



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

## The “McCarthying” of Roy Moore — and What He Stands For

*From the print edition of The New American*

“The nail that sticks up gets hammered down,” the Japanese saying goes. Judge Roy Moore has been sticking up for years — for the Constitution, the rule of law in general, the little guy, sexual propriety, and faith and family.

And he got hammered down hard.

The choice in the December 12 special election in Alabama for Attorney General Jeff Sessions’ open Senate seat was Moore or less, the latter in the person of Doug “Jacobin” Jones — and we got a lot less. I dubbed him “Jacobin,” after the radical-leftist French Revolutionaries, because the moniker fits: Pro-prenatal infanticide up to the point of birth, pro-“transgender” agenda, and pro-amnesty, Jones is everything the Cotton State isn’t supposed to be. Thus did the powers-that-be have to pull out all the stops to drag him across the finish line.

Jacobin’s narrow, 1.5 percent victory — strike that, as it was the Fourth Estate’s handiwork more than his own — was the result of a conspiracy of events, as well as of people. First and foremost, of course, were the allegations of sexual misconduct against Moore, craftily mischaracterized by that crack Democrat public-relations team, the U.S. media. There was a lack of support from the Republican Party. There were the out-of-state interests devoting massive resources to Moore’s defeat, resulting in Jones raising \$10 million to Moore’s meager \$1.8 million from October 1 to November 22 (consequently, Jones had spent seven times as much as Moore on TV ads through late November). There also likely was vote fraud. But most distressingly, and relating to larger issues, there is our deteriorating culture in which good guys look bad and bad guys, good.

### The Hanging of Moore

Before getting to that, it is necessary to address the sexual misconduct charges. In truth, the establishment had just enough rope to hang Moore with, as he was guilty of being, sadly, an anachronism. You see, there’s no question that he courted of-age teen girls while an early-30s man seeking a wife. This can sound bad to modern ears, but perspective is needed. As I wrote November 10:

Certainly, such male-female age gaps aren’t in fashion today. Yet historically, such gaps weren’t unusual. Why, truly pushing the envelope, famed comedian Charlie Chaplin married an 18-year-old





Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

when he was 53; they lived happily and had eight children together.

Moreover, greater age gaps are more common in the Deep South, and especially were so 40 years ago. This explains the mothers who were thrilled at the prospect of Moore courting their daughters.

Lastly, Moore is a devout Christian. From this more traditionalist perspective, age gaps between age-of-consent individuals are not as significant as whether a man and woman abide by God's laws governing sexuality (e.g., no premarital relations). Interestingly, though, the cultural-relativism preaching Left, which rails against the "imposition of values," has no tolerance for Deep South Christian culture.

It should be emphasized that the seven women who spoke of these relationships described Moore as nothing but a gentleman, with courting behavior that never went beyond kissing and hugging. Nonetheless, this established a pattern of behavior, an opening, that allowed alleged incidents of a sub-species (involving underage teen girls and misbehavior) to be introduced. The three women in this category, Beverly Young Nelson, Leigh Corfman, and Tina Johnson, had stories that ranged from disproven to unproven. Nelson appeared on television flanked by camera-craving feminist lawyer Gloria Allred, teary-eyed, claiming that nigh on four decades ago Moore tried to force her to engage in sexual activity. Yet her story soon began to fall apart. Three individuals who worked at or frequented the restaurant where she claimed she met the judge while waiting tables — one of whom is former Moore acquaintance and ex-sheriff's deputy Johnny Belyeu, Sr. — say they never saw Moore at the restaurant and don't remember Nelson ever working there. Her stepson, Darrel Nelson, came out in mid-November and stated that his stepmother's claims are "100 percent a lie." And, finally, mere days before the election, Nelson admitted to dissembling, stating she'd written part of a high-school yearbook inscription she had attributed to Moore.

Corfman's story was different: She doesn't allege any non-consensual activity, but claims to have gone out on two dates with the judge when she was only 14 and that assuming a state of relative undress and a request for inappropriate touching occurred. While we cannot know her claim's veracity, her story does contain inconsistencies. Moreover, Corfman has a checkered past involving drinking; drugs; numerous boyfriends; a suicide attempt at 16; three divorces; financial problems; and, to the point here, the leveling of sexual-misconduct allegations against other locally prominent men. In fact, her behavior was so bad at the time she allegedly met Moore that her father was in the process of taking custody of the girl.

As for Johnson, she alleged that Moore grabbed her buttocks in his offices in 1991. But there are no corroborating witnesses. Moreover, Johnson may have an axe to grind: Moore was at the time a private attorney representing Johnson's mother, Mary Cofield, in a custody dispute with Johnson involving the latter's 12-year-old son. Johnson did not get custody. In addition, she has a criminal history, which includes pleading guilty to felony fraud charges as late as 2010.

Also notable is something in the news: It was recently revealed that Lisa Bloom, disgraced attorney and daughter of should-be disgraced attorney, the aforementioned Allred, offered money to women who were willing to make sexual-misconduct allegations against Donald Trump before the election. This, mind you, was *after* it was disclosed that she'd offered money to Harvey Weinstein's accusers to shut up. The point is that with dirty-tricks deceivers being a lot dirtier than most think, we have to wonder how much mischief-making cash was spread around before the Alabama election.

But none of the above facts mattered. The media conflated all 10 ladies into one amorphous mass of



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

“women claiming misconduct,” and implication and inference did the rest. Why? Without explanation, an average news reader — living in a world of accepted fornication — would assume that Clintonesque sexual behavior was at issue. (After all, why would the media be talking about this so much if it involved just puppy-dog stuff, right?)

Unfortunately, the Moore campaign probably didn’t manage this ideally. Moore denied inappropriate activity with underage girls, and that’s where the defense should have ended, for the best defense is a good offense. As Chinese philosopher Sun Tzu instructed about warfare, avoid the areas where your adversary is strong; attack where he is weak. Because of Jones’ toxic policy positions, his only recourse was to keep the focus on Moore’s alleged transgressions — and every Moore defense served to do just that. As long as Moore was fighting the women, he wasn’t fighting Jones.

*Photo: AP Images*

*This article appears in the January 22, 2018, issue of The New American.*

Jones’ weakness was everything for which he stood, and this should have been emphasized relentlessly. To this end, taking a leaf out of President Trump’s book and “branding” Jones would have been beneficial. Remember when Trump labeled Senator Ted Cruz “Lyin’ Ted” (no, not fair) and Hillary Clinton “Crooked Hillary” (eminently fair)? It may seem childish, but branding works; ethereal musings don’t win elections. This is why I call the man Jacobin Jones (admittedly, something less esoteric would be ideal for a campaign), and as long as the branding reflects truth, there’s nothing wrong with it.

Having said this, perhaps part of my perception of the Moore campaign’s inadequacy is a function of reportage. After all, it’s hard to get your message out if the media suppress it.

As for the vote-fraud factor, I mention it because it is a constant in today’s elections. As Project Veritas illustrated last year via hidden-camera sting operations, vote fraud is rife and organized (one Democrat operative, Scott Foval, admitted that they’ve been rigging elections “for 50 years”). Regarding the December 12 race, I watched closely an interactive map showing county-by-county results.

Suspiciously, deep-blue Montgomery County had only 3 of 99 precincts reporting long after most other counties’ results were largely to completely in. This could have been incompetence — or it could have been the “slow count” fraud technique, where reporting is delayed until you can see exactly how many votes you have to steal for a clean but plausible win.

I’ll emphasize that I have no idea whether vote fraud could have accounted for Jones’ entire margin of victory. Until a good-faith, bipartisan effort is made to stamp it out in our elections, however, suspicion will be warranted.

Yet there is something of which there is no doubt: Sex was used to destroy Judge Moore, but Judge Moore was not destroyed because of sex. In point of fact, the Sexual Devolution is leftists’ business. They have done everything to define deviancy downwards, to open the closet of the carnal, to make licentiousness legitimate. They have put sex miseducation in schools, infused the entire culture with decadence, and made perversions of the flesh fashionable. This is why it’s no surprise that most all the figures recently caught up in sexual-misconduct scandals have been leftists. And it’s why, traditionally, sexual misconduct has never been a résumé ruiner among the unfailingly untraditional.

Let’s take a brief trip down Bad Memory Lane. Not only did womanizing senator Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) get drunk and drown hapless young Mary Jo Kopechne in his car in 1969 — an act that, though



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

unpunished, was perhaps negligent manslaughter — he also perpetrated the infamous “waitress sandwich” incident in 1985, with Senator Chris Dodd (also a Democrat) being the other slice of stale bread. Dodd remained odd and in office, and Kennedy was hailed throughout his life and beyond as the “Lion of the Senate.” Well, lions do have what essentially are harems.

Then, as I also wrote November 10:

Ever-quotable ex-Louisiana governor Edwin Edwards (D) boasted in 1983 that the only way he could lose the upcoming election “is if I’m caught in bed with either a dead girl or a live boy.” But late Democrat Massachusetts congressman Gerry Studds did him one better: He was caught with a live boy and still won elections.

In 1983, Studds was censured by the House for having a sexual relationship with a subordinate, a 17-year-old *male page*. Nonetheless, Studds was consistently reelected until his retirement in 1997 (gotta hand it to those Bay State voters). Oh, it was pointed out that the teen was the “age of consent,” and Studds defended his actions as a “consensual relationship with a young adult.”

Note that unlike with Moore, this “relationship” involved actual sex — homosexual sex. Yet according to liberals, Studds deserved reelection and Moore deserves revulsion.

Speaking of revolting, Democrat Nevada Congressman Ruben Kihuen, responding to Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi’s recent call for him to resign over sexual misconduct charges, claims she “knew about the allegations last year” but continued supporting his campaign. She’s only posturing now because the revelations became public, making him a liability. So it is, too, with fellow warrior princess Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.), who made news in November stating that Bill Clinton should have resigned over his ’90s sexual depredations. She noted that “things have changed today” — obviously — from a year ago, when she welcomed the Clintons’ support and was seen in a photo happily posing with the Inhaler in Chief himself. But there is method to this madness, as well explained by someone who, not needing a majority vote but only a minority of eyeballs, can be marginally more honest. As journalist Nina Burleigh said in 1998 in reference to Clinton, “I would be happy to give him a b\*\*\*\*\*b just to thank him for keeping abortion legal. I think American women should be lining up with their Presidential kneepads on to show their gratitude for keeping the theocracy off our backs.”

### **Why Moore Was Really Vilified**

And this explains the real reason Roy Moore may be, politically, no more: He’s part of what the Left calls the “theocracy.” The assault on him had to do with power and a wider agenda. Of course, it did concern sex as well: By standing against our Great Sexual Heresy — against prenatal infanticide and the homosexual and “transgender” agendas — and for what condemns sexual sin, Christianity, he became the un-Bill Clinton. Private virtue or vice is irrelevant here; only virtue-signaling and voting left matter.

In a way, Judge Moore has been “McCarthyed.” Of course, I’m turning the much-maligned Senator Joe McCarthy’s name into a verb to describe the effect of the Left turning it into a noun. Just as McCarthy was defined, defamed, and discredited as a wide-eyed nut, so has Judge Moore. Both men’s “trespass” was of the same species: robustly exposing the so-called Left’s complicity with evil. McCarthy sought to unearth communists in the U.S. government — and was shown to largely be right with the 1990s release of the Venona Papers — and an American Left that ranged from tolerant of to sympathetic to this infiltration. Judge Moore addresses another internal rot: the moral decay, and ignorance of and



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

contempt for constitutional principles, that defines our establishment.

The effect of McCarthying McCarthy was to make it politically impossible for anyone else to so aggressively attack communist infiltration, and in recent times we've seen open communists (or second cousins) in government: Barack Obama's "Green Jobs Czar" and self-proclaimed communist Van Jones; his former communications director Anita Dunn, who said that Mao Tse-tung was one of her "two favorite philosophers"; his "Manufacturing Czar" Ron Bloom, who stated in a speech, "We agree with Mao"; and his "Global Warming Czar" Carol Browner, who was once listed as a leader of the socialist organization "Commission for a Sustainable World Society."

It would be incorrect to say that Moore's election defeat makes standing against the libertine and unconstitutional spirit of the age also politically impossible (though it doesn't help); rather, his defeat reflects how it is being made politically problematic. Consider a comment under my December 12 online *New American* piece "The Swamp Wins: Roy Moore Defeated in Alabama." A longtime reader — someone presumably sympathetic to the magazine's cause, in other words — wrote, "Roy Moore was weird. That's why he lost. IMHO he was a sexually repressed martinet." Then there's conservative columnist George F. Will. Fellow pundit Ann Coulter lamented in 2012 how Will repeated "bogus Democratic talking points about how Joe McCarthy allegedly smeared innocents with false allegations." Well, he's at it again with Moore, having penned a December 13 op-ed in which he calls the judge "an anti-constitutional recidivist, twice removed from Alabama's highest court for his theocratic insistence that his religious convictions take precedence over U.S. Supreme Court decisions" and who thus "could not have sincerely sworn to 'support and defend the Constitution' and to 'bear true faith and allegiance to the same.'"

The tragedy here is how easy it is to be unwittingly swayed by lies. We live in a time where prudishness is considered worse than perversion, and where perversions of the Constitution are thought true. When Soviet defector Yuri Bezmenov in the early '80s told interviewer G. Edward Griffin of the communist effort to "demoralize" (undermine the morality of) Americans, it was important to fully grasp his message. While he said that the KGB would give pushes in the right (read: wrong) direction, he emphasized that most of the demoralization was done "by Americans, to Americans." The effect was to change Americans' perception of reality, Bezmenov explained, so that they would no longer be able to separate fact from fiction.

And fiction killed Roy Moore. Note that, by all accounts, Moore never engaged in fornication or anything we would consider premarital sexual activity. This should be in his plus column, but such forbearance seems "weird" to woolly headed people to whom chastity is repression and perversity is expression. It's reminiscent of how a commentator (his name escapes me) once mentioned that while in the '50s Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen could have the top-rated, faith-oriented TV show *Life Is Worth Living* on a mainstream station, today it would be seen as "weird." For sure — this is a weird time, where many will wink at someone saying women should get on their knees before Bill Clinton, but roll their eyes at a man saying we should get on our knees before God.

The Supreme Court, too, comes before the Supreme Being. It's surely not news to George Will that the "separation of church and state" isn't in the Constitution. The concept was first expressed in an 1802 letter President Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptist association in Connecticut, written to reassure them that he wouldn't impose his unorthodox brand of religion on them. Yet it's not just that Jefferson's wall was a one-way filtration system, keeping government out of the church, not religion out





Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

of government. It's that it also *separated the federal government from the states*. Today, however, the central government's judicial branch dictates religion policy to the states. In other words, they not only apply an extra-constitutional principle, but they apply it in a way that is the *exact opposite of its original intent*.

The bottom line is that the federal judiciary only has those powers assigned to it by the Constitution. It has no authority to remove the Ten Commandments from a state court or to impose so-called same-sex "marriage" on the states, and it was standing against such usurpation that got Moore removed from the Alabama Supreme Court. He was doing the job most Americans won't do: abiding by the Constitution, standing up for the rule of law. Will and others confuse this with the rule of lawyers.

But just as the Constitution has become an unfashionable document, Moore has become an unfashionable man. In their 1990 book *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90's*, Hunter Madsen and Marshall Kirk called for a desensitization of Americans to homosexuality via a "continuous flood of gay-related *advertising*," a "conversion of the average American's emotions, mind, and will, through a planned psychological attack, in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media." The authors also wrote that if homosexual activists can "produce a major realignment solidly in favour of gay rights, the intransigents (like the racists of twenty years ago) will eventually be effectively silenced by both law and polite society."

This has largely happened, and it's just a part of what Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci prescribed when recommending his "war of position." This is the long march through the institutions, in which the civilization destroyers (what better description?) gradually infest the culture-shaping entities: the media, academia, and entertainment. This process is advanced, and continues apace.

Thus have I long said that, really, what we call "modern liberalism" is far more insidious than Marxism or Nazism. It's as if Satan has honed his act. While any destructive ideology can only take hold if the people are sufficiently degraded morally, Marxism and Nazism were largely revolutionary, in your face, and overt. Liberalism is evolutionary, working slowly, incrementally, over generations, converting the "average American's emotions, mind, and will" so he and his fellows develop passions that, as British philosopher Edmund Burke put it, will "forge their fetters."

The result? An esteemed intellectual such as Will calls Judge Moore a "gross national embarrassment" that "has been narrowly avoided." What moral blindness. The real embarrassment is an Alabama senator who believes it's okay to rip babies apart in the womb, that mentally ill boys belong in girls' locker rooms, and that we should flood the nation with unassimilable foreigners to take the place of the murdered babies. But demoralized people are always embarrassed about the wrong things.

### **Remake a Moral Culture**

As German leader Otto von Bismarck observed, "Politics is the art of the possible." There are many lessons in Judge Moore's defeat, but one of them is that if we want to make the election of moral statesmen and constitutionalism possible, we have to take a leaf from Gramsci's book: The culture must be made conducive to such things. We would need our own "march through the institutions" and, of course, a general Judeo-Christian rebirth. After all, the Founding Fathers didn't say that our Republic was for just anyone. Rather, as our second president, John Adams, put it, "Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious People. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

So we'd better make morality and religion fashionable again. Otherwise, our Republic will just be



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

---

millions of people slowly and inefficiently making the bad decisions that a dictator could make with the stroke of a pen.

*Photo: AP Images*



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 22, 2018

Published in the January 22, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 02

## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,  
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



**Subscribe**

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.