The Pasadena Doubletree is an unlikely site for a conspiracy. The elegant pink structure is sumptuously landscaped and fragrant breezes circulate in the spacious courtyards even on the sultry afternoons of Southern California’s Indian Summer. And the dozens of scholars from campuses all over the country who met here late last month did not look like revolutionaries. But behind closed doors of the meeting rooms, the conference on “Cultural Diversity Enhancement” had the tone of one of those “by any means necessary” conventions staged by SDS in the late 60s. The subject was how to turn American higher education inside out.

It was sponsored by the Ford Foundation, whose strategy for a radical transformation of the university one critic has called “the academic equivalent of an ethnic cleansing.”

Continuing in this vein, Lee reported that his group had considered the question, “Is the multicultural approach an adaptation or a revolutionary transformation?” He had come down on the side of the more radical position: “At stake in multiculturalism is a direct challenge to privatized teaching, to privatized work and to privatized life.” Even science, the one area so far immune to this radical transformation, would have to change, according to Lee: “Instead of teaching science as a doctrine divorced from its social context, we could teach science from a historical, economic perspective.”

The final speaker was Eve Grossman, a Princeton dean, who said that her group had worried about tenure: “If we want to restructure the university, tenure stands in the way.” She said that her group was aware that promotion and tenure were based on “discipline-based” research. Therefore, “When we talk about changing things, we’re really talking about something no less radical than changing disciplines and the definition of research.” Grossman made it clear that her group of thinkers had kept their eyes on the prize: “If we want to change the world, we have to change the students.”

As the session concluded and the participants got ready to adjourn for a multicultural reception at the Asia-Pacific Center across the street from the Doubletree (“an important meeting place for the cultures of East and West”), it was hard not to feel a sense of unreality. How did the biggest foundation in the world get into the business of academic revolution? Why was Ford pushing so hard for the deconstruction of American higher education?

Steele was followed by Jonathan Lee, a Philosophy Professor at Colorado College who began by reporting that the workshop he represented had wondered if “consensus was an appropriate goal.” That is, should advocates of multiculturalism act as a popular front or a vanguard? One of Lee’s prescriptions for success was to “divorce courses from instructors” — that is, conceive and institute courses with a false simplicity that is often biased as well as well bogus.

The well-publicized Just a Dream by Chris Van Allsburg (Houghton Mifflin, 1990), for example, is about a little boy named Walter who is “not an enlightened individual” because he doesn’t sort his trash. His punishment is to have politically correct dreams that all the trees are cut down to make toothpicks and that everyone gets lung diseases from the smokestacks of factories. He wakes up chastened, begins to sort his trash, and is redeemed. In the bad old days it might have been the savage Indian or the world, the flesh and the devil that was routed by our hero. Today it is rapacious capitalism.

What is the message of this new environmentally sensitive literature? That personal evil is in symbiosis with systematic evil. The spittleball thrown in class is responsible for the depletion of the rainforests; industry and
I was happy to receive your May issue of Heterodoxy. The reader response from the left-wing pinheads is especially amusing. You know you are on the right track when you provoke such a response. Perhaps a program of gift subscriptions to the politically correct would send them completely over the edge. I would be happy to participate in sponsoring such a subscription.

The first issue, which I received after subscribing, is the September 1992 issue. Is there any way you could send me Nos. 1 and 3?

Michael Grant
Okahoma City

Ed: We have had a lot of requests for the first 3 issues. Unfortunately, we have only a handful left and in fact would appreciate it if readers would send us any copies of those issues they are willing to part with. We do have copies of the editorial “PC Riot,” which we have prepared as a flyer, and appreciate it if readers would send us any copies of those involved were over budget cuts, not my tenure which I already had.

Science as Power, now in its second printing, is a controversial book. If you have read it carefully (or at all) you would know that it does not, as you report, “advance the proposition that science is just an instrument of class oppression.” This is a silly proposition that, as any knowledgeable student of Soviet ideology knows, even Stalin never clearly articulated. My book, in concurrence with the preponderance of social studies of science, most of which are Durkheimian, not Marxist, argues that scientific knowledge is subject to the social and cultural context within which it is produced and, far from enjoying an socially and politically neutral entity is intertwined with power, of which class is only one of the elements. To the crude mind this may amount to little more than theoretical hair splitting, but I assure you it is a far cry from Stalinism for which science was the salvation of humankind. Stalin’s theory of history had many convolutions, the most consistent of which was technological determinism where science was ipso facto divine. They do not know their masses from scrool in the ground. Beef is good for you and for good the planet. Lean beef has the same percentage of cholesterol as lean tuna. Cattle eat stuff that you and I and my animals cannot digest; stuff that grows on land that will not grow the veggies that you and I can eat. Without the protection of mankind, beef cattle would not exist on this planet. The gasses that cattle release are good for the environment. They react with the overabundance of carbon dioxide and water vapor that collect in the upper atmosphere. These in turn capture the sun’s warming rays and are important in protecting the earth from the ice age that would otherwise be rapidly approaching. Meanwhile, the small percentage of sulfides in these gasses make the earth appear from outer space as inhospitable. This protects us from alien invaders. Have you never wondered why the flying saucers have not come in force and subdued us? To them we appear to be a ticklish ball. (i.e., class/race/gender) oppression. This is a Stalinist proposition, presenting itself as truth” and that power amounts to social control, even though Stalin had not thought of the race/gender (i.e., class/race/gender) oppression. This is a Stalinist proposition, even though Stalin had not thought of the race/gender angle before giving up the ghost. When we look back over the bleak and bloodstained landscape of Soviet totalitarianism and assess the intellectual inputs of Engels, Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin, do we really need to calibrate every nuance of their theoretical differences in rejecting their political agendas, or can we just agree that first they were totalitarian first of all?

Stanley Aronowitz

Editors Respond:

Like many radicals, Stanley Aronowitz has no sense of humor and no ear for satire. The quotation marks around “labor organizer” were not inserted because that Stanley was not a labor organizer, but to indicate its famous importance to his sense of an intellectual portfolio, as when he became labor organizer in residence at Studies on the Left and then went on to become labor organizer in residence at CUNY. On the other hand, Stanley does have the radical’s inexhaustible capacity for self-parody, as in his claim to have produced a corpus of “heretical work”—this from a man whose Church of Gender/Race/Class Oppression controls every academic “discourse” in which he operates and is credentialed, and whose “union” of intellectuals was created in order to defend the Turquerias of the PC Inquisition. Like all commissars, Stanley is adept both at academic hair splitting and brazen deception. He claims his book Science as Power shares insights with “Durkheimian” rather than Marxist. We count 4 pages of reference to Durkheim in the book and 155 to Marxian (not including the chapter devoted to the Frankfurt School). His book is not his thesis.

But it is self-described as an argument that science is “a socially constructed discourse that legitimizes its power by presenting itself as true and the power amounts to social control (i.e., class/race/gender) oppression.” This is a Stalinist proposition, even though Stalin had not thought of the race/gender angle before giving up the ghost. When we look back over the bleak and bloodstained landscape of Soviet totalitarianism and assess the intellectual inputs of Engels, Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin, do we really need to calibrate every nuance of their theoretical differences in rejecting their political agendas, or can we just agree that first they were totalitarian first of all?

Skipping over Stanley’s other tedious points, we come to his punch line. Right, Stanley, we don’t care what kind of a communist you are. If you were really an anti-Stalinist, you would have joined the National Association of Scholars or some other group opposing the politicization of the university.
WITH MALICE AFORESKIN: The last week in September is the beginning of the High Holy Days for the Jews and the silly season for Tikkun editor Michael Lerner, who annually rewrites the two thousand year old prayers to bring them into harmony with his idea of political correctness. Lerner’s versions are, needless to say, suitably liberal and liberal from any references to the God of the Jews Himself: closer in fact to the musings of a multicultural schmuck (or Obi Wan Kenobe’s Marxist brother) than the Hebrew prophets:

“...for all our sins, may the force that makes forgiveness possible forgive us...”

The sins of accepting the current distribution of wealth and power as unchangeable;

The sins of feeling so worn out when we hear about oppression that we finally close our ears;

The sins of participating in a racist society and not dedicating more energy to fighting racism — or even pretending that the problem had gone away until others began to hum down cities in their despair.

And for the sins of allowing our society to give low priority to the fight against AIDS, cancer, Alzheimer’s and other diseases, while squandering hundreds of billions of dollars on unnecessary defense expenditures;

And for the sins of expecting that our leaders and activists must be perfect or far more together than the rest of us...”

WITHMALICEBEHIND-THOUGHT: The following statement was provided by the Office of Affirmative Action of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in response to a query from reader Louie Dewey of Littleton, Mass., about dropping its exclusion of pedophilia from the protected category “sexual orientation” in its discrimination policy.

“A new statement titled “Affirmative Action Statement, in discussing our desire to not discriminate on the basis of what is customarily called “Sexual Orientation” went out of its way to be clear that pedophilia was not acceptable. When that version was revised it became clear that it would be impossible to spell out all of the various unacceptable practices (for instance, those that were illegal) and so we dropped back to using the customary brief statement which is almost universal nowadays. One or two alert and malicious characters picked up this change, and elected to interpret it as an endorsement of pedophilia. It was no such thing.” Well, since they brought it up, why is pedophilia regarded as a “sexual orientation,” or, if it is, how does it differ from other “sexual orientations”?

Why, unlike all those other illegal and/or unacceptable practices, was pedophilia singled out in the first place? Could it have to do, possibly, with some internal struggle among the politically correct?

RED ED: Angela Y. Davis, immortalized in campus lounges and Women’s Studies Centers across the nation explains her recommendation of the autobiographies of convicted felon Assata Shakur as essential education reading in a recent issue of The Nation: “Without undervaluing the role education plays in our history and in our life, Assata does not, for example, privilege the narratives of her encounters with the educational system over those representing her experiences with the penal system.” In other words, Shakur learned more about criminality from doing time in jail than doing time in school. When someone like Angela Davis is a professor, education is a crime.

BHOENI KONDO PLAYS THE NONCONFORMIST: Mary Johnson, editor of The Disability Rag, a civil rights journal, attacks Jerry Lewis for raising hundreds of millions of dollars to help disabled people. “Helping “those people” by making them be like us — normal, not disabled — is one thing,” she sneers. “Helping them to be equal and remain disabled is something entirely different.”

Once again the old saw is proven: no good deed goes unpunished.

HITTING THE HAND THAT FEEDS: Mary Johnson, editor of The Disability Rag, a civil rights journal, attacks Jerry Lewis for raising hundreds of millions of dollars to help disabled people. “Helping “those people” by making them be like us — normal, not disabled — is one thing,” she sneers. “Helping them to be equal and remain disabled is something entirely different.” Once again the old saw is proven: no good deed goes unpunished.

CONDEMNING ANYONE WHO DOESN’T SIGN ON TO THEIR AGENDA AS SENTENCING GAYS TO DEATH: Bob Dummer’s Address Book, a kind of FODOR’s for homosexual travelers enters its 28th publishing year. Available at large bookstore chains such as Barnes & Noble’s Booksrus outlets, the guide lists gay accommodations and sights of erotic interest in all 50 states, Canada, The Virgin Islands, Costa Rica and Mexico. It includes not only sex establishments and businesses, but such freelance post-office peddlers as Red Ed: freelancer sissy gay areas are: Cruising Areas. “Thus, for example if you are thinking of a vacation in Decatur, Alabama...”

IMMUNE DEFICIENT METAPHOR: After the outing of Phyllis Schlafly son, Randy Shilts, gay historian and writer (And the Band Played On, etc.), had this statement: “All these people have gay kids, and they know the line against gays is complete nonsense. It’s like being the piano player in the whorehouse and pretending you don’t know what’s going on upstairs.”

CARTOON CRIME: The logo of the University of Northern Arizona was recently fired by Affirmative Action police in the administration for having a newspaper cartoon on an office wall. The cartoon pictured three dogs in an alley watching a cat, tail in the air, saunter in their direction. The cartoon was drawn by a member of the Latin Kings. Delgado was one of their heavy hitters. (See Heterodoxy, June, 1992.)

TUFTS鎮 COLLEGE faculty members remember Delgado, who was wearing a large beaded necklace, threatening violence during the negotiations if the protestors’ demands weren’t met. His bearded necklace turned out to be the insignia of a local Latino gang called The Latin Kings. Delgado was a high-ranking member. As school term began this fall in Amherst, a teenager in nearby Springfield named Amaldo Estes-Perez made the mistake of disparaging one of the gang’s necklaces. Shortly afterwards he turned up dead, the victim of an execution-style killing, which Amherst police say was plotted by Delgado and the Kings.

MULTICULTURAL SNAKES AT STANFORD: Stanford’s push for multicultural correctness is slightly disoriented this fall having lost its leader, former president Donald Kennedy, as the result of multiple money scandals. It also has lost its Multicultural Educator Greg Ricks, who went on to greater pastures, and the director of its Black Community Service Center, Keith Archuleta, who was arrested for secretly videotaping women during photography sessions in his apartment. But then, no one said it would be easy.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION QUEENS: Harvard announced that although 171 black students were admitted to this year’s freshman class, only 95 chose to attend. Senior Admissions officer David Evans contacted most of the black students who had declined Harvard’s offer and found that the most frequently cited reason was Harvard’s need-based financial aid policy. Other institutions, in effect, were willing to pay them to enroll to fulfill local affirmative action quotas. According to Evans, several of the black students who chose to avoid Harvard and take advantage of full tuition race scholarships had family incomes of more than $100,000.

NUREMBERG LAWS, USA: The philanthropic community has joined the rush to the future. Participants to the “Wingspread” conference, a gathering of Wisconsin foundations to discuss “Private Philanthropy and the Needs of Women” were sent the following request by its organizer, the Johnson Foundation: “Please list the number of Governing Board Members/Board of Trustees, Professional Staff who identify themselves as: Men, Women, African American, Asian American, Hispanic Native American, White, Other, please specify...” Please also list the card carrying members of Racists of America.

KUDOS TO KAZIN: While in the other sections in the nation’s English departments plow the party line, the distinguished literary critic Alfred Kazin puts political correctness in perspective: “In the name of class-race-gender equality, teachers and students all across America are now being trained in intolerance to defame and exclude those who do not follow the party line. The cultural damage seems irreparable.”
From its founding in 1936 through 1991 Ford has doled out over $7 billion to over 9,000 organizations and 100,000 individuals across America and overseas. Its tax returns stand a five-year-a-year member of the board of directors of the Manhattan bookphone, and in September of 1991 its assets stood at 66.1 billion. Its staff of 574 are spread across offices in New York, Mexico City, Rio de Janeiro, Dakar, Jakarta, Bangkok, Manila, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, Cairo, Zimbabwe and Kenya. Its program budget for 1992 and 1993 is $644.5 million, a 7.5 percent increase over the previous biennium.

Ford is America's philanthropic superpower and by far the largest and most powerful foundation in the world. But if in the past it has thought globally, it is now acting locally through an effort to mass-produce political correctness on campus in the way Henry Ford bought out Model T's in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution. Old Henry said you could have a car in his Dearborn factories to acquire the billions that endangered this institution.

It was likely this group that Ford Foundation President Franklin Thomas, a former New York Deputy Police Commissioner, was thinking of when he gushed, "there is more intellectual horsepower in this place now than there has ever been." Some of the teachers and administrators who had worked with the individuals probably would have had a different word to use with theprefix horse.

Thomas wielded substantial power as both President of the Ford Foundation, an office he has held since 1979, and a member of the board of directors. In his review of 1988, Thomas wrote, "It is ironic that at just the moment when the world is embracing the American ideal, here at home we seem to be retreating from America's great promise of opportunity."

"This is the time when, he linked to the Great Society-like programs of the 1960s, which he said were washed through without the benefit of "objective assessments."

"It doesn't seem to let the same thing happen to the adventures in multiculturalism Ford has begun to sponsor. In a September 12, 1990 press release, Thomas explains Ford's intent to "broaden cultural and intellectual diversity in American life, highbrow style. The program's goal is to "ensure that college curricula and teaching keep pace with the rapid demographic and cultural changes under way in American society."

Ford's affirmative action guidelines. According to a recent article in the Chronicle of Philanthropy, every grant application must include a "diversity statement," st a map of the Western thought map, which details "the number of non-whites and women involved in the project and, sometimes, at the entire institution." And in Ford's view some minorities are more equal than others. Asian-Americans may be one of the groups suffering most discrimination in higher education, particularly in the University of California system, but Ford does not consider them a minority eligible for hiring preferences.

Ford's ramrod in multiculturalism is its vice president Susan Berresford, whom the Chronicle describes as "dogged in her efforts." According to administrators who have dealt with Ford, Berresford often calls applicants on the carpet about their percentages to bulk them into conformity. As the same time, she denies that the rules constitute a "quota system."

Indeed, in the to Ford's-Words to engineer some human souls, Berresford persists in claiming that the primary criterion to receive Ford money is "talent."

Looking at Ford's obsession with percentages of minorities and women at the institutions with which it does business, Michael Joyce of the Bradley Foundation says that such a draconian affirmative action program is "an amazing thing because it means they are behaving as if they were a government." Joyce adds that "None of us are on the moderate or conservative side even thinks of doing anything like that. We'd be laughed out of the business if we tried to impose. Not would we dare involve ourselves in the criteria for hiring and that sort of thing."

Joyce's point is worth pondering. Imagine if, say, the John M. Olin Foundation (which people on the left have vilified simply because it gave a small grant to Dinesh D'Souza to complete Inheritance) attempted to establish the "Ronald Reagan Free-Market Studies Program" at Stanford and insisted that, as a condition of funding, the school hire more middle-aged, white, Austrian-American
and Anglo-American economists and change the base curriculm to include Von Mises, Hayek, Frederic Bastiat, Thomas Sowell, and Hernando de Soto. People all over the philanthropic community, with Ford no doubt leading the charge, would say that Olin was politically interfering with university structures in behalf of a fascist agenda.

One of the schools which qualified for Ford's $100,000 "Cultural Diversity Grant" and which therefore became one of its R&D projects was Tulane University. "The amount of money is nothing," says Tulane political science professor Paul Lewis, "it's simply an excuse to do what they wanted to do," adding that "what they would really like is one university to be a proving ground for their ideas."

The goals of Tulane's "Initiatives for Race and Gender Enrichment," were breathtaking in scope. According to the University's President Eamon Kelly, their objective was to "change, over time, the character of our university, and to bring it to the next level of social and human progress." At present, racism and sexism were "pervasive" in American society and "fundamentally present in all institutions." No one was immune because racism and sexism were "subconscious or at least subterranean."

If the disease was a pandemic, a strain of racism and sexism resistant to such remedies as free inquiry and spirited open discussion, the cure was systematic quota hiring, with the Tulane provost empowered to intervene when enough "people of color" were not hired. The quota hirelings were to be treated according to the following table:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Quota Hirelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>People of Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>People of Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>People of Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>People of Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>People of Color</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, students were encouraged to report on one another as one way of providing the university "with tools to begin the process of removing racism and sexism from ourselves and our institution." Department heads were ordered to report periodically on racist and sexist attitudes among their colleagues and students. The initiatives also provided for an "Enrichment Liaison Person" in each department to act as a commissar in charge of monitoring conformity. On all counts, the Tulane experiment gave a good sense as to what Ford's PC initiative would look like in widespread practice.

"My gut feeling about this," says dissident Tulane professor Paul Lewis, "is that Kelly has been sent down as a missionary from the Ford Foundation." Indeed, Eamon Kelly was a Ford Foundation project officer in charge of social development from 1969-1974. (From 1974-79 he headed the Foundation's Program Related Investments.) Ronald Mason, Kelly's senior vice-president at Tulane in charge of implementing the diversity initiative, was also a Ford transplant, as was the man Kelly installed as chancellor, who after a wave of faculty protests over the program has since departed.

For Lewis, a veteran of the civil-rights movement, the Ford initiative at Tulane was "the worst assault on academic freedom since Senator Joe McCarthy's escapades in the 1950s." In the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Lewis argued that "universities cannot operate where dissent is discouraged, where inquiry is under the thumb of orthodoxy and where professors and students are spied upon and reported."

As a result of his agitation against Ford's carpet-bagging, Lewis found an ally in philosophy professor Eric Mack. Mack pointed out that the University's multicultural "initiatives" did little to remedy the fact that Tulane "offers almost no course in Islamic, African, Near Eastern, Indian, Chinese, or Japanese history, literature, fine arts, philosophy, or religion. Nor does the document display any interest in intellectual diversity."

Throughout 1991 Lewis continued to mobilize opposition to Kelly's plan. As a result, Tulane eventually dropped the initiative that diversity, rather than scholarship or teaching, was the university's highest priority. Last May, Tulane's board of administrators scrapped most of Kelly's plan. Trying to snatch victory out of the jaws of defeat, Kelly claimed implausibly that the board's statement, far from foiling his plans, was actually an endorsement. "A liberal pragmatist would have cut his losses," Lewis says, "but Kelly is digging in. He's an ideologue."

While the Tulane battle raged, Ford was proceeding with his grand strategy elsewhere. Boston College announced plans for a course on "alterity" or "otherness." Denison University announced efforts to extend its minority and women's studies requirement into its Freshman studies Program. Harvard College announced plans to create or revise ten courses relating to prejudice and discrimination that would make up its new core requirement in social justice. The University of Rochester announced plans to expand its Freshman Ventures to include "the experience of oppressed groups and their resistance to oppression."

The fact that all these announcements were made simultaneously, and in virtually identical PC boilerplate, was no coincidence. Each of the schools had received a grant under Ford's "Race Relations and Cultural Diversity Initiative." Other schools which got grants from Ford included Bermudian State, Brandeis University, U.C.L.A., University of Iowa, Millsaps College, Mt. St. Mary's College, New School for Social Research, Notre Dame, Pitzer College, University of Redlands, Spring Hill College, Southwest Texas State, Virginia Commonwealth, and Wesleyan College.

The inclusion of Wesleyan, a prestigious liberal arts school in Middletown, Connecticut, was of special interest. Wesleyan is the alma mater of Ford's Education and Culture Director Edgar Beckham. Beckham was also a lecturer in the German department before going into administration. As a Dean of Wesleyan, Beckham championed politically correct programs. The kind of networking Ford can do is shown by the fact that Beckham was able to deliver Wesleyan to Ford for its pilot program and bag $100,000 for his alma mater at the same time.

In 1990 Beckham told the New York Times that he was enthusiastic about the Ford job "because of the experience I had on a single campus. It was Beckham's "strong view that if you want to get at the heart of culture, you have to engage the faculty and you have to affect the curriculum."

How has this engagement proceeded with Ford's PC dollars? Wesleyan boasts four organizations for "stu-
Ford's initiative at Wesleyan also got a boost from President William Chace, a former Donald Kennedy crony during his days helping to dislodge Stanford's Western campuses. Besides the Washington Center, Ford channels money to clusters, leadership teams that will undergo an educational intervention" to promote cultural pluralism and "manifestations," the foundation notes, "will be required to make an explicit public commitment, endorsed by the governing board, to work toward greater campus diversity." The concept will include addressing "goals, strategies and timelines for hiring minority faculty and staff, increasing the enrollment and retention of minority students, establishing faculty development programs, renewing the curriculum ... and making appropriate changes in administrative practices." Along with the clusters, Ford grants continue to flow to individual schools. In Los Angeles, St. Mary's College is using a $100,000 Ford grant to hold faculty-student "development workshops led by experts on multicultural education and teaching." Northeastern Illinois will use Ford money to hold a campus-wide "University Day" with a diversity theme and workshops for faculty. Pitzer College is using $100,000 in Ford funds to revise traditional courses to "incorporate the perspectives of different racial, ethnic and cultural groups." Queens College will launch a Departmental Diversity Initiative that will include "re-evaluation of each department's educational philosophy and program." The University of Iowa will use a Ford grant in "a required two-semester course." (Ford is not in the business of funding electives.) Notre Dame's $91,640 Ford grant will bankroll two-week intensive workshops for faculty members in core curriculum.

De Pauw University in Greencastle Indiana, where Dan Quayle went to school, is now having financial problems but thanks to Ford has a "well developed idea where diversity should go," says the Bradley Foundation's Michael Joyce, "because they worry that if people with common sense understood what they are doing they would be rejected." If Ford, as claimed, learns from its grantees, they should pay heed to Marty Strange of the Ford-funded Center for Rural Affairs, in Walloth, Nebraska. "It is a sad day when philanthropy becomes the cornerstone of change," Strange recently told the Chronicle of Philanthropy, "because then when change occurs you've got a vested interest and you don't want any more change to occur. And that's exactly what a foundation ought to avoid." By all indications Ford has thrown such caution to the winds. In fact, it is speeding up its PC production line. The Ford Foundation plans to hire a scholar in residence to advise it on "diversity-related issues."
A sk James Joseph about Jesus and he sweats. The powerful president of the Council on Foundations, trade association for major American money-givers such as Ford, Rockefeller, and a thousand other philanthropic foundations, is cool before the television cameras as he promotes his favorite cause: the politicization of charity. Yet, sit in a small interview room with him, pop a theological opener (“What do you think of Christ?”), and the water starts to flow.

The question may be provocative but it is not irrelevant. Before he became the Jack Valenti of the charity world ten years ago, Joseph was a man of God. Part of a black family that regularly attended a traditional church, he “grew” from those roots by matriculating at Yale Divinity School during the New Age Sixties and gaining ordination in the United Church of Christ, a Protestant denomination so socially liberal and theologically tepid that one wag said that its churches ought to have a question mark rather than a cross on their steeples. Later, Joseph found a home in the Carter Administration as a cabinet undersecretary and after that, when Reaganomics left him unemployed, a place in the philanthropic sun with the Council on Foundations.

In his new job, indeed, that hallowed house of big money foundations to follow the politicized path set by Ford in the 1960s when it financed black separatists in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school battle, funded Democratic Party registrars in the Cleveland mayoral election and sent Bobby Kennedy’s staff on an international junket following his assassination. A study published by the Capital Research Center last year spelled out the bottom line of Joseph’s reign: “For Joseph and philanthropoids like him who grew up in a religion that emphasizes acts of charity rather than political agendas, there is probably some remembrance of beliefs past, some consequent guilt, and some...sweat.

Many American foundations grew out of a Protestant tradition that was evangelical early in this century, and drifted into secular humanism later on. Some philanthropoids like John Winanaker worked hard, lived frugally, and then retired from business to devote their time to charity. and, I daresay, helping those in need. Today, the annual conferences of the Council on Foundations are held in settings like the Chicago Hilton’s Grand Ballroom, which appears to have been inspired by Versailles, with its inset murals, carvings sparkling chandeliers hanging from 34-foot-high ceilings, with 22 karat gold leaf on the walls and mirrors everywhere.

Some philanthropists, of course, shamelessly love the splendor even as they speak of their solidarity with the poor and oppressed. “We live in a time of terrible sonnolence and anemia...a time of broken promises,” declared Columbia Professor Maxine Green in a recent example of conference oratory. Professor Green, who was protesting the “orienta- tion of this government to the military,” virtually called for civil disobedience, and many audience members responded enthusiastically: “I agree. We can choose social change, we can choose justice, or we can back away from that...I try to find a person’s idealism, but I just call it leadership development... Yes, we hold an incredible amount of power as funders.”

The Council on Foundations is ostensibly an apolitical trade association for members with over $74 billion in assets. And this indeed was once its role. The Council has metamorphosed into a vanguard organization seeking to carry the descendents and representatives of crass entrepreneurs toward a brave new socially progressive future. It is a change that would have the foundation fathers, many of whom were practical skinflints, rolling in their graves. S.S. Kresge, builder of a chain of stores, scrimped for a lifetime, endowed a foundation, and did not want to waste any of its $350 million of assets: “I’ve never spent more than 30 cents a day for lunch in my life and it hasn’t killed me.” James Duke told his estate’s trustees exactly where his money should be spent: 32% to hospitals (“If [people] aren’t healthy they can’t work, and if they don’t work they ain’t healthy”), and the rest to schools, churches, retired ministers and their widows, and orphanages. These founders sought direct help, not cosmic causes. Now, however, steering committees for the Council on Foundations conferences seem to be made up of people who have spent too much time watching Star Trek’s Captain Planet and the Planeteers. Rainforests and the ozone layer are foundation heroes for the nineties, and the business leaders whose creative efforts made the foundations possible are its ubiquitous villains.

How did this happen? In some ways the Council is one more institutional victim of the Sixties and its afterlife. Wilmer Shields Rich, its executive director from 1957 through 1967, opposed politicization, saw no need for a large national organization, and tried to “hold overhead to a minimum.” But she was succeeded by David Freeman, a Ford and Rockefeller veteran. Freeman knew how to think big, and during his decade as president the Council became a large national organization with 835 members and an influential voice in Washington. Freeman also emphasized “adult education” for foundation trustees and staffs. When I first interviewed him in 1984, he recalled his “feeling that the Council ought to become more of a spokesman about the [foundation] field, not necessarily/or its members, but to its members.” One piece of advice was to turn away from the philosophy of entrepreneur- ship and private enterprise that characterized the careers and lives of most of the founding donors, and towards the idea of government “partnership” with the specific goal of influenc- ing various government policies. Freeman and the Council’s chairman, former Princeton University president Robert Goheen, stressed the need for “private-public collaboration,” with “governments and foundations working alongside one another.”

Some, the idea of partnership had a radical twist. Thus David Freedman of the Ford Foundation told the Council’s annual conference in 1974, “We need to look at all the laws on the books and change them.” At the same conference, the radical environmentalist Barry Commoner elaborated: “We are all children of private enterprise. We’re getting ready to bite the hand that feeds us.”

A Boston Globe reporter excitedly described the scene at this conference, which in retrospect proved to be a water- shed event: “At a convention of the heads of foundations set up by the Ford, the Rockefellers, the Pews, the Carnegies, the Kresges, the Mellon’s and other middleweight foundations for the purpose of giving away $2.5 billion to $3 billion of the profits of private enterprise every year, the message seems as much a departure as we would be, a paean to capitalism by Chairman Mao...”

Conference time was not the only time for political propagandizing. Council leaders also used Foundation News, the organizations’ house organ, magazine, to print foundations that funded—in their words —“anti-imperialism, corporate respon- sibility, access to media, and the rights of tenants, GIs, prisoners, workers, third-world communities and women”. This politically correct message even offered an apology and justifica- tion in advance for any inconvenience its radical objectives might cause: the need to “be protective of the physical, social and mental well-being of mankind...will result in some limitations of our freedom as entrepreneurs, but the cost benefits to us as human beings will far exceed all these.”

Throughout the 1970s Foundation News extended its agitation in behalf of radical agendas to the familial realm as well. Council members were told that “our marriage and family system is undergoing a major transition from the traditional pattern of the past—rigid, legal, hierarchical and monogamous...to the new roles—the new companionship pattern — fluid, flexible and based on loving and creative interpersonal relationships.” There might be some resistance to these changes, but foundations could help.

Indeed, that inaugural address was full of good news: “ Everywhere I have been there is a feeling that this is a new era for philanthropy, one of those moments of time which transcend other moments of time, proclaiming a special vision and calling us to a special mission.” Joseph said he had detected “a new enthusiasm, a liberated spirit, even a audacity to be provocative.” Mixing theological metaphors (and religious messages), he compared conference partici- pants to “Prometheans chained to the rocks, yet defying the gods and raging openly...” It was no accident that Joseph had invoked Karl Marx’s favorite myth: “Rarely in human history” he continued, “has there been so intense a discus- sion of the nature of the social contract between a society and its people.” It was a time when the philanthropoids were getting acquainted with the maquis.

The specifics of Joseph’s gospel became clearer in statements throughout the 1980s that built on his animosity toward private enterprise and showed no awareness of socialism’s failure around the globe. For instance, Joseph told a Yale University audience that decisions about invest- ments of private pension funds should be made by “officials according to public commitments.” Their goal should be “to build a secure and just economy” rather than just a secure retirement.

During a speech to students at Stanford University in 1984, he simplified the revolutionary note: “It is the peculiar destiny of this generation to live between two worlds—a old order which is dying but not yet dead, and a new order which is conceived but not yet born.” The idea of being between two worlds may have been Matthew Arnold’s but the twist Joseph gave it had a decidedly Jacobin ring. “For two hundred years this system [of American democracy] worked quite well,” he went on to explain, but now the “communications revolution” should enable us to put into practice “what we are now learning from the new forms of direct democracy emerging.”

Joseph was aware that the radical nature of the agenda he was advancing, not only for American society but for tax- exempt foundations he was encouraging to become the spearhead of his “new order” revolution, could inspire political opposition. In the Fiftees, Congressional investiga- tors had targeted foundations engaged in what they regarded as subversive and subversive activities. Even a public wave of Congressional investigations might become alarmed at the prospect of billions of dollars administered by self-appointed, self-perpetuating and unaccountable bureaucracies with radical political agendas.

The problem, Joseph realized, would surface if foundations openly united behind any single cause, or if founda- tion executives were too explicit about their agendas. Such problems could be avoided, the other hand, if Council mem- bers were discreet, not to say Machiavellian in the way they packaged their schemes: “We must find ways to trans-
Thomas Jefferson called them the "merciless Indian savages on our Western frontier" whose "known Rule of Warfare is an undisguised Destruction of all Ages, Sexes, and Conditions." And this not in an obscure document, but in the Declaration of Independence — the incitement of the "merciless savages" to depredations against American colonists being one of the Declaration of Independence's major grievances against the British.

But frontier Indians, now portrayed as gentle, peaceful bucolic, at one with the universe and with nature, have after 200 years made it to the other end of Washington's Constitution Mall from the Jefferson Monument to the National Gallery of Art, up to now a bastion of "high culture." A handsomely lit and laid out new exhibition, "Art of the American Indian Frontier," all earthenware and buffalo robes and moccasins, containing not the slightest hint that these are relics of what was a warlike, predatory people (war bonnets are called "feather bonnets"), marks the first time that America's regnant art establishment has seen fit to exhibit such handicraft cheek and jowl with its Rembrandts and El Grecos. The catalogue and texts affixed to the walls of the exhibition mention that some of the Indians' buckskin jackets are decorated with "human hair," but the visitor would be hard put to guess that this human hair was a warlike, predatory people (war bonnets are called "feather bonnets"), marks the first time that America's regnant art establishment has seen fit to exhibit such handicraft cheek and jowl with its Rembrandts and El Grecos. The catalogue and texts affixed to the walls of the exhibition mention that some of the Indians' buckskin jackets are decorated with "human hair," but the visitor would be hard put to guess that this human hair was a trophy cut from the heads of adversaries whom the wearer of the jacket had gently scalped or, as was the general practice whenever circumstances allowed, gen-tly tortured to death for the entertainment of friends and family.

The father of modern anthropology, Franz Boas, wrote in his classic study on Primitive Art:

"Opinions energetically propagated and spurious facts diligently disseminated color the thinking of people, and not only uneducated people. The intellectual is deceived as easily as the untutored by sanctimonious professions that conform to the moral code of time and place and flatter the feeling of self-righteousness."

Writing in 1927 for a civilized world that still felt it had little to learn from "primitives" (a word Boas would be ill-advised to use now, much as Jefferson would be ill-advised to use "savages"), Boas would be startled to observe that the spurious facts diligently disseminated today are all running in the opposite direction. Taking comfort in his perception of gullibility on the part of intellectuals and his sense that a key element for the believer is self-righteousness, Boas would certainly be impressed by the virtues now attributed to his Indians by correct thinking modern-day Americans, from the aesthetics of the National Gallery to the moralists of Beverly Hills and Malibu. He could not, of course, be expected to foresee that the Harriet Beecher Stowe of the Indian revisionist movement would be a marketing ma- jor from Cal State-Fullerton named Kevin Costner, or that the movement's Uncle Tom's Cabin would be a cinematographic fairy tale in which an officer of the Union Army defects from his own people to the Sioux (Comanche in the original novel) because he finds them more pacific, environmentally responsible, and sweeter smelling. The hero of Dances With Wolves has no precedent in history, of course, in that no officer of the Union Army ever defected to the Sioux, who in the middle of the Civil War unleashed a nightmare of fire and death on the western frontier, causing President Lincoln to withdraw sorely needed troops from the struggle with the Confederacy to fight them off. But that's the way it is with fairy tales. Nor, since the Indians often dressed their hair in rotting bear grease, did contemporaries find the Sioux, or Comanche, or other warrior tribes of the frontier, very sweet smelling.

Teddy Roosevelt was a great admirer of Indians for qualities that they truly did possess: prodigious bravery and stoical resistance to pain — military virtues — and a large contingent of Indians was included in his Rough Riders, who stormed up Cuba's San Juan Hill in the Spanish-American War. But these are not virtues ad-mined today by refined members of the entertainment elite. And indeed Hollywood, following Dances With Wolves, its sanctimony reinforced by a sincere desire to make money, is ablaze with projects for movies about peace-loving Indians — or at least sorely aggrieved Indians. The first post-Wolves films to make it to the nation's screens are Thunderheart with Val Kilmer (The Doors), Robert Redford's Incident at Oglala and, an HBO original, The Last of His Tribe with Jon Voight. As I write, James Fenimore Cooper's Last of the Mohicans, starring Daniel Day-Lewis, recipient of an Academy Award for My Left Foot, is in post-production. But judging by the commercial fizzle of Thunderheart and Oglala, Hollywood executives might now be having second thoughts about the durability of this great Indian craze, the raging conflagration perhaps turning out to be a mere Brushfire. For, unlike American universities, where as a tenured professor Kevin Costner could go on lecturing hapless students about Saint Francis-like Amer-Ican Indians forever, when moviegoers tire of daydreams about what fun it would be to ride bareback over the plains, or wear buffalo robes, or confront another buffalo, Hollywood's great new Indian daydream will have come to end.

The daydream shows signs of greater durability in publishing and above all the education industry—where young minds are more malleable and students, unlike moviegoers, cannot easily take their money and go else-where. An autobiographical tale of the childhood of a Cherokee orphan, The Education of Little Tree, said by critics to be "filled with love and respect for the Indian way of life," was on the New York Times non-fiction bestseller list for weeks before it was discovered to have been written by no Indian at all but by a one-time KKK activist named Asa Earl Carter. And an even more inspiring phenomenon is the cult that has grown up around "Chief Seattle," who represents the purity of the state of Washington before such modern abominations as Speaker Tom Foley and the House Bank. Chief Seattle was said to have written in an 1854 letter to President Franklin Pierce, "I have seen a thousand rotting buffalo bones on the prairies left by the white man who shot them from a passing train." Now this is very impressive, in that there wasn't a single buffalo within 600 miles of Chief Seattle on Puget Sound and the first railroad didn't cross the plains anywhere near those parts until a good 15 years later. When these details were revealed, the Earth Day people, who've been boosting Chief Seattle as a kind of environmental prophet, toned down his "letter" to President Pierce, dropping the railroad, blurring the buffalo reference, and changing it to read: "What will happen when the secret corners of the forest are heavy with the scent of many men and the view of the ripe hills is blotted by talking wires?" But Chief Seattle didn't write this to President Pierce either. The lines were composed by a screenwriter and great user of talking wires named Ted Perry, who wrote them for a 1971 fictional film on ecology named Home, broadcast on the talking airwaves of network television. But this didn't stop Dial Books from shamelessly publishing Perry's words in an illus-trated child's version of the alleged speech by Chief Seattle entitled Brother Eagle, Sister Sky: A Message
from Chief Seattle. The book has sold over 250,000 copies since its publication in 1991 and it, also, re-
mained for weeks on the New York Times non-
fiction bestseller list until a spat with the paper's news
department brought about its removal. In point of
fact, there is no historical record of Chief Seattle
having demonstrated any concern for the environment
whatever. He is known to have written simply
nothing and to have made in his life exactly one
speech, 117 years before his hidden posthumous
conversion to environmentalism in a 1971 film. A
Vision of the Speech — the one we have — mentions nothing at all about the
environment. But the Earth Day people and Dial
Books are stuck with their environmental version, an
afterward to Brother Eagle, Sister Sky now stating
that in the Speech "Seattle's words are all too
obscured by the mists of time." Since time has not
accumulated much mist since the 1971 television
movie, what is obscuring Chief Seattle's real words is
not the mists of time at all, it is brazen deceit on the
part of the Earth Day organization and Dial Books.

Peter Matthiessen's _In the Spirit of Crazy Horse_ is
decent of a different color. Also a bestseller, it is an
enlarged account of injustices — largely imaginary —
are to the American Indian, particularly since the
radical Indian occupation in 1973 of Wounded
Knee, a place completely unknown to the general
public before Dee Brown's widely tendentious
_The Real Redskin: My Heart at Wounded Knee_ of three years before.

The major focus of Matthiessen's book, also the basis for Robert
Redford's _Incident at Oglala_, is the Peltier Affair. In
June, 1975, two young FBI agents, Jack Coler and
Ronald Williams, were killed on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Although Matthiessen calls the incident a "shoot-out," the word "ambush" seems more
appropriate as an appeals court found that over 125
bullet holes were discovered in the agents' cars,
while only 5 cartridge casings from the agents' guns
were ever located at the scene. After the first
fusillade, the two agents were lying helpless and a
member of the radical American Indian Movement
watched organization leader Leonard Peltier walk
down a slope and, firing point blank a high-
velocity AR-15, blow their heads off. Peltier has
had five lawyers, including William Kunstler, all
chosen by himself. His attorneys were allowed to
question the jury, a practice rare in federal court. He
got almost double the number of peremptory
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The EUROPEAN INTRO-
DUCTION OF THE HORSE
DID WONDERS FOR THE
INDIANS' MOBILITY AND
SPEED IN ATTACK, BUT
NOTHING TO DECREASE
THEIR TASTE FOR WAR,
WHICH, ALONG WITH
HUNTING, THEYCONSIDERED
THE ONLY ACTIVITIES
WORTHY OF A MAN.
WOMEN, VIRTUAL SLAVES,
DID ALL OTHER WORK.
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Drake's eatery, operating since 1937 on North University Street in Ann Arbor, and featuring hundreds of varieties of imported teas and hard candies is a fixture in the campus community. Its owner, Truman Tibbals, a white-haired, legally blind octogenarian is famous among students for his crusty enforcement of Drake's Rule Number One: Order Something to Eat or Leave. So it was no surprise to most of the patrons one spring day when the old-timer lit into Eat or Leave. So it was no surprise to most of the

Drake's until his 80s

DRAKE'S Until Our demands Are Met. These "demands" were that old man Tibbals compose a public letter of apol-

Drake's Five persecution of Tibbals, I would work to see
time after the Tibbals incident, which itself had reached; kind of resolution when a protest march organized by the Drake's Five Kicked off, and more people showed up in support of Tibbals than to protest. During this period, the national press had discovered the phenomenon of political correctness, which is charac-

represented in 'That is Known as HETEROSEXISM, MISTER'
the question period, when a blonde woman, sitting among
the large contingent of campus lesbians who had come to
support MacKinnon, singled him out as the editor of The
Review and accused him in a voice quivering with emo-
tion: "Your words oppress me!"

The issue of the administrative memo seemed momen-
tantly to disorient MacKinnon, as she groped for a way to
introduce a division in the pc ranks over which orthodoxy
to impose. She was not completely happy with the
memo. Among lesbians, she pointed out, "sexual
preference" rather than "orientation" is the preferred
term, because it valorizes "act of women loving
women."

This was a self-admission that the whole pc agenda was
about something other than...well, political correctness.
Power is clearly the agenda for MacKinnon and .her
supporters. The mood of the hall, demonstrably hostile
about something other than...well, political correctness.
EMBARRASSED TO
BE CALLED A
LESBIAN
AFTER THIS
INCIDENT...

I in the end, my experiences with Michigan's radical
homosexual activists were instructive in ways I
could not have foreseen. The activists missed a great
opportunity with me. I was an identified conservative
who was outspoken in my opinion that homosexuals should
be treated with the same tolerance and respect accorded to
any minority. I stated publicly more times than I can
remember that I was not opposed to guaranteeing the Consti-
tutional rights of Americans who, for whatever reason, identi-
fied themselves as homosexuals. I was steadfastly opposed,
howerover, to granting any group special rights based on a sense
of historical victim hood or societal oppression.

This sentiment was shared by many homosexuals who,
because they abhor the tactics of ACT-UP and the agendas
of radical homosexual groups, are seldom heard from. "I'm not
asking for any special rights," Rich Tafel, President of the Leg
Cabin Federation - a group of gay Republicans - told the
Michigan Review. "I'm not asking for money. And I'm not
asking for affirmative action. I just want the same rights as
every other tax paying citizen."

Many homosexuals on campus felt that the actions of the
radical groups generally, and the Drake's Five in particular,
were unrepresentative of the gay community and were embar-
rassing besides. "I am ashamed and embarrassed to be called
a lesbian after this incident," Karen Businsky told the campus
newspaper during the Drake's Five affair. "Mr. Tibbals kicks
people out of his restaurant all the time. The man is 83 years old.
All he wants to do is maintain business so he can go home at
night and pay the bills."

Had the university activists been concerned with build-
ning broad coalitions of people to ensure the rights of gays
and other minorities, they would have found allies in conservatives
like me. There were more than a few of us at the University of
Michigan who, as a matter of principle, felt that all individual's
rights should be protected. Instead of joining forces or showing
any awareness that libertarians even existed, ACT-UP, LGMPO,
 Queer Nation and UCAR just lumped us with the hell fire
and damnation religious right and actual gay-hating bigots.

While catastrophic in terms of building broad coalitions or
defining the campus atmosphere on this issue, this strategy
was productive on some level. By attacking everybody who
didn't swallow their agenda whole as red-necked racists, they
were able to isolate themselves as an embattled minority and
convince the university and student government to give them
legitimacy and lots of money. Creating enemies and posing as
victims is a time-worn tactic of political fund-raising off
campus as well.

Being taken under the wing of the university bureau-
cracy, and its apparatus of control, by no means ensures public
acceptance of the radicals and their agendas. In fact, it probably
guarantees that they'll continue to be a despised (and feared)
minority. And that's probably exactly the way they want it.
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Page ii
Our culture finds it appealing for males to have centrality, for them to control females and paternalism," says Adrienne Zihlman, a Professor of Physical Anthropology at the University of California at Santa Cruz. "I don't believe there's true objectivity when dealing with evolution."

Our cultural ear has been assaulted with words such as these so regularly in the last few years that it has lost the ability to distinguish what is serious from what is radical boilerplate. In fact, however, Adrienne Zihlman is not just another activist in the politicized university. She stands in the forefront of a feminist surge in the field of human evolution and is championing ideas which, if they are not yet mainstream, have earned her a cover story in Discover; a popular science magazine. She is, moreover, an avatar in the next forefront of a feminist surge in the field of human evolution.

The whole storm about disinterested research as it applies to feminist paleoanthropology began in 1971, when Sally Linton Slocum argued that of men were up to no good. She pointed out that only females and otherwise have an organ devoted specifically to sexual pleasure (the clitoris), which to her suggests that human females are destined for something other than monogamy. Moreover, the female ability to have deserted organisms close together in time (contrasted with the masculine inability), hints that women are best equipped for something other than a place in the nuclear family. "Men go on to determine that various cultural institutions like purdah, clausination, infibulation, and clitoridectomy are all inspired biologically in males to keep adventurous women in tow."

The feminist paleoanthropologists believe that what kept these revolutions undiscovered, as Slocum originally noted, was the innate sexism of research. If men were doing it, it must be political. It was political, it must victimize women. Anne Fausto-Sterling argues in her book Myths of Gender: Biological Theories About Women and Men that when considering the topic of sex differences, "it is inherently impossible for any individual to do unbiased research." This inability to transcend gender, to her, makes all science political and the politics of science she believes can be seen in the male behavior as a masculinization and monophasic which "express deep hatred and fear of women." The introduction of the word "rape" into the vocabulary of academic sociobiology, Fausto-Sterling proclaims, was at the very least a non-conscious attempt to establish rape as a widespread natural phenomenon and thus deflect and depoliticize a subject of intense and specific importance to women.

Adrienne Zihlman, too, thinks that the language of science has been politicized. "When discussing reproductive strategies, females are called 'promiscuous' when the males are simply 'competitive,'" she said.

This all fits rather comfortably into the larger topic of feminism. Feminists who have studied the links between gender and scientific theory often conclude that a receptive strategy, females are called 'promiscuous' when the males are simply 'competitive,'"

"There's always a major publication delay until after the primary researchers [in this case, Johanson and several others] had his request to review any paper she chose to publish prior to the specimens, that she never accepted the invitation, and that the conference's near-utopian atmosphere that should be present at all conferences, which is 'at the end of the first day, we were where we'd be after three days of discussion without victory or defeat,' Morbeck joined in the praise: "At that first of the 1960s, the Great Debate will move the political correctness issue into the sciences. Is there a stage of the Great Debate which will move the political science magazine. She is, moreover, an avatar in the next forefront of a feminist surge in the field of human evolution.
her work, offered to defend her controversial views of the Lucy skeleton in an open forum. Encounters like these are what led to Zihlman's co-sponsorship of the all-female conference. They also demonstrate the infantile reductionism at the core of feminism. If a man and a woman fight over an idea, and the man appears to prevail, the result does not always reveal sexism. Yet those who allow their feminist politics to taint their scientific lives often see ideas that lose out in the "Darwinian competition for procreation" as having been victimized by a god of skill and sagacity. Much of their "work" is concocting elaborate theories that "prove" the destructive nature of the infantile reductionism at the core of science. Donna Haraway, for instance, discusses sexual and political identities in her book Primate Visions: Gender, race and the Nature of Science. She provides a critique, quasi-deconstructive analysis in the heady, obfuscating jargon of the lit crit industry: "In a sense, science itself is a kind of gender. For the realms of both nature and culture, "science" is the key authorizing subject, the chief sign of rationality and order. Sex is categorically opposed to order; it is what must be ordered; woman remains the sex; woman the scientist becomes the trope figuring biased man is simply scientist; his gender is unremarkable, not a problem, resting easily within the genre (gender) of science. His gender does not seem in danger of becoming the semiotic order to science, namely, a politics." What she tries to do here, in very many words, is to make scientists members of an exclusive world order created and maintained by men—women as threats to their profession. The sinisterness of ideas such as these are actually a smokescreen for the stakes of the battle being waged in science, a battle that will grow in intensity and consequence in the years ahead. Those who choose objectivity in research lost the humanities long ago. Now science, previ- ously impermeable to questions of value judgments and political propagandizing, finds itself assaulted by suppos- edly marginalized scholars who see value in nothing and politics in everything. For them, science is to be won over or conquered, and it was simply a matter of elections and coups. Politicians, of course, have often used science as a tool. They have proven "theories" about racial and ethnic inferiority that have led to holocaust; about health and disease which have led to misery in daily life. Those who would now produce a feminized science may think that they are merely creating a space for affirmative action in our notion of the truth, but the results of such experiments are always more destructive than they can imagine.
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late what we know into the policy options our public officials are debating; and we must do so without appearing to be either partisan or political."

By the end of the 1980s, the means for advancing policies without appearing to be political were well-established: use Council on Philanthropy conferences, publications, and training to change attitudes among key board members at foundations that remained conservative. Or better still, ease them out altogether. Foundation News described this last technique in a fictional article which detailed how a new board member learns ways to pressure senior members to leave so that philanthropic correctness can be introduced into the foundation's programs. The article amounted to advice on how to subvert a foundation's board: "Introduce a discussion of rotating terms...gather an advisory committee...use some of the foundation's administrative funds to hire consultants...bring on younger members...the family to counter-balance the calcification...[Suggest that those] who have been serving for years should move on by moving off."

The changes were subtle at first. A foundation staffer hired here, a trustee eased out there, a more radical project funded here. But in 1991 the years of proselytizing and hiring here, a trustee eased out there, a more radical project moving off."

"Could there be two, three many Pews? Could others among the small number of conservative foundations either left as older board members leave, as bloodlettings occur, and as power-seeking executives encounter board members willing to be dominated?"

Already, a majority of foundation officials — according to a Capital Research Center study — believe that the American private enterprise system is unfair to working people, that families and other basic institutions cause alien- ation, and that a system restructuring of American society is necessary. Already foundations are putting their money where the Council's mouth is: over one billion dollars in leftwing grants have been made during the past five years, with the big winners including the American Civil Liberties Union, the NOW Legal Defense Fund and the Environmental Defense Fund. Already, big leftist philanthropies such as the John D. and Catharine T. MacArthur Foundation, the J. Roderick MacArthur Foundation, the Public Welfare Foun- dation, the New World Foundation and the George Gund Foundation, make over twice as many grants to leftwing organizations as their counterparts on the right make to conservatives. But even this disparity is not enough for the Council: it demands unconditional surrender.

James Joseph seen ten fat years since his elevation to the Council presidency. His staffers are on call to answer questions on topics such as computer systems and foundation investments. They offer tips on management to foundation boards and to donors interested in starting a foundation. The Council's annual survey of salaries helps foundation execu- tives who hope for raises above the $100,000 per year level. It is the best of all possible worlds.

A

their 1992 gathering in Miami Beach, Council on Philanthropy conference attendees sat on the floor of the Fontainebleau Hilton ballroom, put on hats and antique bronze of the Fontainebleau Hilton. Ted Turner, who now has a foundation of his own, complained that "we have 10 million, I don't know, different species, and one species uses up half the resources of the planet." Peter Goldmark, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, com- plained that "a lot of us, a lot of my friends, feel isolated," and the goal now should be government-guaranteed jobs and nationalized health care. Melanie Verveer of People for the American Way argued that any federal de-funding of pornog- raphy was "government censorship" through the purse. Mark Rosenman of the Union Institute complained that any restriction on use of non-profit postal rates for advocacy mailings is a plot "to deny the sector its full capacity to speak forcefully in the public interest." Summing up, Council on Foundations board member Iris Hirschfield declared that many money-givers need the Council to "create vision, grab them, and motivate them."

Over the past two decades the Council on Philanthropy seems to have been successful in its task of grabbing and re-educating, but there's always room for innovation. For much of two days the Council placed 66 conference attendees in a closed room where they received instruction in New Age visualization techniques and then used crayons and construc- tion paper to portray what they had learned concerning the purpose of their lives and dollars. The Dream Catchers initially were led by Peter Russell, who studied with the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi and argues that if humanity were to evolve into a healthy, integrated, social super-organism, this transmutation could signal the maturation and awakening of the global nervous system... Gaia would become a conscious, thinking, perceiving being."

The short-term material remnants after the Dream Catchers' closing session were unpressive: some crumpled- up drawings, an empty box of Carr's Assorted Biscuits for cheese, and one brown crouton. But the stage is now set for the contestants of the 1990s and the 21st century: Environmental pantheism vs. the religious theism that laid the base for American philanthropy. James Joseph has abandoned that vision. He concluded one of his speeches to Council members with the ringing proclamation, "We are the revolution. We are the future." It make look like smooth sailing to Joseph and his brethren, but one of these days these self-aggrandizing liberation philanthropists will find themselves colliding with the people whose destiny they arrogantly try to direct.
CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

the profit motive represent spittle-throwing vitriol large; the evil represented by "the system" can be miraculously thwarted by the profit motive spittin' spitball-write large; the book din's in the ears of young readers from page one.

Two books from Chicago's African-American Press exemplify this new racial "sensitivity." The first is by Jawanza Kunjufu, which begins with a picture show—a black history paperback for elementary school children by a black artist. The second is by Lorraine, children's book editor at Houghton Mifflin, for instance, the list of guidelines he has received from a gay-rights group. As for the danger that children's literature will be taken over by boring "message" books, she contends that good literature will endure no matter what the topic or political slant. This sort of "natural selection" philosophy was common among publishers I interviewed. Judy Wilson, the editor in charge of all eight imprints of children's books at Macmillan, had a more nuanced view of the problems facing a publisher today. Though social changes require that certain issues be addressed, she feels many of these issues are out of place in picture books and should be saved for the 12-and-up books or "problem novels." Books on gay parents, for example, would be inappropriate for the children's literature that is truly empowering to every social problem in the adult world at the age of 5. Authors of "relevant" children's literature seem intent only on prematurely robbing young readers of that loss of innocence which in prior times would come through personal exploration and the collision of a young child with the intractable adult world. What does it say about our society that books for five-year-olds titled What Are Drugs? and You Can Say No to Drugs sit on the shelf next to The Very Hungry Caterpillar?

Publishers and librarians have mixed feelings towards these didactic picture books: some are enthusiastic about the fact that it's now acceptable to educate children as leftists from the cradle is the desire to introduce them to every social problem in the adult world at the age of 5. Authors of "relevant" children's literature seem intent only on prematurely robbing young readers of that loss of innocence which in prior times would come through personal exploration and the collision of a young child with the intractable adult world. What does it say about our society that books for five-year-olds titled What Are Drugs? and You Can Say No to Drugs sit on the shelf next to The Very Hungry Caterpillar?

Twinkle Twinkle Little Star has a new ending:

"If the sky stays pure and clean, We will see your twinkle bright But smoke, exhaust, and acid rain Will cloud your flickering light."

What's next? Will the old lady in the shoe become a rent-control activist? Will Solomon Grundy die of AIDS?

The problem is that these books on homosexuality seem to have been written by social scientists on lithium. Most of these books have plots that can be summed up by a composite title: "Little Johnny Has Two Daddies" and "That's Okay." The problem is that books on homosexuality are almost never creative and imaginatively liberating. They seem to have been written by social scientists on lithium and have a banal adult vision in their ideological baggage. In Lester Newman's Gloria Goes to Gay Pride (Boston: Alyson Wonderland Books), for instance, the child narrator calls her parents Mama Rose and Mama Grace. The book opens with her talking about all the holidays they celebrate, like Valentine's Day and Chanukah. Then she says, "But today is a special holiday. Today is Gay Pride Day, and I get to be in a parade." During the march, many of the dual mamas' friends wave. "But right next to the park, some people aren't singing or clapping. They stand very quietly on the sidewalk next to a sign." It says GAYS GO AWAY. Gloria's dog, the PC Pet of the Year, growls at them, but Mama Rose patiently explains that though love is the best thing in the world, some people think she and Mama Grace shouldn't love each other.

Concern for the homeless is another issue that might conceivably be relevant to children, since the homeless are a fact of life in most cities. But what is the proper attitude to take? That the homeless are like everyone else except temporarily down on their luck? That there are dangerous lunatics mixed in with the homeless population? One of the most popular books on this subject is Leonarra O'Grady, a collection of verse which depicts the homeless child at the end of the rainbow in a mystical encounter with nature. "The dew is her blanket/The clouds are her pillow." The charming pastel colors of the illustrations make it all seem very benign. While it is no doubt true that the homeless are people too, one should probably be wary of thinking of bag ladies as counter-culture fairy godmothers.

Perhaps as depressing as the attempts to train children as leftists from the cradle is the desire to introduce...
Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America by Ellen Chesler (Simon & Schuster) 639pp $27.50

MICHAEL ANTONUCCI

Many once revered figures of the American past have become targets of academic revisionists. Christopher Columbus, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln are among those who have been vilified as racists and architects of genocide by the new historians and reflecting current academic fashions. Operating along a predictable bias, the revisionists, not surprisingly, have overlooked more obvious targets, closer to home.

One of the most revered icons of campus feminists, for example, is Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood, who coined the term “birth control” in 1914. From her first days of political activism to her death in 1966, Sanger was honored, feted and acclaimed by progressives all over the world. She received a medal from the American Woman’s Association along with a citation which read: “She has opened the door of knowledge and given light, freedom and happiness to thousands in the tragic meshes of ignorance. She is opening the world.” Sanger's most recent biographer, Ellen Chesler, states: “Every woman in the world today who takes her sexual and reproductive harmony for granted should be taught by Sanger’s life to never have been born.”

Who are “those who should never have been born”? Sanger was never reticent about listing them: “Modem studies indicate that insanity, epilepsy, criminality, prostitution, pauperism and every defect, are all orginically based. They are organically born, and varied through the generations so that the slim and Intelligent people are the most degenerate classes in every community who are the most productive.”

By the time Sanger became politically active, the birth rate of American women had actually been falling steadily since 1820. As people became richer, they tended to have fewer children (a trend which continues to this day). The rate of American women had actually been falling steadily since 1820. As people became richer, they tended to have fewer children (a trend which continues to this day). The immigrant birth rate, however, was some 70-80% higher than the native birth rate. So, in the early stages of her career, Sanger targeted immigrants, especially the Chinese, as growth in income, demonstrate that all segments of America: What Went Wrong!

John H. Hinderaker and Scott W. Johnson

The most rapidly metabolizing if not the most notable newspaper series of the past year is Donald Barlett and James Steele’s “America: What Went Wrong?” Their subject is the corporate liquidations, i.e., asset sales. Barlett and Steele argue that the decade of the 1980’s was a feast for the rich at the expense of the middle class and an unrelenting story of American decline. Barlett and Steele conjure a phantasmagoria of predictable bogeymen to which they attribute this decline: corporate takeovers and restructurings (criticized for causing job losses), foreign trade criticized for exporting jobs, deregulation criticized for causing job losses and increasing prices, and redistribution of the tax burden from corporations and the wealthy to the middle class.

While Barlett and Steele describe themselves as supplying “detailed information” that their readers can “get nowhere else,” they have produced instead a compendium of contulation.

They argue, for example, that the economy of the 1980’s resulted in “the dismantling of the middle class.” Although their book does not dispute the fact that nearly nineteen million new jobs were created during the Reagan years, the authors insist that jobs growth was centered in the retail trade and services sectors which pay the lowest wages. This point has been repeated so often, that it has rapidly become a cliché. But according to data compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 82% of the increase in employment during the 1980’s was in the higher paying occupations (categorized by the Bureau as technical, precision production and managerial occupations). Only 12% of the increase in employment occurred in the lower paid, low-skilled service occupations. And of course, other equally significant yardsticks, such as growth in income, demonstrate that all segments of America substantially improved their lot during the 1980’s.

Can Barlett and Steele possibly be unaware, for example, that median family income (measured in constant 1988 dollars) rose from $20,792 in 1981 to $32,191 in 1988; reversing a downward trend caused by the stagflation of the Carter years? Their book fails to mention, let alone account for, this fundamental and well-known fact.

Indeed, two recent studies of income dramatically give the lie to Barlett and Steele’s portrait of a vanishing middle class punished by a contracting economy. A Treasury Department study of income distribution between 1979 and 1985 dramatically demonstrates that the explosive income growth of poorer taxpayers during this period as well as the changing identity of “rich and “poor” taxpayers. According to the Treasury Department study, 85% of those taxpayers in the bottom quintile or poorest one-fifth of the sample taxpayers moved up at least one quintile by 1988, while 14.7% actually rose to the top quintile. Only 14.2% of those in the bottom quintile remained there, making statistically more likely that the “poor” taxpayer of 1979 had become “rich” by 1988 than that he had stayed poor, or that the middle quintile, 47.3% had moved to a higher quintile by 1988, while 33% remained in the middle quintile.

A recent Urban Institute study by Mark Condon and Isabel Sawhill demonstrates similarly dramatic income mobility, particularly among the poor, over the period 1976-86.

Instead of coming to terms with such basic economic data, Barlett and Steele assemble a cascade of slanted anecdotes to support their assertions. Without presenting even one account of any ordinary person who improved his lot during the 1980’s, or of any American industry that prospered on the strength of Barlett and Steele’s lamentations, they select such issues as corporate takeovers, i.e., asset sales. Barlett and Steele argue that the business community had been left with no choice but to liquidate in order to reduce the cost of municipalities raising money through bonds. If the tax exemption were removed, municipalities would be forced to pay market interest rates. The returns to investors would be virtually identical, but the increased interest expenses would be borne by taxpayers.

In other instances the authors’ lack of economic literacy leads to conclusions that are almost comic. Thus in one chapter Barlett and Steele criticize corporate restructurings for leading to asset sales that create job losses; in a subsequent chapter they criticize the reformed bankruptcy law of 1978 for facilitating corporate reorganizations rather than forcing corporate liquidations, i.e., asset sales.

Taking the Great Depression as their model, Barlett and Steele posit solutions for America’s alleged decline that are reminiscent of the New Deal: “comprehensive changes in the law, including, but not limited to, improvements in our bankruptcy laws.” This book serves no other purpose, it definitively highlights a central fact of contemporary politics: when people the world over are choosing freedom and rejecting state control, “reformers” in America are promoting an absurdism that has been thoroughly discredited by experience.
THE HUMANITIES IN THE MISSIONARY POSITION

A necdotal horror stories from today's politically correct campus are legion, and the cases are endlessly absurd. But the darker aspect of the vast, Vichy-like capitulation of the academy lies in the cowardice and opportunism revealed. For the most shocking aspect of the transformation of higher education really is that it was not resisted, but welcomed. There's an Us and Them, all right, and We were not so much conquered as sold out. Why?

Camille Paglia speaks of the "old" New Criticism in literature in terms of a vulnerability inherent in it. (This, in an op-ed commentary in the Times Literary Supplement on what she calls, with chilling accuracy, "The Nuremberg School Campus"). This vulnerability came to be exploited by its successor, that bizarre congeries of Continental imports and domestic hybrids — deconstruction, the New Historicism, Critical Legal Studies, feminism, the communalist impulse — currently presiding over the academic curriculum.

Paglia indicts only one aspect of the New Criticism that arose in the two decades prior to the Second World War and against which the new doctrines developed: "The New Critics...". Paglia, a professor of German Philology, produced a generation of academics trained to think of literature as largely detached from historical context," she writes. "This was ideal breeding ground for French theory... a useful defensive strategy for the minds of great power and sincerity, but which (as New Critics) was a more-or-less inevitable result of the subversive decade (of the 1960's)..."

The core difficulty of the New Critical approach (and I use this term as a shorthand for an entire broad style of intellectual activity) is of course the fact that real practicality — useful simplification (always the first step in explaining anything), relevant generality, the ability to describe a planet complex in its own chemistry and physics and artist has constructed over yonder — is not a gift very many critics possess. Better to have command of "ovarian hermeneutics," "valORIZED cliperig imagery" and a spray can or two of anti-philologocentric sensibilities on hand, and one can sound very profound indeed without the embarrassment of revealing the triviality of your insights (incidentally, doesn't hermeneutics always sound like a good name for the latest L.A. rap group?). When, in a famous critical passage on Hamlet, T.S. Eliot could describe the core of his poetic procedure as a search for "an objective correlata..." a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion," at least two generations of intelligent readers could see for themselves (no jargon, no bluff) the intention and the technique behind, say, J. Allen Prufrock's inner reality — how it was brought before us as images, not rhetoric, how that mutilated, endlessly aware innerness was precisely represented by an image of astonishing desolation and self-loathing. / should have been a pair of ragged claws Scuttling across the floors of silent seas.

Eliot, the critic, told us how to read the beautiful part was that the product of this mutinuity could be made to look like it had a high-minded moral dimension: the radical study was revealing at last the hidden implication of the vast, ancient conspiracy of dead white males that is Western culture, and who would not approve of that? As for the ambitious administrator (in psychology, habit, and style so emphatically distinct from the stud), he/she at last had both the quantitative stats which would justify the great expense of the system and the messianic justification for the project — the moral reform of America was suddenly the obligation of its humanities faculties. On the politically correct campus these days the atmosphere is blanched of subtlety and as fraught with reflexive prudery as a summer Bible school. To effect a counter-revolution is the task that lies ahead of us. Or, really, Us.

DOUGLAS FOWLER
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