The day the Senate traded corn for porn

By James J. Kilpatrick

This is the looking-back time. In that retrospective spirit, I look back to Thursday, October 31, on Capitol Hill. That was the day on which Congress consummated the great Corn for Porn Plot of 1991. The Hill knew a number of loony moments last year. This was the looniest of them all.

Actually, the deal had plenty to do with porn, but nothing at all to do with corn. It had to do with grazing rights, performance artists, plain old politics and Spineless John Frohnmayer, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. Spineless John is called Spineless John because he has no spine. He has no guts either, an interesting thought.

This was the situation. Most grants from the National Endowment go to museums, ballet companies, string quartets, symphony orchestras and other such high-class forms of entertainment. No one complains about these. There is no constitutional justification for them, but never mind.

The Endowment also gives away many millions in the form of individual grants. These go to novelists, poets, musicians, painters, sculptors and other such freeloaders who believe the world owes them a living.

Among the individual recipients are four who have become symbols of what ails the Endowment.

The four are Karen Finley and Holly Hughes of New York, and John Fleck and Tim Miller of California. They are all in show biz, of a sort, but theirs is not the sort of show biz that you would want to suggest to your old Aunt Gertrude for a night on the town. All four have been feeding nicely—nicely at the trough of the NEA.

Ms. Finley is justly renowned for her chocolate syrup and bean sprouts act. Ms. Hughes talks about her lesbianism and engages in "genre busting." Mr. Fleck' s most engaging moment comes when he urinates, on stage, over a picture of Christ in a toilet bowl. Mr. Miller celebrates his homosexuality in dancing that has been described as "witty" and "graphic".

Is this art? More to the point, is it the kind of art that ought to be funded by the taxpayers? A few far-out fans of the avant-garde insist that the Famous Four deserve their grants. Ninety-nine percent of the taxpayers—if they could see this stuff—would say, he-- no. They may not know art, but they do know garbage.

Two years ago Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC) began trying to put some sort of sensible restraint on the National Endowment. No luck. But members began to hear from outraged folks back home. Four months ago both houses voted two-to-one for a Helms amendment to the Interior appropriations bill. It looked for a while as if the rule of decency might yet prevail.

That was before Rep. Sidney Yates of Illinois cooked up his little tricker. The city-slicker House was indifferent to porn, but it wanted to double the grazing fees that are paid out West. The country-boy Senate resented the porn grants, but it resented a higher grazing fee with greater passion.

Thus was born Corn for Porn. If the Senate would abandon Helms, said the cunning conferees, they would abandon a boost in the grazing fee. With a nudge and a wink and a slap on the knee, the deal was done. Twenty-five Western senators had voted with Helms on September 19. On October 31, 22 of them saddled up and rode away. On a vote of 68-28 the Helms amendment disappeared.

The debate was at a level below the Senate's usual low standard. Kennedy of Massachusetts asserted that "basically the issue is censorship," which basically it is not. Wirth of Colorado made an address that was remarkably fatuous, even for him. Bumpers of Arkansas equated Helms with Hitler.

The Helms amendment was couched in language any child could understand. Metzenbaum of Ohio and Jeffords of Vermont could not understand it. The amendment would have prohibited Spineless John from giving our money to artists who produce material "that depicts or describes, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs." What in the world is wrong with that?

Six days later, after the Interior bill was safely out of danger, Spineless John announced 735 quarterly grants totaling $116.8 million. Among these were grants of $8,000 to Holly Hughes and $8,000 to Tim Miller. Take that, Jesse Helms!

Very well. We look back to last October. We look ahead to next November. Election Day! Between now and then, the public funding of porn will offer a lovely issue for debate.

Backroom deal flouts majority will in NEA debate

By Congressman Jon Kyl (R-AZ)
Special to AFA *Journal*

Recent votes in the United States House of Representatives confirm that momentum is building to stop federal funding of pornographic and obscene "art."

Those who support such funding, however, have responded with ever more clever ways to thwart the majority will.

As last year's session of Congress came to a close, House members were forced to choose between stopping taxpayer-funded pornography and protecting the livelihood of hard-working ranching families across America. That's right: jobs versus pornography.

How did it happen? A little history is in order.

Funding for the NEA is included in the Interior Appropriations bill. There were several efforts to defund or reduce the NEA's budget when the FY92 Interior Appropriations bill came before the House last June. The first amendment, which would have eliminated all funding for the NEA, failed on a vote of 66 to 361. A second amendment to cut 5% from the NEA's budget was also rejected on a vote of 196 to 228. The Interior bill subsequently passed, though 75 of my colleagues and I voted against it.

When the Interior bill later went before the Senate, Senator Jesse Helms successfully attached an amendment to bar the NEA from using funds "to promote, disseminate or produce materials that depict or describe, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs." The Helms amendment certainly imposed a reasonable constraint on the type of works that could be funded.

And, twice, the full House of Representatives voted to instruct members of the House and Senate conference committee to accept the Helms language, on votes of 286 to 135 and 287 to 133 on October 6 and 17 respectively.

Despite the fact that the Helms language was supported by majorities in both the House and the Senate, the conference committee, which was controlled by NEA supporters, chose to ignore the will of these majorities and strip out the Helms provision. And, because they saw that their decision was unlikely to stand once it was returned to both chambers for another vote, they devised a strategy which forced House members to choose between the Helms language and the livelihood of American families who make their living by ranching.

Their "compromise" was to eliminate the restrictions on NEA-funded artwork, and also stop a proposed 400% increase in the fees that ranchers pay the government to graze their livestock on federal lands. That 400% increase would have effectively put all but the biggest ranchers out of business.

On October 24, Congressman Bill Lowery offered one last motion to send the Interior Appropriations bill back to the conference committee with an instruction that it accept the Helms language. But, the members of the conference committee made it clear that if they were forced to adopt the Helms language, they would tie it to an increase in grazing fees.

As a result, several members of the House, most of us from the West, were put in an untenable position. Though many of us had voted against the NEA's position at every previous opportunity, this time voting against the NEA would devastate hardworking families, costing thousands of jobs. Though NEA funding can and will be revisited this year, the same cannot be said for the elimination of thousands of ranching operations. Once they are lost, they are lost forever.

So, reluctantly, many of us who had opposed the NEA's position over and over, voted against the Lowery amendment, which failed on a vote of 205 to 214.

Though the January issue of the AFA *Journal* took us to the woodshed for "flip-flopping" on the NEA issue, we have not lost our commitment to stop the NEA.

The bright side, I believe, is that when supporters of NEA-sponsored pornography are forced to use such legislative legerdemain to prevail, it shows that time is running out on taxpayer-funded pornographic art.

AIDS...

Continued from page 16

which it disapproves and, perhaps most infamously, desecrates the Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral. Another resource listed is Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC,), a somewhat less militant homosexual activist group. Other resources listed are equally committed to the homosexualist agenda.

According to the publication, these groups will supply teachers and students "with prompt support and accurate information." In short, active homosexuals who are self-described as advocates of the gay lifestyle are, under the auspices of the school system, counseling boys on the use of condoms for sexual fun and satisfaction—with safety in mind, of course. Those in charge of the program insist that condoms not be handed out willy-nilly; distribution must be accompanied by appropriate instruction. Homosexual organizations promptly volunteered to provide instructors, and the offer was readily accepted. It is not too much to say that the public schools have become an institutional procurer for the recruitment of school boys to the homosexual subculture, which in this city is less and less a subculture. Little wonder that the champions of the condom program were adamant about eliminating any provisions for parental notification or consent. Little wonder that in the public hearings preceding the program's adoption the most vocal organized support was from the homosexual activists, loudly led by ACT-UP. At city hall, aides do not bother to deny that Mayor Dinkins' backing for the program was a matter of paying off a political debt to the homosexual activists without whose support he would not have been elected.

Only the children of the poor are so vulnerable to the designs of the sexual revolutionists. In New York City, with extremely few exceptions, people who can afford an alternative do not send their children to the public schools. The result is that there is a racialist, if not racist, component to the "AIDS education" program. The message is clear: black and Hispanic youngsters are not capable of the self-restraint expected of others. And again, behind that message is the assumption that, for everyone, self-restraint is unnatural and unhealthy. As one activist at the condom hearings said, "We're going to give public school kids the opportunities denied other kids in this uptight, homophobic society." Some opportunities. The sadness is deepened by the fact that a few key black churches have been enlisted in the program and, in the words of the Times, "now recognize that AIDS is not a moral but a medical problem."

The necessary consequence, we reluctantly conclude, is unambiguous. Homosexual activists, public school officials, politicians, and their allies in the media and some churches are, in the name of AIDS education, sentencing an indeterminate number of young people to a horrible death. Some are culpably ignorant, others know perfectly well what they are doing. In the words of the late Abraham Joshua Heschel, "Some are guilty, all are responsible.'' And Americans who think that this enormity is limited to places such as New York City and San Francisco have not begun to understand the culture that, absent a revival of moral sanity, their children will inherit.

Rapist/murderer cites porn as catalyst

"Porn is a consuming beast," wrote Mark "Gator" Anthony. "Smut becomes food for thought, then fuel for action equivalent to the most entrapping of drugs."

The statements were a part of Anthony's explanation of why he raped and murdered a 21-year-old San Diego woman. The man said he had turned his back on God and become obsessed with pornography.

"It is no exaggeration to say I became completely enslaved to these devious [pornographic] mental images and inescapable thoughts," Anthony concluded.

SD Tribune, 1/26/92; Blade-Citizen, 1/26/92

Movie connected with vampire attack

A suburban Milwaukee man has been accused of attacking and cutting his girlfriend, then trying to suck her blood, after he reacted violently to the end of a vampire movie they were watching.

Stephen J. Wilhelm, 35, was charged with second-degree reckless endangerment while armed. The charge stemmed from the alleged New Year's Eve attack on Katherine W. Zielski, 30.

According to police, Wilhelm, Ms. Zielski and two male friends were watching videotapes and drinking beer at Wilhelm's apartment. When the movie, **Son of Darkness: To Die For II** ended with the death of a Dracula character, Wilhelm became violent, a police report said.

The report said that Wilhelm began to throw knives around the apartment, then choked Ms. Zielski, broke a beer bottle, held it to her neck and cut her chest and ear.

Ms. Zielski told authorities she did not know how it happened, but Wilhelm was attempting to drink blood from one of her wounds.

Sheboygan Press, 1/8/92