

War is for other people's children



JAMES YOHE
STAFF COLUMNIST

This is the second of a two part series by James Yohe on Bosnia, Vietnam and President Clinton.

"... because I believed so strongly that our policy in Vietnam was wrong. I still believe that. I believe it weakened and divided America and made us reluctant to use our strength in other parts of the world."

Are these the words of a pacifist, an isolationist, an anti-imperialist, someone opposed to the draft or a conscientious objector? Why did Bill Clinton oppose Vietnam? What makes Vietnam and Bosnia different? Would Bill Clinton serve in Bosnia? Did Bill Clinton dodge the draft, and if he did, will he then ask the sons and daughters of those he abandoned in Vietnam to serve in Bosnia?

To look at whether or not Bill Clinton's policy in Bosnia is a contradiction to his beliefs on Vietnam, we must determine why Bill Clinton was not drafted and why he avoided being drafted.

The significant parts of Bill Clinton's draft history began in 1964. In November of 1964 Bill Clinton was classified 2-S (student deferment) by his draft board.

In 1968, President Johnson abolished draft deferments for all graduate students except those in the medical and dental fields. Bill

Clinton's was reclassified as 1-A (available) by his draft board after graduating from Georgetown and being accepted as a Rhodes scholar. Up to this point there does not appear to be anything unusual in Mr. Clinton's draft history.

In August of 1969, Bill Clinton is reclassified 1-D, after agreeing to enter the army R.O.T.C. program at the University of Arkansas law school. This is where questions arise about Bill Clinton and the draft.

According to an article titled "Ex-R.O.T.C. official tells why he kept letter" in the February 14, 1992 issue of the *New York Times*, Col. Clinton Jones, a R.O.T.C. recruiter, suggests "Mr. Clinton may have broken a contract for military service. Army regulations at the time, required every cadet to sign a contract to join the program, and every member of advanced R.O.T.C. was required to be enlisted in the Army Reserve. Both were prerequisites for obtaining the R.O.T.C. deferment."

If Clinton violated a contract with the government he loves so much, how can he be trusted with the lives of those serving for America?

According to Clinton, on September 12, 1969, he wrote a letter to his R.O.T.C. board asking to be made 1-A. The only problem is he never mailed it. This fits in perfectly with other Clinton events while at Oxford. The "I smoked marijuana, but didn't inhale" incident also falls into this sort of scenario. Bill Clinton's R.O.T.C. deferment postponed his exposure to the draft until the next summer.

This change of mind, backed only with "Slick Willie's" own testimony, miraculously falls prior to events which make Mr. Clinton's supposed decision to expose himself to the draft virtually risk-free. On September 19, 1969 President Nixon announces a cut back in the draft.

On October 1, Nixon also announces that graduate students can finish the school year without being inducted. At this point in time, Clinton probably also knew his chances of being drafted were slim, since "men and their families routinely learned from draft boards where they were" with respect to the draft. In fact a *New York Times* article in the September 14, 1992, issue contains an article devoted to Clinton's probable knowledge of his draft status.

Looking at the facts regarding Clinton's draft history, it's hard not to call him a draft dodger. Is draft dodging a bad thing? The draft amounts to nothing more than slavery, which was supposedly outlawed during the Civil War.

Instead of being outlawed, the government of the United States merely declared itself the monopoly enslaver in this country, through the draft. Mr. Clinton's protection of his freedom is not a blemish on his record, but his reasons for avoiding the draft, and his actions as president are blemishing.

In his letter to Col. Jones, Mr. Clinton writes that he was troubled about not going to war, but had decided to give up his deferment "to maintain my political viability

within the system." Why was Bill Clinton opposed to the draft and Vietnam?

Was Clinton a pacifist? Obviously not. His comment at the beginning of this column proves he is not a pacifist, along with his actions in Waco and Somalia. The comment, "made us reluctant to use our strength in other parts of the world," can be interpreted minus the "Slick Willie" polish as it made us reluctant to use force, violence, murder, and coercion in other parts of the world. Bill Clinton is no pacifist.

Is Clinton an isolationist or anti-imperialist? Again his actions and comments tell us he is not.

"To use our strength in other parts of the world" is not the comment of an isolationist. Clinton's words can be viewed as strictly imperialistic, the use of strength can only be used to coerce foreign nations into "toeing the Bill Clinton line."

Was Clinton opposed to the draft? Apparently not, specifically when it does not apply to him. Have you heard him talk about abolishing the selective service lately? No. Was Clinton a conscientious objector? Ask the Somalis.

This leads us to the ultimate question. Why did Clinton oppose Vietnam and the draft? The answer that sticks in my mind after reviewing the facts is, because his neck was on the line. It's OK to have a draft as long as "Slick Willie" is exempt.

Sending American men and women to fight in a foreign civil war is okay, as long as Clinton is Commander in Chief and safe in his newly redecorated office in the White House.

A Matter of Timing

This is a record of then Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton. This information was provided by the *New York Times*.

1964

November

After enrolling at Georgetown U., Bill Clinton is classified as 2-S by his Arkansas draft board.

1968

Feb. 16

The Johnson Administration abolishes Bill Clinton's study program as a legitimate draft deferment.

Mar. 20

Bill Clinton is reclassified as 1-A and told by his draft board he will be given leniency.

Jun. 9

Bill Clinton graduates from Georgetown. He starts his Rhode Scholarship at Oxford in the fall.

1969

Feb. 3

Bill Clinton passes draft physical at Oxford.

Aug. 7

Bill Clinton agrees to join the R.O.T.C. program at Arkansas' law school. He is Reclassified 1-D.

Sept. 12

Bill Clinton says he wrote a letter to the draft board asking to be made 1-A, but never mails it.

October

Bill Clinton's stepfather met with local draft officials and told the University of Arkansas R.O.T.C. that his son wanted to be left out of the agreement.

Oct. 30

Bill Clinton is reclassified as 1-A after R.O.T.C. tells the draft board he will not be attending Arkansas.

Nov. 26

Congress enacts lottery law.

Dec. 1

Bill Clinton's birthdate is drawn number 311, to high to get drafted

Dec. 2

Bill Clinton applies to Yale Law School

Dec. 3

Mr. Clinton writes Col. Eugene Holmes, the R.O.T.C. recruiter and thanks him for "saving me from the draft."

James Yohe is a Rebel Yell columnist. His column appears every Thursday.

Introducing: a regular conservative column

Donovan M. Steltzner
Staff Columnist

Thomas Jefferson. Abraham Lincoln. Herbert Hoover. Dwight Eisenhower. Hubert Humphrey. Henry Wallace. Ronald Reagan. Sam Nunn. Rush Limbaugh. Not too much in common with each other, eh?

All are conservatives - at least as we define conservatism in our day. The definition of the term has changed at least twice this century alone; by using the standards of their day,

Jefferson and Humphrey were both liberals.

As a conservative columnist writing my first editorial piece, I know that you haven't read much right-wing journalism lately, because not much of it has made the press, and when it does, it is immediately (if it is in a mainstream publication) shot down, derided, highly scrutinized, and in some cases, censored by those gracious and thoughtful defenders of the First Amendment - liberals.

I occasionally get disheartened not only by the fire-

breathing, smoke-belching liberals (it's good that there are actually VERY few of those) but by conservatives with a knack for cliches, which are not arguments in and of themselves, but too many people think that they are. I HATE CLICHES (which is a cliche).

Furthermore, there is another small problem that some editorial columnists have. They attack the motivation of the people who hold to a certain set of beliefs in a vain attempt to invalidate the belief by discrediting the people who

hold them. Not good. *Ad hominem* arguments are cheap cop-outs for those who do not wish to critically analyze anything.

Let me offer a hypothetical example. Adolf Hitler says that Jews are people, deserving of all civil rights. And proves it.

Some journalist from London says that because Hitler is a bad dictator, and that there are reports that he is exterminating all the Jews in his nation, his opinion shouldn't be trusted. But even the worst of spokesmen can

give good premises for an argument, and the argument should not be dismissed.

(As I would say to any student writer on the *Rebel Yell* who ever tried to pull this stunt, "Dear So-and-so, did you ever take PHI 101 or 102? Gee, if my memory serves me right, I believe it's required for graduation.....you DID take it??? Obviously, you DIDN'T LEARN A THING.

On the serious side, I intend to say what I mean, and mean what I say. Everything written

see *Conservative* pg. 6