

2/19/97

CSPAN  
Suite 155  
400 N. Capitol St. N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001

To the Program Director:

Please note that it has been a long time since I wrote to CSPAN but I watch it more than any other TV offering.

Please assure me that the rumor that some cable companies will be removing CSPAN from many areas is not true! Please fight this move!

Also please in your influential interviews can the subject matter and/or persons associated with any of the items noted in attached articles from NYPost editorials of 2/18/97, be featured in any of your program?

We need information and we need people to fight for this country. It is getting terribly depressing to see the slide we are in.

Sincerely,

Albany NY 12205-2803

attachments  
copy (2) articles NYPost 2/18/97

P.S. Names that come to mind are: Sen. Trent Lott, Senator D'Amato, Congressman Helms, Solomon, Hyde, Pat Buchanan, Howard Phillips, and perhaps a great number who are fighting the good fight, I noted above in the article on revisionist history. It is destroying us from within..



## Scandal of a new type

"The first I knew of any of it was last evening." This was President Clinton's not-instantly-believable protestation last week after being confronted with reports that the Chinese Embassy in Washington was directly involved in channeling contributions to his re-election campaign and to the Democratic National Committee.

Bill Clinton may be surprised by this scandal — but so, in a way, are all Americans. For what now emerges from the President's fund-raising operation are facts that reside on a completely different plane than Whitewater.

The latter reflects a kind of corruption which is almost commonplace. A smooth-talking, attractive young politician cutting ethical corners in a one-party state where corner-cutting was almost expected. The rub was that the Clintons talked piously about their high ethics — and the evidence shows they acted otherwise.

But while Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr is sorting it out, the Whitewater scandal — despite its numbing complexity — seems to illustrate venality of a shopworn type. Not so the Chinese connection.

Americans live in a global economy — where virtually every product they use is seemingly designed in one place, manufactured in another and packaged in a third. The distinctions between foreign and American financial interests, in short, are not so clear-cut.

Actions which would — to past generations, and certainly to the presidents whose memory was honored yesterday — have seemed intuitively anti-patriotic now linger in a sort of ethical limbo. It requires investigation and partisan squabbling to determine whether "mistakes were made" — or, instead, that "laws were broken."

At this point, virtually no Americans outside the White House understand the degree and depth of the Clinton-China influence-peddling scandal. There have

been credible reports linking the President's abrupt turnabout on immigration reform — until last March, Clinton backed recommendations of the late Barbara Jordan's committee — to a fund-raising dinner arranged by Commerce Department official-turned-DNC-fundraiser John Huang.

There have been reports that large amounts of campaign cash collected in the U.S. territory of Guam influenced Clinton to support legislation allowing the island to import vast numbers of low-wage Asian workers.

Rep. Gerald Solomon (R-N.Y.) has asked the FBI to investigate whether high-ranking administration officials were involved in economic espionage against the U.S. We do know that Clinton eagerly solicited money from individuals with tight links to foreign countries — including one Chinese-American described in National Security Council parlance as a "hustler."

And we know that the Clinton staff's worry was not the appropriateness of taking money from persons linked to foreign regimes, but whether it would look bad if photographs of those meetings leaked out to the public.

Congressional Republicans are right to press for a new special counsel to investigate the matter. It's doubtful the Justice Department has the resources — and the independence — to conduct a necessary probe.

But a deeper question underlies these reports of illegal behavior — one not present in Whitewater, or Watergate or, for that matter, the Teapot Dome scandal. It reaches beyond personal greed or an unseemly quest for partisan advantage.

It touches instead on whether those standing at the pinnacle of power in Washington retain any sense of loyalty to the United States — or indeed, in this increasingly "global" age, whether they retain a sense of what that even means.

INDEX 0



# THE DIVERSITY GOLD MINE

TWO stories in The New York Times last week gave us an interesting look at the way the subject of race is nowadays covered — and not covered — in a paper that has made “diversity” one of the central principles of its journalistic practice.

Consider, for example, Drew Christopher’s Page One story in Saturday’s Times about Alexis Herman, whom Bill Clinton has nominated to be his new secretary of Labor. Christopher’s story was headlined “New Questions On Investments For a Nominee,” but the word “investments” turned out to be something of a misnomer.

What in the headline was discreetly described as “investments” was actually a gift — now worth upwards of \$500,000 — that was bestowed upon Herman in the 1980s by a big-time developer, Herbert S. Miller, so that his Market Square project in downtown Washington could meet a federal law that required the project to include minority partners.

In this lucrative endeavor, Alexis Herman was never required to invest a dime. The color of her skin was sufficient to meet the government quota for federal contracts. Such a transaction might be called many things — but it cannot by any stretch of the language be called an “investment” when its beneficiary was never obliged to invest any of her own money.

For the woman who has now been chosen to be the next Secretary of Labor, the diversity-affirmative action statutes have certainly proved to be something of a

## Why did the Times miss critical details in the Alexis Herman story?

Times, Herman’s consulting firm, A. M. Herman & Associates, was awarded a contract in the amount of \$205,000 “to oversee the hiring of minority workers and contractors at Market Square.”

The Times also reported that, in 1989, A.M. Herman & Associates won a \$500,000 contract “to create and monitor affirmative-action plans for the construction of the Government’s new \$1 billion Ronald Reagan Building” in Washington.

By the early 1990s, moreover, the same firm was performing the same functions — at fees we can only guess — for Burger King, Proctor & Gamble and Levi Strauss. When Herman herself joined the Clinton White House in 1993, she sold this thriving enterprise for a sum that has not been disclosed.

According to the Times, “People involved in the [Market Square] deal” describe it “as a fairly typical effort to meet Federal affirmative action goals.” What the Times story neglected to point out, however, was that the statute governing these goals was the work of

### MEDIA WATCH



— guess who? Why, Alexis Herman, when she served as an official in the Labor Dept. under Jimmy Carter.

This — and some of Herman’s other contributions to race-quota largess while serving in the Carter Labor Dept. — was reported on National Public Radio Sunday night, but it somehow escaped notice in the Times.

How, you may wonder, was Alexis Herman chosen as the beneficiary of so much government-mandated money? In other words, who put in the fix?

The Times mentioned that she’d worked in the Labor Dept, but it didn’t say what she did there. It also reported that she served as chief of staff of the Democratic National Committee from 1989 to 1991 — but there was no reference in the story to the late Ron Brown, who was running the DNC at the time.

You would have to have read Paul Gigot’s column in Friday’s Wall Street Journal to get a true picture of the way the political “food chain” — to use a favorite term of the Clinton White House — functioned on Herman’s behalf.

According to Gigot, Herman was “a protege and close friend of Ron Brown.” As the Secretary of Commerce in the Clinton administration, Brown brought pressure on the Japanese government to benefit a company owned by the same Herbert Miller who’d bestowed that cost-free gift of a partnership on Alexis Herman.

Meanwhile, Miller donated \$50,000 to the DNC after attending one of the White House coffee hours while his business partner, Alexis Herman, was running the White House office of public liaison.

Perhaps all this was too complicated for Drew Christopher to deal with in his Times story. But then, the liberal media have never been eager to look very closely into the sordid details of Ron Brown’s career as a public official — and you can’t report the whole truth about Alexis Herman without reporting the truth about Ron Brown.

Anyway, I’ll hazard a prediction that Alexis Herman’s nomination will have



Associated Press

**ALEXIS HERMAN**  
Race-quota largess.



Associated Press

**KEN BURNS**  
More revisionist history.

to be withdrawn once the Senate committee considering her appointment begins to get a true picture of her “qualifications.” To put this “diversity” entrepreneur in charge of the Labor Dept. is simply to invite further abuses of an already overabused government mandate.

My other example of race coverage in last week’s Times was to be found on — of all places — the front page of Thursday’s Home section. There, in Mitchell Owens’ Design Notebook, we were treated to a theory of human achievement so astounding in its claims that it, too, should have been given Page One treatment — if only on grounds of intellectual novelty.

As befits a column devoted to design, its focus was on the furniture and other crafts designed by Thomas Jefferson for his home at Monticello. Actually, however, the whole feature was a sweetheart promotional interview with Ken Burns, the PBS poster boy whose revisionist documentary on Jefferson will be broadcast tonight and tomorrow on Channel 13.

What Burns wanted to

however, wasn’t Jefferson but his black slaves. In Burns’ Politically Correct view, the labors exerted by Jefferson’s slaves in building and furnishing Monticello make them nothing less than the “co-creators of Monticello.”

And that’s not all. According to Burns, “American liberty was born out of the free time that slave labor was able to provide for Jefferson.” Thus in Burns’ view, “The slaves of Monticello, you could argue, are co-authors of the Declaration of Independence.”

Needless to say, Mitchell Owens raised no questions about this novel theory of intellectual authorship, which, if generally accepted, would require us to rewrite the history of practically everything.

But then, come to think of it, that’s exactly what is now going on in the writing of school textbooks and the chronicling of history on public television — as you will be able to see for yourselves tonight with the airing of Ken Burns’ “Thomas Jefferson.”

Hilton Kramer is the ed-

**The liberal media have never been eager to look closely into the sordid details of Ron Brown’s career — and you can’t report the whole truth about Alexis Herman without reporting the truth about Ron Brown.**