

Clinton Revisionism

Joe Simonson
Editor-in-Chief

Let us start with an obvious fact: Bill Clinton is a repulsive person. No, he's not repulsive because he balanced the federal budget, reformed welfare, signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or repealed Glass-Steagall. Bill Clinton is a bad person because he is the personification of rape culture and the living, successful embodiment of almost every harmful patriarchal structure we are taught to revolt against.

Despite multiple rape and sexual assault accusations from different women, Bill Clinton has never been held responsible for his predatory behavior. Liberals and the media are somehow willing to anoint this conniving lecher while simultaneously eviscerating any no-name Midwestern Republican state representative, whose constituency is half-composed of corn stalks, because he can't understand elementary biology (then again, I don't even want to know Bill Clinton's conception of biology). Both individuals are problems, but only one was President of the United States.

The worst part of all of this is that Bill Clinton's sexual deviance has become a cultural meme of sorts. Content creators and manchildren on Buzzfeed and Reddit are one step away from having a picture of Bubba diddling his housekeeper and slapping some big white comedic text over it next to a lolcat. If the media treated every man like Bill Clinton, the piggish thugs in the viral catcalling video would be seen as the epitome of chivalry.

Hillary Clinton's public response to her husband's behavior was to stick to the infamous Clinton playbook and declare all of the alleged sexual misconduct by her husband to be part of a "vast-right wing conspiracy." It's impossible to prove whether Hillary knew she was telling a vile lie when

she accused Republicans of planting women in Bill's life to later accuse him of sexual harassment or assault, but I'm not giving her the benefit of the doubt. The great irony of Hillary's comments is that if any family were to concoct such a heinous conspiracy, it would be the Clintons.

A few months ago, a friend of Bill Clinton, Jeffrey Epstein, was implicated in a massive child sex scandal. Information has come out that Bill spent quite some time with Mr. Epstein in his Florida mansion where the alleged sexual romps took place for years. Considering that Bill Clinton couldn't help himself from receiving a blowjob by a White House intern, I don't think anyone expects that he controlled himself at the hedonistic playground that was Mr. Epstein's Florida mansion. Bill Clinton will get a pass on this, unfortunately, because apparently depraved sexual misconduct is acceptable only when you're a Democrat and even more when you're the last competent Democratic president in 60 years or when Hillary is the last chance the Democrats have to win in 2016.

Obviously, placing blame on Hillary for any of Bill's indecent behavior over the past decades would be erroneous. But asking questions about why she has remained with Bill all of this time isn't inappropriate, considering she is expecting to become President of the United States. If we are to adopt the suggestions by some feminist commentators like Zerlina Maxwell outlined in the *Washington Post* last December, that society must take all rape accusations as true, is it a stretch to say that Hillary has remained married to a rapist for nearly 40 years? What if this were the case with a Republican woman? Moreover, would it be a stretch to ask what exactly Hillary's commitments are to women's rights when she can't even denounce her own husband's behavior and simultaneously allows the Clinton Foundation to accept millions of dollars from countries that

Upcoming Events

Wednesday, April 1

Body and Soul - The State of the Jewish Community: A Movie Screening and Discussion
7:00 p.m. | KJ Auditorium

can execute women for even filing a rape accusation?

These questions will have little bearing on whether Hillary is elected president or not. Many progressives have accepted the fact that the Clintons seem to live on a lawless island in international waters where moral standards need not apply. The most damaging feature of the Clinton legacy to the American political system, however, is the reality that if the average citizen committed or were even accused of a fraction of any of the Clintons' misdeeds, his or her life would be completely ruined.

If multiple women accuse a professor or student of sexual assault on a college campus, the suspect becomes a social pariah and should be jailed. If a business owner does not keep perfect records and instead willingly ignores laws and regulations and opts for a personal system while under subpoena, like Hillary did at the State Department, they are jailed. If a group of individuals try to defraud creditors in a land deal, as was the case in the Whitewater scandal, they are jailed (well, everyone did go to jail in this example, except Bill and Hillary). If employees die under your watch at a job and your only response is, "what difference does it make?" you can be held criminally negligent and jailed. If you make an outrageous return speculating on cattle futures, you can get a knock on the door from the SEC and then have charges brought against you by the FBI and later be jailed.

If a job applicant and her husband have been accused of a number of crimes throughout their lives, why would you hire them?

Is Indie Rock Too White?

Mike Adamo | *Senior Editor*

Hey there, put down that Guided by Voices album and let's talk about race. Indie rock is too white and that's a big problem. Bet you didn't know that, huh? By the way, EDM is also misogynistic. Have fun trying to enjoy anything

ever again.

A few weeks ago I wrote about how the independent music website Pitchfork.com wants you to know that the Affordable Care Act is really, really cool. Just in case you still had doubts about Pitchfork's indie cred, they published a few more articles that really cement their totally hip views on race and gender and whatever else is

fashionable to pontificate about.

Pitchfork.com recently published an article titled “The Unbearable Whiteness of Indie,” in which author Sarah Sahim complains about the capital-W Whiteness of independent music, which is apparently a sign that indie listeners are big fat racists in need of reeducation.

Sahim whines that she can only count five high-profile independent musicians who “look like me.” How, after all, can someone appreciate artists who don’t look like her? She complains that Vampire Weekend’s gay Iranian keyboardist isn’t overtly gay and Iranian enough. Anyone else would call this shallow tokenism. The progressive calls it “fighting oppression.”

Remember when you could just *enjoy* music? Well, get with the times. If you haven’t thoroughly evaluated the socioeconomic baggage of your favorite genres, you’re part of the problem. The brightest and shrillest undergraduates have applied the vast wisdom of Intro to Africana Studies and Sociology 101 to nearly every field of human existence (see “Queering Agriculture”). If you thought music was safe, then boy, do they have news for you.

The way to prove your worth in the college activist crowd is by shoehorning politics into the most apolitical places. The more obscure, the better. It’s the same attitude that led to the ridiculous Starbucks campaign where baristas were supposed to write #RaceTogether on customers’ drinks in order to start a conversation about race. Of course, “Let’s have a conversation about race” really means “Let me lecture you while you keep your racist mouth shut.” It’s unclear how activists want to solve the pressing issue

of white people playing indie rock, but it’ll probably start with you “acknowledging” something or another.

They tried to do it to metal, but metal fans told them to screw off. Luckily indie rock offers a greater supply of hypersensitive beta males who will do just about anything to seem cool. If you tell them to screw off, some longhaired guy in a Godspeed You! Black Emperor t-shirt will throw out his hand and say, “Whoa, dude, chill,” while another nerd in a beanie stares uncomfortably at his Vans.

When the Tipper Gores of our generation really want to elevate the moral panic about this most inoffensive of genres, they’ll start pushing for trigger warnings on albums. They can go right next to the Parental Advisory labels that hysterical mothers campaigned for in the 80s. “Trigger Warning: King Krule appropriates elements of jazz and hip hop from black Americans.” “Trigger Warning: Conor Oberst was accused of rape one time and even though the accuser admitted to lying we think you really should know about it.”

I’m glad none of this nonsense was around when I was in high school and going to see bands play in basements. There were only two rules for house shows: “No parking on the grass,” and “Don’t be a dick.” The latter involved leaving your politics at the door and just enjoying the music like a normal human being.

So calm down, listen to whatever music you want, and save the moral outrage for problems of actual substance. The only thing that’s problematic about the Antlers is that they suck.

Amtrak Subsidies

Sarah Larson | *Staff Writer*

Since its formation in 1971, Amtrak has been criticized for catering to neither the traveling public nor the taxpayer. Amtrak is unique in that it has cost the government over \$45 billion in subsidies over the last 44 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), a non-partisan agency. Matthew Sabas of the Manhattan Institute concluded that much of the waste is due to “unprofitable routes, overstaffed trains, and the mismanagement of its food services.” Sabas was not the first to point out Amtrak’s excessive spending and waste. In 1985, Tom Wicker wrote in the *New York Times* that David Stockholm (then-Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)) “threw a tantrum the other day before a Senate subcommittee.” Stockholm said, “If senators did not have ‘the courage, the foresight, the comprehension’ to ‘pull the plug’ on what he called an ‘irredeemable’ Amtrak rail passenger system,” American taxpayers would have to continue to foot the bill. Stockholm was right. Amtrak still relies on public money.

A few weeks ago, the Republican-controlled House passed the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015 (PRRIA). The bill authorizes “appropriations totaling \$7.2 billion

over the 2016-2020 period for rail programs.” According to the CBO, that amount includes \$5.3 billion for grants to Amtrak, \$1.2 billion for grants to states for intercity rail projects, and \$625 million to renegotiate and prepay a portion of Amtrak’s nonfederal debt.”

\$7 billion is tough to imagine. But just to compare: Congress granted \$6.9 billion to the National Science Foundation (NSF) in 2014. \$7 billion is not pocket change, Amtrak’s subsidy could do a lot of good. Right now, however, it’s not. More importantly the \$45 billion that Amtrak has consumed in past years could do much more good. It makes one wonder why Amtrak charges consumers so much for tickets on top of what consumers are already paying in taxes.

Amtrak, like other industries, must be subject to market forces. It is grossly unfair and undemocratic to prop up a flawed business on taxpayer dollars. As Sabas writes, Amtrak’s “promises of reform have never fully materialized into solvency, and its failure to follow congressional mandates never resulted in penalties.” Despite 44 years of operation, Amtrak remains insolvent. And while Americans protest bailout plans to the auto industry or too-big-to-fail banks, Amtrak continues to slide by without complaint. Amtrak executives must have realized their privilege: they



don’t need to profit, so long as they continue to “improve.”

The ease with which this bill will pass points to a greater problem in American politics. Amtrak’s subsidy is not large enough for us to care, but it is large enough to matter. Even if Americans chose to do nothing about it, we should at least be aware that it exists.

Enquiry Staff

Editor-in-Chief: Joe Simonson

Senior Editor: Mike Adamo

Staff Writers: Taylor Elicegui, Amy Elinski, Alex Klosner, Sarah Larson, Andrew Nachemson, Phil Parkes, Will Swett

The opinions expressed in these articles are the views of their authors and do not represent the views of Enquiry or the Alexander Hamilton Institute.

Enquiry accepts articles of 500 to 800 words at jsimonso@hamilton.edu and madamo@hamilton.edu. Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.