

WHERE IS THAT FELLA

Pat Kavanagh

Patrick J. Buchanan, the early Republican primaries and the Washington Post. A view from a visiting observer.

On the evening of Monday, 12 February 1996, the Republican Party in the State of Iowa held precinct caucuses to begin its process of selecting delegates to attend the Republican convention in San Diego, California in August to nominate the Party's Presidential candidate in this election year. While not regarded as necessarily definitive in identifying the eventual candidate, the Iowa caucuses are regarded as reliable in sorting out the field.¹ On the morning of the same day the *Washington Post* ran a story of a 57-year-old Baltimore man who had recently contacted and met for the first time his 33-year-old daughter.² He had been aware of his daughter's existence since her birth and could at any time have contacted her through his sister who was and remained a friend of the mother. Except for one half-hearted attempt, he made no move to do so. Indeed, for 33 years he played no role in his daughter's life whatsoever: no contact, no support, nothing.

On Tuesday, 13 February 1996, the *Washington Post* published the outcome of the Iowa caucuses: Dole had 'edged out' Buchanan for the lead. Alexander came in third and Forbes, a fair way back, fourth. The same morning the *Post* ran a story on a women's basketball league in Fairfax, Virginia, composed of 60 'beyond thirty-something' women which functions without the players keeping score, and with no practices, no coaches, no fouls, no team standings and no playoffs. The competitive elements have been leached out as 'unpleasant' and male.³ On Wednesday, 21 February 1996 the *Post* reported that Buchanan had 'edged out' Dole in the New Hampshire primary. Alexander and Forbes again came in third and fourth but, for the moment, attention is focused on Dole and Buchanan who are shaping up as a two-person race. Specifically, attention is focused on Buchanan for his ability to put pressure on Dole, a respected and experienced senator who carries serious wounds as a memento of his courageous World War II service and who, at his third attempt, ought to have earned the nomination. Alexander's attempt to vault himself into Dole's position as a younger version of the same is both mean and lame. Buchanan has got there on the strength of his own appeal.

This article was written after the New Hampshire primary on 20 February 1996 and before the Delaware primary, held four days later.

Tales from the Republic

The *Washington Post* is an excellent start to one's day, for a mere 25 cents each morning. Apart from the human interest stories such as those mentioned above, the *Post* has well-written and extensive reporting, stimulating and intelligent political commentary. The coincidence of the above stories and reports is interesting because, in a curious way, it throws light on the source of Buchanan's appeal.

Take the 'Father' story. One is easily moved by this charming story of a 57-year-old Baltimore school teacher and his daughter; he a black activist in the 1960s and now a role model for male black teenagers in his school, happily married for 33 years with two sons, one almost

Pat Kavanagh teaches law at Macquarie University.

[Editor's note: Buchanan used the expression 'Where is that fella?' after he won in New Hampshire. He was gleefully observing that no-one can figure out where he's coming from (so he thinks).]

exactly the same age as his daughter; she a College graduate and successful businesswoman, also happily married but without children. But in what sense could he lift the phone after 33 years silence and say 'I'm your Father?' Ought he not at least have said: 'I'm your biological father'? The story in fact made plain the parties are aware of the problems in this, but one could say he appears to regard fatherhood as indicating a mere biological *fact* and therefore he can give it what *meaning* he pleases, become 'a father' to his daughter when and how it suits him. Would not one rather want to say he is *becoming* his daughter's 'father', as that term does not indicate a mere biological fact but draws its meaning from moral presuppositions which impose obligations on him he is only now demonstrating his willingness to fulfil? In short, one can argue that the term 'father' is a teleological term importing objectively binding obligations directed to that telos. Identification of a father then defers to both factual and normative criteria, the latter of which this undoubtedly remorseful Baltimore teacher is only now beginning to meet.

A similar analysis can be made of the women's basketball league. With the competitive elements carefully leached out, one can say the women are playing the game distelically.⁴ Of course, the women have their own end which appears to be exercise and a lot of laughs without 'unpleasantness'; but the self-chosen end justifies a self-chosen meaning to their activity on the court, a meaning which has no place for either rules or skill. Again, a fun story to read. But the interesting thing is the women regard their activity as 'basketball': they have a league. Their husbands also regard it as 'basketball': they umpire and apparently keep score. Both parties then feel able to identify 'basketball' and husband-umpires to identify 'goals' from matching factual activity to rules, which rules need not themselves presuppose an objective understanding of the game which gives meaning to the rules by organising them around an objectively justifiable end purpose. Remember, there are no fouls. In an ordinary game of basketball a player will accept the characterisation of his/her play as a foul because he/she acknowledges and accepts the end purpose of the game; the rules 'bind in conscience' for this reason.⁵ Of course, one could say this basketball league does have an end purpose, the self-chosen one of exercise and laughs, and so it does. And that purpose does explain why the umpires can identify goals and not fouls. But there is a crucial shift in here. In the traditional model one starts with an objectively identifiable end purpose which gives meaning to the rules which in turn give meaning to the activity. These basketballers are doing it the other way around: they start with their activity (running around a basketball court with a ball), direct it to a subjectively justifiable end purpose (exercise and laughs) and then select rules of 'basketball' to characterise their activity in such a way as to achieve their end purpose. Thus, the umpires can identify goals (pleasant, warming, female) but not fouls (unpleasant, competitive, male). All that's fine of course in a small, friendly local league in northern Virginia; but 'basketball' has been emptied of objective meaning, its rules available like cans of beans in a supermarket, which one can select or not according to one's self-chosen purpose. What if this sort of thing were done on a large scale? Do we give a gold medal to every participant and spectator at the 100 metre sprint in Atlanta in 1996 except for anyone prepared to admit he/she did not achieve his/her self-chosen purpose in attending?

Pat Buchanan: touching sensitive nerves

It seems to me that Pat Buchanan, in pursuing the Republican nomination, is directing his rhetoric to those Americans who fear that, in the law and government of their country, exactly this sort of thing is happening on a large scale. The interesting thing is that Buchanan finds it worth his while to make this appeal and that people respond to it. This sort of thing gives American electoral politics quite a different flavour from Australian electoral politics. In the latter, candidates are more likely to parade their managerial skills, ability to get things done, than their sensitivity to the corruption of an objective moral base to politics. Buchanan has touched a very sensitive nerve, not only in the midwest (Iowa) but in the (said to be) more sophisticated northeast (New Hampshire). The people supporting him cannot be dismissed as a Christian fundamentalist wing of the Republican Party. Apart from the fact only some Christian movements support a partisan intervention in politics, one does not have to be Christian to be concerned about the life and character of society.⁶ Nor can those people be dismissed as those who are easily led and who can be counted on to respond to simplification of issues and populist demagoguery.⁷ To what then are these people responding? I think they believe Buchanan understands their fears, and their fears are that American law and government have shifted ground. Instead of seeking a teleological justification by reference to a pre-existing and objectively verifiable good, law and government are justified on result-oriented utilitarian grounds. This perception causes concern for two reasons: first it tends to disintegrate the moral cohesion of society (by failing to respond to its normative character) and thereby runs counter to the American narrative of exceptionalism, which teaches that Americans created and defended whenever they were asked, a society built on the civic dignity and autonomy of the citizen and constructed around truths declared in 1776 to be self evident. Respect for this commitment must be the foundation of meaning in law and politics, which then become the constant public working out of the meaning of the self-evident truths. If it is not, we move into the second concern, namely, that the people will no longer be free because they will no longer be bound in conscience. Only a law and politics justified in this teleological fashion can bind them in conscience. A law justified in a result-oriented utilitarian manner will subject the people to the tyranny of an international economy administered by self-serving politicians and courts that have become confused and lost their way.

Crucial to this diagnosis is a loss of confidence in the courts. A common theme in recent American films is that the administration of criminal justice, from police to courts, has become marginal to the issue of crime in America. The elements in the administration of criminal justice connect with crime but do not engage with it morally. The reason for this is that the courts which should supervise that administration have lost their moral foundation and the simple ability to delineate right from wrong. The people therefore have to claim back moral vindication for themselves through any means available to them: vigilante activity and revenge taking. A leading example of this genre is the current film 'An Eye For an Eye'.⁸ Unable to obtain a conviction because of a procedural technicality, the police officer visits the rapist/murderer at his place of employment, knees him in the groin, and says 'get out of my city'. The rapist/murderer quite simply becomes a law unto himself. The courts are so knotted in procedural form that the law and its morality simply pass him by. For this reason the grief and anger of the mother of

the first victim become channelled into an obsessive demand for justice which, in desperation, spills over into vigilantism. The film underlines its message with irony as the mother achieves her justice precisely by exploiting the moral detachment of the formal legal system. This film specifically diagnoses the problem as one where the courts have descended from the olympian heights of maintaining a distinction between justice and injustice and interfered directly in the social context of crime and policing. The film is not an argument for a stronger state, for the courts to be tougher on crime. It is a plea for the courts to return the administration of criminal justice to a secure grounding in the moral certainties of right and wrong.

Buchanan, morals and marriage

Another moral issue where Buchanan has made his mark is same-sex marriage. One may be surprised to learn that this is an issue in the United States. Last year one State, Utah, passed a law banning legal recognition of same-sex marriages. Eighteen other States have similar Bills in train, or Bills which limit recognition to heterosexual couples and more are expected to follow. In 1995 similar Bills in Virginia and Alaska died in committee.⁹ What is the problem here? The law already limits marriage to union between a man and a woman does it not? Yes, but the law may change, in Nebraska and Hawaii to be precise.¹⁰ If that happens then gay people may go to such States, marry and then go home and demand recognition of their marriage.¹¹ Well so a few might, but this is hardly likely to be a significant social issue, especially in States like Alaska and Wisconsin. Furthermore, same-sex marriage is said to weaken heterosexual marriage.¹² It's hard to know what the evidence for this can be. Clearly these laws cannot be explained on utilitarian grounds. The explanation is more likely to be something like this: why would we want to recognise same-sex marriage anyway? Only as part of a disticel feel-good politics which identifies marriage as a legal shell which the parties can fill with meaning as they please. Within that perception of marriage what grounds could there be for *withholding* legal recognition of same-sex marriage? And such a perception is well under way: people look on marriage as not so much valuable in itself but as an arrangement justified by its ability to deliver them happiness, which they define for themselves. If it does not do so they are entitled to resign their commitment to it. Both at the creation of marriage and at its dissolution, the law plays more and more of a facilitative role and the creation of meaning is handed more to the parties themselves. Inevitably, this decline in the objective meaning of marital obligation will be seen by some as a moral decline which will dissolve society into its particularised members who know nothing but pursuit of their own satisfaction. Apart from moral decay, such a self-seeking society has always been seen as incapable of self-rule and ripe for subjection. Within this teleological model same-sex marriage is not so much the disease as the symptom of moral decay. It is in defence of a teleological view of marriage that the drive for prohibition of recognition of same-sex marriage makes sense.

If that analysis of the issue is correct, then how do we assess the stand of the candidates? On Saturday, 10 February, two days before the Iowa caucuses, a National Campaign to Protect Marriage Rally took place in Des Moines. A resolution identifying marriage as 'an essential element in the foundation of a healthy society' which 'government has a duty to protect' and concluding that 'the special sanction of civil marriage' should be reserved for heterosexual union,

was endorsed by all the Republican candidates with the exception of Richard Lugar, in person or by letter.¹³ However, there are interesting differences. Dole wrote that he supported the resolution but it did not go far enough. The resolution should positively promote heterosexual marriage with tax incentives as today's social ills are directly linked to the decline of the two parent family.¹⁴ Maybe Dole is here attempting to turn the resolution into positive support for heterosexual marriage to deflect gay bashing charges, but in his attempt to have it both ways (sue for the support of bigots without being open to the charge of bigotry himself)¹⁵ he quite misses the mark. If marriage has objective meaning and imposes objective obligations building in conscience, what role could tax incentives play? Dole is accepting the reality that people enter and leave marriage as they please. His solution: give them a reason for staying in! A solution that panders to the very selfishness that is the source of the problem. There was no such missing the issue for Pat Buchanan. Attending and addressing the rally in person, he called for a 'cultural war' against the 'false god of gay rights'. 'There is no equal rights between what is sanctified by God and what is morally wrong'. Any Congressional Bill that failed to respect that by promoting a 'gay rights agenda' would necessarily receive a Buchanan Presidential veto.¹⁶

What do we make of this? One can sympathise with concern over moral decay and dismay at observing foundation social institutions turned to private ends (whether of the mean or the oozy variety). But this would not direct attention to same-sex marriage without the intervention of some prejudice.¹⁷ Any legal recognition of same-sex unions at the moment is unsystematic and incidental, directed to the features of individual unions, rather than to the substance of the idea.¹⁸ One would think that, in these circumstances, commitment and moral courage are precisely what hold same-sex unions together. Same-sex unions can teach something about the solution, rather than being a symptom of the problem.

Pat's economics: conservatism of the heart

The views of Buchanan which have attracted a great deal of interest are his views on economic matters. Buchanan's message here has sought to focus on the human cost of America's participation in the global economy. The Clinton administration is concerned about this cost too, but its policy assumes the good and inevitability of global engagement and proposes programs to increase 'human capital': more 'investments in education and job training' indeed a 'lifetime of learning' to keep the US worker more skilled and more productive than his/her (cheaper) foreign counterpart. This plan is justified on specifically utilitarian grounds, wealth and expansion.¹⁹ The problem with this approach is that it treats the worker as a mere cog in the economic machine, and accommodates the human values of work within the economic values of expansion. The workers' pain becomes their private concern; and the solution? More pain: a 'lifetime of learning' things you don't want to know.

Against this Buchanan offers a 'conservatism of the heart' characterised by 'nativism, protectionism and isolationism'.²⁰ Nativism is Buchanan's focus on immigration: a security fence to keep out illegal immigrants and zero immigration for five years. Protectionism promises tariffs as high as 20% on imported goods and pulling the United States out of the World Trade Organisation and the North American Free Trade Agreements; generally speaking, rejecting all such international accords designed to open markets and allow economies to flow into each other and form a global

economy. Isolationism means shrugging off parasitic allies living off American protection and no longer having American troops overseas unless under specifically American command in pursuit of specifically American policy. These nationalist policies have enabled Buchanan gratuitously to attack Hispanics in the United States in sweeping generalisations ('break into our country, break our laws, and go on welfare').

In a series of erudite and interesting articles in the *Washington Post*, commentators have challenged Buchanan's presuppositions, both economic and historical, his understanding of the American economy, of what causes insecurity, his evaluation of 'the new world order' and America's role in it, and the likely effectiveness of his policies in achieving his objectives.²¹ These criticisms assume that Buchanan is diagnosing the problem and proposing solutions within economic discourse. Many of his comments, however, suggest he is operating within a more civic discourse within which he seeks to contain his understanding of the American economy. This could explain his frequent appeal to American constitutional history for justification. For example, Buchanan's attack on international market-opening trade accords reveals an understanding that a global economy is not neutral. It is normative, but its normativity is nothing other than its drive to its own objectives. Within a civic discourse, such accords are *prima facie* undesirable as they subject the free citizen to the logic of a system on which his/her own civic authority does not bear. The very celebration of such accords is a symptom of the decay of politics and of government's failure, with the complicity of large financial interests, to preserve space for the free, courageous and outward looking citizen to participate in the creation of meaning. A similar analysis can be applied to Buchanan's sensitivity to those who lose their jobs. The value of a job is more than economic. It brings the job holder respect and a feeling of usefulness, a feeling of contributing to the collective creation of value. In that way 'having a job' could be linked to the experience of political freedom in the American historical narrative to which Buchanan so often appeals and which he promises to re-deliver to the American people. Buchanan's views on academic matters could dictate a re-grounding of the American economy in the American people, which in turn dictates nativism, protectionism and isolationism. 'We're going to recapture the lost sovereignty of our country and we're going to bring it home' he said after his New Hampshire win, home to the 'legitimate and rightful heirs' of the Founding Fathers.²²

Buchanan's views on the power of property and capital are even more interesting. For example, in criticising giant pig feed lots for bankrupting family farms, he is reported to have said:

I think giant feedlots are immensely destructive of conservative values. I'm sure the economic guys think this is great, we get cheaper beef or cheaper pork. But that's where economic and the traditionalist conservatives come into conflict. I think the idea of all these little stores and shops that were close to neighbourhoods is a good thing.²³

He continued:

It was at one time probably true that what was good for General Motors was good for America. But what is good for General Motors is not good for America if General Motors is shutting down its plants in the United States of America and opening up in Mexico and Indonesia. The interests of corporations and the nation are going their separate ways.²⁴

These remarks could be interpreted as a criticism of the owners of capital for allowing the developmental power of capital to respond merely to the logic of the (global) economic system. Part of the civic philosophy is that the owners of property understand their ability to affect the lives of all who are somehow defined as a community by that property interest. Therefore, they should understand the value of their property as grounded in the good of the community defined by it. This is not an economic argument: it is an argument for the civic responsibility of property owners. Buchanan is arguing this has always been the American understanding and he wants to return America to it.

What do we make of it?

So once again Buchanan appears more complex than might have been thought at first sight. It seems to me that it is very possible Buchanan is turning to a civic tradition for his understanding of the American economy, to diagnose the problems and identify his solutions, but I am not convinced that he seeks to see the values of the civic tradition actually re-generated in American social and economic life. If this were so, one would expect the desideratum of his arguments to be the participation of 'citizens of the economy' in the creation of meaning. Perhaps he seeks to re-locate the power of property in the common good, but the 'common good' as he sees it actually looks more like a unified and sovereign national interest. This interpretation is, indeed, consistent with Buchanan's rhetoric. And his message to workers seems not so much a promise to enfranchise them as rather that he understands their pain and will redress it.²⁵ What Buchanan actually seems to have in mind then is a state-sponsored national economy which the state (representative of national interest) will require to be more sympathetic to the human victims of economic and technological change. The result would be a state far more interventionist and authoritarian than the Americans have now, a state which will claim a sovereign legitimacy by its ability to speak for all. Furthermore, such a state will do nothing to address the moral decay that so many people believe is eating away at America. Grounded in an objectively defensible conception of the common good, devoted to pursuit of the essentially private goods of security and wealth, excluding all from the creation of meaning and turning them into recipients of state sponsored largesse, such a state will encourage the very suspicion and greed it seeks to eradicate.²⁶ One would expect too that Buchanan would seek to use the same state power to sponsor his partisan position on moral issues such as abortion and 'gay rights' (his term) in the 'national interest'. Cultural and racial diversity will be expected to succumb also; Buchanan has called for an end to 'hyphenated Americanism' in support of 'one nation, one people,' and for English to become the 'official language' of the United States.²⁷ Such an authoritarian, homogenising program would put Buchanan at war 'not only against American reality but even more against American ideals'.²⁸

So, Patrick J. Buchanan emerges as a complex, interesting but unattractive figure. Few people expect he will actually win the nomination let alone the election, but stranger things have happened.²⁹ If Dole does not succeed in pulling Buchanan back in the March primaries, he could well be done for, especially if Alexander stays in, splitting the moderate vote. But, whatever happens, Buchanan has put his mark on this election year.

In my visit to the United States I have so far been fortunate to spend time at the Law Schools at Marquette University,

Milwaukee, Hamline University, Saint Paul and the Columbus School of Law at The Catholic University of America, Washington DC. At each institution I have been struck by the commitment of scholars there to the issue of meaning in law, and the facility with which they think legal knowledge is grounded in objectively verifiable moral principles. I have come to realise that this issue is still very much alive in American law and politics.³⁰ I know I have benefited enormously coming into contact with such scholars; I thank those who have made my trip possible: Macquarie University, the Law Foundation of NSW, and last but not least, my colleagues at Macquarie Law School.

References

1. Nine candidates went in to the caucuses. One withdrew his candidacy for the nomination the following day. After Iowa, only three and possibly four candidates appear to have any real chance of nomination. They are Robert Dole (Senator, Kansas), Patrick Buchanan (ex Nixon staffer, now commentator), Lamar Alexander (ex Governor, Tennessee), and the fourth, Steve Forbes (millionaire publisher).
2. Kyriakos, Marianne, 'I'm Your Father', *The Washington Post*, 12 February 1996, pp. A1, A6.
3. Tournant, Maryon, 'Hoops and Hollers Without the Hype', *The Washington Post*, 13 February 1996, pp. A1, A13.
4. I heard this marvellously expressive term used by Professor R.F. Hittinger to his Jurisprudence class on Thursday, 22 February 1996 at the Columbus School of Law, Catholic University of America, Washington DC. Indeed, it is the insights of Professor Hittinger in his brilliant critique of HLA Hart that have led me to the analysis I seek to develop in this article.
5. This concept is a subjective participation in the objective meaning. Therefore, one chooses to play fairly and the recalcitrant can be coerced (e.g. by being sinbinned).
6. Hentoff, Nat, 'A Christian Nation', *The Washington Post*, 17 February 1996, p. A25.
7. These tempting conclusions are not supported by an analysis of actual exit polls: Harwood, Richard, 'People Behind the Numbers', *The Washington Post*, 23 February 1996, p. A19. The polls themselves are published, *The Washington Post*, 21 February 1996, p. A14. It is worth remembering too that New Hampshire, where Buchanan won the primary, is a State where the economy is growing: see McGrory, Mary, 'Democrats' Dream Candidate', *The Washington Post*, 22 February 1996, p. A2. Also, one must remember the closeness of the vote in New Hampshire (Buchanan 27%, Dole 26%) which makes it difficult to see one's support as partisan and the other's as generalised: *The Washington Post*, 22 February 1996, p. A1. For a different reading of the exit poll figures see Edsall, Thomas, B. and Morin, Richard, 'Angry, White, Working-Class Voters Come to the Fore', *The Washington Post*, 21 February 1996, p. A14.
8. A John Schlesinger film with Sally Field, Kiefer Sutherland and Ed Harris.
9. *The Washington Blade*, Vol. 27, No. 7, 16 February 1996, pp. 1, 27.
10. *The Washington Blade*, above.
11. It seems that the Bills typically seek to forbid such recognition: *The Washington Blade*, above.
12. *The Washington Blade*, above.
13. *The Washington Blade*, above. See too *The Washington Post*, 12 February 1996, p. B1.
14. *The Washington Blade*, above.
15. Dole fully deserved the charge of cowardice levelled at him for this letter: Cohen, Richard, 'A Pledge Against Gays', *The Washington Post*, 13 February 1996, p. A19.
16. *The Washington Blade*, above; *The Washington Post*, above. Buchanan has described homosexuality as 'an assault on the nature of the individual as God made him' and AIDS as a 'retribution'. See the summary of his views on the internet at www.electionline.com.
17. A poignant footnote is that the same issue of *The Washington Blade* as carried the report of the rally also carried a long report of a serial killer of transient men, operating in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia, who has claimed eleven victims in nine years, in murders with overtones of anti-homosexual violence. One wonders if the organisers of the Des Moines rally would like to organise a rally in Norfolk Virginia to express concern over this symptom of moral decay.
18. For example in 1995, in Newcastle NSW, two men obtained an order requiring a medical fund to treat them and the son of one of them as a family when calculating their contributions.
19. Rosenfeld, Stephen, S., 'Economic Resentments . . . ' and Krauthammer, Charles, ' . . . And Political Power', *The Washington Post*, 16 February 1996, p. A21; Broder, David, S., 'As Workers Become Weaker', *The Washington Post*, 14 February 1996, p. A21.
20. Krauthammer, above.
21. For example, Rosenfeld, above; Krauthammer, above; Samuelson, Robert, J., 'Playing Politics with Job Fears', *The Washington Post*, 21 February 1996, p. A19; Will, George, F., 'Time to Take the Republican Party Back', *The Washington Post*, 22 February 1996, p. A25. For some doctrinaire criticisms from economists see Blustein, Paul, 'Economists Disdain Protectionism', *The Washington Post*, 14 February 1996, pp. D1, D6.
22. *The Washington Post*, 21 February 1996, p. A1.
23. Blustein, Paul, 'Patrick Buchanan . . . Liberal?'. *The Washington Post*, 23 February 1996, pp. B1, B2.
24. Blustein, Paul, 'Patrick Buchanan . . . Liberal?', above.
25. Cohen, Richard, 'The Little Guy's Guy', *The Washington Post*, 22 February 1996, p. A25.
26. Raspberry, William, 'Why We're Losing Sight of the Common Good', *The Washington Post*, 23 February 1996, p. A19.
27. See the summary of Buchanan's views on the internet at www.electionline.com.
28. Will, above. For Buchanan's patronising unawareness of negro distinctiveness, see two sensitively written pieces by Kind, Colbert, J., 'Thanks Again Pat', *The Washington Post*, 17 February 1996, p. A25, and 'Buchanan's Slur on a Churchman', *The Washington Post*, 24 February 1996, p. A15. See also Gilliam, Dorothy, 'One's a Pariah, the Other Might be President', *The Washington Post*, 24 February 1996, p. B1.
29. Ward, Andrew, 'On the Trail with Eugene McCarthy', *The Washington Post*, 22 February 1996, p. A25, recalling Nixon's return from the dead in 1968.
30. *The Marquette Law Review*, Vol. 78, No. 2 (Winter 1995) contains papers from the First Conference of Religiously Affiliated Law Schools, held at Marquette University Milwaukee in 1994. For an example of a social reform model, formulated within a natural law tradition and more interested in pursuit of a telos than a social program, see William J. Byran, JJ 'The Future of Catholic Social Thought' (1993) 42 *Cath U L Rev* 557.