

WESTERN CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE

2001 PRIMARY SPONSORS

American Defense Council
California Republican Assembly
Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep & Bear Arms
Christian Voice
Committee for a Republican Future
Conservative HQ.com
Eberle Communications Group
Fortress America
Freedom Center Foundation
Legal Affairs Council
Military Magazine
More Power to You
National Security Center
Right Concepts, Inc
Stuart/Grey
U.S. Intelligence Council
U.S. Justice Foundation
Washington Times National Weekly Edition

2001 SPONSORS & CO-SPONSORS

California ProLife Council
Capitol Resource Institute
Christian Coalition of California
Conservative Opportunities PAC
Human Events
Kimco Business Resources, Inc.
American Conservative Union
Conservatives of Los Angeles
Freedom List Corporation
Name Exchange
Stop Puerto Rico Statehood Committee

NEW — 2002 PRIMARY SPONSORS

ConservativePetitions.Com
Judicial Watch
Traditional Values Coalition
U.S. Seaports Commission

training school.” The Leadership Institute, founded and run by conservative graybeard Morton Blackwell, has a well-deserved national reputation for training the best and brightest conservative activists — a “must attend” for conservatives interested in maximizing their effectiveness in grassroots politics.

The conference officially opens Friday with an optional tour of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Museum. Any Reagan fans who have not been to the Museum, or visited the Reagan Ranch (now run by Young America’s Foundation) in Santa Barbara, owe themselves a sentimental, inspiring journey to these landmarks. Largely free of revisionist obfuscation, these are places to re-capture the sense and feel of the Reagan era, the exuberance and excitement Reagan created in a generation of Californians, Americans, and, eventually, in people around the world. The large section on display of the now long-fallen Berlin Wall is, by itself, a piece of history worth a trip to the museum.

Saturday breakfast will feature U.S. Rep. Ron Paul, hosted by Gary Kreep’s U.S. Justice Foundation.

California political talk and state political leaders will be in ample supply throughout the weekend. Last year’s most popular speaker, state Senator Tom McClintock — now the GOP nominee for state Controller — will address the conference. Post-primary surveys showed McClintock and Bill Simon, alone among Republican statewide candidates, leading their Democrat opponents heading for November. WCC-attendees will also hear from *CPR* regular contributor, state Senator Ray Haynes, who serves as honorary Conference Chairman for the third year in a row. Haynes and McClintock are two key conservative stalwarts in the California GOP Senate caucus. Each played central roles two years ago in forcing majority Democrats to abandon a campaign to kill the car tax cut passed at the end of Pete Wilson’s term. Last year, Haynes and McClintock again emerged as leaders during the mid-summer budget battle over a quarter-cent sales tax increase that Democrats finally forced to take effect last January 1.

Pacific Rim politics will be a third Conference theme, with special emphasis on the Panama Canal and on communist China’s stepped-up military activity and growing role in regional affairs. A key WCC underwriter, the United States Intelligence Council, will release a new book, *China Beachhead*, by USIC’s Richard Delgaudio, co-authored with John Stoos. Mr. Delgaudio will be on hand to autograph copies.

Also on this theme, Conference-goers will have an opportunity to learn about the activities of the National Security Center, an organization specializing in issues involving the Panama Canal: communist China’s extensive activities in and around the canal zone and the continuing strategic importance of the entire Central American/Pacific/Caribbean area. The Center sponsored a recently-concluded fact-finding mission to Panama led by Richard Delgaudio and Major General Richard Anson, USA (ret.). General Anson’s long, distinguished military career included service in the office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and two tours of duty as Commander of U.S. ground forces in Panama. He will lead a panel discussion on “Emerging Threats to American Security.” The “all-star” panel will feature six retired generals and admirals and an open, “roving” microphone to take audience questions.

With the conference still more than two months away, organizers continue to line up speakers and panel participants. Bill Simon has been invited, along with several state legislators, and other political leaders.

Will 2002 replay 1966? Be in Ontario in June — you may see the beginning of the answer for yourself. You may even become part of it.

CEB



Plan of

A CPR

Another Richardson PAC, Gunowners of California, under *CPR* Editorial Board member William E. Saracino's executive directorship, played a decisive role in defeating 1982's Proposition 15 in a campaign the senator discusses below.

An accomplished author, Senator Richardson has written books on politics, a series of western novels, and hundreds of regularly-published columns for newspapers statewide. While in the Legislature, he aired a weekly radio commentary heard throughout the state. *CPR* asked him to talk about the keys to his effectiveness.

HL. "BILL" RICHARDSON first entered the California Senate in 1966 — the same year Ronald Reagan was elected governor. During the ensuing 22 years, he bypassed three opportunities to go to Congress, instead remaining in the Senate, working in the GOP leadership. Three redistrictings gave him three vastly differing constituencies during his tenure, yet he convinced each to send him to Sacramento by landslide margins. He left the Senate, following his own timetable, in 1988.

But after nearly 14 years, California continues to feel Senator Richardson's influence. He created five separate, enormously effective political action committees, two of which remain major players in California and Washington D.C. He was among the first to see the power of targeted direct mail, employing it decisively to win California state and national elections. One of his PACs, the Law and Order Campaign Committee, was the organizing force that overcame a governor's veto and passed the death penalty act. It also played a pivotal role in defeating Supreme Court Chief Justice Rose Bird and two of her colleagues. Senator Richardson was a prime mover in a California political movement that so thoroughly discredited the 1960s' and '70s' liberal pro-criminal stance that by 1998 candidate Gray Davis had to praise caning in Singapore — nothing less could distinguish him as even less liberal on the issue than the herd of pols from both parties all now stampeding under H.L.'s "law and order" banner.

CPR: By the time you left the Legislature, many conservatives thought you indispensable to the movement. Were they right?

HLR: No one is "indispensable." Charles de Gaulle said the graveyards are full of "indispensable" men. I did nothing others couldn't do as well or will not do better in the future.

CPR: But no one seems to be doing so yet. Why not?

HLR: Oh, any number of reasons. Some Republicans are overjoyed just at being elected, as if that is the ultimate goal. Election should be considered the first step to becoming the majority; only then can you really change policy. A Republican office holder who isn't working to that end is just taking up space. I soon learned the Legislature was only a "bloody pulpit" for a conservative Republican — and most of the blood would be mine if I tried to move any substantive legislation through that Democrat-controlled body. I could use it as a platform to promote conservative issues, but of the three ways my message could reach the public, I could control only one.

First, I could use direct mail, put out a newsletter, appear on talk radio, give speeches, and write for a limited number of conservative publications and newspapers. This method depended on how much money I could muster.

The second way to reach the public was through

Action for a Grand Old Party

INTERVIEW: SENATOR H.L. RICHARDSON (RET.)

the major TV and print media, which happens to be tilted to the port side. They often doctored my press releases to suit their political correctness and always saw that the “other side” was heard as well. More often than not, Republican press releases were round filed or given slight mention.

The third avenue is the leftist opposition and what they say about conservatism through their multi-varied organizations such as the labor unions, radical leftist groups, Democrat Party, left-wing foundations and their buddies in the mass media. The left “stuck it” to me and us every chance they got.

It was obvious the press and my leftist opposition weren’t going to tell the conservative side accurately. I had to figure out how to overcome these obstacles.

CPR: Did you figure it out?

HLR: Yes, one piece at a time. I realized the office I held could be a “bloody pulpit” if intelligently used. I couldn’t fight the whole liberal establishment, so I chose a few issue areas where they were vulnerable and I had great interest and concentrated on them: guns and law enforcement. I formed PACs, raised money, hired professional staff, and put out informative newsletters to the given constituencies. I didn’t waste time jumping from one subject to another, as most Republican office-holders do. In time I came to be recognized as quite proficient in both fields and received a lot of press because of it.

CPR: As an illustration, tell us about the 1982 defeat of Prop. 15, a ban on new hand-gun purchases.

HLR: Our polling showed us losing by better than two-to-one at the beginning. Gunowners Political Action Committee played a significant role in organizing the leading activists in the gun community: Gunowners of California, NRA, and the California Rifle and Pistol Association. We formed a joint committee to organize the fight, and I made sure our GOC executive director chaired the committee. Overcoming such overwhelming odds demanded highly sophisticated political acumen — acumen the average

firearms owner didn’t possess. Our survey data showed that law enforcement assistance was vital, support we worked diligently to garner. We had little support in either TV or print media, but by election time we had reversed public sentiment, winning by better than two to one. Tom Bradley, the Democrat candidate for governor, backed the anti-gun initiative and later admitted it was the issue that cost him the election.

CPR: You also helped elect several solid GOP legislators dedicated to becoming a majority — correct?

HLR: A lot more than several. Over the life of the PACs I’ve helped form in the last 25 years, we’ve been active in hundreds of races both state and national. That’s what it’s all about: electing decent, moral citizens to public office.

CPR: You say GOP legislators not working to become a majority just take up space. Don’t most aim to take control?

HLR: When I first arrived in the Capitol, I was surprised how politically naïve some of the Republican legislators were, how many were resigned to remain a minority, satisfied just to be part of the Senate club.

CPR: Being “The Loyal Opposition?”

HLR: Loyal to the point of pain. The Demos don’t care how many minority Republicans there are as long as they don’t attempt to be the majority. They tolerate Republicans as long as they are “schmoozable,” polite, good little boys and girls.

CPR: Schmoozable?

HLR: It’s a Hollywood term for blowing smoke up one’s bazoo. For example, liberal Demos can spot a moderate Republican a mile off. They go out of their way to be friendly and complimentary, buffing up his or her ego. “You’re not like those strident right-wingers,” they say. “You’re a rational, thinking legislator, not given to extremes.” The more they fall for this line of pap, the more they are “rewarded” — a nicer office, maybe a vice chairmanship on a standing



committee, which is really nothing but a title, because Democrats control the committee. They may give or promise a nice, safe district in the next redistricting. One Republican colleague, after voting with the Democrats on a redistricting bill, told me, “HL, you know how to make a living on the outside; this is all I know.” I admired his honesty, while I felt contempt for his lack of ethics.

CPR: Are today’s Republicans any different?

HLR: Not appreciably so. A percentage are cutting the same deals and, basically, making the same mistakes — such as getting wrapped up in day-to-day trivia, wasting time reacting like Pavlov’s dogs to Democrat *minutia* rather than following a plan of action toward positive goals.

CPR: What was your plan of action?

HLR: I had to define the problem. When I was in the advertising business there was a saying I’ll never forget: “The subject matter dictates the solution.” That presupposes knowledge of the subject matter before solutions can be attained. The subject matter here was the methodology of liberal Democrats and of Republicans.

CPR: What do you mean by methodology?

HLR: A brilliant man named Richard M. Weaver once said, “Ideas have consequences.” People’s actions directly result from their ideas, which are the railroad tracks of the mind. Understand how the tracks are laid and you can predict where the mind will go. Methodology follows intellectual assumptions.

CPR: Do you believe fundamental ideological differences divide the voting public, both Democrats and Republicans?

HLR: No, not much ... but there is a wide chasm between the minority of left-wing Democrats who control the Democrat Party and Republicans who believe in traditional American values.

CPR: Do Republican legislators understand the ideas that motivate the left?

HLR: Not enough of them. Few can even identify the genesis of their own ideas, much less the ideology of the left. A few years ago, I was on a hunting trip with two senior Republican congressmen. I mentioned the term “scientific dialectical materialism,” the basic doctrine of Marxist methodology. Neither had ever heard

of it. How are you going to fight an enemy you know nothing about?

CPR: What did knowledge of the left tell you?

HLR: Many things: first, that arguing issues logically with the left would get me nowhere. We argue from fundamentally different assumptions.

CPR: And they are?

HLR: The left is committed to implementing a socialist/humanist agenda and no amount of logic based on traditional American values will change their minds. Reasonable men operating from the same assumptions can agree, but if they start from radically different presuppositions, it becomes nothing but a power game.

CPR: What do you mean by: traditional American values?

HLR: Oh, that’s simple. There are those of us who believe in God and the opposition that gives lip service to the Almighty or doesn’t believe in God at all.

CPR: But some liberals profess belief in God.

HLR: That’s why I said lip service. If you believe in the God revealed in scripture, the living God who gave us the Ten Commandments, you couldn’t possibly believe in programs such as abolishing the death penalty, or abortion on demand, or covetous taxation. God isn’t some good-feelie, whoopee-do, sky-person conjured up while watching a sunset. He is real, eternal, all powerful, so are his laws and so is his Son. This nation was settled, founded, and developed by God-fearing, Bible-reading people. Even a cursory study of American history tells that; in-depth study confirms it emphatically. In fact, every American president referred to America as a Christian country until the 1950s, including F.D.R. and Harry Truman. America was founded on concepts in the Bible. What’s more, it was the most successful experiment in government the world has ever seen.

CPR: Critics might call that a narrow view.

HLR: Is the truth narrow? The Bible, God’s Word, has been the instruction manual and value guide for Washington, Madison, Hamilton, Adams, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt — just to name a few. It is also the best political manual in existence.

CPR: A political manual?

HLR: You bet. What small success I’ve had was directly based on Biblical concepts. Whether voting or politically organizing, Scripture has been my guide.

CPR: Can you give an organizational example?

HLR: Sure. Liberal Democrats organize around atheist Marxian concepts; as an example, they relegate people to classes. Class warfare is the heart and soul of their world-view. Nowhere in the Bible are people categorized or relegated by class. Scripture says people are unique, precious in God's eyes, each given talents and capable of reasonable choices. That tells me that instead of categorizing by class, God created us issue-oriented.

CPR: The left has succeeded politically by playing the class card.

HLR: Yes, but only in absence of opposition. Almost any organizational idea that's implemented works better than no organization at all. Leftists have a plan to change America, which they are implementing. The majority of us, especially Republicans, are happy with the USA the way it is. We're not out to change the government our forefathers gave us. By nature, traditional Americans defend the *status quo*.

CPR: Is the *status quo*, then, static, unorganized?

HLR: Correct, by its nature, totally defensive. The best football team will lose if it never goes on offense. Same thing is true in politics. Americans can be instigated into political action by hot button issues with which they identify — pro-life, excessive taxation, national defense, Second Amendment rights, sanctity of the family, to name a few. Properly politically organized, these issues cut class concepts to shreds.

CPR: What do you mean by "properly politically organized?"

HLR: To be effective, political action must have political goals, a Political Action Committee, culminating in the election of decent conservative candidates. Educating people is not enough. Translating knowledge into election victories and, ultimately, control of the Legislature is paramount. The organization must work scrupulously within the law. Because it takes time and funds to organize with any chance of success, the issue must also have what I call "shelf life": it must be around for a long while and the hot button must create deep emotions over an extended period. And a professional staff is necessary.

CPR: Is that expensive?

HLR: Not necessarily. There are bright, young, issue-oriented people who want to be active in politics. Those worth their salt can, in a period of time, help raise enough to sustain their salaries. Seed money, a good issue, and hard work are enough.

CPR: Can such "good issues" always be found?

HLR: *[laughing]* As long as liberals are around, hot button issues will exist. Liberals don't solve problems, they create them. The more power they obtain, the more obnoxious their programs become. But these opportunities can reach a point of diminishing returns. Conservatives can't wait forever to organize.

CPR: Did the gun issue lead you into the direct mail field?

HLR: It was an instrumental tool in politically organizing gun owners. Before I set up Gun Owners of America PAC and Gun Owners of California PAC, the gun movement's PAC activity was practically nonexistent. The nation's gun owners eagerly responded to political action. *[Editors note: The NRA's political arm, ILA — Institute for Political Action — was formed after and in response to GOA's political action success.]*

CPR: Did that lead to other PACs?

HLR: Yes, but each new area demanded a different approach. For example, Californians wanted the death penalty restored and stronger laws. Protecting the innocent public should be the Legislature's first job, but liberal Democrats gave rights of criminals precedence. I formed Law and Order Campaign Committee to fight crime. We supported Senator George Duekmejian's death penalty bill. I hired away from the LAPD a bright officer to head the committee and quickly wound up with about 65,000 active financial supporters, not to mention hundreds of thousands of petitions returned in response to our mail. I loaded 27 huge mailbags on a cart and rolled it onto the Senate floor during debate on overriding Governor Brown's veto of the bill.

CPR: But Democrats controlled both houses and a veto override requires two-thirds to pass.

HLR: Yes, but we succeeded by rallying public support through the mail and built tremendous pressure on targeted Democrats. Several defied their leadership and voted with us. I had a terrific time.

CPR: Did that victory help Duekmejian become Attorney General?

HLR: It certainly didn't hurt him.

CPR: How did you do all this and still keep your Senate seat?

HLR: My PACs gave me great visibility with my con-



stituents. They liked the issues I promoted. The PACs also gave me independent fund-raising ability. No strong Democrat opposed me for Senate.

CPR: With your book-writing and running three state PACs and a national PAC, the Senate Republican Caucus, a direct mail business, and your Senate office, did you neglect your family?

HLR: I can honestly say I probably saw more of my family than most other legislators saw of theirs. I rented a home and brought my family to Sacramento. I learned early that constituents don't mind if leave them physically, as long as you don't leave them philosophically. I hired bright, moral people and gave them direction and I learned how to manage my management time.

CPR: How?

HLR: I attended weekend classes to learn how. Many legislators poorly manage their staff, schedule, personal family time, constituent demands, colleagues, the bureaucracy, legislation — it overwhelms them. I can't express how valuable that management education was for me. Legislators often can be pushed around by their staff and don't even know it. I learned to control it.

CPR: Was the Legislature then as partisan as now?

HLR: The Assembly was heavily partisan when I arrived in 1966. Jesse Unruh saw to that. The Senate still had a vestige of non-partisanship under the pro-tem leadership of Hugh Burns, a conservative Democrat from Fresno. However, the radicals in his Party were gaining strength. Many of them came from the Assembly to the Senate in the 1966 election. Soon they formed a highly-partisan Democrat caucus, the first in the state Senate. It was only a matter of time before they took control of the office of the pro-tem, the majority leader, and caucus leadership. From there on, it was raw-boned partisan power in both houses. They started changing rules to serve politics, freezing out any real bipartisanship. But most Republican legislators didn't wake up to what was happening and the Demos weren't going to give them no-doze. They continued to play the "we're all members of the same gentleman's club," schmoozing the gullible.

CPR: Has committee work changed over the years?

HLR: When I came to the Senate, a committee quorum had to be present to hear bills and when testimony was finished, the vote was taken. Roll calls weren't held open. You couldn't wander in hours later to cast your vote. Committee attendance was im-

portant; even minority party members could play a role. Today, unless the TV cameras are present, the hearings are little more than dog and pony shows.

CPR: Does that depress you?

HLR: Not much. I've learned never to get upset when dogs bark, jackasses bray, and snakes wriggle. It's their nature to do so. Liberal Democrats have their own nature as well; what they do doesn't upset me. Their behavior is based on false premises. If you understand them, they are something to take advantage of politically. Sun Tsu said victory comes when you know your enemy as well as you know yourself. I've spent a lot of time studying the left, their authors and the genesis of their beliefs. Also, it is equally important to understand the origin of traditional American values.

CPR: Why?

HLR: Several reasons: to understand why we react inadequately to leftist tactics and to comprehend why our ancestors had such an aversion to government. They knew that, by its nature, government is the enemy of a freedom-loving people. It grows geometrically, becoming uncontrollable bureaucracy if given the chance. That's why the Constitution limits government. Americans have forgotten that. When I entered the Legislature, the state budget was four billion. Now it's more than 100 billion. Population has increased by a third, but state government costs have ballooned to 25 times what they were. Government doesn't run on hot air, but on hard cash: money it covets and plunders from taxpayers.

Voters should know a bureaucrat gets promoted in only two ways: either a superior dies or retires creating an opening, or the bureaucrat creates a reason for his department to expand, needing more employees and more upper management positions. It doesn't take a genius to figure out that bureaucrats are in the business of finding problems, not solving them.

CPR: Did you get along with your Democrat colleagues?

HLR: I'm a friendly cuss. I got along with my colleagues and with the lobbyists. As a Christian, I'm called to be civil to all my neighbors. But none of them were friends, just acquaintances. I believe effective legislators can't afford the luxury of friendships with lobbyists and men you should try to defeat in the next election. Only rarely did I mingle socially with any of them. My 22-year legislative experience was all business. I agree with Harry Truman's advice: "In the world of politics, if you want a friend, get a dog." CPR



Stirling

(Continued from page 9)

vis medical school in both 1973 and 1974, while admitting far less academically-qualified minority applicants. He contended that UC Davis's quota-like process made him a victim of reverse discrimination. With only a modest attempt to disguise their long-range objective, the Regents argued that their diversity admissions program was not a quota system, but merely a goal. Although the Court found reverse discrimination and ordered Bakke's admission, a five-to-four majority allowed the university to continue utilizing skin color, but as "a single important (not the primary) element" in the selection process. The *Wall Street Journal* editorially criticized the Court's use of this language as setting the stage for "discretionary mischief" by the Regents. As the UC administration's response to the "Cook Report" 16 years later would demonstrate, that criticism was, if anything, highly understated.

Two years after that 1994 Regents' meeting, public university Professors Glynn Custred and Tom Wood, who had seen and experienced the unfairness of race-preferences, presented to California voters a state constitutional initiative measure they titled "the California Civil Rights Initiative." Proposition 209 reads simply:

The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of ... public education" It passed by a substantial margin.

Once the measure was declared constitutional by the federal courts, the UC administration was obligated to bring the university's admissions program into compliance with the new law. Indeed, in their oath of office, each Regent swears to uphold the state constitution. After all, unlike the Supreme Court's malleable language in *Bakke*, this language does not lend itself to "discretionary mischief." But instead, the Regents have now defiantly adopted "Comprehensive Review."

From the little now known about the new criteria, even cynics must wait to see whether or not it proves to be race-neutral. But in time, the UC administration will have to demonstrate that increases in the number of so-called under-represented admittees beginning next fall were not caused by race-preferenced policies or practices. Because a secretive, subjective process involving thousands of individual selection decisions is incompatible with the keeping of coherent records, the UC administration will find that burden unsupportable. The immense cost of their attempt will be borne by the same California taxpayers who meant Proposition 209 to be the final word. DEF.

Klamath Victory

(Continued from page 12)

ers of Klamath have not adversely impacted the ecosystem of Klamath nearly so drastically as the innumerable urban communities that dot the state and the nation. Indeed, if we are to believe the sloppy and entirely unsupportable sentiment, expressed in the *Times* editorial, that "when an entire species is sufficiently threatened to require protection, it usually means that the same ecosystem will eventually fail the humans who depend on it as well," the world would have been doomed long ago by the likes of New York, Boston, Chicago, Miami, and Los Angeles. Are we really to believe that the vital key to the survival of our environment lies in sleepy little Klamath Basin — a community of ten thousand people? It is beyond belief.

All of this is not to say that environmental values are without

merit. Indeed, there are valid reasons to establish national parks and monuments and forests, to protect flora and fauna. The "intangible benefit" mentioned by David Brower is indeed real, but the benefit is only meaningful in terms of the quality of human life, and our appreciation for the welfare of all living things and for nature itself. The environmentalist mantra that the world will end because some obscure bug or snail is endangered is flummery and, what is worse, it is mendacity employed in service to a more insidious goal: destroying the rights of other people to enjoy the fruits of nature.

Fundamentally, the Klamath Basin crisis is a microcosm of the larger battle being waged in the public's collective mind about the environment and the land, but contrary to the dire and hand-wringing picture painted by the environmentalist crowd, it is assuredly not about man *vs.* the en-

vironment, man *vs.* nature, or even man *vs.* fish. No, it is the same battle that has been waged for centuries, and which is likely to go on until the end of time: it is about man *vs.* man. I have no particular desire to see the sucker fish of Upper Klamath Lake go extinct, and I think we should make every reasonable effort to restore Pacific salmon runs. But everyone is getting David Brower's "free ride" every time they shop in a supermarket, drive to the mall, sleep in their cozy houses, or even turn on the shower.

We're all benefitting from human manipulation of the natural world to make our lives more comfortable, more enjoyable, and longer. So when it comes to the Klamath Basin farmers, I have little tolerance for anyone — especially duplicitous environmental activists — who says these farmers owe it to the rest of us to give up their livelihoods and leave. DEF.