

Ceausescu, Tito, Pol Pot, Deng--are these proper allies for a free people? What a disgrace. What a shame. What a lesson.

Religion in the Post-Communist Era

Next to the Party elite, the biggest losers in Communist countries may be the officially approved churches. In the Soviet Union, no one respects the heads of the Russian Orthodox Church. They are collaborators if not members of the KGB, and many believers regard the entire church as having been compromised.

It is the persecuted who have moral authority in such a situation. In this case, that includes the Ukrainian Catholics, Orthodox Jews, and Russian Baptists and Pentacostals.

The meeting between Pope John Paul II and Mikhail Gorbachev had a tremendous effect. The leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church had opposed the meeting, but they didn't expect to be left out in the cold. Why did Gorbachev call the Pope "the greatest moral authority in the world"? He was baptized in the Russian Orthodox Church, but perhaps he too thinks it is compromised.

I am fascinated by the religious imagery that peppers the speech of Gorbachev, who has vastly increased religious freedom in the U.S.S.R. For example, he said that the Soviets should not react to the idea of a multi-party system the way "the Devil reacts to incense." Some say this means nothing, and that many non-believing Russians talk this way.

Maybe. But it seems to me that is not the apt comparison. When did Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Breshnev, or Andropov talk that way? The answer is never. Such talk would have been considered in very bad taste, and an implicit violation of official atheism.

And given that the Communists, from their early days, have always been arch-feminists, how do we react to this Gorbachev statement: "I think it is time to review the role of women as mothers versus producers. Women are more important as producers of good people than as producers of fabrics or whatever." He sounds, says conservative columnist Don Feder, "like Phyllis Schlafly."

The Coming Race War

Black leaders sure are radical in this country. Benjamin Hooks, president of the NAACP, is considered a moderate, but he's an arch statist who wants government programs to abolish black unemployment, poverty, and low levels of education, and he calls the Supreme Court "racist" for slightly questioning preferential treatment for blacks.

Another "moderate" is Coretta Scott King. On Martin Luther

King Day, she said "now it the time" for a "global" movement "to put an end" to "poverty, hunger, racism, and bigotry" by taxing the American people. The "non-violent" Mrs. King doesn't hesitate to use the IRS on the rest of us.

(Boy, it sure burns me to have a national holiday for that pro-communist philanderer, Martin Luther King. I voted against this outrage time and time again as a Congressmen. What an infamy that Ronald Reagan approved it! We can thank him for our annual Hate Whitey Day.)

Listen to a black radio talk show in any major city. The racial hatred makes a KKK rally look tame. The blacks talk about their own racial superiority, how the whites have a conspiracy to wipe them out, and how they are going take over the country and enact retribution. They only differ over whether they should use King's non-violent approach (i.e., state violence), or use private violence.

Black leaders are calling for a "fundamental" change: uprooting the entire "White Establishment." They want to replace "Eurocentrism" with "Afrocentrism," and make white schoolchildren "more humble." Although I am not clear on what that means, I do know that, as Ludwig von Mises said, "the idea of liberty is Western." If they intend to replace Western culture with third-worldism, they are looking for a battle.

The racial hatred being created will surpass anything we've seen so far. If there is any issue the Republicans have in their favor for the next presidential election, it is the question of race. It was all over for Michael Dukakis when Jesse Jackson gave his awful prime-time speech at the last Democratic convention, and the cameras focused on masses of teary-eyed, left-wing blacks.

Not that we should let Republicans off the hook. Commenting on national TV about the legacy of Martin Luther King, a prominent Republican conservative said that if the great "Dr. King" were alive today, he would be opposed to more welfare spending. That's malarkey. King was--at best--a socialist, as his writings and speeches show. He was a pal of Communists, and an advocate of a gigantic welfare state. (Why, by the way, is King the only person in recorded history to keep his doctorate in death? No one ever says "Dr. Einstein.")

On the holiday honoring King, the films shown in the government schools depict whites as evil. From watching them, kids can think that 25 years ago, whites held blacks in cages until MLK came to unlock the cells.

On MLK Day this year, 200 high-schoolers in Concord, NH, walked out because classes weren't canceled. And at the University of Missouri, students "sat in" at the administration building to protest the school's decision to close for only two hours. The schools' decisions were cited as examples of racism.