

Now these activists, still determined to defend *Roe* at all costs, find themselves Johnny-come-latelies to street-level politics practiced on the doorsteps of abortion clinics in Wichita and Buffalo.

Admirers of *Brown* and advocates of *Roe* have, in Rosenberg's opinion, simply overestimated the effectual importance of these two decisions by the Supreme Court. *Brown* was not implemented until there was an almost nationwide improvement in race relations, while today the backers of *Roe v. Wade* find themselves overextended, fighting for *Roe* not only in the Supreme Court but in all 50 states, locality by locality. Rosenberg concludes that activists' money, time, and talent would be better spent attempting to mold public rather than judicial opinion if sustained social reform is their goal. "Social reformers, with limited resources, forgo other options when they elect to litigate. Those options are mainly political and involve mobilizing citizens to participate more effectively. . . . [W]hile such exercises [as *Brown* and *Roe*] may make for fine reading constitutional-law textbooks, they seldom bring reform any closer." Obviously, this is a lesson that hasn't been lost on Operation Rescue.

Jim Christie is a staff writer for the California Republic.

War and the Social Life

by James Thornton

The Conduct of War:
1789-1961

by Major-General J.F.C. Fuller
New York: Da Capo Press;
352 pp., \$14.95



British Major-General John Frederick Charles Fuller is remembered today as one of the great strategists and military historians of this century. Always controversial, he is renowned for such works as *The Generalship of Ulysses S. Grant* (1929), *Grant and Lee: A Study in Personality and Generalship* (1933), the monumental *A Military History of the Western World* (three volumes, 1954-56), *The Generalship of Alexander the*

Great (1958), and *Julius Caesar: Man, Soldier, and Tyrant* (1965). So prolific a writer was he that before his death in 1966 he had completed and published 45 books and innumerable essays and articles.

General Fuller's fame as a strategist is such that he is sometimes called the "20th-century Clausewitz." One of the first to understand the significance of the tank and to anticipate accurately the upheaval that this invention would engender, he became an early and uncompromising advocate of mechanization. In some respects, his ideas were the logical outgrowth of his service as commander of the Royal Tank Corps during World War I. Yet Fuller was not a conventional British officer. A visionary of sorts and possessed of an extraordinarily agile mind, his thoughts leaped decades beyond those of other military men. The war of the future, he predicted in the 1920's, would be one of movement and fluidity and would not be a repeat of the bloody stalemate of 1914-1918. During the period between the two great European wars, the general staffs of both Britain and France not only failed to grasp these theories but took pains to ridicule them.

Fuller was undaunted and continued his provocative writing. The cumulative weight of his blunt criticism was finally too much for the military establishment to bear, and he was retired in 1933. It is typical of the man that his autobiography, published in 1936, has as its motto a quotation from Heraclitus printed boldly on the title page: "Asses would rather have refuse than gold." This was a parting shot at the hidebound obstinacy of the Imperial General Staff, since for them and for the French nothing changed after 1914. France, as we know, opted for the ultimate in trench warfare, the Maginot Line, which Fuller at the time dubbed the "tomb of France." Despite such warnings, strategic thinking among the Allies remained imbedded firmly—and disastrously—in the past. German military planners, however, were not so slow-witted. Men such as Guderian and Rommel understood what Fuller was talking about. Thirty thousand copies of Fuller's manual on armored warfare were published in Germany. In contrast, the English published only 500 copies. Of course, when the Blitzkrieg overwhelmed France in an avalanche of steel in 1940, Fuller's theories were at last rec-

ognized as sound.

The Conduct of War is part of a series of reprints of General Fuller's most valuable contributions to military history. It was written when the author was over eighty years old and represents a careful distillation of his lifetime of study.



He begins by noting that Arnold Toynbee was once perplexed by the fact that with the birth of democratic government war had suddenly become more ferocious than ever before, though (in Toynbee's view) democracy's roots were fed by notions of Christian love and brotherhood. How, with these antecedents, was it possible for democracy to act in so antisocial a manner? Toynbee, it seems, was never able to satisfactorily solve his enigma.

Fuller maintains that Toynbee's question is legitimate, "because the understanding of the problem of war is wrapped up in its correct answer." Fuller insists that this answer may be found not in abstractions but in the very nature of the human being, who at best is only partly civilized and who, with a minimum of prompting, will quickly revert to his primitive ways. Moreover, democracy is not rooted in Christian love. On the contrary, the idea is "as great a myth as Rousseau's 'noble savage.'" Instead, he tells us, "the motive force of democracy is not love of others, it is the hate of all outside the tribe, faction, party or nation. The 'general will' predicates total war, and hate is the most puissant of recruiters."

The foregoing reveals much about the *leitmotif* of this volume, which is that the French, Industrial, and Russian revolutions (such a peculiar embodiment

of democratic ideals) set in motion forces that transformed civilized society and its concept of warfare. The author asserts that for several hundred years prior to the French Revolution war had slowly come to be limited and even somewhat humane. Armies were small and comprised of professional soldiers, war aims were tightly circumscribed, and, by and large, civilians were left unmolested by battle. However, with the dawn of the age of nationalism and the rise of democratic ideologies, armies expanded to enormous size, new technologies offered ever more efficient methods of devastation, and, perhaps most significantly, the passions of civilian populations were inflamed, and thus mobilized, through the medium of propaganda.

Democratic warfare aimed at the obliteration not only of the enemy's military forces but of his government and noncombatants, along with their homes and places of work. "Unconditional surrender" became a watchword, and war was once again "total." Moreover, Fuller remarks, this cycle of amplified brutality appears to have no end: from the Napoleonic Wars springs the Franco-Prussian War; the Franco-Prussian War gives birth to the First World War; that

catastrophe, in turn, leads to yet another world war; the Second World War sets the stage for the Cold War, and so on. Each new war, though it held forth promises of decisive results and lasting peace ("the war to end all wars," "the war to make the world safe for democracy," etc.), served instead to usher in a fresh and more barbarous sequel. Only with the Cold War did the universal savagery seem slightly to abate, and that, according to Fuller, came about only with the development of weapons of mass destruction and a threat to the existence of both victor and vanquished. Yet, even this is illusion. Our age, he says somberly, is one of random terrorism, fierce regional conflicts, and permanent emergency: "Today, fear of annihilation grips every heart; no longer are there any signs of stability, or feelings of security, and, as bad, no bonds of honour or even of common decency bind the nations together."

Fuller, an avid reader of Thomas Carlyle, espoused the "great men" theory of history. He therefore devotes much of this book to leaders who have contributed to the shape of modern warfare and determined the course of contemporary events: Napoleon, Moltke, Foch, Lenin, Hitler, Churchill, and Stalin,

among others. Clausewitz, "the father of modern war," receives the most comprehensive treatment, "because he was the first and remains one of the few who grasped that war 'belongs to the province of social life.'"

The Conduct of War received laudatory reviews when it first appeared, including one from another military historian and pioneer, Basil Henry Liddell Hart, who considered it Fuller's finest book. It is indeed fascinating to read. Like all of Fuller's historical works, this book is filled with a rich eloquence and vivid imagery that one does not usually expect from the pen of a professional soldier. In addition, it is marked by an impatience with and a contempt for the delusions and banalities of our era and by astringent judgments against the feckless dilettantes and unscrupulous opportunists who have led a once great civilization to the very edge of the precipice.

Father James Thornton is an Orthodox priest, editor of Orthodox Tradition magazine, and a research associate at the Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies in Etna, California.

GREAT TOPICS, GREAT ISSUES

Reactionary Modernism—August 1992—Thomas Molnar on Céline and French reactionary modernism, Peter J. Stanlis on Robert Frost, J. O. Tate on Wyndham Lewis, and Larry Woiwode on Dos Passos. Plus David R. Slavitt on the novels of 1991, Justin Raimondo on Ayn Rand as plagiarist, Bill Kauffman on Sinclair Lewis, and Chilton Williamson's review of R. Emmett Tyrrell's *The Conservative Crack-Up*.

Rotten to the Core—**American Colleges**—September 1992—Thomas Fleming on literature and the curriculum debate, Robert Weissberg on the life of a campus conservative, E. Christian Kopff on a true classical curriculum, and student reports on political correctness at the University of Florida, Grinnell College, and Georgetown University. Plus Laura Rogers' exposé of the Parents as Teachers program and Lawrence Uzzell's review of Chester Finn's latest reforms.

1492—Italians and America—October 1992—Christie Davies on blaming Columbus, E. Christian Kopff on Margaret Fuller in Rome, Chilton Williamson on pseudoscholarship about Columbus, and Samuel Francis on *The Godfather* as political metaphor. Plus Thomas Fleming on Italy and the changing frontier, David R. Slavitt on the life of Lorenzo Da Ponte, and Thomas O. Jones on Columbus' descendants in America.

BACK ISSUES ORDER FORM

Each issue \$5.50 (postage and handling included)

Title	Date	Qty.	Cost
REACTIONARY MODERNISM	AUGUST 1992	_____	_____
ROTTEN TO THE CORE	SEPTEMBER 1992	_____	_____
1492—ITALIANS AND AMERICA	OCTOBER 1992	_____	_____

Total Enclosed \$ _____

Name _____

Address _____

Mail with check to: *Chronicles* * 934 North Main Street * Rockford, IL 61103

The Campus Security Cost Scam.



Conservative speakers are rare at the University of Illinois. That's why Illinois student, Celeste Ann Lawson, asked Young America's Foundation to sponsor a lecture at her school by 75th U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese.

But five days before the event she was informed by a campus dean that because Mr. Meese was an "attractive nuisance"

there might be a disruption of his speech. So to pay for the "necessary" security, Celeste and the other conservatives would have to fork over \$400 or have the lecture cancelled. But Celeste and her friends weren't about to cave in. They called the governor of the state as well as other state officials to protest. The next day the campus Chief of Police called Celeste to tell her that the university would "absorb" the cost of security. On the night of the lecture Mr. Meese appeared before a crowd of 1,000 enthusiastic students in spite of the scheming of the school administration.

Unfortunately, the story doesn't end here. Because the security cost scam is a common tactic that liberal campus administrators use to discourage

students from inviting conservative speakers to their schools. Security costs are never demanded for the appearances of speakers on the left. But they have been attempted against conservative students at institutions such as Hamilton College, Georgetown University, and others.

Don't let your deans railroad you. We're helping students like Celeste Lawson with speakers, advice and literature. If the security cost scam is being used against you, let us know.

If you need our help, we want to hear from you. Or if you would like to help Young America's Foundation to assist students like Celeste Lawson, please contact us.

Write or call:



F.M. Kirby Freedom Center
110 Elden Street
Herndon, Virginia 22070
703 318-9608

CH11/92B

Letter From Virginia

by Anne Marie Morgan

Redistricting Apartheid



Elbridge Gerry's infamous salamander district pales in comparison to the monster-like menagerie birthed in redistricted states that fall under the preclearance requirement of Section Five of the federal Voting Rights Act. Although Virginia's state constitution requires that "every electoral district shall be composed of contiguous and compact territory," the feds overruled it and mandated that Virginia's recently reapportioned electoral boundaries incorporate districts contoured like a hooded cobra, snapping alligator, terrier head, half-eaten apple, seahorse, rooster, and an upside-down, tailless Trojan horse. One serpentine district is now 180 miles long and only four miles wide in one section, spanning the rural tobacco counties of Southside Virginia to urban Portsmouth near the Atlantic Coast—a violation of the historical norm that election districts encompass "communities of interest" and not split the political subdivisions of localities. To accumulate the prescribed percentage of minority voters per "majority-minority" district, even some voting *precincts* are split under Virginia's new plans, a source of considerable consternation and confusion to would-be voters, who go to the polls and find unfamiliar names.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act departed from previous civil rights laws in that it singled out the old Confederacy states for unique regulation. Under congressional presumption that low voter registration or turnout signified deliberate racial discrimination, the act applied automatically to any state that fell under one or both of the following conditions: use of a literacy test as a prerequisite for voting in the 1964 presidential election, and voter registration and turnout of less than 50 percent in that election. Although the black vote provided the margin of victory for Lyndon Johnson in Virginia in 1964, under both counts the act was applied to Virginia, with one immediate effect being termination of its lit-

eracy test—a test that had been liberally given for decades to both white Republicans and anti-Byrd Democrats.

In 1970, the act was extended for five years, and in 1975 for another seven. Since 1965, Section Five of the act has had the effect of requiring *all* Virginia voting law changes—congressional, state, and local electoral boundaries, voting registration or procedures, designation of polling places, terms of all elective offices, party plans, nomination processes, shifts from elective to appointive offices, redistricting patterns, methods of election—to be submitted for "preclearance" to the U. S. Department of Justice or to the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Any state or locality submitting changes was burdened with proving that the changes were not discriminatory in purpose or effect.

In 1982, the act was extended for 25 more years and further amended, with Congress attaching an additional "results" test in Section Two. In 1987, the Justice Department altered its regulations to correspond to the 1982 revision. These new regulations made it obvious that all changes submitted for preclearance would be denied if the Department of Justice thought that the proposals would cause a racially discriminatory "result"—even if no deliberate intent could be proven.

The effect of preclearance is enormous, as jurisdictions bend over backwards to avoid even the slightest, unanticipated appearance of racial discrimination. The requirement has proven to be an onerous burden to states and localities: in practical effect, no matter how convoluted or strange the district, if Justice bureaucrats think that "majority-minority" voting districts can be carved in a locality or throughout the state, then a jurisdiction must carve them out or have its plans denied—even if a district has *lost* minority population since its previous preclearance approval at the last population census. The new district boundaries are, paradoxically, modern *de jure* segregation.

Prior to Virginia's most recent redistricting conflagration, a dozen municipalities had their plans altered through Department of Justice objections, consent decrees, or court orders. Richmond

was enjoined by a federal court order from holding councilmanic elections for seven years, until local officials backed down and consented to single-member ward elections. Newport News, which decided through an 85 percent favorable vote in a local referendum to directly elect a mayor, was forbidden to do so by the Justice Department upon discovery that city officials had not sufficiently precleared two other minor changes. And these examples represent only the tip of the iceberg. For nearly thirty years, the state of Virginia has stumbled over its share of redistricting obstacles, including complaints by special interest groups (especially the ACLU and the NAACP), Justice, and the U. S. Supreme Court and federal court imposed interventions.

Last year's redistricting fights over Virginia's legislative and congressional districts included squabbles over the definition of "black majority": did this term signify a majority of the total black population or rather a majority of the "voting-age" black population, as asserted by the NAACP. The latter interpretation prevailed. The Department of Justice even rejected the reapportionment plan for the Virginia House of Delegates on the recommendation of the ACLU and NAACP, which asserted that the legislature's numerical increase in black-majority districts was insufficient and that at least one more such district could be sculptured. This grievance was filed in spite of the fact that the initial House plan was approved by the General Assembly's joint Black Caucus and by the legislature's Democratic majority and signed by the state's black Governor, Douglas Wilder. A chastened legislature then bowed to ACLU wishes and, after three tries, including a gubernatorial veto and amendments, submitted a state Senate plan that the Justice Department would authorize. This plan's division of the representation pie (among other things) handed Richmond yet another senator—in spite of the fact that the city had *lost* population since 1980.

The legislature-approved plans were noteworthy for their incumbency protection of insider Democratic lawmakers and for their punishment of nonpolitically correct outsiders, Republicans, cn-