any models. Here are his peculiar specifications, written in his own words:

"A partial listing of my interests: physical prodigies of all kinds, pinheads, dwarfs, giants, hunchbacks, pre-op transsexuals, bearded women, active or retired side show performers, contortionists (erotic), women with one breast (center), twins joined at the foreheads, twins sharing the same arm or leg, living Cyclopes, people with tails, horns, wings, fins, claws, reversed feet or hands, elephantine limbs, etc. All people with unusually large genitals. Sex masters and slaves. Human skeletons and human pin-cushions. People with complete rubber wardrobes. Geeks.

Private collections of instruments of torture, romance, of human, animal and alien parts. All manner of visual perversions. A young blonde girl with two faces. Any living myth. Anyone bearing the wounds of Christ."

The April issue of the magazine *Vanity Fair* featured a glowing article about Witkin. The author was apparently star-struck with Witkin's perversions and preoccupation with morbidity, praising his "quixotic sense of his divine mission" and calling him "Saint Joel-Peter of Kodak." *Vanity Fair* even gave its readers a preview photo of one of Witkin's latest creations, which will be featured in an upcoming exhibition: the head of a man, with a section of skull removed, converted into a vase with flowers stuck into it.

Witkin is much fawned over by the artsy groups and exhibits at leading photography galleries around the world. One of his most notorious photographs, a picture of a corpse's head sliced in two and smushed lip to lip, sold at Sotheby's in 1990 for \$27,000. There is something so rotten about the process under which such kooks as Witkin are able to get grants of taxpayers' money that it cries out for remedy.

The NEA's FY 92 Visual Artists Fellowships panel in photography reviewed a total of 1,708 applications in a series of four rounds of review. After the first round, 625 applicants remained for further consideration, and 137 were left after the second round. Witkin survived all four rounds. The minutes of the panel meetings show that one spoke of Witkin's "importance" as an artist, and that the panelists finally agreed that Witkin "is a major talent deserving of support."

Dr. Radice explained why it is impossible for the NEA to reform itself in her letter to Senator Helms: "This [Witkin grant] points to the difficulties which the [NEA] Agency will continue to experience with these 'buy time' types of awards. There is really little protection for the taxpayers. Unless the chairman can be everywhere and know everything, it is impossible to guarantee that such an unfortunate situation cannot reoccur."

"Protection for the taxpayers"? Another current "art" project was to hand out \$10 bills to illegal aliens near the Mexican border. Public ridicule forced the NEA to withdraw its backing, but an NEA spokesman praised the overall project (which received a \$250,000 NEA grant) as "an exemplary project."

Yes, there is a way to guarantee that such outrages do not reoccur: abolish the National Endowment for the Arts.

Joycelyn Elders Talks Too Much

The job description of U.S. Surgeon General consists mostly of moving the jaws. It's a talking job, and that's where Joycelyn Elders' qualifications break down. Her confirmation hearings showed her so inarticulate in response to questions that she had to be "rescued" by Senator Ted Kennedy's "clarifications."

Republican Senators challenged her about her distribution to teenagers of condoms that she knew were defective. Her defense? She didn't want to diminish

teenagers' faith in the use of condoms by warning them that a particular lot was defective (in addition to the ordinary failure rate).

When Elders does get her point across, she reveals herself to be a bigot who is absolutely the wrong person to be giving advice to teenagers. Here are a few of her more outrageous remarks.

Elders said on CBS's 60 Minutes that every girl should take a condom in her purse when she goes out on a date. That's tantamount to turning minor girls into sex objects by telling them that fornication is the expected social activity on a date.

In her frequent addresses to pro-abortion groups, Elders makes such polarizing statements as: pro-lifers need to get over "their love-affair with the fetus" and "they love little babies only as long as they are in someone else's uterus."

In fact, there probably has never been a social movement in which so many people gave so generously out of their own pockets to care for pregnant women in distress and their babies. Joycelyn Elders, on the other hand, does all her social work with the taxpayers' money.

Elders attacks her conservative critics as "very religious non-Christians . . . having a slave-master mentality." Nobody gave her any authority to define Christians. The "slave-master" thrust is totally untrue and shows rank bigotry.

Elders charged that the pro-life movement is led by a "celibate, male-dominated church," which she criticized as not doing anything about slavery, the Indian problem, women not having the right to vote, and the Holocaust. Only an anti-Catholic bigot could talk like that.

Elders was quoted by the *Arkansas Democrat* as saying she has "no qualms about using her official position to promote abortion rights." According to the *Arkansas Gazette*, she is an advocate of sex education starting in kindergarten.

She is notorious for displaying a "condom plant" in her office. *U.S. News & World Report* calls it her "trademark in-your-face gesture."

Elders came to national attention as the "Condom Queen" of Arkansas. As the director of Arkansas' Health Department since 1987, she installed more Condom Clinics in public schools than any other state: Arkansas has 24 Condom Clinics out of fewer than 200 nationwide.

In 1989 Elders backed a bill to establish school-based health clinics in Arkansas but, when the legislature amended it to prevent the dispensing of condoms, she withdrew her support. The bill was defeated, but Elders installed Condom Clinics in schools anyway, with Governor Bill Clinton's blessing.

The supposed purpose of the Condom Clinics is to reduce teenage pregnancies, but condom distribution has miserably failed to achieve that goal. The pregnancy rate rose in ten of the eleven Arkansas counties where she installed school Condom Clinics.

According to Henry Masters, medical director for the AIDS/STD Division of the Arkansas Department of Health, since 1989 syphilis cases have risen 130 percent

among Arkansas teenagers and teenage pregnancies have increased 13 percent. Both figures were declining before Elders came into office.

What is Elders's response to critics of her Condom Clinics? She says, "These are the same people who were against Indians, the blacks, the Jews."

Of course, as a typical liberal bureaucrat, there is indeed one thing Elders is good at — spending more of the taxpayers' money. The budget for her Health Department (in the face of failed results) increased from \$67 million in 1987 to \$150 million in 1993.

Her tax-paid activities have been immensely profitable to her personally. She was a triple dipper, getting two salaries from the Arkansas taxpayers (the Department of Health and the University of Arkansas) totaling \$103,297 per year, plus \$550 per day salary and \$135 a day in expense money from the federal taxpayers as a "consultant" to the Department of Health and Human Services.

Elders is supremely unqualified for a job whose principal "work" is public statements. She is an embarrassment even to the Clinton Administration, which has already distinguished itself by an unprecedented series of embarrassing appointments. Of course, none of this is any surprise to President Clinton. As Elders boasted, "He's had five years of me [in Arkansas]. President Clinton knows what he's getting."

Clinton's Plan for National Servitude

President Clinton's national "servitude" act is a misguided effort which promises to make it easier for young people to afford college. Mounting evidence suggests that we are sending too many of them to college already.

At least 35 percent of recent college graduates now have to take jobs that don't require college degrees, up from 15 percent five years ago. The dismal job market has prompted many graduates to take factory or other blue-collar jobs. They would have been ahead financially if they had started to work right out of high school.

Career prospects for the college class of 1993 are the worst in decades. Successful job searches now take nine months to a year. Colleges had an average of only 23 corporate recruiters visit their campuses this year, compared to 42 in 1986.

From 1988 to 1992, the number of graduating college seniors grew 11 times faster than the number of full-time, non-farm jobs, according to the National Center for Employment Statistics and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Bureau warns that there will be 200,000 fewer jobs than graduates every year for at least the next decade.

If Clinton's generosity with our tax dollars sends more young people to college, he will only increase the number of dissatisfied twentysomethings. The *Wall Street Journal* recently profiled one such couple as they sat naked in a Portland, Oregon coed hot tub house, commiserating with each other about the menial jobs they have to take to earn a combined \$20,000 a year.

It's not just hot bubbling water they are soaking in; they are wallowing in self-pity. Boo, hoo.

Just a few years ago, according to the *Journal*, they were hanging out in college pubs, living the easy life of a college student, confidently expecting their diplomas to be a ticket to the fast track.

The "Generation X," according to the *Journal*, now believes "there is little hope of matching their parents' standard of living." Translated, this means that these young people had foolish expectations of starting out in their twenties at the standard of living their parents achieved only after a lifetime of hard work.

Their parents didn't start out at the median wage, with a house, new car, household appliances, and other conveniences that today's young people seem to regard as necessities. Their parents had the quaint, old-fashioned notion that you start out with any job you can get and work your way up to the good things in life.

One of these hot-tub crybabies whined, "Sometimes I wonder why we haven't all committed mass suicide, because we don't have a hell of a lot to look forward to." If you were an employer, would you hire a young woman with that kind of attitude toward life?

While still in college, she acquired two credit cards on which she ran up charges of \$5,000 for nice clothes, trips to Mexico, and gifts for friends. If you were an employer, would you hire someone who ran up such debts when she didn't even have a job? This college graduate also complains about the indignity of not being rewarded for her 3.8 grade point average. But why should she be? Everybody gets good grades now.

Success and achievement, and sometimes even survival, are built on years of long hours of hard work. College life today does not prepare young people for the real world.

For most students, college means spending four years living on somebody else's money (either their parents' or the taxpayers'), in beautiful surroundings on a well-manicured campus, enjoying a casual schedule that allows plenty of leisure time for "fun" and non-productive activities, where their self-esteem is enhanced out of all proportion to their work and ability by the deception called "grade inflation," and where they develop the unrealistic expectation that they are entitled, upon graduation, to a well-paying job.

Of course, many students apply themselves diligently, make wise choices about courses, and get a first-rate education. But thousands of others, who received the same diploma, were admitted to college when they weren't prepared even to take freshman English, then received college credit for courses that have no college-level academic content or career value, and were given high grades that they did not earn (because it has become Politically Incorrect to fail anyone).

Even at Harvard, the average grade exceeds B+ and, according to a recent issue of *Harvard Magazine*, "in some departments A stands for Average."

It's time for students, parents and taxpayers to wake up and realize how they've been ripped off by pricey colleges and universities that get half their money from hardworking taxpayers, most of whom themselves didn't

go to college. Thousands of young people would be better off to get a job and continue their education on the side, by night classes, correspondence or video classes.

Men, Learn a Lesson About Feminists

Two news stories reported on the same day reveal the double standards of the feminists as well as their extraordinary power within the Clinton Administration.

One item reported Navy Secretary John H. Dalton's demand that the Navy's top officer, Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Frank B. Kelso 2d, take the fall for the Tailhook incident of two years ago. The case against the younger officers who were accused of indecent exposure and assault has fallen apart, and so the Navy, in panic and full retreat in the face of feminist fury, decided to pin the blame on Kelso and 12 other admirals, none of whom committed the offenses or was even present during the alleged actions.

President Clinton, who likes Kelso, overruled Dalton and let Kelso keep his job; but that didn't erase the embarrassment of Dalton's order. Kelso was thus taught a bitter lesson about feminist vindictiveness and lack of gratitude. Since the Tailhook incident of September 1991, Kelso has been the most obsequious of all senior officers in acquiescing to Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-CO) and the other feminists who are demanding that Navy women be assigned to military combat jobs. He led the campaign within the armed services to implement their demands that women be assigned to fighter aircraft and all combat vessels.

Kelso never dared to point out the total non sequitur involved in the argument "Tailhook, ergo women in combat." Kelso never asked any common sense questions such as, "If Navy women can't handle themselves in the company of some friendly drunks in a Las Vegas hotel, how can they survive in combat against the sorts of sadistic enemies our troops have fought during our lifetime?"

But carrying water for these outrageous demands didn't save Admiral Kelso from the warwhooping feminists who are demanding scalps, any scalps, for Tailhook. When information surfaced that the case against the junior male officers was collapsing for lack of evidence, and that the feminists' lead witness Paula Coughlin allegedly participated in the leg-shaving events and then fingered the wrong man for court martial, the feminists demanded that heads roll anyway, and Kelso was the easiest target.

You see, to the feminists, it doesn't matter whether or not they prosecute the right man. In their view, since all men are guilty of "sexism" and are "potential rapists," it's okay to lynch any man they can catch.

That's the same kind of non-logic that led the feminists to argue during the Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings that, since some women have been sexually harassed, therefore, Thomas should not be confirmed. If you don't get the connection, you just don't understand feminism.

Side by side with the Kelso article in most newspapers

was the news about the Justice Department report on the fire that burned to death most of the members of a cult in Waco, Texas on April 19. The Department's report criticizes mid- and lower-level Federal agents who recommended the assault in which armored vehicles punched holes in David Koresh's building and filled it with gas, instead of simply arresting Koresh on one of the many times when he openly left the compound.

But the Justice Department report completely cleared senior FBI officials and Attorney General Janet Reno, even though it was she who ordered the assault that proved fatal to some 85 people, including women and children. It was one of the deadliest law-enforcement operations in memory, and perhaps in history.

Pardon me. Didn't we all see Reno on national television, soon after the Waco debacle, wiping a tear from her eye as she admitted that she made the fatal decision? You bet we did; but the report said she didn't make any "significant mistakes."

So, what do you think is the reason why, on the very same day, the top dog of the Navy (Frank Kelso) is told to walk the plank for the unauthorized actions of his subordinates, while the top dog of the Justice Department (Janet Reno) is not even reprimanded for her own tragic decision that proved fatal to 85 people? The answer is pretty obvious: he's a man and she's a woman.

More precisely, she's a feminist who is part of Hillary Clinton's ruling clique, and he's a man who, having done all he could for the feminists as Navy Chief, is forced to serve the feminist cause additionally by being disgraced.

The same day, most newspapers carried pictures of Ruth Bader Ginsburg taking her seat on the Supreme Court. At her confirmation hearings, no member of the Senate Judiciary Committee scraped enough nerve to ask this radical feminist about her bizarre published writings, such as her demands that the laws against statutory rape and prostitution be repealed, that prisons be sex-integrated, that the age of sexual consent be reduced to age 12.

The big news of the week was actually Hillary Clinton's health-care debut on Capitol Hill. But the Congressmen didn't ask her any tough questions, either; they were too busy posing for pictures.

When are we going to have some real men in Congress who will treat Hillary, Ginsburg and Reno like a man? And ask them the same tough questions they would ask a man?

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; 3 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.