

Stephen R. Soukup Publisher
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

Mark L. Melcher Editor
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

THEY SAID IT

My life would have gone along perfectly well, politically speaking, if it hadn't been for girls. I found them interesting. They found me less so. On my first weekend at college I was walking down an alley that had a bar on either side. Each bar had a patio full of students. The girls on one patio were very attractive, their sweaters well-filled, their pleated skirts worn daringly above the knee, their blond hair styled in what was called a "sorority flip." They sipped demurely from beer mugs decorated with Greek letters.

But I wasn't athletic or handsome or a Sigma Chi legacy. And I had a feeling that, even if I were, getting such girls into bed would involve attendance at mixers and dances, romantic chat-up, fumbling under coats in the shrubbery while a house mother tsked out a window, bestowal of one's fraternity "pin" or even an engagement ring, and lots of talk about "our future."

The girls on the other patio were fetching as well, in their black leotards and peasant blouses, denim skirts and sandals. Their long, dark hair was ironed straight. They strummed guitars, smoked unfiltered cigarettes, and drank beer straight from the bottle. I thought, "I'll bet those girls do it."

They did. I went home at Christmas break with my hair grown long, wearing a blue-jean jacket with a big red fist emblazoned on the back.

P.J. O'Rourke, "The Unthinking Man's Guide to Conservatism," *Why I Turned Right: Leading Baby Boomer Conservatives Chronicle Their Political Journeys*, Mary Eberstadt, ed., 2007.

WEINERGATE AND THE GLOBAL GOVERNING CLASS.

So . . . ummm . . . have you seen the pictures of Anthony Weiner?

No . . . no . . . no! Not *those* pictures. The pictures of him in high school. Or college. Or whenever they were taken. The pictures *we* have in mind are the normal yearbook-type photos of the goofy, gawky, awkward-looking Weiner that have accompanied many of the news stories about the Congressman over the past week.

What news stories? Funny you should ask . . .

On the off chance you spent the last week in a cave, let us summarize:

In this Issue

Weinergate and the Global
Governing Class.

Circumcision and the New
Anti-Semitism.

A week-and-a-half ago, Democratic Congressman and notoriously self-obsessed media hound Anthony Weiner of New York, whose district covers parts of Queens and Brooklyn, “allegedly” sent a picture of his . . . ummm . . . “namesake,” – little Anthony Weiner – via Twitter, to a 21-year-old college student in the Seattle, Washington area. Short story short: Weiner initially claimed he was the victim of hacking; then claimed to be a victim of a prank; then he admitted that he couldn’t say with “certitude” whether the little member of Congress in the photo was or wasn’t him.

By the end of the week, Weiner had resorted to using strategies from the *Democratic Politicians’ Sex Scandal Handbook*, which his wife, a longtime aide to Hillary Clinton, had apparently brought home from the office. The whole thing, he claimed, was nothing more than a silly “distraction” that was keeping him from “getting back to the work of serving his constituents.” As we go to press, he has confessed to all wrongdoing and said he is sorry. When scandals hit, Republicans resign, and Democrats magnanimously rededicate themselves to “the people.”

But, the part of the story that we found most fascinating is that this guy, who is known mostly for being an obnoxious, loudmouthed, camera-mugging former staffer for and current poor impersonator of New York Senator Chuck Schumer, has a rather notorious reputation as a Capitol Hill lothario. We guess that kind of shocks us. We don’t mean to be cruel, but to look at the pictures of the guy in high school – the ones we mentioned above – you’d kind of get the impression that his cousin was probably pretty ticked off that her mom and dad made her go to prom with him.

He didn’t exactly get a whole lot better looking or ungainly as he aged. And he certainly didn’t get any less obnoxious. And yet he is apparently well known as one of Washington’s biggest and most successful “players.” *The New York Post* fills in the details:

“The rap he gets is that he’s a smooth operator,” says Fox news analyst and occasional *Post* contributor Kirsten

Powers, who dated Weiner for three months in 2002. “But he’s very sweet, very funny, very charming.” . . .

Weiner married Huma Abedin, Hillary Rodham Clinton’s top aide, in July 2010 -- but “everybody knows Anthony is a bit of a cowboy,” says one New York political player.

While a City Council member in the 1990s, Weiner pursued interns, but as his profile rose over the last decade, he was able to raise his own bar, chasing a slew of smart, attractive glamour girls.

In addition to Powers, he dated former *New York* magazine publicist Serena Torrey (she later married Theodore Roosevelt V), TV journalist Gigi Stone, and television producer Alli Joseph, whose blog lists “[driving] her convertible with her knees” as a favorite pastime.

According to one ex-girlfriend, Weiner spent years mooning over Abedin but his active social life perhaps kept her from taking it seriously. Weiner’s preoccupation with beautiful women extended to his policy prescriptions: In 2008, he co-authored a much-mocked bill that would have loosened immigration restrictions on foreign supermodels.

The model, the bill said, should have “distinguished merit and ability.”

Back on Earth, Powers and Weiner met at the now-defunct dive bar Siberia, on Manhattan’s West Side. He called her the next day, and they began dating immediately, having low-key dinners at Dos Caminos or catching movies in Chelsea, her neighborhood.

The only thing that struck her as odd was that “women would frequently just walk right up and shove their business cards at him . . .

Weiner made national news as a freshman congressman in 2001 when he made an appearance in a *Vanity Fair* story about sexual politics on Capitol Hill. He introduced himself to 22-year-old intern Diana Davis as “an auto-parts salesman” but later casually mentioned that he’d be joining the president on Air Force One to tour the smoldering wreckage at Ground Zero.

Weiner then e-mailed her the next day, suggesting she visit him on the Hill “in person.” (As opposed to what?) Davis never replied.

“I thought that was cheesy,” she told the magazine.

Weiner then lashed out in *The Washington Post*, saying he found it disgusting that two days after 9/11 – an event he had used as a pickup opportunity – *Vanity Fair* was covering sex on the Hill.

You will note that in her description of her onetime beau, Ms. Powers relies heavily on the notion that Weiner is especially “charming,” which we don’t doubt for a second – though we’d probably be more inclined to call him “unctuous” or “slimy” rather than “smooth.” But opinions can differ, we guess. In any case, despite Ms. Powers’ insistence on the unmistakable charms of Weiner, there is clearly something more to his attractiveness. And we know this because a great many women who have never met the man – and therefore have never experienced his “charm” – also apparently find him quite steamy. For example, the young woman to whom Weiner tried to text the picture of his, ah, Weiness is an attractive college student who has called the Congressman her “boyfriend” and is said to be quite enamored with him, despite never having met him and never having

been to either New York or Washington D.C. And she is not alone. As we learned this week, another big fan of Weiner is the porn star, Ginger Lee, who claims to have had “private” Twitter conversations with the big fella himself.

As it turns out, Congressman Weiner had some 40,000 “followers” on Twitter, many of whom were attractive young women. And unsurprisingly, given his reputation, he, in turn, has followed 198 of his followers back, and a remarkable number of them – including porn star Lee and the student from Washington state – are attractive young women. Funny how that works, huh?

Now, far be it from us to suggest that Anthony Weiner actually went into politics for any reason other than the noble pursuit of the “public service.” But if we didn’t know better, we might think that the guy got into the racket specifically to pick up chicks. And we *do* know better, because that would be absolutely ridiculous, right? Right?

Or maybe not . . .

Part of the reason that Anthony Weiner’s tale fascinates us so is that he reminds us great deal of the man who performed the ceremony at Weiner’s wedding to Huma Abedin – the Right Reverend William Jefferson Clinton. Recall that Clinton was, by his own admission, a chubby, goofy, awkward kid who played the saxophone in the marching band. And then he came into his own. And he became “charming.” And then he went into politics, of all things. And then he started chasing his Anthony Weiner around Arkansas and, eventually, Washington D.C., waving it at state employees, introducing it to the interns, and generally enjoying himself a little more than a “public servant” should.

Also like Weiner, Clinton’s appeal was more than just personal “charm,” in that it provoked intense yearning and fascination even amongst erstwhile reasonable women most of whom had never met him and never had the pleasure of experiencing his reputed magnetism in person. Who could forget, for example, *Time* political reporter Nina Burleigh creepily telling

the world how excited Clinton made her and declaring that she would “happily give him [oral sex] just to thank him for keeping abortion legal?”

Finally, if we recall correctly – and we paid so little attention to it at the time; it’s hard to know if we are, in fact, remembering correctly – Bill, like the Congressman from New York, had a little trouble keeping his Anthony Weiner from getting in the way of his political career. The explanation given at the time – and every day since – was that Bill simply didn’t have control of his appetites and therefore allowed his more basal instincts to control him and to upset his greater plans.

We’re not sure that we agree. As we see it, for Bill, the politics was secondary to the “appetites.” Politics, we think, was the means to the ends. It allowed Bill to have what he always lacked but thought he deserved – the interest and admiration of smart and attractive women. Joe Klein (the erstwhile “Anonymous” author of the thinly-veiled Clinton book *Primary Colors*) and the rest of the disillusioned Clintonistas spent the second half of the ‘90s attributing all the “missed opportunities” and the failures of Bill’s White House years to the big lummo’s inability to manage his appetites. Clinton, by contrast, thought of “missed opportunities” differently, in more “personal” terms, and lamented only that he got caught, thereby screwing up the greatest set-up a guy could want.

When the book on Anthony Weiner is written, we suspect the conclusion will be much the same.

Of course, the conclusion to the “book” on this entire era might be pretty much the same as well. Bill Clinton and Anthony Weiner may be the two guys we know about and they may be the two guys we think about when we look back on this era, but only because they were the two most flamboyant and reckless enough to get caught. But they are, in our estimation, hardly unique, despite their particular luridness. If anything, we’re afraid they’re emblematic.

According to the basic premises of natural selection, the type of mates whom females of a species should find most attractive are those who are the strongest, the

most powerful; those best able to ensure successful breeding and the successful transmission of the most desirable characteristics to the next generation. For millennia, in humans as in most animals, those criteria were most generally, though not always, met in physical terms. The strongest was, quite often, literally the strongest.

As civilization itself evolved, though, the criteria by which male attractiveness was judged also evolved, with such attributes as familial ties, intellect, creativity, and money helping to level the playing field and to compensate for and even overcome the purely physical. These factors too help define the likelihood of successful propagation and have therefore come to factor heavily in the conscious and unconscious delineation of attractiveness.

But with Weiner, Clinton, and a host of others, we see the evolution of a new standard, apparently, one that blends the old variable of power with the new variable of “administration,” for lack of a better term. These guys aren’t desired for their brute strength or their physical prowess. They aren’t wanted because of their money or their family name. What makes them attractive, apparently is their willingness and ability harness *other people’s* power; to lay claim to *other people’s* money; to take control of *other people’s* brute strength and direct it all to the ends of “the state.” They are the members of the new, global governing class that not only lives off of the goods and services produced by others, parasite-like, but also has dedicated itself exclusively to determining the “best,” “fairest,” or “most responsible” uses for all that produced by others.

A few weeks ago, before Weingate but in the wake of the arrest of the French-weiner, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, the inimitable Mark Steyn made a very similar point:

Whatever the head of the IMF did or didn’t do, the reaction of the French elites is most instructive. “We and the Americans do not belong to the same civilization,” sniffed Jean Daniel, editor of *Le Nouvel Observateur*, insisting that

the police should have known that Strauss-Kahn was “not like other men” and wondering why “this chambermaid was regarded as worthy and beyond any suspicion.” Bernard-Henri Lévy, the open-shirted, hairy-chested Gallic intellectual who talked Sarkozy into talking Obama into launching the Libyan war, is furious at the *lèse-majesté* of this impertinent serving girl and the jackanapes of America’s “absurd” justice system, not to mention this ghastly “American judge who, by delivering him to the crowd of photo hounds, pretended to take him for a subject of justice like any other.”

Well, okay. Why *shouldn't* DSK (as he’s known in France) be treated as “a subject of justice like any other”? Because, says BHL (as he’s known in France), of everything that Strauss-Kahn has done at the IMF to help the world “avoid the worst.” In particular, he has made the IMF “more favorable to proletarian nations and, among the latter, to the most fragile and vulnerable.” What is one fragile and vulnerable West African maid when weighed in the scales of history against entire fragile and vulnerable proletarian nations? . . .

Before you scoff at Euro-lefties willing to argue for 21st-century *droit de seigneur*, recall the grisly eulogies for the late Edward Kennedy. “At the end of the day,” said Sen. Evan Bayh, “he cared most about the things that matter to ordinary people.” The standard line of his obituarists was that this was Ted’s penance for Chappaquiddick and Mary Jo Kopechne — or, as the Aussie columnist Tim Blair put it, “She died so that the Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act might live.” Great men who are

prone to Big Government invariably have Big Appetites, and you comely serving wenches who catch the benign sovereign’s eye or anything else he’s shooting your way should keep in mind the Big Picture . . .

The arrest of a mediocre international civil servant in the first-class cabin of his jet isn’t just a sex story: It’s a glimpse of the widening gulf between the government class and their subjects in a post-prosperity West. Neither Geithner nor Strauss-Kahn has ever created a dime of wealth in his life. They have devoted their careers to “public service,” and thus are in the happy position of rarely if ever having to write a personal check. At the Sofitel in New York, DSK was in a \$3,000-per-night suite. Was the IMF picking up the tab? If so, you the plucky U.S. taxpayer paid around 550 bucks of that, whereas Strauss-Kahn’s fellow Frenchmen put up less than \$150. So if, as *Le Nouvel Observateur* suggests, France and America really do belong in entirely different civilizations, the French one ought to start looking for a new patron for the heroic DSK’s lifestyle.

We’d add only that Steyn, in his desire to make a broader point about how this new global ruling class doesn’t think that any of the rules apply to it (note the appearance of tax scofflaw and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner), misses the fact that these men, for all their arrogance, have a genuine and undeniable following. DSK, Bill Clinton, Anthony Weiner, and Ted Kennedy, despite being greasy and coarse, chubby and trashy, gawky and awkward, and bloated and drunk, respectively, have never lacked for the companionship they so clearly and so desperately seek (or sought). Which is to say that their insistence on their own greatness, their belief in their own potency in the new “post-prosperity world” (as Steyn calls it) is anything but contrived. It is real. It represents real and undeniable power. They are the new men in this

new world, the men who boldly promise to take from the rich and give to . . . well . . . whomever they damn well please. And they'll take from the middle class too. And anyone else. And what are you going to do to stop them?

Nothing. Because, like we said, they have the power.

So as Weinegate plays out and hopefully ends – with the Weiner himself doing the decent thing and leaving Congress for a dreadfully rated show on CNN. We wish he were just another internet pervert. But he's not. Or at least he's not *just* that. He's an internet pervert alright. But he's also Marx's "new man," a shining representative of the governing class. You can call him DSK. Or EMK. Or Bill Clinton. Or John Edwards. Whatever. They're all Weiners. And there are a lot more where they came from.

CIRCUMCISION AND THE NEW ANTI-SEMITISM.

Over the past week or so, the conservative commentariat has exhibited considerable consternation over a proposition that will appear on the ballot in San Francisco this fall that would ban "genital cutting" or "mutilation" – which is to say *circumcision* – of boys under the age of 18. The proposed penalty for this heinous offense is up to \$1,000 and/or a year in jail.

Part of the reason that this proposed ban in San Francisco has caused so much anxiety is that, contrary to some purportedly educated opinion, this isn't just about San Francisco and its "unique place" in American culture. Indeed, the sponsors of the ballot measure hope to have a similar one on the ballot in Santa Barbara in November. Additionally, and perhaps more to the point, critics view this as a particularly egregious governmental intrusion into the private affairs of individuals, outside the limits of both the law and common sense, even as defined in San Francisco.

But lastly, and most importantly, there is the question of why circumcision should be targeted. Clearly, given the language that the proposition's supporters use,

they intend to portray the issue as one of mercy for baby boys, similar in nature to the national movement in opposition to genital cutting of females, which is carried out by some Islamic cults but which has been outlawed by federal statute. Needless to say, this is highly misleading, given the differences in the procedure, the cultural importance of the procedure, and the health and sanitary benefits of circumcision on males. All of which raises questions about the true motives of these paladins of the penis.

Fortuitously, the suspicions of the skeptics were confirmed last week, when it was learned that the people behind the circumcision ban, called the MGMBill, might have some explaining to do when it comes to their depiction of Jews. Debra Saunders, a conservative columnist for the *San Francisco Chronicle* (the conservative columnist for the *San Francisco Chronicle*), followed up her recent piece on the topic of the circumcision ban with a blog post which read as follows:

I've been wondering if the folks behind the circumcision ballot measure in San Francisco – the subject of my most recent column – are anti-Semites.

Here's a clue. The mgmbill.org web site links to this site.

The cited site is a comic book named "Foreskinman," published by mgmbill and drawn by a man named Matt Hess. The lead character is a blond, Aryan-esque superhero, who valiantly prevents circumcisions. More tellingly, it also features, as the arch-villain, a nasty-looking, evil Jewish rabbi – "Mohel Man" – who appears complete with hook nose, beady eyes, long and sharp fingernails, and a coterie of machine-gun toting Hasidim henchmen. The side-by-side of Mohel Man and various Nazi-era propaganda pictures of Jews are frighteningly similar, though we should note, for the record, that MGMBill denies any anti-Semitic motivation whatsoever.

MGMBill's denials notwithstanding, this appears blatantly and overtly anti-Semitic to us. And if you

check out the pics and the side-by-sides here (<http://pajamasmedia.com/tatler/2011/06/03/proof-that-s-f-s-circumcision-ban-is-anti-semitic/>), we think you'll agree. But we also think that, in the grand scheme of things, it doesn't matter. Whether or not a handful of the supporters of this ban are anti-Semitic in a traditional sense, the ban in its entirety is anti-Semitic in the broader, post-modern sense.

Any reasonable examination of the circumcision ban and especially of the language that it uses (e.g. "cutting" and "mutilation") indicates that this is, more or less, a response to the aforementioned federal ban on female genital mutilation – sort of a tit-for-tat. If you're going to ban the cutting of little girls, then it's only fair to ban the cutting of little boys. Moreover, it's pretty clear that the people who are doing this all but certainly think that they are, in fact, doing something noble. They're just sparing baby boys the pain that baby girls have already been spared. Fair is fair, after all. And if Jews have to suffer a little cultural discomfort in the process, well so be it. Muslims have already suffered similarly.

As reasonable as the bill's advocates try to make this seem, it is actually borderline crazy, which is why it's perfect for San Francisco. First, male and female circumcision are in no way related. One is a historical, cultural procedure with ancient roots that has benefits with regard to cleanliness and health, both of which have been corroborated by the American Academy of Pediatrics and the World Health Organization, among others. The other has no health benefits and is exclusively for the purpose of subjugating women and decreasing their sexual pleasure. Like so much of Islam, it is *all* about the feminine mystique (to borrow a phrase from Betty Friedan) and about robbing women of their sexual identity. One is about health and history, while the other is about oppression and nothing more.

Second, and equally important, this notion that Islamic and Judeo-Christian traditions must be afforded precisely the same treatment is both ludicrous and, in this case, ill-informed. With regard to the latter, as it turns out some 70% of all the circumcised males in

the world are Muslims, because Muslims too regard male circumcision as a historical, hygienic measure and part of their cultural heritage.

As for the former, we refer to what we wrote last week – and several times before – about the left's obsession with Jews, Israel, and their connection to the West. The intellectual and pseudo-intellectual left is determined to undermine what it sees as the deleterious effects of the Western tradition – from religion to culture to philosophy to politics – that dates back, quite literally, some three thousand years. In the arena of foreign policy, this manifests itself as a reflexive hostility to American military action and, more so in the case of Barack Obama, Israeli military action. Israel is an ancestor to and integral part of "the West" and, as such, its motives are always presumed to be malign.

But this effort to undermine Western culture has hardly been restricted to foreign affairs. Indeed its greatest impact can also be found in a domestic setting, where it generally goes by the name of "multiculturalism" or "diversity." No sentient being denies the efficacy of the knowledge that can be gained by learning about and experiencing other cultures. But, by the same account, no sentient being pretends that all cultures have produced equal and similarly beneficial results and therefore deserve to be afforded precisely the same respect and treatment. And the fact that this is precisely what the multi-culti left preaches merely proves our point about sentience.

Once upon a time – and throughout almost the entirety of Western history – Jews were discriminated against by majority populations because they were different, because they were "the other." Today, precisely the opposite is the case in the western world. Jews are discriminated against not because they are different but because they are too much the same. They are not "other" enough. In a post-modern society, which reviles the concept of absolutes and detests itself above all else, anyone and anything that contributed to the building of that society is considered ungodly and unworthy. And in the Judeo-Christian world, the Judeo and Christian bits often both come in for their fair share of opprobrium.

Do the residents of San Francisco hate Jews enough to ban circumcision? We doubt it very seriously. In fact, San Francisco is, according to the World Jewish Congress, the sixth largest Jewish-populated city in the United States.

But that's not really the issue.

This issue is whether the residents of San Francisco think so little of Western culture to believe that banning a "non-Western" circumcision procedure should be met "fairly" with the equivalent banning of a "Western" circumcision procedure? We hope they do not. But if there is a city of such people, it would likely be San Francisco, where Nancy Pelosi is considered a right-wing nut.

As our fearless President has proved over the last several weeks, a great deal of anti-Jewish sentiment in this country spills not from traditional fonts, but from newer, more pretentious and pseudo-intellectual sources. The effects of this sentiment are not limited to foreign affairs and, frankly, won't be limited to circumcision either.

Throughout the rest of the Western world – from continental Europe to Britain, from Canada to Australia – the scourge of multiculti mindlessness has already threatened what were once considered sacrosanct and inviolable freedoms. It is only a matter of time before it does the same here.

Circumcision may not seem like a big deal. Nor do Foreskin Man and his arch-enemy Mohel Man. But they are. They very well could be, to borrow a phrase from Max Eastman, "laying the tracks along which another death train will travel."

Copyright 2011. The Political Forum. 8563 Senedo Road, Mt. Jackson, Virginia 22842, tel. 540-477-2696, fax 540-477-3359. All rights reserved.

Information contained herein is based on data obtained from recognized services, issuer reports or communications, or other sources believed to be reliable. However, such information has not been verified by us, and we do not make any representations as to its accuracy or completeness, and we are not responsible for typographical errors. Any statements nonfactual in nature constitute only current opinions which are subject to change without notice.