When Jiri Valenta was fired by the University of Miami this past October after being charged with sexual harassment, the event sent shock waves throughout the community of Soviet Eastern European Studies. A friend of Zbigniew Brzezinski and the longtime Director of the Institute of Soviet East European Studies in the University of Miami's Graduate School of International Studies, Valenta had been an important supporting actor in the drama surrounding the fall of communism. Active in Miami's anti-communist Cuban community, he had used his position as an advisor to Vaclav Havel's government to get the Czechs to stop representing the Castro regime in Washington. He had also established a dialogue with the new Russian government that resulted in Moscow cutting its subsidies to Cuba and withdrawing its troops.

It was inevitable that such a man would make enemies, but when his major accuser in the case turned out to be a woman once active in the Czech communist party who was opposed to Miami's anti-Castro Cubans, the case of Jiri Valenta became more than just another tawdry skirmish in the bleak arena of PC. Lodge, a matter of PC coming in from another erogenous zone policed by campus feminists. More than anything, as one colleague of Valenta's observed, it resembled an episode from a novel co-authored by John Le Carre and David Lodge, a matter of PC coming in from the Cold War.

Energetic, volatile, possessed of an at times overbearing charisma, the 47 year old Valenta is another of the self dramatizing emigres who have made a mark in the West since the advent of the Russian Revolution. Born in German-occupied Czechoslovakia, Valenta participated in the student resistance against the Soviet invasion of Prague in 1968 and eventually managed to escape. With other survivors of the resistance, he went to Switzerland and wound up studying at the University of Bern. Acquiring an impressive academic resume, he won a fellowship to the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University.

While working on his Ph.D., Valenta became a fellow at the Brookings Institute. In 1976 he was appointed Coordinator of Eastern European Studies for the U.S. Navy Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. Galvanized by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which he saw as a pivotal moment in the imperial aspirations that had overtaken the USSR in the wake of America's loss in Vietnam, he began publishing articles and wrote and edited books on the threat facing the West. It was a body of work that resonated harmoniously with the new Reagan administration's foreign policy. Valenta's work was recognized by Jeane Kirkpatrick, who recommended him for the post of Director of the University of Miami's prestigious Graduate School of International Studies. He landed there in 1985 as Director of the Institute of Soviet Eastern European Studies.

The next few years would be marked by academic achievement. Valenta would write nine books and countless articles on Czech and Soviet affairs. In 1984 he was invited to join the Council on Foreign Relations. The Washingtonian magazine named him one of the five most consulted Sovietologists outside of Washington in the country.

Yet he was one of those emigre figures who find it impossible to separate narrow group of commission insiders more than it does the views of the faculty at the institutions the commission controls.

The WASC's Accrediting Commission decided several years ago, as its chair Donald R. Gerth said in April, "that general education, diversity, and assessment were special topics that would pervade each accreditation process." The commission's decision to emphasize diversity is not only an intrusive political move, but also a preemption of the member institutions' right to choose their own priorities. WASC has gotten away with this high handedness only because it, like other regional accredi-
Today I am in receipt of your paper entitled "Heterodoxy." I have no idea where you obtained my name and address, but please see to it that this filthy publication is never sent to me again. "Smut" would be too gentle a name for this and I a, to say the least, embarrassed for such a paper to be delivered to my address.

Mildred Thompson
(Mrs. W. O. Thompson)
Vickburg, MS

Except for an occasional lapse of taste, *Heterodoxy* is generally well done and interesting. Yet I read less of it each issue. Its focus is on so narrow a range that it provides little other than pyramiding of already sufficient evidence. Having read Collier and Horowitz's other work, I wonder if they aren't wasting their talents on so limited a canvas.

Mark Taifer
Long Beach, CA

Stop sending me *Heterodoxy*. Is mailing unwanted copies the only way you can get rid of them? If you don't stop sending me your garbage, you will be reported for harassment.

Unsigned
Seattle, WA

"When Sensitivity Training is a Good Thing" is a delightful piece. I only hope that we can send semi-Nazis off to First Amendment boot camp for re-education in democracy.

G. Hall
Oak Park, IL

The ideas wildskey expresses so well in "Aaron Wildavsky in Memoriam!" about the erosion of standards of academic excellence in our universities are important and deserve to be remembered. They are an excellent example of the reasons I don't fund art through a tax code and people like your-...
HETERODYN

ROLLING BACK THE TIDE: At Chico State University in Chico, California, History Professor Joseph Conlin has been given back his free speech rights which were knocked down by a band of Native American students. Conlin had been in hot water last spring when he wrote a letter to the local newspaper arguing that Native American student demands for Indian teachers were unrealistic because of the lack of qualified candidates and that Indian students ought to be on campus "to get the best education...not have their sensibilities stroked and grades of 'A' doled out on the basis of their race or correct politics." He also took a swipe at the school's affirmative action hiring procedures by saying that faculty hired under such a process must do little more than "show evidence of a majority of vital life signs." This was the beginning of a major political brouhaha on this campus, previously best known for parties that erupted into street violence. Students in the American Indian Club rallied support from students and Indian leaders nationwide. Chico State administrators informed Conlin that he had violated the school's racial harassment policy, which calls for expulsion of faculty or students who create "an atmosphere of intimidation and hostility." Conlin hung tough, threatening to sue for his free speech rights and saying that the policy was "McCarthyism all over again." Early in December, prodded by its worried attorneys, Chico State Universities dropped the racial harassment policy.

ROLLING BACK THE TIDE PART II: At Stanford a group of students, teachers and alumni who disagree with the University's capitulation to academic radicals is considering backing a candidate to run for the Stanford Board of Trustees. They call their group The Winds of Freedom, and they want to see Stanford return to the core curriculum in Western Civilization which jettisoned several years ago, place less emphasis on ethnic and feminist studies, and recommit itself to academic excellence. "What is needed at Stanford," says one disgruntled student, "is not merely the winds of freedom, but a hurricane or a typhoon!"

ANOTHER TAXING SITUATION IN MINNESOTA: In early September, as students were returning to the University of Minnesota, college Republicans included in their repertoire at the orientation fair a mock 1040 income tax form ("The Clinton Extended Tax Form"). Under filing status were the following choices: single; married heterosexual filing jointly; married homosexual filing separate return; married homosexual filing joint return; married Inter-species filing jointly; feminist. University vice president Marvalene Hughes immediately ordered the students to remove the material because it was offensive to women and gays and lesbians. The Young Republicans claimed that their views were being censored, that they were trying to take aim at the "propaganda" found elsewhere during orientation, and that they were being unfairly singled out for discipline. The furor raged for days before Minnesota President Nils Hasselmo finally issued a statement saying that the administration would not insist on reviewing materials to be handed out at orientation: "I must and will protect freedom of speech as a fundamental right under rules of academic freedom and under our Constitution." The episode has left scars on the Minnesota campus. One faculty member says, "If the administrator who suppressed these materials had been a white male instead of a black female he would be gone by now."

LUNA BEACH By Carl Moore

It was a terrific piece of performance art. Hey. Hey. You're now a symbol of women's race and I'm with you all the way. Dear. Luna: You're welcome. Bye. Bobbi T.

...and yes, as a token of my support, I'll order the first set of your inaugural line of Condoms, LORENA. LORENA ... LORENA, WIND? Bobbi T.

host to The Black Family Reunion, an outdoor festival celebrating black American culture. The weekend was a huge success with over 100,000 people in attendance. Ed Murphy, the president of the African American Business Association, however, had one major complaint: 4 out of the 36 food vendors were Asian. Though the food served was consistent with the festival's fare of fried fish and barbecue, Murphy complained of the use of foreign cooking techniques and "Asian spices." According to Murphy, "It sends mixed signals to call it an African-American family reunion and have others serving our food."

BETWEEN A ROCK AND A HARD PLACE: Maya Angelou, a Wake Forest professor and the poet-in-residence for Bill Clinton's 1993 inauguration, effectively stumped her way into the spotlight with her much acclaimed poem "On the Pulse of the Morning" and the appearance at the Clinton inaugural. Since her political debut in Washington, she has been in high demand, bouncing from talk-show to talk-show and even helping to script a film starring Janet Jackson. An article that appeared in the New Republic by Daryl Strawberry and other home-grown stars, a new celebrity strolled upon the scene. Henry Keith Watson, one of the black youths recently acquitted for the beating of truck driver Reginal Denny, was mobbed by enthusiastic fans in search of autographs, giving him high-fives and blowing him kisses.

MODERN DAY ROBIN HOOD: At a recent Franky, Beverly and Maze concert at the Universal Amphitheater in Los Angeles attended by Daryl Strawberry and other home-grown stars, a new celebrity strolled upon the scene. Henry Keith Watson, one of the black youths recently acquitted for the beating of truck driver Reginal Denny, was mobbed and sending mixed signals to call it an African-American family reunion and have others serving our food."

AND NOW, THE BUSINESS OF THE STUDENT LEADERS PC...Distribution of offensive right-wing student newspapers...Right-wing control of student government...and the criticism of progressive professors."

MONEY WELL SPENT: The results of a U.S. Department of Education study that spanned 3 years and involved 58,000 students on 80 different university campuses are in. 85% of all college students drink. How much money did this one cost?
THE SECOND THOUGHTS
OF WARREN FARRELL:
The Myth of Male Supremacy

Myth: Wars were caused by men and are simply an exercise of male aggression. Another Perspective
To assign a boy that idea is preparing for death prior to the age of consent, and then to blame men for causing the wars we assign them to fight, is a case of projection.

Wars might be assigned by men, but they are not caused by them. Wars are caused by the need to survive. The historical record shows that when societies had adequate food, adequate water and no fear of attack, women did not need men to protect them by killing food or killing enemies and therefore women did not marry killers. In society, killers do make men and men make killers. When the conditions obtained among the Minoans, Tahitians or the central Malaysian Semai, for instance, the men were Senate. However, outside groups eventually discovered these rich and fertile lands and attempted to conquer them so that they could feed their women and children. The need for adequate food and water forced societies without resources to train their women to act as assassins or die, to lead societies with resources to defend their resources or die.

Aren't empires, though, the quintessential example of male greed and power? Men were to countries what insurance policies are to individuals: a source of security. For example, as European countries saw themselves as vulnerable to attack, empires became a buffer zone—a good offense became the best defense. Similarly: when famine struck, food could be obtained from the empire more easily than from an enemy.

But why did men invade countries that were not a threat to them and go to war against groups like the American Indians who were never a threat to the European? Where a group felt they were oppressed, the country feel oppressed, it frequently fled, another territory and killed those gentler people who dared resist. The people who did the killing—and the people who were killed—were men, but the people who benefited were men and women.

The series of wars that eventually led to the formation of the United States are just one example of men being less important than prosperity, property, women who lived on the property that was often their husband's grave.

Put it another way: major powers have become major via the deaths of young men. Because young males died and large numbers of killing—and the people who were killed—were men, but others lived on, empires can also be seen as the male contribution to the survival of various societies and nations.

Myth: Women are nature's civilized beings. Another Perspective
It is often said that women are a civilizing balance to the innately warlike male. It could be said that by taking care of the business of killing, men civilized them.

When survival was the issue, the killing done by men protected women. But the men who protected women were to countries what insurance policies are to individuals: a source of security. For example, as European countries saw themselves as vulnerable to attack, empires became a buffer zone—a good offense became the best defense. Similarly: when famine struck, food could be obtained from the empire more easily than from an enemy.

But why did men invade countries that were not a threat to them and go to war against groups like the American Indians who were never a threat to the European? Where a group felt they were oppressed, the country feel oppressed, it frequently fled, another territory and killed those gentler people who dared resist. The people who did the killing—and the people who were killed—were men, but the people who benefited were men and women.

The series of wars that eventually led to the formation of the United States are just one example of men being less important than prosperity, property, women who lived on the property that was often their husband's grave.

Put it another way: major powers have become major via the deaths of young men. Because young males died and large numbers of killing—and the people who were killed—were men, but others lived on, empires can also be seen as the male contribution to the survival of various societies and nations.

Myth: Women are nature's civilized beings. Another Perspective
It is often said that women are a civilizing balance to the innately warlike male. It could be said that by taking care of the business of killing, men civilized them.

When survival was the issue, the killing done by men protected women. But the men who protected women were to countries what insurance policies are to individuals: a source of security. For example, as European countries saw themselves as vulnerable to attack, empires became a buffer zone—a good offense became the best defense. Similarly: when famine struck, food could be obtained from the empire more easily than from an enemy.

But why did men invade countries that were not a threat to them and go to war against groups like the American Indians who were never a threat to the European? Where a group felt they were oppressed, the country feel oppressed, it frequently fled, another territory and killed those gentler people who dared resist. The people who did the killing—and the people who were killed—were men, but the people who benefited were men and women.

The series of wars that eventually led to the formation of the United States are just one example of men being less important than prosperity, property, women who lived on the property that was often their husband's grave.

Put it another way: major powers have become major via the deaths of young men. Because young males died and large numbers of killing—and the people who were killed—were men, but others lived on, empires can also be seen as the male contribution to the survival of various societies and nations.
men work one. But this is misleading. Women do work more
hours inside the home, but men work more hours outside
the home. And the average man also commutes farther, and
spends more time doing yard work, repairs, painting. What
happens when all of these are combined? The University of
Michigan's study (reported in the Journal of Economic
Literature in 1991) found the average man worked 61 hours
per week, the average woman 56.

Who has the options? Today, when the successful
single woman meets the successful single man, they appear
to be equals. But should they marry and consider children,
she almost invariably considers three options:

Option #1: Work full-time

Option #2: Mother full-time

Option #3: Some combination of 1 and 2

He considers three slightly different options:

Option #1: Work full-time Option #2: Work
full-time Option #3: Work full-time

We have entered the Era of the Multi-Option Woman
and No-Option Man. The obligation to work is not power;
the option to work is power. Women who married successful
men were the first group in the world to be free from the
preoccupation with survival—the first group to have not
just obligations, but also to have options: the first group to
have real power.

It would be hard to find a single example in history
in which a group that cast more than 50% of the vote got
away with calling itself a powerless victim. If power resides
in the person who holds the office, it is present even more
in the one who chooses the person who holds office. Blacks,
Irish, and Jews never had more than 50% of the
American vote.

Myth: Male hierarchies are proof of the male preoccupation
with power. Another perspective
Hierarchies can also be seen as a system developed
by men to give each other incentives to better serve their
families—often at significant cost to themselves. For
example, a lieutenant in the Army has served longer,
sacrificed more and usually lived his life more than a private.
Calling himself Lieutenant is his reward—or his bribe—
for serving longer and risking more.

The Lieutenant's second reward—increased
money—often went to his family (or, if he was a single
man, made him more eligible to attract a woman so that his
earnings would soon go to feeding the family they would
ultimately form.)

Increased appreciation in terms of prestige and money
were incentives to risk his life. In wartime, they were, in
essence, bribes to die.

Our era tends to see the hero as an egotist. Actually he
is a servant of others. (The very word hero comes from the
Latin "ser-ow," from which comes our word servant, as well
as slave and protector.) A hero was basically a slave whose
purpose was to serve and protect.

Hierarchies were part of a system of incentives offered
to men to serve and protect women, children and the commu-
nity.

Myth: Men are interested in power; women are interested in love.
Another Perspective
A man learns he will not earn love until he earns money
(or has the potential for doing so). His life experience teaches him
that a loving, caring, tender man reading AP in the
unemployment line will not find a lot of women competing
to love him. Men are interested in love. They focus on
success and power, though, because they know that these
elements of life are a prerequisite for love.

The woman knows that whenever she may fall in the
socioeconomic spectrum, even if she is unemployed and
perhaps unemployable, a man will marry her despite these
defects if she has the qualities he desires. To the degree that
women are socialized to not make the sacrifices it takes to
support themselves, they will tend to marry for income. To
the degree men are socialized not to be able to be vulnerable
with other men, they will tend to marry women with whom
they are not likely to fall out of love.

Myth: Men are not attracted to successful women
Another Perspective
When asked if they were to meet two equally attractive
women who were both equally in love with them but
one of the women was more successful than the other, a
vast majority of men saw they would be more interested in
the more successful of the two women.

Most women think such a response is mendacious
because they believe men are threatened by successful
women. In fact, men are both attracted to and threatened
by successful women. Why? Because even successful women
marry up. Therefore the more successful a woman is, the
more likely a man is to be rejected. It is the fear that
the successful woman will not want him that makes him feel
threatened, not the success per se.

Myth: Men are interested in power; women are interested in
heterosexuality. Another perspective
When asked if they were to meet two equally attractive
women who would be equally in love with them but
one of the women was more successful than the other, a
vast majority of men saw they would be more interested in
the more successful of the two women.

Most women think such a response is mendacious
because they believe men are threatened by successful
women. In fact, men are both attracted to and threatened
by successful women. Why? Because even successful women
marry up. Therefore the more successful a woman is, the
more likely a man is to be rejected. It is the fear that
the successful woman will not want him that makes him feel
threatened, not the success per se.

Sub myth #1—Sexism is the reason that more studies have
been done on breast cancer than on male cancer. Another perspective
In 1920 women in the United States lived one year
longer than men. Today women live seven years longer.

Men die earlier of all 15 major causes of death, yet, there
is no governmental agency focusing on health which
spends as much on men's health as on women's health.

We often hear that the National Institute of Health
spends only 10% of its budget on women's health. True.
But what we are not told is that only 5% is spent on health
issues that are specifically male. (This is the analysis of the
NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health.) The
remainder is spent on basic research that benefits equally
both sexes.

Sub myth #2—If diseases were killing men as fast as breast
cancer is killing women, men would make sure that there
was funding available to solve the problem.

In fact, while a woman is 14% more likely to die
from breast cancer than a man is from prostate cancer,
funding for breast cancer research is 600% greater than
funding for prostate cancer research. Here, in the case of the
two leading gender-specific cancers, the death-to-funding
ratio is 47 to 1 in women's favor.

Sub myth #3—Nearly all of women's health prob-
lems such as ovarian cancer and menopause have been
neglected in terms of research and treatment.

In fact, there has been a lack of research for these and
other aspects of women's health. But it is being remedied
by the new Office of Research on Women's Health within
the National Institute of Health. There is also a need in
research in the following areas of health predominantly
affecting men that is not being adequately remedied by
anyone, least of all by a Office of Research on Men's
Health, which in fact does not exist:

male birth control
post-traumatic stress syndrome
circumcision as a trauma-producing experience
dyslexia
tests of reproductivity
homelessness
steroid abuse
colorblindness
testicular cancer
prostate cancer

crime rate over 30
sexual identity
homelessness
non-specific urethritis

Myth: The women's movement should rightly be com-
pared to the civil rights movement because women have
been second-class citizens and slaves. Another perspective
In the early years of the women's movement, an
article in Psychology Today called "Women as Nigger"
quickly led to feminist activists (myself included)
making parallels between the oppression of women
and blacks. The parallel allowed not only the hard-
earned rights of the Civil Rights movement but also the
moral primacy of that movement to be applied to
women as well. The parallels themselves had more
than a germ a truth. But what none of us realized was
how each sex was the other's slave in different ways
and therefore neither sex was the other's nigger (a term
which implies a one-sided oppressiveness). Actually,
the civil rights analogy fits the male experience as
much as it does the female experience.

Blacks were forced, via slavery, to risk their lives in
cotton fields so that whites might benefit economically.
As a result of this arrangement, blacks died prematurely.
Men have been forced, via the draft, to risk their lives on
battlefields so that everyone else might benefit economi-
cally while men died prematurely. Both slaves and men
died to make the world safe for freedom—someone else's.

Blacks were forced, via slavery, into society's most-
hazardous jobs; men, forced, via socialization, into society's
most hazardous jobs. Both slaves and men contrib-
tuated almost 100% of the death professions. Men still do.

Blacks are more likely than whites to be homeless; men are more likely than whites to be in prison; men are almost 20
times as likely as women to be in prison. Blacks die earlier
than whites; men die earlier than women. Blacks are less
likely than whites to attend college or to graduate from
college. Men are less likely than women to attend college (46%
v. 57%) and less like to graduate (45% v. 55%).

Blacks who are heads of households have a net worth
much lower than heads of households who are white; men
who are heads of households have a net worth much lower
than heads of households who are women. No oppressed
group has ever had a net worth higher than the oppressor.

Women are the only oppressed group to share the
advantages of the civil rights movement. We have
demanded almost 100% of the death professions. Men still do.

Women who are heads of households have a net worth
much lower than heads of households who are white; men
who are heads of households have a net worth much lower
than heads of households who are women. No oppressed
group has ever had a net worth higher than the oppressor.

Women are the only oppressed group to share the
advantages of the civil rights movement. We have
demanded almost 100% of the death professions. Men still do.

Women who are heads of households have a net worth
much lower than heads of households who are white; men
who are heads of households have a net worth much lower
than heads of households who are women. No oppressed
group has ever had a net worth higher than the oppressor.

Women are the only oppressed group to share the
advantages of the civil rights movement. We have
demanded almost 100% of the death professions. Men still do.

Women who are heads of households have a net worth
much lower than heads of households who are white; men
who are heads of households have a net worth much lower
than heads of households who are women. No oppressed
group has ever had a net worth higher than the oppressor.

Women are the only oppressed group to share the
advantages of the civil rights movement. We have
demanded almost 100% of the death professions. Men still do.

Women who are heads of households have a net worth
much lower than heads of households who are white; men
who are heads of households have a net worth much lower
than heads of households who are women. No oppressed
group has ever had a net worth higher than the oppressor.

Women are the only oppressed group to share the
advantages of the civil rights movement. We have
demanded almost 100% of the death professions. Men still do.
cold wind was blowing off the Bay, gusting every now and then. It was past midnight, raw and damp. I walked across the Embarcadero and up to the top of the grassy knoll on the other side of the street. I squatted with my back against a PG&E power station block—it was the sort of thing used to house transformer cables. I could feel something humming through my back. I could see the pier and the gray hulk of the Marquis de Camilla and the massive concrete supports of the bridge, graceful curving lights high in the sky above them.

The clock on the ferry building struck one o’clock. The fog horns sounded mournfully, first the little one, then the big one, then the monster out by the Golden Gate. At a little past one o’clock, an old yellow school bus put its way slowly down the Embarcadero, passed Pier 96, and stopped a quarter of a mile farther down. I could hear the gable of voices carrying indistinctly over the night air; I couldn’t make out the words.

Half a dozen men or so, looking like somebodies, had materialized on the upper deck of the Marquis de Camilla. Someone said something sharp in what sounded like Chinese, the open tones sounding like gongs, and then the gangway began clattering down.

I waited there, squatting again, for another quarter of an hour.

Then I heard the sound of a steel door or bulkhead being opened. A group of men began filing down the gangway. They were dressed in pea coats and had dark woolen berets pulled over their heads. They were hustling. As soon as they reached the pier, they made for the school bus at a sprint.

No one said a word.

At a little past two, the gangway was raised. The old school bus coughed, swayed, twirled, and then made off slowly down the Embarcadero. I got up and caught a cab that had been idling by the corner.

“You want to follow that school bus for awhile,” I said. The driver folded the copy of The Chronicle and was after three o’clock.

“I have the driver pull over and turn out his lights. The school bus rattled down the Embarcadero, turned on the corner of Pacific and Grant. It was the largest and fanciest restaurant in Chinatown. The place was dark; it was the sort of looking going away; it was the sort of thing used to house transformer cables. I could feel something humming through my back. I could see the pier and the gray hulk of the Marquis de Camilla and the massive concrete supports of the bridge, graceful curving lights high in the sky above them.

The clock on the ferry building struck one o’clock. The fog horns sounded mournfully, first the little one, then the big one, then the monster out by the Golden Gate. At a little past one o’clock, an old yellow school bus put its way slowly down the Embarcadero, passed Pier 96, and stopped a quarter of a mile farther down. I could hear the gable of voices carrying indistinctly over the night air; I couldn’t make out the words.

Half a dozen men or so, looking like somebodies, had materialized on the upper deck of the Marquis de Camilla. Someone said something sharp in what sounded like Chinese, the open tones sounding like gongs, and then the gangway began clattering down.

I waited there, squatting again, for another quarter of an hour.

Then I heard the sound of a steel door or bulkhead being opened. A group of men began filing down the gangway. They were dressed in pea coats and had dark woolen berets pulled over their heads. They were hustling. As soon as they reached the pier, they made for the school bus at a sprint.

No one said a word.

At a little past two, the gangway was raised. The old school bus coughed, swayed, twirled, and then made off slowly down the Embarcadero. I got up and caught a cab that had been idling by the corner.

“You want to follow that school bus for awhile.”

The driver folded the copy of The Chronicle and was after three o’clock.

“I have the driver pull over and turn out his lights. The school bus rattled down the Embarcadero, turned on the corner of Pacific and Grant. It was the largest and fanciest restaurant in Chinatown. The place was dark; it was the sort of looking going away; it was the sort of thing used to house transformer cables. I could feel something humming through my back. I could see the pier and the gray hulk of the Marquis de Camilla and the massive concrete supports of the bridge, graceful curving lights high in the sky above them.

The clock on the ferry building struck one o’clock. The fog horns sounded mournfully, first the little one, then the big one, then the monster out by the Golden Gate. At a little past one o’clock, an old yellow school bus put its way slowly down the Embarcadero, passed Pier 96, and stopped a quarter of a mile farther down. I could hear the gable of voices carrying indistinctly over the night air; I couldn’t make out the words.

Half a dozen men or so, looking like somebodies, had materialized on the upper deck of the Marquis de Camilla. Someone said something sharp in what sounded like Chinese, the open tones sounding like gongs, and then the gangway began clattering down.

I waited there, squatting again, for another quarter of an hour.

Then I heard the sound of a steel door or bulkhead being opened. A group of men began filing down the gangway. They were dressed in pea coats and had dark woolen berets pulled over their heads. They were hustling. As soon as they reached the pier, they made for the school bus at a sprint.

No one said a word.

At a little past two, the gangway was raised. The old school bus coughed, swayed, twirled, and then made off slowly down the Embarcadero. I got up and caught a cab that had been idling by the corner.

“You want to follow that school bus for awhile.”

The driver folded the copy of The Chronicle and was after three o’clock.
dent. "God, some of the women on this campus soon bite it off as look at you."

The Dean and Mole Axhiblack chuckled broadly.

"Is there a multicultural angle on this, Mole? I want to know where it's coming from."

Montague was a white male, said Axhiblack dubiously.

"There you go," said the President happily.

"Trouble is," said the Dean, "it's going to look sexist."

The President turned to me. "How can it be sexist, Asherman. You're telling me Montague was busy fisting ten guys when he died?"

"Ten guys?"

"I see what you mean," said the President. Then he said: "I want to be deniable on this Mole."

"I understand, Sir."

The President looked at him over his gold aviator glasses.

What do they want?" he said abruptly.

"They want half a million dollars," said the Dean. "Give it to them," said the President. "Take it out of my discretionary account. Just keep me deniable on it."

Later that day, the Dean explained the system he had for paying off whoever needed to be paid off. Deep lines of aggravation and worry had formed in his face. We were in his office and it didn't seem much fun being a Dean.

Money comes out of the President's discretionary account, Asherfeld," he said. "Means the drops got to be untraceable. You understand what I'm saying?"

You're saying the drops got to be untraceable.

"Right," said the Dean. Very solemnly he pushed an envelope toward me. "Five checks in here; one hundred thousand apiece. They're made out to cash. You take them, set up five accounts at the B of A. That's so there's one whole layer between where the money is going and the university. Then what you've got to make fifty ten thousand dollar drops in these accounts."

The Dean pushed a piece of paper toward me with a list of account numbers.

"It's a hell of a lot of work, but this way—"

I cut the Dean off. "But this way the IRS doesn't have to be notified of any deposits."

"Right," said the Dean. "I'll take at least three business days for the checks to clear.

"No choice," said the Dean. "I suppose not," I said; I pointed to the account numbers. "Where'd these come from?"

"The tape," said the Dean. I took the checks and the paper with the account numbers and said: "Me, I'd want the money in cash."

"Why's that, Asherfeld?"

"I'm sentimental that way."

The little banquet room on the second floor had just enough room for a large elegantly appointed table surrounded by a set of eight high-backed red chairs. The exquisite child who had greeted me at the reception counter flowed into the room and stood by Jimmy Joy. Engineenjoy, said Jimmy Joy proudly, inclining his head in one of those culturally curious gestures immigrants make from time to time.

"Nancy Sinatra Joy," I asked.

"Everyone in my family, they name after Frank," said Jimmy Joy, "he the inspiration of my happiness."

"I can see that. You have a lovely daughter."


The bamboo curtain parted and Montague's accountant Wah Gee slipped into the room; he nodded to me and nodded deferentially to Jimmy Joy. He was accompanied by a heavy set Chinese man of about thirty who carried himself in that relaxed way that indicated that he was native born.


"How you don't?" said Frank Sinatra Jr. Joy, I said I was doing fine; we all sat down at the table again.

"I arrange dinner," said Jimmy Joy.

"You're in for a treat, my Dad arranges dinner," said Frank Sinatra Jr. Joy.

As if on cue, a diminutive waiter slid into the banquet room and removed our covering plates; almost immediately he was followed by another waiter, serving the first course.

We ate in absolute silence for the next hour or so; course after course of Cantonese dishes. Frank Sinatra Jr. Joy was right. The meal was extraordinary.

It was not until the last dish had been cleared and the tablecloth changed, that Jimmy Joy leaned back, cigarette in hand, and looked discreetly at me over the half-space...

This scene could be described as countless incidents on college campuses each week. At Indiana's Valparaiso University, however, a drama fitting these contours took on a wholly unexpected ending. When John and Jane Doe, as the two principals in this brief story, are now known, engaged in their late-night amours, they probably had little idea that they would find themselves in a growing controversy where, after hastily-scheduled on-campus trial in which the defense was not permitted to call witnesses nor question his accuser, John Doe would be suspended on the charge of rape and wind up suing the university for $12 million.

But there was no happy ending to the tryst. After a few preliminaries, the couple left her room at the Phi Beta Chi sorority house, where, after talking of many things, the subject turned inevitably to sex. Although both of them had significant others back home, the woman apparently confided in him that she wouldn't mind having sex with someone else. They kissed briefly, and John Doe left.

The first week of classes at Valparaiso brought with it the usual "Welcome Back" parties. Among them were two parties at the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity house on August 27 and 28. Among these present at the parties were the two people destined to gain a certain immortality as the University's most famous John and Jane Doe, two juniors who were gearing up for their third year of college.

Following the weekend parties, the woman called the man and asked him out to dinner on Tuesday. He accepted, and they went out. According to later testimony, after dinner they returned to her room at the Phi Beta Chi sorority house, where, after talking of many things, the subject turned inevitably to sex. Although both of them had significant others back home, the woman apparently confided in him that she wouldn't mind having sex with someone else. They kissed briefly, and John Doe left.

The next day the female student, along with some of her friends, went to John Doe's fraternity house late in the evening. After playing drinking games with the fraternity members and guests, John and Jane headed toward his room, stopping on the stairway along the way, and in full view of all those present, conducted intimate sexual touching. After entering his room, they had sex twice.

On the day of the hearing, Bushemi faxed a list of eight witnesses to Hersemann, in accordance with the university's published policy that witnesses be made known "ahead of time." The eight listed witnesses included the accused student, his accuser, and three additional witnesses. At the hearing, Hersemann refused to allow the accused to call any of his witnesses, claiming that the policy regarding witnesses states that the names of the witnesses shall be made known "in advance" and he had not been given the names soon enough. (Bushemi notes that one of the reasons that the witnesses were not made known sooner was that he had only two business days to prepare the entire defense.)

The hearing went on without the witnesses. Among those who testified were members of the Student Coalition Against Rape (SCAR), who spoke on behalf of the alleged victim. This organization (which Bushemi feels was talked Jane Doe into filing her charges) was formed on the campus of Valparaiso University last year and has been active in leading the battle against rape and sexual assault. SCAR was the primary sponsor, advocating the university's participation in the nationwide "Take Back the Night" program last year. It was through encouragement of SCAR that the university adopted in new sexual assault policy over the summer.

According to Bushemi, despite written guarantees in the VU handbook relating to the hearing, Hersemann did not permit the accused student to be present during all times of the hearing, nor did he permit the accused student's attorney to be present at all times. (Apparently, during at least one break in the hearing, Hersemann and VU President Alan F. Harre reportedly spoke with the accuser about the facts and issues that were to be decided in the hearing in a conversation that took place outside of the presence and hearing of the accused student, his attorney, and the panel.)

When the accuser took the stand to testify against the John Doe, he was not permitted to confront and cross-examine her. She was not present for his testimony, although she heard it on tape later on and said, "I felt like he betrayed my trust again."

When it was all said and done, the panel heard the testimony of the accuser, the accused, and three witnesses called by the accuser. The disciplinary panel found that the male student had committed rape, and he was suspended for the duration of the time that the woman was enrolled at Valparaiso University.


This situation arose at just the right time to put Valparaiso University's newly-adopted sexual assault policy into effect. During the past summer Valparaiso had instituted a new policy for dealing with reported sexual assaults. The policy permits the alleged victim of a sexual assault to choose to have the matter dealt with exclusively within the confines of the University. If the alleged assailant agrees to this process, Valparaiso becomes the last and highest court in determining whether a rape occurred and if so, what should happen to the rapist. Should the accused student agree to this process, the alleged rape will not be reported to city or county law enforcement officials, despite the fact that rape is a felony in the state of Indiana.

The procedure provides for certain safeguards in the adjudication process, including the right of both parties to call witnesses on their behalf, the right not to have prior sexual experiences brought forth during the hearing, and the right to have whenever they want present during the hearing. In the case at hand, when the woman elected to have the University deal with her complaint, she set the stage for the first test of the new policy.

On Friday, September 10 John Doe received written notification from Dr. Daryll D. Hersemann, Vice President of Student Affairs, charging that he had violated the rules against physical abuse, including sexual assault, and the threat thereof. This written notification was the first indication the student had that charges had been brought against him. It advised him that a hearing would take place four days later (less than two working days), and that this hearing would determine what, if any, punishment would be afforded him. The minimum punishment for these charges is suspension from the University for the duration of the accuser's enrollment.

The following Monday, John Bushemi, attorney for the accused student, notified Hersemann that additional time was needed to prepare for the hearing, since it would be impossible for a fair hearing to take place without additional investigation and an opportunity to gather witnesses. Bushemi asked for one week's continuance. Shortly before the close of business, Hersemann notified Bushemi that he would not agree to any continuance of the hearing and that it would go on, as scheduled, the next afternoon. Bushemi then consulted with the University's attorney and was finally allowed a continuance of one day.

Bushemi and his associates spent the entire evening and early morning, as well as several more hours during the day of the hearing, conducting their investigation, interviewing witnesses, and working with the accused student to assemble evidence.

On the day of the hearing, Bushemi faxed a list of eight witnesses to Hersemann, in accordance with the university's published policy that witnesses be made known "ahead of time." The eight listed witnesses included the accused student, his accuser, a witness who was also called by the accuser, and five additional witnesses. At the hearing, Hersemann refused to allow the accused to call any of his witnesses, claiming that the policy regarding witnesses states that the names of the witnesses shall be made known "in advance" and he had not been given the names soon enough. (Bushemi notes that one of the reasons that the witnesses were not made known sooner was that he had only two business days to prepare the entire defense.)

The hearing went on without the witnesses. Among those who testified were members of the Student Coalition Against Rape (SCAR), who spoke on behalf of the alleged victim. This organization (which Bushemi feels was talked Jane Doe into filing her charges) was formed on the campus of Valparaiso University last year and has been active in leading the battle against rape and sexual assault. SCAR was the primary sponsor, advocating the university's participation in the nationwide "Take Back the Night" program last year. It was through encouragement of SCAR that the university adopted in new sexual assault policy over the summer.

According to Bushemi, despite written guarantees in the VU handbook relating to the hearing, Hersemann did not permit the accused student to be present during all times of the hearing, nor did he permit the accused student's attorney to be present at all times. (Apparently, during at least one break in the hearing, Hersemann and VU President Alan F. Harre reportedly spoke with the accuser about the facts and issues that were to be decided in the hearing in a conversation that took place outside of the presence and hearing of the accused student, his attorney, and the panel.)

When the accuser took the stand to testify against the John Doe, he was not permitted to confront and cross-examine her. She was not present for his testimony, although she heard it on tape later on and said, "I felt like he betrayed my trust again."

When it was all said and done, the panel heard the testimony of the accuser, the accused, and three witnesses called by the accuser. The disciplinary panel found that the male student had committed rape, and he was suspended for the duration of the time that the woman was enrolled at Valparaiso University.

No sooner was the decision handed down by the disciplinary panel than an appeal was filed with VU President Alan Harre. When the appeal was denied, Bushemi filed suit on behalf of the suspended student and his parents against the University for $12 million.

In the midst of the fallout from the revelations surrounding the lawsuit, many in and out of the university community have been left with some serious questions regarding the university's policy and its means of implementation. One of the most serious questions is why a potentially criminal act is being shielded from state and local authorities. Although there is no general legal obligation of a private individual or group to report the commission of a crime, some have questioned the wisdom of finding a student guilty of rape and simply turning him loose to possibly commit the crime elsewhere.
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Still others have questioned what business the university has in deciding this matter at all. If he [the suspended student] is guilty, he should be behind bars; if he’s innocent, he should be in class. Either way, the University shouldn’t be the one making that decision,” said Dale Stache, a third-year student of Valparaiso University. “What has this solved?” asked Stache. “If this student is a danger to the community, then by simply suspending him from the university, they are harming him free to commit the crime again. If he’s not a danger to society, then why has he been kicked out?”

Stache is not the only one voicing such concern. In a letter sent to The Torch, the undergraduate student newspaper of Valparaiso University, nearly twenty law students expressed concern over the university’s handling of the situation, asking questions such as whether the campus system has the resources, equipment and expertise to conduct a proper and thorough criminal investigation.

While others have attacked the disciplinary panel’s decision as unjust—either toward the accused or the accuser—most of the outcry from on and off campus has dealt with the policy of the university deciding for itself the serious matter of rape.

"The result of the hearing,” said Shannon Welch, Vice President of SCAR, "was a victory for all women on Valparaiso University’s campus. Yet it could just as easily be said that the victory went to the fabulators of date rape. According to statistics released by Valparaiso, the calendar years of 1990 and 1991 each saw the reporting of one forcible sex offense, and none were reported for 1992. (Two non-forceable sex offenses were reported in 1992.) Since this first-of-its-kind decision against John Doe was handed down by the disciplinary panel a few weeks ago in which the accuser won by alleging that the alleged rapist was "just persistent," as many as ten additional cases of date rape have apparently been reported to University Police—three of which are said to have occurred on the same night.

These numbers, which have the appearance of mass hysteria, are all the more striking when viewed against the total sex crimes reported in Porter County, Indiana—the home county of the University. From 1989 to 1993, a total of four sex crimes was reported county-wide. The reported ten date rapes for this academic year came during the first six weeks of school.

Since the filing of the lawsuit against the university, employees of the university have been instructed not to make any comment relating to the pending case, and university officials have refused to confirm or deny reports used in this article. However, Daryll Herseman, Vice President of Student Affairs, has said, "...It was important for the wellfare of the parties involved as well as for the welfare of the campus community as a whole that the matter [was] decided on merit and that [the decision] rendered cannot be subject to challenge or denial to the technical [or] legal arguments.” Thus is the First Amendment trumped by date rape at Valparaiso.

MIKE THOMPSON is a student at Valparaiso School of Law.

Everytime I see one of those sleepaway summer camp movies, like "Little Darlings" or "Meatballs," I wonder if everyone else really did go to camp where swimming, climbing, and sports were the main activities. I grew up in Berkeley in the 70's, where premature political correctness was the rule and when I think about my summers away at camp, it's the "Friday the 13th" camp at Crystal Lake that comes to mind.

There we were, tucked away in our sleeping bags in a mild dewy cabin in the Santa Cruz Mountains, exhausted from a day that began at 6:30a.m. with religious services and was packed check-full of entertaining activities that followed the theme of camp that summer: Jews in Crisis. There's nothing more fun on a sunny July afternoon then to experience a pogrom. We were rudely awakened by loud counselors in fur hats pretending to be Nazis. Apparently, the staff thought it would be a good idea to show us Jewish American Royalty types what it was like to experience a pogrom. We were ousted from our warm beds and instructed to take only the bare necessities with us. The twelve of us who were living in the cabin padded outside in our jammies and tennis shoes clutching toothbrushes, teddy bears, pictures of our boyfriends, and clean underwear. We didn't know what was going on, but we figured it couldn't last too long (it already being two hours past lights out). Wrong.

The "Nazis" proceeded to march us up a dark dirty hill of a chicken without a head (or with a head hanging sort of half severed) and spewing of the common sense. The selection for executioner, and the common thought that ensued involved the classic running of the bulls. A seven year old is not always the best camper was selected to behead the chickens. Why the chickens were there until the day a camper was finally subdued, barbecued, and served to a group of vegan parents who opted for the TLT—tofu, lettuce, and tomato—sandwich instead.

A.C.E.Y.W.L.M. CAMPERS
To Have-A Meaningful-Experience-During-Summer-Vacation. Her tale of summertime activities gave new meaning to the term "hair-raising."

The camp my pal went to was called A Country Experience for Young Women of Lesbian Mothers. The director was Sage Runnigwater, a large white woman with unshaven legs. The "young women" were girls ages six to sixteen with one thread of connection: their mothers were lesbians. Well, that and the fact that they were all subjected to A Country Experience somewhere in the northerly regions of California's Mendicino County. The camp itself was a motley collection of tents and tree stumps, a swimming hole, and a makeshift kitchen. No Port-a-Potties (Green Machines at my camp) marred the natural landscape; the campers and counselors peeled freely in the bushes off the walking paths and pooped in holes specifically created for the purpose of pooping in. The swimming hole was a mud pit where the girls splashed around in their birthday suits. Clothing was optional at ACCEYWL.M, and most of the campers roamed about topless, feeling the wind blowing freely through their armpit hairs as they dutifully tackled the chores of compost-heaping tending and shit-hole digging. "I had never seen so much body hair," confided my friend.

Of course, every camp has a swimming hole and a compost heap. The real excitement came during the speculum demonstrations. Nose-ringed counselors draped themselves across tree stumps while the campers basked in the warm embrace of pelvic examination. Then the campers were invited to check out their own perky little cervices. "I passed on that one," my buddy said. "You see one cervix, you've seen 'em all."

And what's camp without art and crafts? The Artist-In-Residence was an odd woman who painted pictures of peaches and other conic fruits in her own menstrual blood. "They stark," I was told, "They looked like passies and they stank."

It goes without saying that the food was strictly vegetarian. There was an uprising among the campers, and two chickens were brought into the Common Area where they lived in a cage for a week. No one knew why the chickens were there until the day a camper was selected to behead the chickens. A seven year old is not always the best selection for executioner, and the communal tension that ensued involved the classic running of a chicken without a head (or with a head hanging sort of half severed) and spewing blood all over the naked audience. The chickens were finally subdivided, barbecued, and served to a group of reborn vegans who opted for the TLT—tofu, lettuce, and tomato—snadwich instead.

There are several explanations for the fantastic summers my friend and I spent at our respective camps. Perhaps it is because we went to camp in the Seventies; maybe it is because we went to camp in Northern California; or possibly I has to do with the fact that our parents were just a little bit overzealous in their fact that our parents were just a little bit overzealous in their efforts to make sure our lives were full of experiences that would help shape our minds and turn us into the politically correct, philanthropic, peace-loving liberals that everybody hates. Thanks, Mom and Dad.

ANNE DEBORAH is a health care worker in Northern California.
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ACCREDITING DIVERSITY continued from front page

ing agencies, has the power to choke off federal funds to schools that don't bow down to its demands.

That threat may recede of the Department of Educa-

tion hangs tough with its recently announced regulations effectively depriving the regions of their monopoly. But in the recent past accrediting agencies have exercised a quiet tyranny over schools it feels are out of line with its political agenda.

Last year, Thomas Aquinas College in Santa Paula, Calif., had good reason to be apprehensive about its schedule re-accreditation visit by a WASC team. Aquinas is a Catholic college with a very traditional great-books curriculum. It had been an outspoken opponent of WASC's draconian diversity standard as a threat to the integrity of its curriculum.

WASC's charter requires it to evaluate institutions based on how well they are accomplishing their own objectives. The Aquinas faculty decided that the college is small, relying on the charter as a means of defending itself against demands about diversity. The campus evaluation took place in November 1992, and in early 1993 Aquinas was re-accredited for a full eight-year term, without any conditions. Yet members of the faculty found the experience harrowing.

The report of the evaluating team that visited the campus was very positive overall, even glowing, and it conceded that the college is not racist or sexist, although it does chide Aquinas for using "non-inclusive" language. (Even studying great books turns out to be permissible, as long as they are properly identified as great Western books, thus implying a panonochous narrowness.)

The Anthony of Stephen Weiner, Director of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, is condescending. "Thomas Aquinas College is a good institution of its particular kind," he recently said in a statement that suggests the WASC's bias. "I think it would be a better institution if it were more concerned with a variety of cultural institutions."

The favorable outcome for Aquinas—for the time being, at least—has a lot to do with its determination. The college is small, relying on the charter as a means of defending itself against demands about diversity. The campus evaluation took place in November 1992, and in early 1993 Aquinas was re-accredited for a full eight-year term, without any conditions. Yet members of the faculty found the experience harrowing.
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pas and at all campus activities.

Student Services
• Traditional students have adequate opportunity to learn about diversity and their own ethnicity.

INDICATORS/EVIDENCE: (How will you know if you have attained the outcomes?) Student Outcomes:
• Articles in the student newspaper [An earlier draft was more frighteningly specific: it said, "Articles in student newspaper celebrate diversity rather than reflect on problems."]
• Faculty reports of classroom discussion.
• Reports on tolerance by minority and international students.
• Few or no racial/ethnic incidents on campus.
• Observed behavior of students in group settings (e.g., dining halls, athletic events).

Campus Environment
• Numbers and distribution of minority and international students and faculty.
• Self report of contact with students from different backgrounds via new or current student surveys.
• Existing attendance/participation records for campus clubs, organizations and residences.

EVALUATION/CRITERIA (How will you know when you have achieved your goal?) Student Outcomes
• Students use their second language in appropriate situations.
• Students are observed by faculty and others to show sensitivity to diversity.

Academic Program
• Students take courses in ethnic studies regardless of their own ethnic backgrounds.
• Students report on course evaluations that course content is sensitive to diversity.
• ___% of minority faculty are retained.

Campus Environment
• ____% of students in each target ethnic group are retained.
• ____% of minority faculty are retained.

Student Services
• Student groups use student services in proportion to the number of students in their own ethnic backgrounds.

I want to help fight the PC Police Force.

Here is my contribution for:

- $5  Student Member
- $25  Member
- $50  Supporting Member
- $100  Sustaining Member
- $100  Other

Card #  Exp. Date

Members will receive a subscription to the IRF newsletter, The Defender. Contact: The Individual Rights Foundation, 800-752-6562, 12400 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 133, Studio City, CA 91604

The Individual Rights Foundation is a California 501(c)(3). Membership is $20 per annum. Members will receive a subscription to the IRF newsletter and a copy of the book Surviving the PC University.

LINDA SEEBACK is an editorial writer for the Los Angeles Daily News.

Are You Being Harassed By Members Of The Campus Thought Police For Exercising Your Free Speech Rights?

THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION IS HERE TO DEFEND YOU.

Your campus can be a free speech zone too.
rate academic from political activity and who become intellectual entrepreneurs in behalf of The Cause. During his years at Miami, Valenta was keenly interested in doing what he could to support international communism. Isolated for the time being from the resistance gradually building within Eastern Europe, he found natural allies in the anti-Castro Cuban community of Miami. Shortly after taking his position at the University, Valenta made contacts with Jorge Mas Canosa of the Cuban American National Foundation, the largest and most powerful of the Cuban groups in Miami. Together they opposed the Cuban offensive in Central America in the mid-80s and gave a forum to Nicaraguans opposed to the Sandinistas and Salvadorans opposed to the FMLN guerrillas.

Valenta had a tremendous capacity for putting himself at the center of things; he built alliances that linked him not only with Mas Canosa and the anti-Castro Cubans of Miami, but also with conservative Jews. He raised nearly $1 million of grant and research money for the Graduate School of International Studies. Figures like Henry Kissing and Breznizer began to cycle through Miami. As one of his colleagues later said, "Valenta put us on the map."

When the slow motion disintegration of communism speeded up in the late 80s, Valenta intensified his activities. Seeing glasnost as the beginning of a process rather than the end, he made contacts with the influential figures in Gorbachev's circle. He met Yuri Pavlov, senior Russian official in charge of Latin America, and Georigi Arbatov, head of the prestigious Soviet Institute of U.S. and Canada. He was one of the first Sovietologists to see Boris Yeltsin as something more than a buffoon, a figure more representative of the temper of the times in Moscow than Gorbachev and a likely future national leader. When Yeltsin arrived in the U.S. in 1989 on a tour marked by remarkable observations (he said that what was called a slam in America would be considered good housing back home) and a snub by the White House, Valenta raised money among his Cuban and Jewish friends to bring the Russian leader to Miami. This began what would be referred to at the University as the Moscow-Miami Dialogues, a constant exchange of ideas and people. Valenta had an agenda that went beyond mere conversation, how- ever. As Yeltsin and the figures around him began to move into positions of real power, he introduced them to his Cuban friends and helped establish a Cuban American National Foundation in Moscow. He successfully lobbied them to decrease the $5 billion annual subsidy the Castro government received from Moscow and to accelerate the withdrawal of Russian troops from Cuba. Once asked to characterize his goal, Valenta said: "It is to take advantage of the struggle between Gorbachev's perestroika and the homeland. When Vaclav Havel's Velvet Underground came to the Czech Ministry of Industry, who was less than diplomatic with them. But most argued that he was overly brusque and some of his graduate students believed him occasionally peremptory manner and jealous of the power he had acquired both in Washington and abroad. One person who was particularly unhappy with him was another Czech ambassador, Danyal Baloyra, a scholar of Latin American affairs and once time associate Dean of the Graduate School of International Studies, a woman named Vendulka Kubalkova.

In 1990, shortly after the Yeltsin visit, Kubalkova's criticism of Valenta would move beyond the classrooms and into the halls of the University's Graduate School for International Studies. In 1991, she was appointed an associate. "I often criticized his ideology, but never once complained about anything personal,\" she said in an interview that year. In 1992, Kubalkova was using class time to attack him, according to a good teacher with high standards. Tad Winickie, a student of Dr. Enrique Baloyra, a scholar of Latin American affairs and once time "representative from the people with whom she met at the University of Miami in 1989 as a good teacher with high standards. Arthur Amao, a student who took classes under both individuals, says, "It was quite clear that she was envious. Valenta was producing, he was bringing in international figures, and he was getting his students jobs."
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or disapproval of his pedagogical defects. The real key to their disagreement was Cold War politics. In addition to being a professor, Baloyra was president of the Democratic Cuban Party, a leftish organization made up of "social democrats." Baloyra had views on the Cuban question which were in contrast to those of Valenta. (In 1992 interview with the janitor, pro-Castro journal Arrieto, for instance, he said that he had "no desire or interest in... overthrowing the Cuban government.") This put him at odds with Valenta's friend Jorge Ma Canosa, whose Cuban American National Foundation was for transforming the Cuban state along democratic lines and it also put Baloyra in opposition to Cuba's Democratic Cuban Party in a bitter competition against CANF to influence Moscow's policy on the proper relationship for Russian-American government relations.

Valenta tried to keep a civil relationship with Baloyra for years. But later on, when he was no longer a scholar but a defendant in a university effort to terminate his employment, he made the terms of the antagonism clear: "The key is that Baloyra wants a role in Cuban politics, and I as an anti-Soviet Cuban American National Foundation and a friend of his archival, was an obstacle to him. He was against anything that CANF and I were trying to do. He favored dialogue, we favored isolation. We favored keeping the embargo, he favored lifting it." While Valenta was shuttling back and forth to Czechoslovakia during the latter half of 1991 and early 1992 working with the Foreign Ministry there, a juggernaut of forces against him was forming. Joining Kubalkova and Baloyra was Craig Simon, a sometime Berkeley student who had been in the graduate program at Miami for eight years without completing his dissertation. He had the usual personal character assassination about Valenta, notably the fact that he had not given him research funds to continue his Ph.D. work. But with him too the political dimension seemed paradigmatic. He held it against Valenta that he had refused to support a debate he had tried to set up between supporters of the Reagan administration policies in Central America and Alexander Cochrane and Christopher Hitchens, radical advocates of the Sandinistas. Like Baloyra, Simon disliked the connection Valenta had made with anti-Castro Cubans, and generally was appalled by the fact that Valenta had used the "progressive" label as a successful launching pad for his anti-communist efforts.

While Valenta was in Czechoslovakia, Simon agitated against him. He began writing to present and former students urging them to join in his attack on his teaching, scholarship and lack of commitment to academic freedom. Some did, but many were scandalized. Charlotte Kassab spoke for them when she wrote to the University administration strongly defending Valenta and objecting to Simon's "public bloodletting" not only as a form of slander, but also as an invasion of the students' privacy.

Now there was a scent of blood in the waters of Miami. Becoming a defendant in the fall of international communism had taken Valenta away from the campus and put him in Prague most of the time where it was impossible for him to defend himself against the drumbeat of charges by his enemies. Yet it was also the case that the concerns raised by Kubalkova, Baloyra and Simon were clearly engendered among a set of them who were out of the country in different parts of the world. Valenta was a sexual harasser. One was Ana Miyares, his former secretary and graduate student who contended that Valenta had "loved" Valenta during their affair and believed he loved her. Eventually she would be in effect identified as a false witness by university lawyers.

The second plaintiff, Andrea Ewart-Simon, who had been educated in Moscow at Patrice Lumumba University during the Brezhnev era, was a series of ideological conflicts with Valenta and often complained about his bringing Russian referrers to Miami. She also testified in the course of Valenta's major accusers. In 1991 Ewart-Simon had written the university rule against accepting CIA money. The accusations involved tiny matters. In 1992, after the Hill-Thomas hearings had aired the nature of the; in 1992, after the Hill-Thomas hearings and there was a symmetry in the two relationships. Like Clarence Thomas, Valenta had been somewhat of a maverick. Like Anita Hill, Kubalkova had gotten significant favors before turning on him.
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Becoming A Postmodernist Critic: A User's Guide  
by ROBERT J. WILSON

To be a postmodernist critic in a Western capitalist country, you must first acknowledge your seminal influences (but don’t use the word “seminal”). You must choose at least one from the following names. Females: Cixous, de Beauvoir, Gauthier, Irigaray, Kristeva, Millet, Woolf. Males: Bakhtin, Derrida, Foucault, Freud, Lacan, Markert, Marx. (Do not claim de Man as an influence at present). By making these names into adjectives you can use them more readily: e.g., Woolfist, Milletian, Foucauldian.

Second, choose a word from each of the three columns below for help in phrase-making. For instance, write that “[Your nemesis] privileges the classist project,” or “[Your friend] subverts phallocentric discourse.”

Here are some other hints. Be sure to pluralize as much as possible as in “decentering hegemonic strategies,” or “deterritorializing disjunctive processualities.” Use parentheses freely to deconstruct words and create arcane puns which show that you are not really heavily invested in what you are writing. For instance, in an essay about gender, you might well write about “displacing her(men)eutic constructs.” It is important to change parts of speech to allow your subject its full complexity. It is good postmodernist usage, for instance, to add -(at)ize to form verbs, and -(at)ize to form nouns: “to problematize textual historicizations.” Add de-, non-, or un- to negate, as in “devalorization,” “nonlogocentric,” or “unnarratological.”

Finally, you should nearly always use a colon in your title and, if possible, a nonfinite -ing participle, which helps you deconstruct your own title, as in “Interrogating Bodies: Gendering Colonialist Narratives,” or “Defamiliarizing the Centers: Fetishizing Monological Discourses.”

Once again, memorize and use, largely to the exclusion of other language, the terms below:

formalist, gynocritical, erasure, heterogeneity, heteroglossia, indeterminacy, minoritize, objectify, logocentric, monological narratological, recuperate, reinvent, subvert, signifier, theatricalize, subjectivation, universal, diversity, écriture, interrogate, marginalize, ideological, intentionalist, interpretive, metacriticism, misprision, oppositional, phallogocentric, postcolonialist, poststructuralist, strategize, theorize, subtext, valorize

fetishize, hegemonic, hermeneutic, hierarchal, homotextual, intertextuality, iterability, jouissance, phononym, privilege, patriarchy, processuality, project, signify, text, totalize, supplementary, victimize

BECOME A POSTMODERNIST CRITIC.

SUBSCRIBE TO HETERODOXY NOW!

Only $25 for one year of Heterodoxy. ($10 for students.)

Also, order a copy of Surviving The PC University, a collection of Heterodoxy’s greatest hits for only $10.00 (a $15 value).

CALL 1-800-752-6562

OR MAIL YOUR ORDER TO:
12400 VENTURA BLVD. SUITE 304, STUDIO CITY, CA 91604
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Le Vice Francais

Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals, 1944-1956
By Tony Judt,
Reviewed by Kenneth Asher University of California Press, 348 pp, $30.00

Despite the relatively narrow focus suggested by its title, this book is indispensable to anyone interested in the origins of ideas that currently fuel the Kulturkampf in America. Notions that ought to have died in the France of 1956 (indeed, according to Judt, ought to have died in the France of 1956) continue to enjoy a Dizarre half-life (indeed, according to Judt, ought never to have existed). More generally, what Judt has provided in his meticulously researched work is a fascinating study of how intelligent—often exquisitely intelligent—thinkers come to badly distort reality and lose their ethical moorings. The particular relevance of Judt’s analysis to contemporary intellectual debate in a fresh light. Judt’s starting point is the question why so many post-WWII French intellectuals had been called on to play a role with no more Nazis to fight, were reduced to dappled streets of Irvine, California. It suggests a sort of metaphoric spectacle when these ideas are personally transported over by their discredited originators. As Judt dryly observes, “There is something quite right in the sense that Jacques Derrida selling his wares on the unsupervised streets of Irvine, California. It suggests a sort of patronizing self-exploitation, rather as though Maurice Merleau-Ponty had chosen to hawk paperback editions of Humanism and Terror among vacationing schoolteachers in an early Club Med.” Yet, unfortunately, when a leading feminist scholar can be taken seriously in her judgment that “women are raped by guns, age, white supremacy, the state—only derivatively by the penis,” we can see that these ideas dressed in the old rhetoric still have a great deal of intellectual, or even particularly intelligent to hold a faith!”—Cornelius Castoriadis, a largely ignored dissenter at Genesco.

KENNETH ASHER is an Associate Professor of English Literature at SUNY, Genesco.
Out On A Limb Over The Fugitive

by TURK RICHARDS

The Fugitive, Hollywood's second top grossing movie of 1993 is about to be released on home video, and this has one advocacy group in arms. Members of the Society To Unite Men of Prostheses (S.T.U.M.P.) spent months picketing theaters showing the Harrison Ford thriller to protest "its cruel, stereotypical and harmful" portrayal of amputees. Now, they are attempting to block release of the film on home video.

As fans of the classic "Fugitive" T.V. series of the 60's know, Dr. Richard Kimball is an innocent man sentenced to death for the murder of his wife, a murder committed by someone known to Kimball and the audience only as "the One Armed Man." Until the final episode of the series, the one armed man is seen only in glimpses, a menacing figure serving as an objective correlative to the全社会 and oppressive forces against which Kimball is contending.

"It took us years to fight the fear and negativity generated against us by that evil pirate in Peter Pan," S.T.U.M.P. founder, Claude "Lefty" Jackson says. "Now, just when people are forgetting that horrendous Fugitive T.V. show, the movie comes along and reopening old wounds."

According to Jackson, prosthetophobia and street crimes against people of prostheses are up 25% since the Fugitive premiered. In one particularly heinous hate crime this past August, a street gang watched a homeless man in Manhattan remove his wooden arm and settle down for the night. The youths suddenly pounced on the prothesis, set it afire, and roasted them in the flames, all the while directing a stream of prostheticphobic remarks at the victim.

"The only image most Americans get of amputees is from the media," Lefty Jackson says, "so the link between prosthetic devices and evil, psychopathic behavior is indelibly etched in the mind of the public.

S.T.U.M.P. members are particularly up in arms over the The Fugitive's in-depth depiction of prosthetic clinics and laboratories as ominous places where Richard Kimball relentlessly pursues not just the killer, but any one armed man he can get his hands on. "This is stigmatizing an entire class of people," Jackson charges. "Is there anyone who has witnessed these scenes in this film who won't now look with fear and loathing at the next prosthetic wearer he encounters on the street or in the supermarket?"

To tie the hands of the film's distributor Warner Pictures, S.T.U.M.P. has filed an injunction under both the U.S. Civil Rights Act and the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act to block distribution of The Fugitive video "to prevent further harm and abuse, as well as real discrimination to people of prosthetics." A civil suit filed in Los Angeles asks that the studio hand over a percentage of the profits to S.T.U.M.P. "For the purpose of funding OUT-REACH programs and to undo the cruel and savage image created by the producers."

S.T.U.M.P. also has insisted man in the future real amputees, not armed-persons like Dustin Hoffman be given roles in films such as that of Captain Hook. And finally the organization has demanded "reparations" money to establish a sensitivity curriculum for public schools which would celebrate the achievements of figures from the entertainment world like legendary black dancer Pegleg Bates and Harold Russell, the Academy Award winning double amputee in The Best Years of Our Lives.

The legal furor over prostheses, violence and media has also found its way into the halls of Congress in proposed legislation Lefty Jackson believes adds insult to injury. Because of an incident last spring in which a one armed man used his hook to defend himself against an attacker, the Senate is now considering the "Kimball Bill," named in honor the protagonist of The Fugitive. This bill would require a five day waiting period before anyone can be fitted for an artificial limb. Police would then be given time to conduct a background check to determine whether the individual has a propensity to exhibit nefarious behavior or a record of violence," as Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass) said in a recent floor debate. In five years, a computerized system for "instant" background checks would replace the waiting period.

Naturally this has S.T.U.M.P. leaders and civil libertarians hopping mad. "Hooks don't kill people," says attorney Steven Fingers, "people do." Citing a classic decision by Judge Learned Hand, Fingers declared, "Clearly the proposed Kimball Bill violates the Second Amendment which gives each one of us the right to bear arms."

To counter the Kimball Bill, a House committee chaired by Representative Edward Markey (D-Mass) will hold hearings in January on the role of entertainment industry in perpetuating violence towards people of prosthetics. Testimony by lead-off witness Peg Walder, author of Whiplash—The War Against Against Victims, is expected to echo her famous statement that "television and movie producers are making money hand over fist by turning victims into criminals."

Markey believes that Congress will "force the media to clean up its act" after these hearings, and added "a new civil rights bill is not far behind."

Asked to comment, Hollywood studio executive Ernest Shilling took an aggressive line, insisting that "artistic freedom and freedom of expression must take precedence over political correctness." Noting that despite angry protests by librarians and gays over a behead killer in 1992's Basic Instinct and a cross-dressing psychopath in Silence of the Lamby, both movies were major box office hits, "A group of stutterers even tried to censor "A Fish Called Wanda" b-b-b-b-b-b-because of the Kevin Kline character," Shilling mockingly added. "What's next, hockey goales protesting Friday the 13th?"

S.T.U.M.P.'s Lefty Jackson vows to continue his stand against precisely this type of callousness, insensitivity and exploitation. "We must put our foot down," he said, "even if it's the only one we have."

TURK RICHARDS is a writer living in Boston.