



Investment Program (MFIP), showed far less willingness to end dependency and insist on self-reliance. This “gentle” approach gained the state sympathetic coverage in the liberal media, but recent claims of the state’s success are deceiving.

MFIP encourages work by threatening long-term welfare recipients with a potential 10 percent cut in benefits if they fail to undertake job-related activities. More unusually, it allows welfare recipients to retain much of their benefits even if they are working. Not surprisingly, a recent evaluation by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation found that MFIP increased the incomes of welfare recipients (and decreased reported incidents of domestic abuse). Press releases touted this as a great success.

But actual results detailed in the report reveal that the program’s achievements were marginal at best. First, the report’s conclusions were based on comparisons of welfare recipients on an MFIP pilot program that began before Congress passed welfare reform, which means the report compared recipients of MFIP with Minnesotans receiving AFDC. And it’s difficult to imagine any welfare program worse than the old AFDC.

The report even reveals that MFIP is worse than AFDC: MFIP “modestly increased dependence” compared to the

AFDC control group. And among two-parent families receiving MFIP, the “primary effect was to cause one parent in some of the families to cut back on work, either by reducing his or her hours worked or leaving work entirely.”

When all participants in the pilot program are counted, MFIP didn’t encourage recipients to leave welfare. MFIP participants stayed on welfare longer than their AFDC counterparts because they were able to combine welfare and work.

Since the pilot program ended and MFIP was implemented statewide in 1998, Minnesota has had almost no reduction in its welfare rolls, and MFIP has failed to produce any significant work effort among its participants. In May 1999, for instance, only 28 percent of families with eligible adults had 20 or more work hours per week—despite Minnesota’s record low unemployment rate. Jobs at every level have gone begging throughout the state since MFIP’s birth, nowhere more than in Minneapolis-St. Paul. Yet in May 1999, 64 percent of Minneapolis-St. Paul welfare families had no working adult at all.

According to a study released this year by Minnesota’s Office of the Legislative Auditor, if those MFIP participants who are now working part-time instead worked full-time, the vast majority would be self-supporting.

In short, Minnesota’s politicians have re-created the very features that made the AFDC program so devastating to the families that became dependent on it. In January, Minnesota’s welfare commissioner projected no decline in the state’s welfare caseload over the next three years. And he recommended the state continue making welfare payments to families that exhaust the five-year limit set by federal law. Is this not a confession of failure?

The pity is, Minnesota need only look to neighbors like Wisconsin to discover much more effective ways to encourage self-sufficiency instead of destructive check-collecting. But some people never learn.

—John Hinderaker and Scott Johnson are Minneapolis attorneys and adjunct fellows of the Claremont Institute.

DOUBLE DORM STANDARDS

For years, tony colleges have sneered at the military for worrying about open homosexuals in the ranks. Indeed, a number of schools are supporting legal challenges to the services’ policy. Some consider banning ROTC (though they usually decide it’s not worth the federal research dollars that would be lost—there are limits, apparently, to the value of diversity).

The military says its “Don’t ask, don’t tell” policy promotes the unit cohesion needed in combat by reducing sexual tension and respecting personal privacy. The colleges say these claims only mask irrational prejudice. University administrators insist troops in mortal combat should be able to handle the tension of living in mixed quarters.

But it turns out that college kids living in dorms and frat houses, threatened by such dangers as beer kegs and basketball games, are quite a different matter.

Tufts, for example, in the same year it joined a lawsuit against the military, established “The Rainbow House,” a college residence for gay students that, according to its mission statement, “exists to provide lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students and allies a housing option where their sexual orientation will not be an issue of conflict.” Carl Sciortino, the house manager, told

the *Boston Globe*, "Students in the past have found themselves having a major crush on their straight roommate, and that's a really uncomfortable situation."

In fact, the situation is so dire that colleges nationwide are establishing separate barracks for gays, not only as a haven from homophobic sophomores, but also to guard against emotional troubles gay students face in mixed living quarters.

The University of Oregon this year placed homosexual students in special "residence clusters" within university housing. "This is a place where people would know they would be safe," said Heath Hutto of the university's Standing Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Concerns.

For six years, Amherst has maintained a residence hall especially for gay students. "We mention it in the tours," says housing staff member Chris Budz. "It's been completely filled up in the last two years." Similar residences exist at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Wesleyan College in Connecticut, and the University of California's Irvine and Berkeley campuses. The University of California at Santa Cruz even has two separate residence halls, Bayit Wiesel and Harvey Milk House, that serve as affinity housing for Jewish homosexuals specifically.

Even apart from straight students, same-sex housing makes many gay students on campus uncomfortable. "It's institutionalized homophobia," says Sciortino of Tufts. So some colleges—Haverford, Wesleyan, Antioch, and Hampshire—now mix males and females as roommates in some dorms. "The single-sex housing rule 'protected' straight students from having to deal with the possible consequences of living with someone one might get romantically involved with," explains Kilian Kroell, a member of Haverford's Bisexual, Gay, and Lesbian Alliance, "but that 'protection' never existed for queer students."

The hypocrisy in all this has not gone entirely unnoticed. When gay students argue they feel uncomfortable about rooming with straight students, complains Tufts' president John DiBiaggio, "it flies in the face of the fact that many

of us have been engaged in trying to change military policy on gays. If students can't live in this situation, what will they do in the military, living with someone who is not gay?"

—Steven Menashi is editor in chief of the Dartmouth Review.

FOREIGN POLICY AFTER CLINTON

The Clinton administration's foreign policy has quietly piled up serious problems for our future. Let me spotlight its errors by contrasting some principles I think should govern foreign policy.

- The quest for a blinding flash that will instantly bring peace to the Middle East should be abandoned in favor of gradual work on root causes. More immigration visas to Western nations could do much to reduce the Palestinian refugee problem and would also provide the eventual Palestinian state with a flow of remittances from abroad. The Israelis should be advised to modify their Weimar Republic-like constitution, which weakens governments and thereby magnifies the influence of Arab and Jewish terrorists and fundamentalist groups. We should offer assistance to the police institutions, public administration, and auditing services of the Palestinian Authority.

- Economic boycotts on countries like Serbia, Sudan, Syria, Burma, and Cuba are not measures short of war but methods of total war. If successful, they destroy the merchant class necessary to a liberal

society, make all citizens slaves to the issuers of their ration books, and ensure that more and more economic activity takes place in black markets ruled by lead pipes and not law. If the desired political upheaval occurs, they guarantee the collapse of society will be total. Thanks to our boycott, a post-Castro government, for instance, will likely not be a law-abiding free-enterprise state led by Miami emigrés, but a Caribbean Albania, without either law or a functioning economy, but with six times Albania's population and a calmer sea for boats to cross.

- Encouraging democracy in emerging nations will require not merely formal elections but a tradition of limitations on the executive. Multi-ethnic democracy in particular requires limited government. Partition or devolution, for all their difficulties and cruelties, would have led to happier futures in Yugoslavia and most of Africa.

- Spheres of influence still have their value. There are good reasons for the United States not to meddle in Francophone Africa. The French have not always supported enlightened governments, but they have usually recognized, as the Clinton administration has not, that any government is better than none. Similarly there are British Commonwealth nations like Sierra Leone and nations in Central Asia that do not deserve our inexperienced ministrations.

- The pretensions of international lawyers must be curbed. The Clinton administration offered little resistance to the proliferation and misuse of human rights conventions; a new administration needs to be tougher. The rules of elected national parliaments should never be rendered subject to veto by "world courts" in Strasbourg or The Hague, not if government by consent of the governed is to survive.

In sum, the object of foreign policy is not "national greatness," but the preservation of peace and self-government. A new administration needs to be clearer about this than the one we have just endured.

—TAE contributing writer **George Liebmann** is the author of *Solving Problems Without Large Government*.

HOW VERY TOLERANT

The New York State Education Department recently recommended that State Education Commissioner Richard Mills require all school districts to phase out Native American mascots.

Given that hundreds of high schools in upstate New York (in fact, one out of every six) have Indian nicknames—reflecting the rich Indian heritage of the region—the bureaucrats would create a lot of outlaw districts with one stroke of the Commissioner's pen.

But then, how can society tolerate an outrage like letting a team call itself the Westhill Warriors?