

The Nomenklatura calls for a Referendum on the Sexual Revolution

Nelson Algren once summed up what he had learned in life by saying that you should never play cards with a man named Doc or eat at a restaurant called Mom's. Editors of monthly magazines might add to that list: never cover a daily story at 30 day intervals. But as of this writing a milestone of sort has been reached. William Jefferson Clinton has now become one of three presidents impeached by the Congress of the United States. The man who used to worry about his place in history need worry no longer. His place in history is secure, even if it may not be the place he wanted. For a while it looked as if the Great Prevaricator might resign, but those hopes faded in the early days of September. President Clinton is determined to hang on to the bitter end, and just how bitter it will be is anyone's guess at this point. Like Pharaoh, Clinton has hardened his heart, and, like Pharaoh, the president seems determined to accomplish some hidden providential plan in spite of himself.

Resigning would, in many ways, have been the easy way out for the nation. It would have fastened all of the opprobrium on one person,

who by being cast into the outer darkness, would have been forgotten along with his transgressions. Resignation would have also been the honorable thing to do, to spare the country, as Richard Nixon did, a long period of paralysis. But Clinton is not an honorable man, and the country which elected him to the office of President twice doesn't deserve to be spared, certainly not from the consequences of a course of behavior which it so av-

idly chose. President Clinton also can't afford to resign. His grip on the levers of power is the only thing keeping him out of jail right now. And so by holding on, Clinton has transformed an incident into a constitutional crisis, but even more than that he has transformed that crisis into a referendum on the sexual revolution.

This Nemesis is of his own making, all generated within the past few months. He could have settled the Paula Jones case, but he chose to lie about it instead. Then the Paula Jones case led to the Monica Lewinsky affair, and here he chose to lie as well. What other choices can you expect a liar to make? And yet all his lying has only served to make the truth more apparent.

The nomenklatura has now taken to airing ads defending the president as well as the president's behavior. People like Desmond Tutu and Sophia Loren Plato are now complaining about "inquisitorial harassment." The pundits are talking as if the sky is falling, as if the course of events is out of control, and of course they are in a way — out of their control, at least. When I wrote on *l'affaire Lewinsky* in March, the stock market was still at the top of its bubble, and Clinton was the major beneficiary of that fact. By the fall, the bubble had burst, and William Raspberry was claiming "We're headed for disaster and the brakes don't work." Even

No one has mobilized the forces of sexual chaos more avidly than President Clinton

Michael Kelly, who is no friend of the president, caught the mood of impending disaster as well and came up, as a result, with his version of the big picture, namely, that "chaos is the natural order; chaos rules, except when order is imposed upon it by brute (and often quite stupid) force. It is the sheriff who keeps the peace, not the scholar. It was mur-

derous and overwhelming might that stopped Hitler."

If things get any more chaotic, Kelly will most probably call for a dictator to restore order. That is the classical trajectory. It is in Plato; it is what brought Hitler to power after the chaos of the Weimar Republic, although Kelly seems unaware of that fact. He is also unaware of the fact that the universe is suffused with reason, and that and not chaos is its fundamental law, from the moment of creation, when God separated the sea from the dry land and said that everything was good, which is another way of saying orderly. Chaos is something we have introduced into our own form of government, a form which worked fairly well, but a form which was predicated on certain realities, moral and spiritual, upon which it has depended and which it did not create.

No one has mobilized the forces of sexual chaos more avidly than President Clinton. Critics are fond of accusing him of having no policy at all, of being merely an opportunist. This is not true. Clinton's policy, the one he has remained true to since the moment he took office when he struck down abortion restrictions and opened the way for homosexuals in the military, is the sexual revolution. He supports the sexual revolution for obvious personal reasons, but he also supports it because it is in his political interest to do so. He, more than any other president in this nation's history, understands how sexual license can be used to political advantage. He knows that sexual liberation is a form of political control. He knows that a nation that spends billions a year on pornography will not be able to respond with indignation

much less outrage, when the president of the United States is implicated in his own little X-rated performance. He courts the homosexuals assiduously. He is the first president ever to speak before a group of homosexuals, in this instance the Human Rights Campaign. He rose to power supporting this ideology and he is not about to abandon it, not now and not ever. Whether he will call out tanks and have them fire on the Capitol remains to be seen. The far-fetched nature of that scenario has less to do with Clinton's will to power than the traditions of the military he has done his best to subvert.

But his support of sexual liberation, no matter how firm, does not exempt the president from the consequences of his actions. Like the man who cheats on his wife in an Arkansas trailer park, he will find that actions have consequences. But

women leave their looms to go off and dance naked on the mountain-side, someone gets hurt.

The pundits are all crying that sex isn't the issue. They do this by claiming that "it's only sex," that there are more important things for our concern, all the while blithely disregarding the fact that the president doesn't feel that way himself, no matter what his defenders say. President Clinton is going to defend Dionysos to the death; he can't afford to back out now; like Ahab he is willing to take the whole country down to make a point. Like Gustav Aschenbach, the aging intellectual in *Death in Venice* who is willing to die rather than relinquish his illicit desires, Bill Clinton is willing to wreck the country to defend Dionysos.

On September 10, *Salon Magazine*, an organ of the Clinton administration, announced "the so-

President Clinton is going to defend Dionysos to the death; he can't afford to back out now; like Ahab he is willing to take the whole country down to make a point.

because he is the president of the most powerful nation on earth, and determined to hold onto that power no matter what, he will find that the consequences are more dire than he imagined. Make no mistake, Bill Clinton worships Dionysos; he got to power by worshipping that god and he will defend his religion to the death — certainly to the death of his colleagues and former business associates. Whenever the

called "Doomsday scenario" one of the options the same Clinton Administration was considering to retain its hold on power. This "scenario" was "the dreaded Armageddon in which the personal peccadilloes of everyone — Republican, Democrat, journalists — are exposed if Clinton's infidelities are dragged into the open." A few days later, *Salon* obligingly put the "Doomsday scenario" into effect by



reporting on an affair which Henry Hyde, chairman of the judiciary committee then considering impeachment, had 30 years earlier. "Everyone," said Henry Jaffe of Salon, "will be punished. It will be a total meltdown."

Here, as before, Clinton's actions simply made the situation worse for himself. In this instance, it certainly didn't deter Congressman Hyde from proceeding with impeachment proceedings, and in retrospect it's hard to see how tactics like this would do anything other than harden Hyde's resolve, if for no other reason than for simple revenge. Once again in this annus mirabilis of American politics, Bill Clinton turned out to be his own worst enemy by following his intemperate desires. It seems that Aquinas was right when he said that lust darkened the mind. Even Clinton's supporters in the fourth

estate were saying as much. Maureen Dowd wrote about a "consensus that Mr. Kendall and the President blundered horribly — just as Bob Bennett and the President blundered when they failed to settle the Paula Jones lawsuit that ended up spawning Monica Lewinsky." President Clinton seems caught up in forces he can't understand. The more he tells lies the more the truth is revealed. Like Pharaoh he seems to be bringing

about the will of the God he seems determined to thwart. Like Pharaoh, his determination to do his will is bringing about his own demise.

In case you hadn't noticed it, a subtle change took place among the savants of the fourth estate when Clinton refused to resign. Bootlickers like Tom Teepen would ply Clinton with advice on an almost daily basis, even writing apologies for the president to sign. Many pundits called for his resignation, but that was understandable in a way. Clinton, like the politician mocked by Churchill, was giving sodomy a bad name. If he had resigned, if he had gone peaceably, then they could have labored under the illusion that Clinton was just an aberration. All the ruling class then needed to do was to replace him with someone of the moral caliber of Mother Teresa, someone of ster-

ling character willing to defend sodomy and abortion, partial birth or otherwise. Then all concerned could go on living according to the Enlightenment illusion that sex is no big deal and that the masters of the universe can tinker with the moral order — decriminalizing adultery and making smoking a capital offense — to their hearts content. By resigning, as both the *Washington Post* and The *New York Times* urged him to do, Clinton could have saved the sexual revolution.

But Clinton didn't resign. And as soon as it became clear that he was never going to do so, a subtle change of heart swept through the talking class. Maureen Dowd is a good case in point here. Dowd lambasted Clinton as a selfish jerk week after week, even comparing him to the devil. In a letter to his supporters, Dr. James Dobson even cited one of Dowd's columns as evidence of a hostile press. Then, suddenly, when the Starr report came out and the evidence against Clinton became inescapable, Dowd changed her mind and began attacking the special prosecutor instead of the president. It was as if this dog had suddenly run to the end of its leash and got jerked back to reality. Why? Perhaps because by this point it became clear that bigger issues were at stake. By not resigning from office, Clinton turned the Lewinsky affair into a referendum on the sexual revolution. Now that he was not going to go quietly and take the rap, it was time to close ranks and defend what Clinton said he stood for. Within hours of the release of the Starr Report, Dowd was attacking the prosecutor as vehemently as she once attacked the president. Clinton had saved himself by wrapping his political fortunes in the

mantle of sexual liberation. A vote against Clinton was now a vote against the '60s, and all that that decade stood for in the minds of the liberated intelligentsia. Maureen Dowd said so herself:

The avenging, evangelical prosecutor never seems to give a thought to how his relentless chase is riving the nation. He seems determined not only to overthrow the President, but to overturn the '60s and restore the black-and-white moral code that existed before the decade of sex, drugs and draft evasion.

Anthony Lewis said much the same thing. The attack on Clinton would have "enormous consequences for our politics." (Our politics?) Lewis then goes on to list the consequences, all of which have to do with the sexual revolution:

Abortion would be targeted for a range of new restrictions, including even a constitutional amendment to outlaw it. And concern with sexual matters would not be likely to stop there. There would be legislation to limit U.S. help for population control efforts around the world. Federal regulations to give equal treatment to homosexuals would be another target. The law forbidding grants to "indecent" art could be expanded to other fields.

Hollywood, next to the Black population, Clinton's most avid support group, is not backing away from supporting Clinton any more than the fourth estate. At a recent fund-raiser in Hollywood, Marshall Herskovitz, a Democrat who was producer of the television series "thirtysomething" said that

"The scandal is really a referendum on sexual morality in the country."

The independent prosecutor, according to Lewis, would "bring about a fundamental change in the political direction of this country, effectively changing the results of our last two elections. It would be a *coup d'état*."

Lewis is right in a way. If Clinton had resigned, he could have saved the sexual revolution by focusing all of the blame on himself. However, self-sacrificing altruism is not a hallmark of those who worship Dionysos. By joining his personal fate to the sexual revolution, Clinton is threatening to take the regime down with him when he goes, if he goes. At this point we may all one day be thankful for Clinton's megalomania because Clinton's fall now means the fall of the liberal regime. Or is that just wishful thinking? Is that just the paranoia of the liberals finding uncanny confirmation in the most fervent wishes of the conservatives? The regime in power now is the regime which came to power as a result of the sexual revolution of the '60s, which brought about a fundamental break with the constitution that was written by the founding fathers, who felt, as John Adams and George Washington said, that the constitution they wrote could not function without a moral populace.

By not resigning, the president is doing the country a favor. He is forcing the people to take sides. He is forcing a referendum on the sexual revolution. There is a risk here, of course, because nobody really knows how corrupted the American people have become after 30 years of sexual indulgence. The pundits have gone just about en masse over to his side already. Now it remains to be seen whether the

legislature has too. This crisis is about the rule of law. It is a referendum, as Hollywood has said, on the sexual revolution and whether that is now going to be the law of the land, taking precedence over the system established by the founding fathers. After 30 years of sexual liberation, the sexual revolutionaries are not going to go peacefully. They are going to force the issue, and the country, through its elected representatives, is going to have to decide whether we believe in the worship of Dionysos or the rule of law. What the pundits mean when they say that "it's only sex" is really that the rule of Dionysos has hegemony over the rule of law. Precedents have already been established. We all have the right to assemble peaceably in this country, as long as we don't assemble in front of an abortion clinic, in which case we have just committed a felony. Abortion, in this instance, rewrote the constitution. What the Clinton case will establish is similar. Lying under oath is bad, except in the case of lying under oath about sex, then "it's only sex." By taking sex out of the moral code, the Nietzscheans who comprise our ruling class have made sex into something above the law. In other words, the law is subservient to sex. Sex, in other words, is the state religion, and Bill Clinton is the emperor, who is also a god, and gods, we all know, are above the law. By allowing Bill Clinton to stay in office, we are tacitly ratifying all of the above, a set of beliefs which we will call the worship of Dionysos. The pundits — give them credit — understand this, and they are so committed to the worship of Dionysos that they are willing to junk the rule of law in order to preserve it. Indeed, people like Mr. Lewis by claiming that the Starr in-

vestigation is a "coup d'etat" have already admitted that.

The other side in this struggle is coming to the same conclusion. Henry Hyde, head of the judiciary committee and a victim of the White House's scorched earth policy against its enemies said that the Congress's task was to now "defend the rule of law." David P. Schippers, the chief investigative counsel for the Judiciary Committee headed by Hyde, concluded his report to that committee by citing the line of St. Thomas More from a *Man for All Seasons*: "The laws of this country are the great barriers that protect the citizens from the winds of evil and tyranny. If we permit one of those laws to fall, who will be able to stand in the winds that follow?" The Democrats on the committee demanded that these remarks be stricken from the record. Congressman Hyde obliged, noting wryly that the Democrats in defending the president were expressing their opposition to the rule of law.

That is precisely the point which Schippers was trying to make. If the country's chief law enforcement officer can perjure himself and flout the law with impunity, then the rule of law has been replaced by some other form of government — the form we have denominated the worship of Dionysos — because, as Schippers says, "the principle that every witness in every case must tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth is the foundation of the American system of justice." If President Clinton prevails in this struggle — and make no mistake, the fourth estate wants him to prevail — then that will mean the end

to the American experiment because that will mean the end to the rule of law.

Clinton and his supporters know instinctively that they can't back down on this issue. In fact, they are going to make the November election a referendum on the worship of Dionysos. They are betting that 30 years of sexual liberation has done its work. They are betting that the

populace has been corrupted by three decades of sexual license and that the people who have been corrupted will choose President Clinton as the guarantor of their illicit sexual desires, even if this means accepting tyranny with open arms

E. MICHAEL JONES

Early Start

Even at seven years
she knew all the visceral words
and the proper tone of voice to
inform us that she spoke
of genitalia
and their many relations —
innuendoes and permutations
in the entire created world:
male and female He made them.

Computer highways, modern parents,
chat clubs (forbidden to minors)
soap operas and passionate TV specials
told all, yes all and then some,
that her pig-tailed peers
shared in whispers
with giggles and glee
when elders were absent.

The entire social landscape
was captured and sexualized
(not to mention a bit off color):
was completely grounded
in all that neglected divine.

So much obsession
and certain, one-sided,
bodily knowledge
for worse, not for better,
sex was so boring!
A forgone divorce.

Charles M. Campbell