

by R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.

# The Party of Corruption



A few weeks back the Democrats' foxy rhetoricians put the poor Republicans on the defensive once again. The battleground was suitably telegenic, the Sunday morning

chat shows. The Democratic mouthpieces were less so, James (The Skull) Carville and the bewitched Dr. Paul Begala. Their stroke of genius was boldly to acknowledge all the investigations that the Boy President had attracted and to make a rhetorical virtue of his scandalousness. They called the Republicans "The Party of Investigations." The Republicans were speechless.

Oh no, not that! Yes, that! Not one of the verbally constipated Republicans had the fluency to reciprocate with the logical retort, to wit, identifying the Democrats as "The Party of Corruption." Not only does "The Party of Corruption" roll from the tongue more sonorously than the ungainly "Party of Investigations," it is an infinitely more onerous burden to bear, particularly before the electorate. After all, what would you rather be known as, corrupt or inquisitive, a crook or an investigator? The Democrats seem to think that the American people are likely to share their prejudice against government investigations, which of course implies being lenient toward government corruption. Do you really think the American people are lenient toward government corruption? We shall see.

The Clinton administration has attracted more independent counsels

*Adapted from RET's weekly Washington Times column syndicated by Creators Syndicate.*

and more congressional inquiries than any previous American government. By some weird intellectual contortion the Democrats believe that they can cite these investigations as proof that their president is innocent. It is as though the legendary bank robber Willie Sutton pointed to all his scrapes with the law as proof of biased police work. Actually in recent history some rather famous criminals have cited their brushes with the law as evidence of their innocence and of prosecutorial overzealousness. The Mafia makes this claim regularly. So did the Black Panthers.

This is not to say that all Democrats suffer this mental disorder—or is it a character disorder? There are senators of integrity such as Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Joseph Lieberman, who recognize corruption when they see it and have called for proper inquiries. But a surprising number of Democrats when confronted with White House cover-up have cooperated with the cover-up. If their consciences do not come alive and they continue to frustrate the investigation into the Clintons' lengthening list of scandals, the Democrats of the 1990's may indeed go down in history as the

Party of Corruption. That would be hoot, for among the Democrats' historical boasts is that they are the Party of Reform.

With the latest revelations about American technology being transferred to China to profit Democratic financial supporters—some residing in Peking—we might think back on the impediment the Democrats put in the path of Senator Fred Thompson. He tried to warn Americans that the Chinese had played an illegal role in the 1996 elections. His Senate Governmental Affairs Committee had access to classified information proving that Chinese money had been distributed to the Clinton campaign. Yet when Thompson disclosed this the Democrats ridiculed him and stonewalled despite threats to our national security.

Such White House co-conspirators as Senators Richard Durbin, John Glenn, Carl Levin, and Robert Torricelli were privy to the same intelligence reports as Thompson. In their committee appearances they misled the public into thinking Thompson was making baseless charges. On CNN the lubricious Senator Levin claimed that "All you've heard is the innuendo that somehow or other the China plan affected the presidential election. And of that we haven't seen any evidence whatsoever." Really, senator. And how about this whopper "But in terms of drawing dots between China and the presidential race, those dots are not yet there. And I—we haven't seen evidence that they are there." Now, of course, thanks to the revelations of Johnny Chung, we know the evidence was there, and in a recent column Robert Novak made clear that these Democrats had in fact seen the evidence.

Since Arkansas state troopers first stepped forward in 1993 to reveal the reflexive abuses of power, conflicts o

## R. I. P.

### KARL O'LESSKER

*The American Spectator* mourns the passing of its long-time senior editor and adviser Karl O'Lessker, who died on Memorial Day in our old home town of Bloomington, Indiana. A wonderful and devoted friend, a first rate scholar and astute political player and observer—and an unbudgetable fan of his beloved Philadelphia Phillies—Karl was a warm, sweet, modern man whom we will always miss and fondly remember.

terest, and coverups in which the Clintons regularly engaged in Arkansas, the evidence has mounted that the Clintons are continuing their rude political ways at the White House. Whether it be the suppression of an RTC investigation, the teaching of campaign laws, the treatment of White House interns, or any of the other White House scandals, the Clintons have continued the machine

politics they learned in one-party Arkansas. Some day—not far off—historians will be pondering whether the Clintons made the Democrats the Party of Corruption or whether the Democrats already were sufficiently corrupt to cooperate with the Clintons. Principled Democrats still have time to summon their party to cooperate in reasserting the rule of law in Washington. ❀

*Sport* one reads that Bossie was one of the chief agents in getting the mainstream press to look into Whitewater, its devious land deal, the assorted lies by the Clintons. It was Bossie who drew early attention to the charges of David Hale. After Senator Lauch Faircloth hired him to work on the Senate Whitewater Committee, Bossie continued to gather up useful information of Clinton scandals and to distribute it to the press. When the corruption of this administration is fully revealed and the reform of Washington politics begins, Bossie will be one of the remembered heroes.



## Who's the Bossie?

Conservative Republicans have a problem with timing, and in politics timing is of the utmost importance. Consider the recent defenestration of David Bossie, for eighteen months chief investigator to Congressman Dan Burton's House Government Reform and Oversight Committee. Bossie has elicited shrieks of partisan outrage from Democrats for his partisan behavior ever since he arrived at Burton's office. "Partisanship" is one of the many bugaboos that the intensely partisan Democrats dramatically abhor in public even as they practice partisanship ubiquitously; another of their bugaboos is "politics."

At any rate, each shriek against Bossie weakened his standing on Capitol Hill. Yet as Bossie was being undermined one of his Republican colleagues had the clue as to what was afoot. None ever defended him, at least until it was too late. Now that he has been forced to resign he is a martyr to their cause. The Republicans can be counted on to honor their martyrs. The question arises, why do the Republicans allow the martyrs to accumulate? My answer is timing. They wait to defend their own until it is too late.

Bossie might remind the Republicans of the late Governor Earl Long's crafty declaration to one of his Louisiana political allies, to wit, "I don't need you when I'm right." He needed his friends when he was in difficulty. Bossie has for a certainty found himself in difficulty. He was held responsible for the Burton commit-

tee's release of Webb Hubbell's jail house conversations. The release was legal, but the documents were clumsily prepared. They were neither edited transcripts nor paraphrased logs. Rather they were something in between, thus opening Bossie to unwarranted charges that he had doctored transcripts to make it appear that Hubbell had implicated Hillary Milhous Clinton in billing fraud.

Reporters who have listened to the entire tapes of Hubbell's conversations believe Hubbell does implicate Mrs. Clinton, but with the confusion about Bossie's mislabeled transcripts came calls for a sacrificial lamb. Bossie served that purpose. His letter of resignation revealed him to be a gentleman, to the surprise of no one who has dealt with him. Many people have, particularly journalists, who will tell you as ABC's Chris Vlasto told the *Washington Post*, "Dave Bossie has never lied to me, and the Clinton White House has lied to me." And Vlasto adds that "If it comes down to a question of whom do you believe, I'd believe Bossie any day." And there is that other Whitewater sleuth, Byron York, who asserts that Bossie "never lied or acted in an irresponsible manner."

But the indefatigable Bossie did act. He was an ingenious investigator who could draw connections from evidence that others missed. Moreover he distributed that evidence widely. Goaded by the insight that the Clintons were profoundly corrupt he offered his evidence to the press. In James Stewart's *Blood*

In his resignation letter Bossie recalled some of the Burton committee's achievements. He spoke of the hundreds of thousands of dollars that the committee discovered flowing towards Hubbell as he engaged in the sham of his plea bargaining. Bossie noted the committee's discovery of the Democratic National Committee's fundraising among South Americans and the information it gathered for the indictment of Charlie Trie. He took credit for the Independent Counsel now investigating Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt. Suggesting the vast corruption of the Clinton administration, Bossie reminded Burton that his committee has been "faced with the unprecedented stonewalling of nearly 100 witnesses who have taken the Fifth Amendment or fled the country."

After all this the Republican leadership let Bossie take the heat and be driven from the job he did so well. His departure will assist the Clintons in their master plan to run out the clock even as they criticize the investigators for dragging out their investigations. But if the Republicans believe that the sacrifice of Bossie will assuage the Democrats' partisanship, it is only a matter of time before the Democrats are shrieking about yet another Bossie in the Republican ranks. ❀

Read RFT's editorials every week.  
Visit TAS Online at  
[www.spectator.org](http://www.spectator.org)



# The Hazards of Charity

## How to give money and stay out of trouble.

Very often, rich people give money to causes that are already being funded by governments. I suppose the idea is that no one will come along later and accuse you of being irresponsible. Roderick MacArthur, son of the insurance man whose wealth created the MacArthur Foundation and its “genius grants,” once asked an assistant to “come up with a list of the world’s problems,” so that he could lavish money upon them. But that was too broad, surely. More often, I think, your newly minted multi-millionaire, contemplating the objects of his benefaction, will narrow the search by requesting a copy of the Federal Budget, or perhaps the United Nations Annual Report. There he will find a worthy cause, and one that has already been validated by politics. Such donors seem to be as risk-averse in giving the money as they were tolerant of risk in earning it.

Microsoft’s Bill Gates recently gave a seven-figure sum to the United Nations Population Fund. No surprise there, certainly. Just as “reproductive services” is a euphemism for abortion, so “population” in this context usually means depopulation. Going back to John D. Rockefeller, this has been perhaps the most enthusiastically embraced cause of the rich. Why? Unconsciously, I suspect, they have in mind the plot of *The Camp of the Saints*, the unmentionable 1973 novel by Jean Raspail (I believe it’s sold under the counter today, the way pornography used to be). Raspail fantasized a Western Europe overrun by uncontrollable hordes

of brown people who arrive in flotillas from the Ganges and points east. Inheritors of large wealth seem to be particularly susceptible to this dread. It’s as though they are confident they will be allowed to enjoy their wealth more or less undisturbed, *as long as* there aren’t too many people born in other parts of the world. The taxman they can handle. The foreign born are another matter. Above a certain number, they are thought to constitute a destabilizing mass. A general despoliation of the rich might then be precipitated.

Another population worrier, Ted Turner of CNN, promised \$100 million a year for ten years to the United Nations itself. Wisely, he decided on further reflection *not* to give the money to existing U.N. programs. Expense accounts would blossom. An aide surely warned Turner that within existing programs, the money would literally be eaten up—in New York City restaurants. Instead, he will be selecting from a “menu” of new programs, intended (I gather) to help “the poorest of the poor.” Right on. The man with most say in pursuing this noble goal will be the former Colorado senator and undersecretary of state for global affairs, Tim Wirth. Harvard Law Professor Mary Ann Glendon observed that Wirth’s paper trail “epitomizes the world view of those who see the poor as a threat to their own consumption, a menace to the ecosystem, and a portent of social unrest.”

The evangelical work of condom distribution continues apace, despite such recent headlines as “The Population Implosion,” and “Birthrates Declining in Much of Africa.” (In the former article, Nicholas Eberstadt points out that the latest U.N. numbers foresee actual world population

decline by the 2040’s. In the latter, published by the *Washington Post*, fertility rate in some African countries are said to have declined by one-third in recent years.) The David & Lucille Packard Foundation, taking no chances, however, and is “pouring money into population control,” the *Wall Street Journal* noted the other day. “It bankrolled 109 projects last year, becoming a crucial backer of groups such as Planned Parenthood, Population Action International and the Alan Guttmacher Institute. The Foundation also spends a ton of money funding abortion training in Ethiopia and Uganda, sending oral contraceptives to Vietnam, and promoting the use of emergency contraceptives in the U.S. “There’s an enormous need for family planning and a very short time window,” says heiress Julie Packard.

David Packard died in 1996, but his long-time partner William Hewlett, 85, is of like mind in this as in business matters. His William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, which ambitiously seeks “the well-being of mankind,” and is administered by Hewlett’s son Walter, has poured tens of millions of dollars into population control. Believing that “rapid population growth continues to be a significant worldwide problem,” it supports family planning in Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia, and gives grants to such well-established groups as the Population Council and the U.N. Population Fund. One year it gave \$450,000 to the radical Catholics for a Free Choice.

Even the maverick donor Richard Scaife, inheritor of Mellon millions, who stirred up such an angry buzzing of the Hive recently—he has boldly departed from the pattern of fashionable giving expected of inheritors—seems not entirely immune to the rich man’s temptation. He has for years been a supporter of abortion rights, and, according to a recent arti-

TOM BETHELL is The American Spectator’s *Washington* correspondent.