

CALIFORNIA★POLITICAL REVIEW

AUTUMN 1994 • VOLUME 5 • NUMBER 4 • \$6



Mr. Shawn Steel
Law Office Shawn Steel
610 S. Harvard Ste 200
Los Angeles, CA 90005

Baby Please Don't Go

**FACING A TOUGH RE-ELECTION BID AND
LOOKING FORWARD TO 1996, PETE WILSON
SEEKS TO WOO CONSERVATIVES BACK INTO THE FOLD.
SHOULD THEY GO?**

**ROGER HEDGECOCK, HUGH HEWITT, DAVID HOROWITZ, MANUEL S. KLAUSNER, HOWARD KLEIN,
JOHN KURZWEIL, BEN MOREHEAD, ROBERT NAYLOR, SHAWN STEEL, & JOSEPH FARAH ANSWER**

HUGH HEWITT

Of course conservatives should vote for Wilson. The folks muttering to themselves about Pete's imperfections probably grumbled through Goldwater's '64 campaign as well.

Look, Wilson has consistently championed the protection of citizens against criminals. He has launched and won major battles over spending with some of Sacramento's most entrenched partisans of an expanding government, including the CTA. Wilson's vetoed scores of obnoxious bills. He's appointed solid judges and a bunch of innovative folks in the agencies.

Am I 100 percent happy with the governor?

Of course not. I worked five years in the Reagan administration and thought the Gipper blew a few calls as well. So what?

It's the package — the whole package — that matters. Does Wilson read Burke late into the evening? I doubt it. Could he have relied more on a variety of conservative sources? Yes. But again, so what?

Wilson is running for a second term. The reason constitutions created second terms is to complete unfinished business. Governor Wilson has spent four years setting up the spike. It's coming.

How ironic it would be if the critics had their way, and a reshuffled Legislature began addressing California's chronic problems only to find Kathleen Brown down the hall with a veto.

And there's a bonus. The governor probably wants to be president. He's qualified, perhaps more so than any other known contender.

To win the nod, Wilson must take his center-right coalition a few degrees towards the conservative purists. Wilson must then use 1995 to prepare to win in Republican presidential primaries.

That promises the conservative purists a governing style and agenda that even they will cheer.

Hugh Hewitt is co-host of PBS Los Angeles affiliate's nightly news and public affairs show, Life & Times, and host of his own radio show Sunday night at 9 p.m. on KFI AM-640.

MANUEL S. KLAUSNER

Free market supporters should look enthusiastically at Richard Rider's candidacy. A vote for Rider is a vote that you can cast with pride — and you will still feel good the next morning!

The polls show Pete Wilson, in a dramatic turnaround, increasing his lead over Kathleen Brown after trailing her by

more than 25 points. Many Democrats are turning their backs on Brown's lightweight candidacy, and it is unlikely that there will be a late surge for Brown that will make a close race in November. Thus, rather than holding your nose and wasting a vote for Wilson, my advice is to vote for Richard Rider for Governor.

Rider is the Libertarian Party candidate. He is committed to the principles of lower taxes and less government. In contrast to a Wilson vote, a vote for a Libertarian is an unambiguous message for getting the government out of our wallets and off our backs.

The public overwhelmingly sees government as inefficient and wasteful. Yet Wilson is out of step with the growing distrust for politicians and skepticism about governmental programs. He has supported massive tax increases, and he opposed Proposition 174, the Parental-Choice-In-Education Initiative.

Earlier this year, Rider supported Ron Unz, who received nearly 660,000 votes in the Republican primary. Unz effectively attacked Wilson's policies, and labeled him an "ideological cross-dresser" — a Democrat in disguise. Nearly 35 percent of Republicans voted for Unz, signaling their opposition to Wilson's big government, high-tax record.

Voting for a Republican is desirable when the party runs a principled candidate such as controller nominee Tom McClintock who is well-known for his out-

spoken opposition to Wilson's massive 1991 tax increase.

But Unz supporters should see no reason to vote for Wilson simply because of his party label. If re-elected by a wide margin, Wilson stands to become a major contender in the race for the 1996 Republican nomination for president.

Those who support big-government candidates such as Wilson unavoidably bear responsibility for the consequences of their action.


Providing support to high-tax Republicans is no virtue.

Voting to reject big-government Republicans is no vice. If there ever were an election where it makes sense to express dissatisfaction with government as usual, this is it! Richard Rider for Governor!

Manuel S. Klausner is co-founding editor of Reason magazine. And Chairman of the Libertarian Law Council.

SHAWN STEEL

No less than Bruce Herschensohn wrote recently "...it is intolerable for me to think of Kathleen Brown as our governor." Bill Bennett says Pete Wilson's race is "key" for "Republicans across



The folks muttering
to themselves about
Pete's imperfections
probably grumbled
through Goldwater's '64
campaign as well.

— Hugh Hewitt

America." Jack Kemp argues we "must rally together for Wilson... or face disastrous consequences in 1996 and beyond."

Many conservatives disengaged in 1992 with George Bush. Mr. Bush's leadership was lacking and his campaign was badly managed, but it did not help for conservatives to play sour grapes and watch millions of conservatives drift into the Perot column. That kind of experimentation was insidious.

Now we see ambitious Clinton programs that just three years ago would have been unthinkable. Health nationalization might be stalled, but hundreds of other liberal programs, rammed through Congress, are now law. The federal government continues to intrude into personal lives on a greater scale than ever. Conservatives will vote for Wilson because there is no practical alternative. Let's review the major issues and talk about Kathleen Brown.

- **Death Penalty** — The death penalty aptly defines Brown's candidacy and provides the brightest contrast between Brown and Wilson. She reverently recalls a time when her father, as governor, commuted 26 death sentences. She originally opposed "One Strike, You're Out" legislation and has "problems" with three strikes reforms. Her anti-crime agenda embraces therapy, not punishment.

- **Illegal Aliens** — Brown opposed elimination of taxpayer-funded services for illegal aliens, opposed constitutional changes regarding citizenship (and the benefits it brings) automatically conferred on children of illegal aliens born in this country, and just announced her passionate opposition to Proposition 187 despite huge popular support even among Latinos.

- **Taxes** — She is not much better on taxes, constantly attacking Proposition 13 and trying to revise it. She supports increased taxes on property, income, and sales. Brown and a Democrat Legislature would accelerate taxing beyond our imagination.

- **Free Trade** — Brown's waffling became embarrassingly clear during the NAFTA debate. Obviously pandering to labor unions, she flip-flopped and opposed NAFTA days before the vote by Congress. Along with Kathleen and her brother Jerry, only two governors opposed NAFTA.

- **Wacky Environmentalism** — Brown consistently supported Tom Hayden's "Big Green" initiative and embraces extreme environmental regulations that place animal rights above human rights.

- **Judges** — Since the Democrats lost the governor's office a dozen years ago, we have seen a 180-degree reform of the judiciary. Judges now tend to support property rights, are pro-death penalty and pro-criminal prosecution. A majority of the California Supreme Court, of California Courts of Appeal jus-


tics, and superior and municipal court judges are much more conservative. Probably no single gubernatorial power is more important than the right to appoint judges. Brown would bring back the bleeding heart, pro-criminal, ACLU lawyer types into

power with a vengeance. Have you noticed Clinton's judicial appointments? Instead of dealing with one Rose Bird, there would be scores if not hundreds of similar judges under her tutelage.

- **Political Appointments** — Conservatives may not be happy with regulatory agencies, but under Wilson at least 50 percent of political commission appointments were eliminated. Under Brown, regulation would grow and political spoils would mushroom.

The question is not to weigh the benefits and costs of Wilson alone. We know his record. It is not perfect, but it is predictable. Weigh a Brown administration against a Wilson one. The vigor of the leftist policies pushed by Clinton surprised me — I never dreamed he would try to nationalize health care. Frankly, conservatives cannot begin to imagine the nightmares Brown could bring to California with the next eight years of our lives.

Shawn Steel is secretary of the California Lincoln Clubs and finance chairman of the Dana Robrabacher for Congress Committee.



Many conservatives disengaged in 1992. Mr. Bush's leadership was lacking...but it did not help for conservatives to play sour grapes and watch millions of conservatives drift into the Perot column.

— Shawn Steel

DAVID HOROWITZ

Should conservatives vote for Pete Wilson? Which is worse: An anti-conservative governor who is also leader of our own party or surren-

dering the state's top office to the socialist opposition? It's an old argument — I don't know the answer. I only know how to fight to win. I will fight for conservative principles with Wilson in office and fight to keep the Democrats out of office.

David Horowitz is president of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture.

JOSEPH FARAH

There's an old saying: "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." That about summarizes why Governor Pete Wilson will not get my vote for re-election this November. He has fooled the California electorate too many times by occasionally (usually around election time) masquerading as something he's not — a conservative.

Lots of people — good, honest, well-meaning conservatives