Underground Frats

The heat had been coming down all week, and things were far too dangerous to try anything close to home. So toward the end of the week, the two men notified others that they’d found a safe locale for the operation. Leaving instructions for everyone coming to the secret meeting to take different routes, they drove cautiously through town, taking care to see that they were not followed, and then proceeded along a deserted highway for about 30 miles. The man on the passenger side unfolded a hand-drawn map and watched carefully for the spot where they were to turn off. The road took them into the woods. They drove until they found three cars parked beside a fence. Some of the others had arrived there before them.

After getting out of the car, the pair followed the map to a small cabin in a clearing. A half-dozen other young men greeted them with cryptic signs and handshakes. Satisfied that they were alone and unobserved, the group stood together, shoulder-to-shoulder and said a traitor who would turn them in to the authorities.

Satisfied that they were alone and unobserved, the group young men greeted them with cryptic signs and handshakes. After getting out of the car, the pair followed the map to a small cabin in a clearing. A half-dozen other young men greeted them with cryptic signs and handshakes. Satisfied that they were alone and unobserved, the group stood together, shoulder-to-shoulder and said a traitor who would turn them in to the authorities.

Greeks by demanding that fraternities become co-ed.

As the fraternities have gone underground to survive, schools such as Amherst College have gone an extra step: setting up a network of snitches to inform on the fraternities’ secret doings. Students caught engaging in private acts of fraternization between consenting adults—even off campus and on their own time—can expect to be summarily expelled, suspended, or disqualified from scholarships and student jobs. Mere membership in a fraternity, regardless of activity, is enough to earn draconian punishment at some schools, the clearest example of guilt by association on the current political scene.

A glance at history confirms that fraternity brothers are the least likely candidates for life in the northeastern United States in 1994. Security measures like the ones described above are carried out with a certain self-dramatization, but they are also well justified. Administrators at a number of American schools, most in the Northeast, are engaged in an all-out campaign against fraternities and are doing everything in their power to stomp them out of existence. From all appearances, they will be satisfied with nothing less than the elimination of the fraternity as a class, a kind of university version of ethnic cleansing.

But what these administrators have done, of course, is not kill fraternities but drive them underground. Banned from campuses, fraternity brothers now meet in secret locations. Their new rituals somewhat resemble the candlelight cave meeting in Dead Poets Society combined with, of course, the usual rowdy highjinks that have defined fraternity life. But college administrators have done something that a few years ago would have seemed unthinkable. By their repression, they have made fraternities something that a few years ago would have seemed unthinkable.

Please turn to page 8

Jimmy Hoffa Move Over, Here's the NEA EDUCATION THUGS

"If you choose Rush Limbaugh, we choose not to buy Florida orange juice!!" With union chief Keith Geiger calling the question beneath a huge banner reading "NEA MOBILIZES FOR ACTION," the NEA delegates immediately passed the boycott measure.

As it worked out, this was one of 111 resolutions passed during the NEA’s 1994 convention. But only four of them had anything to do with education, a fact that substantiated what critics have long said about the National Education Association: Power politics always trumps education in this organization’s scale of values.

And power politics is a game that the NEA has learned to play very adroitly over the past 25 years. To compare this union with the Teamsters during Jimmy Hoffa’s heyday does not do the NEA full justice. This 2.1-million member organization has not only surpassed the Teamsters as the biggest union in the United States but is now the largest and most powerful union in the world. It swaggers every bit as dramatically as Jimmy Hoffa’s bunch did in the ‘60s and is every bit as intolerant of dissent—both from within and without. Its behavior in New Orleans shows that this organization feels good about itself and perceives its clout to be so strong that it can strike with impunity at those, such as Rush Limbaugh, who dare oppose it.

And on the surface, the current NEA seems invulnerable.
Overheard on the Info Superhighway...

Re: chilly climate-biased study
WMST-L@UMD.UMD.EDU
WMST-L@UMD.UMD.EDU
From: kovanij@MIT.EDU (Rich Cowan)
Send WMST-L@UMD.UMD.EDU (WomenStudiesList)
Reply to: WMST-L@UMD.UMD.EDU (Women Studies List)
To: WMST-L@UMD.UMD.EDU
Hi—please put the University Conversion Project on your mailing list if you have one; we are monitoring the right-wing groups who we feel are responsible for making the climate for women much chillier (the Center for Study of Popular Culture [sic] is a prime example) and we need data to refuse their propaganda claims.

-Rich Cowan UCP Box 748
Cambridge, MA 02142

Wonder Bread and WASPs

I'm not sure how I got on your mailing list, but please feel free to keep sending me your paper. Both of my parents are descended from Mayflower pilgrims—good White Anglo-Saxon Protestant stock. Daughters of the American Revolution, etc. I had such a good laugh reading your publication.

It's refreshing to see that you folks aren't ashamed to have your insecurities splashed across every article. I think the more you publish this kind of material, the more it becomes obvious that you are like scared little children who have been taught to fear the world as it really is.

Maybe you could find a nice deserted island stocked with Wonder Bread, mayonnaise, Pat Boone records, and maybe Michael Huffington as your resident philosopher. Then the rest of us can enjoy all of the variety in the world without your drivel polluting our atmosphere.

Carry on the good work, the more you print the more ridiculous and insignificant you appear. By the way, is it like to live day after day with such hatred? It seems like such a sad way to pass your time.

Stephen S. Tiger
San Francisco, CA

A Juicier, Funnier Book

Help! "The Highjacking of C.S. Lewis" (October) was a disappointment. The main mistake was to keep reading on an expanded version of this work to be called Light on C.S. Lewis's Shadowlands, which will be published with a foreword by University of Southern California Religion professor Robert Ellwood.

The new book, a lot juicier and funnier than people expected, came out in October—bearing kind words from Robert Ellwood and 29 other dignitaries than people expect, came out in October—bearing kind words from Robert Ellwood and 29 other dignitaries.

It's refreshing to see that you folks aren't ashamed to have your insecurities splashed across every article. I think the more you publish this kind of material, the more it becomes obvious that you are like scared little children who have been taught to fear the world as it really is.

Maybe you could find a nice deserted island stocked with Wonder Bread, mayonnaise, Pat Boone records, and maybe Michael Huffington as your resident philosopher. Then the rest of us can enjoy all of the variety in the world without your drivel polluting our atmosphere.

Carry on the good work, the more you print the more ridiculous and insignificant you appear. By the way, is it like to live day after day with such hatred? It seems like such a sad way to pass your time.

Kathryn Lindskog
Orange, CA

The CTA on Delivering Mud

When a writer gives me a double negative, I know he's sending a positive. When he gives me a "double clear," I know he's delivering mud.

That is what Craig Hymowitz conveyed in this part of his Proposition 187 "analysis": "Nearly half the money raised to oppose 187 has come from the CTA [California Teachers Association]. And it's clear that the teachers union has clearly pointed out less for reasons of principle than of pocketbook.

CTA members pride themselves on knowing clearly and exactly why they "pork up" money in electoral contests. And their reasons for opposing Prop. 187 with dollars, votes, and work had nothing to do with their pocketbooks. Were Hymowitz an investigative journalist, rather than merely on the staff of the Investigative Journalism Project, he might have attended the meeting of CTA's State Council that voted to fight Prop 187. Failing that, he might have asked any one of the journalists who did cover that session of CTA's policy-making assembly what the debate was all about.

Either method of investigation would have in

Craig L. Hymowitz replies: Mr. Horowitz's concerns regarding my investigation are quite valid. I simply did not have time to interview the CTA spokeswoman Tommey Hutto in early October. Ms. Hutto presented a similar explanation for the CTA's position and actions regarding Proposition 187. Further investigation, however, revealed conflicting information and motives for the CTA's actions.

As for Mr. Horowitz's concerns regarding the costs of illegal immigration, all figures were supplied by the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research and other state agencies.

Although the voters spoke with resounding force passing Prop. 187 59 to 41 percent, carrying majorities of white, black, and Asian voters—the special interests haven't given up yet. Before all the ballots had even been counted MALDEF, the ACLU, and others had filed eight lawsuits against 187 (the CTA is planning to "file a motion to intervene" in an existing suit). So once again, the people have spoken, and the special interests have scoffed.

Thoughts from a Second Thought

I have been an avid reader of Heterodoxy for about two years. I am 44 and was, like Mr. Horowitz, at one time very left-leaning. But after coming to the realization that there was no truth in the Liberal movement, I became a Libertarian/Conservative (I would be more Libertarian, but it leaves Liberals too many cracks to slip through). I particularly enjoy the way Heterodoxy exposes the old guard left, and this is why I am writing.

I have been a member of the entertainment industry, and although I am not involved at this time, I stay up on all the poop. As of late, one could hardly have missed the firefart that accompanied the announcement of the joint venture undertaken by Messrs. Spielberg, Katzenberg, and Geffen. Now, being an old leftie, I seem to remember back in the early Seventies that David Geffen was a name in the movement, and I also seem to remember that he was arrested for drug smuggling, but the FBI couldn't make it stick. Also, knowing people in the music industry, I have heard it rumored that this is, in fact, how Geffen got the money together to buy his way into the record biz. My research hasn't led anywhere as of yet, and I thought you and your paper might do an article on Mr. Geffen and his early days.

Please keep up the fight.

Shannon Van Putten
Andheim, CA

Erratum


Inquiries: 800-752-6562

Heterodoxy is distributed to newsstands and bookstores by Bernhard B. DeBoer, 113 East Centre Street, Nutley, NJ 07110.
Larry Kramer, dramatist and founder of ACT-UP, became frothy about W magazine and failed to mention the topic of AIDS, common name for a disease which causes an intense state of bodily exhaustion and AIDS, which is caused by the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). This lack of understanding of our state's original cause of death led Kramer to write irately, "Those of us who work for and with the State's Indian Museum, and who are interested in the State's功命, "Some lesbian." He was expressing anger at the idea that "lesbian" was a term used to describe the state's historic past. The State's Indian Museum was a place where Americans could learn about the state's original inhabitants, the Native Americans. Kramer was upset that the museum had not done enough to promote awareness of race, culture, and history.

Marilyn Wolf of the California State Indian Museum responded, "It was a picture of another women under the line, "Some lesbian." She was expressing anger at the idea that "lesbian" was a term used to describe the state's historic past. The State's Indian Museum was a place where Americans could learn about the state's original inhabitants, the Native Americans. Kramer was upset that the museum had not done enough to promote awareness of race, culture, and history.

300 women will join the LAPD in the near future. This is a significant increase in the number of women police officers. Smith's diabolical charge that the media seized on the Smith's story of the black man was criminal and that the media was acting as the culprit, but because of the circumstances of the incident, blacks commit 67 percent of all carjackings in the United States. What was amazing about this was that the media seized on Smith's diabolical charge and broadcast it across the country and then lectured us on having taken the charge seriously.

LESBIANS NEED APPLY: An advertisement placed by the Los Angeles Police Department in the Lesbian News states that 300 women will join the LAPD this year. There is a picture of one woman under the line, "Some lesbian." The ad concludes, "We want both.

CANNYO DIGGER IT?: The venerable Sunset magazine, bible of the western gardener, received an irate letter after referring to "digger pits" in its September issue. Marilyn Wolf of the California State Indian Museum wrote irately, "Those of us who work for and with the State's Indian Museum, and who are interested in the State's history, are upset with the state's decision to promote awareness of race, culture, and history."

When a spokesman for Shalala told the Post that Kramer was a minority of one in the gay community, he retorted, "That she has to be asked about AIDS before she talks about it shows what an asshole she is." Kramer lambasted "Donna Do-Nothing" and said, "In fact, and it pains me very much to say it, I think a very good case can be made for not doing anything."

Haitians? What are Haitian troops doing at the White House? kristine sent them... to restore you to power.

Jihad in the Sky: Renee Bilal, a Northwest Airlines employee's wife, sued the airline for religious discrimination after receiving a call about her Muslim clothing. NWA has a policy requiring anyone using an employee pass to conform to a dress code that prohibits sandal-wearing. Bilal, traveling on one of those passes, was wearing traditional Muslim attire that included "a head scarf, long tunic, dress pants, and sandals" without a headscarf. This led customer service supervisor Barb Patrick to stop Bilal and tell her that her outfit was "inappropriate" and that she should dress "as though she was going to church." Although Bilal was not prevented from boarding the plane, she later testified that because of this incident, she "had difficulty sleeping for several weeks, felt humiliated, felt a lack of self-worth, experienced difficulty trusting people, and experienced anxiety and mental anguish." The court concluded that Patrick's comments were motivated by hostility towards Bilal's religion, because she told Bilal to dress as she would to attend a Christian church service. Patrick was awarded $4,000 actual damages, $1,000 in attorney's fees, and $23,700 in attorney's fees. The Court of Appeals upheld this ruling, reasoning that the remark was "offensive to one of the Islamic faith." To the court's credit, one judge dissented. Judge Randall argued that Patrick's right to free speech was violated because the "possible offensiveness of the word 'church' is irrelevant" and thought the court was in a "mindless rush...to political correctness."

DONE IT: We go press just having learned of the passing of our old friend and enemy Jerry Rubin. We knew him back in the good old days when we were all so bad. He liked to think that he had a touch of the revolutionary era drag or when he posed in his sarong-like swimming suit. He was irreverent when he showed up before HUAC in the 1960s and 1970s as a hip venture capitalist and the hippies during the Summer of Love. Never completely trusted by the hardcore radicals with whom he was in loose alliance (which is one reason to treat his principles of the era: There's a sucker born every minute. Rubin became a master of '60s luck and outdied them all in the great race to be noticed. He conceived of what qualifies as one of the fundamental principles of the era: There's a sucker born every minute. Jerry's suckers were the left who had found him irresistible when he showed up before HUAC in Revolutionary Era drag or when he posed in his sarong-like Vietnam get-up with a gun. He tried to sell himself and his contagious enthusiasm in later incarnations during the 80s and 90s as a hip venture capitalist and spokesman for hip tones. Hard to take seriously and hard to dislike, he was irrevocably with all the dreary Stalinist Games—in and out of the university—that other '60s survivors have played in the dawdling half of their lives. Always ready to seize the main chance and 'I always ready to talk non-stop about almost anything,' Jerry was an American Original.
Let me be frank. I am a gay white male who was victimized by the gay and, especially, the lesbian left. My story is my own. It is the story of how I was victimized by the "progressive" wing of the lesbian and gay movement.

To many readers of this magazine, GLAAD's mission itself may be suspect: "To fight for fair, accurate, and inclusive representations of gay and lesbian lives in the media and elsewhere." Actually, I think this definition, which is still used by the organization to this day, is quite narrow. It emphasis on "sufficiency" and not on "sufficiency respect." (That is, I disagreed with her no longer work with me because I didn't treat her with sufficient respect.)

Carton and Bradly have used the "diversity" term to mean something that is really quite different. They use it to mean a "diversity of opinion." I hear this and wonder what group has been more victimized by gay men than the gay, lesbian, and bisexual communities. We have a diversity of opinion. But as I will show in a minute, the dominance of GLAAD by radical lesbians couldn't be more evident.

At the same time, Carton is complaining of ongoing white male domination, however, she tells The Chronicle of Philanthropy, "Now that we've become more diverse, we have a diversity of opinion." I hear this and wonder what right-wing African Americans, left-wing Latinos, left-wing Asian feminists, and middle-class left-wing white lesbians—all of whom think exactly alike—can possibly have a diversity of opinion about, perhaps, which group has been more victimized by gay white men?

Here's the point. To most conservatives, gays and lesbians may seem an undifferentiated radical bloc intent on subverting all the bourgeois norms that underlie the social order. (Especially when we seek the right to marry and leadership (including weighted voting favoring women and people of color) and a disdain for professional expertise. This is evident in the penchant for labeling gay white men, especially gay/white men as part of the "oppressor patriarchy," from which leadership must be wrested.

By Stephen Miller

Gay-Bashing by Homosexuals

Lesbian women bikers in the 1993 gay rights march in Washington, D.C.

GLAAD, I felt I had no choice but to depart. (Board Chair Peggy Brady, by the way, often pointed to the fact that I appeared to have done nothing during one of the organization's interminable all-day "diversity" retreats as proof of my prejudice against women and a "progressive" agenda.)

Carton and Brandy have used the "diversity" term to mean something that is really quite different. They use it to mean a "diversity of opinion." I hear this and wonder what group has been more victimized by gay men than the gay, lesbian, and bisexual communities. We have a diversity of opinion. But as I will show in a minute, the dominance of GLAAD by radical lesbians couldn't be more evident.

At the same time, Carton is complaining of ongoing white male domination, however, she tells The Chronicle of Philanthropy, "Now that we've become more diverse, we have a diversity of opinion." I hear this and wonder what right-wing African Americans, left-wing Latinos, left-wing Asian feminists, and middle-class left-wing white lesbians—all of whom think exactly alike—can possibly have a diversity of opinion about, perhaps, which group has been more victimized by gay white men?

Here's the point. To most conservatives, gays and lesbians may seem an undifferentiated radical bloc intent on subverting all the bourgeois norms that underlie the social order. (Especially when we seek the right to marry and leadership (including weighted voting favoring women and people of color) and a disdain for professional expertise. This is evident in the penchant for labeling gay white men, especially gay/white men as part of the "oppressor patriarchy," from which leadership must be wrested.

According to an editorial in San Francisco's Bay Area Reporter, the meeting "left one Minnesota white male furious that his policy vote was 'weighted down' and therefore did not equal the votes of women and people of color. 'I feel I don't count,' he said. And he was right, and that was wrong."

In knee-jerk fashion, those who challenge the new orthodoxy are deemed racist and sexist. (At a GLAAD/NY retreat, I was denounced as "someone who thinks white men are the main victims of discrimination" simply for raising the issue of gender and race quotas.) As a consequence, those who challenge the new orthodoxy are decried as racist and sexist. It is no accident that gay white men have been shut out of all GLAAD leadership positions since the adoption of the diversity agenda. The executive directors of the two coastal offices, GLAAD/New York and GLAAD/Los Angeles, are women, as is the national coordinator of GLAAD USA. Nor is this quota system in effect only at GLAAD. Most of today's gay organizations are characterized by rigid gender and race quotas for staff and leadership (including weighted voting favoring women and people of color) and a disdain for professional expertise. This is evident in the penchant for labeling gay white men, especially gay/white men as part of the "oppressor patriarchy," from which leadership must be wrested.

Organizers of the 1993 March on Washington for gay, lesbian, and bisexual rights rejected the 50-percent "people of color" quotas in communiques with state organizing committees. Next came Stonewall 25, a march and rally in New York City on June 28, 1994, to commemorate the quarter-century anniversary of the Stonewall Inn that sparked the modern gay rights movement. The Stonewall 25 organizers seemed determined to go to the March on Washington better. The event's executive committee conformed to a requirement for 50-percent gender parity and 25-percent representation by people of color. But since many of the regional delegations that filled the larger national steering committee failed to achieve their quotas at a meeting in Milwaukee in August 1993, it was decided that women present could cast three votes apiece, and people of color, two. Mutterings of reverse discrimination were summarily dismissed by the event's "progressive" organizers with a lecture about the importance of diversity.

The results are not unexpected. The March on Washington came off despite its organizers. In particular, the state organizing committees (with the 50-percent minority quotas) failed miserably at directing participants to lobby their Congress members when they would. Writing in The New Republic, Jacob Weisberg noted the event "was appallingly organized [and] failed to coordinate even a single time for a photo-op on the Mall."
Similarly, the Stonewell 25 committee was beset by suchmismanagement and internal turmoil that when the commemoration ended, the committee was over $300,000 in debt.

Call it another victory for left-wing organizational orthodoxy. Leftist lesbian feminists who dis-proportionately influence the feminist movement have, to a large extent, taken charge of the "lesbian and gay" movement—leaving gay men who don't buy the militant feminist agenda out in the cold. At the 1992 Democratic Convention, for instance, signs demanding "Lesbian Rights" equalled in number the placards proclaiming "Lesbian and Gay Rights," while of course anyone urging "Rights for Gay Men" would have been hooted off the floor.

Gay men receive fundraising letters from the National Center for Lesbian Rights and numerous other women's and lesbian organizations. There is no National Center for Gay Male Rights to focus exclusively on gay male issues (such as defending a gay father's right to child visitation when his former spouse, backed by the courts, says no). Any attempts to form such a group are condemned by lesbian feminists as "sexist and elitist."

The Gay Men's Health Crisis, a leading AIDS service and support organization, was pressed into creating a Lesbian AIDS Project with its own female executive director—despite the fact that women-to-women transmission of the virus remains so rare that whenever a case is documented, it makes headlines. At the same time they are insinuating themselves into the AIDS crisis, however, lesbian feminists, playing a game of "whose disease is more PC," often decry the fact that AIDS receives too much attention compared to breast cancer.

And a left-wing Latino drag queen, one of the co-chairs of the Stonewall 25 rally, blasted gay men as "sexists for wearing red AIDS ribbons but not pink breast cancer ribbons" (a predominate gay male theory also, it seems, being unworthy of a special mem-

If anything, male-bashing within the lesbian gay movement is unashamedly more overt. At last year's Michigan Womyn's Music Festival, a largely lesbian affair, four postoperative male-to-female co-chairs of the Stonewall 25 rally, blasted gay men as "the oppressor" class. Torie Osborn, a former "executive director of the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force, blamed "straight white men talking in gay male bars and announcing that basically told the GWM in the room to sit down and shut up. . . . Talk about disempowering for who they are! After the meeting, when I expressed these concerns to the organizers, all I received was a commitment to a 'progressive agenda' was immediately questioned. . . . Having grown up in a small town where conformity was everything, I needed to be somewhere where I wouldn't be demeaned for who I am. Imagine my surprise to discover that in San Francisco being a male and having white skin, both of which—like being gay—I didn't choose, was something for which I would be ridiculed and insulted.

Now the mere right of gay men to socialize in a gay male environment is increasingly under attack by the religious right, but by the gay left. A recent AP wire story reported that a lounge in New Port Beach, Florida, became a gay bar and announced it would no longer employ female barmaids. Although the bar's manager insisted that his patrons preferred being served by other gay men, a statewide lesbian and gay rights group took up the heterosexual barmaids' cause, arguing that the women were victims of sexual discrimination.

Lesbian feminists and their left-wing, "pro-feminist" gay male cohorts are determined to eliminate all gay male-only space, holding that a "lesbigay" culture should sanction autonomous space for women only, but that male space apart from women is an anti-female conspiracy. This siege against gay male culture by leftists seeking the obliteration of gender distinctions is no different than the attacks being waged against straight male institutions like the Citadel or all-male campus fraternities.

Regardless, the womyn-born-womyn refused to consider compromise-swinging around a simple "no penis" policy. To have been once tainted by maleness was sufficient to be banished, even of the taint subsequentlyremoved with thousands of dollars of legal fees. A"There's a context here that should be recognized. When an entire stratum of gay male movement leaders succumbed to AIDS, radical lesbian feminists, nurtured by the politics of the women's movement, moved in and fundamentally altered the nature of gay politics. Today's radically feminist "lesbian and gay" movement tends to incorporate lesbian feminists' critical attitude toward men, male sexuality, and the patriarchy. Male 'heterosexuality,' once a hallmark of gay liberation, is now aath.

Radical feminists, of course, argue all this is necessary because of the greater discrimination faced by lesbians. In truth, a convincing argument can be made that American society as a whole is far more accepting of women loving women than of men loving men. Gay men are much more frequently victims of anti-gay violence than are lesbians. Even that paragon of PC, the New York Times, admitted recently that "people are much likelier to express animosity toward gay men than toward homosexual women."

But let facts not stand in the way of feminist victimology. It's now common for feminist lesbians to demand that they not only be welcome in gay male bars (few are ever turned away) but that there be something close to numerical parity among patrons—while also demanding the creation of more exclusively lesbian bars. This parallels in the social sphere the feminist lesbian dual priority to the interest of their most powerful constituencies—white men. And this has apparently led to gays of color being alienated from the gay rights movement, which, in turn, caused black churches to support the religious right. (Got that?)

The piece ended with the charge that "anyone who tries to widen the focus of gay activism is characterized as a white-male basher or is accused of coming in to political correctness." (This last reference may apply to me, since I wrote in the November 1993 issue, ofChristopher Street magazine that "support for greater inclusiveness in the gay and lesbian movement has been twisted into something altogether different—a rationale for bashing gay, white men.

One might ask Suggs and Carter to explain just what they think are the exclusively "gay white male" issues that have dominated the gay movement. Sodomy law repeal? Domestic partnership? Religious rights and housing discrimination? Gays in the military? AIDS? None of which, of course, solely concerns "gay white men."

Meanwhile, the柘onion of Islam claimed Jewish racism was the cause of African-American anti-Semitism, that view was denounced by the Jewish community in no uncertain terms. But when lesbian and gay leftists promote the scurrilous idea that straight male males are responsible for homophobia in the black community, we gays are expected to nod our heads in shameful agreement. The amount of knee-jerk this kind of thinking is quite amazing. "I think white gays and lesbians can never move forward until they acknowledge [their] racism," David Smith (he's white) of the National
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for social, religious, or literary purposes. Phi Beta Kappa, now a scholastic honor society, began as a fraternity at the College of William and Mary in 1776. As part of a crop that fought against the stuffy social system of the day, Yale students established the Delta Kappa Epsilon fraternity in 1844. DKE members included presidents Teddy Roosevelt, Gerald Ford, and George Bush; author Nathaniel Hawthorne, composer Cole Porter, politicians Sargent Shriver and John Clafin; Benno Schmidt, former president of Yale, and agnostic philosopher Rick Clark.

In 1854, Delta Kappa Epsilon chartered a chapter at Middlebury College in Middlebury, Vermont, where, as at most schools, the fraternity brothers proved to be faithful alumni and generous financial contributors. For fraternity, this fraternity formed a keystone of their college experience and helped them mature. "It was real world experience," says 1964 grad John Buttolph, whose family has attended Middlebury since 1810, and whose great-grandfather purchased the property for his DKE (or "deke") house. During Buttolph's time, DKE spearheaded efforts to racially integrate both their own fraternity and the Middlebury campus.

Until relatively recent times, schools valued and encouraged the fraternity tradition as an integral part of the academic system. During the 1930s, for instance, when Colby College officials moved the school to its present site in Waterville, Maine, they invited fraternity to come and build houses in the center of campus. As at many other schools, the fraternity dwellings form a key part of campus housing to this day. As late as the 1960s, some 90 percent of Middlebury students joined fraternities or sororities with scarcely a peep of protest from the administration.

But that was then, and this is now. On campuses today, uncommitted middle aged alumni of the Stiffies have gained positions of power in the faculty and the dean's office. And they never forgot that during their time in school fraternities and sororities not only refused to "get serious" but also impeded antiracism, anti-school, and anti-American protests. "After the Vietnam War, a lot of us didn't just crawl back into our library cubicles," says Jay Patin, radical professor of English at Middlebury. "We stepped into academic positions. Now we have tenure, and the hard work of reshaping the universities has begun in earnest."

The raw material for this reshaping is not only the freshmen who are saturated with PC sensitivity during orientation week and thereafter, but also the fraternities. The campaign against them by the tenured left is based both on historical payback for the way the fraternities were in the '60s and on a pragmatic recognition that the Greek brothers and sisters are the last bastions against the incursion of guilt and anger," Easlick wrote in a recent article co-authored with Thomas Short. "More important, fraternities provide a social setting, free of administrative manipulation, in which their members can share their reactions to campus events and discover that they are not alone in doubting the doctrines so insistently promulgated. This provides much needed psychological support for independent thought. Fraternities, in short, have become a sanctuary for campus heterodoxy, and that is why there are those who feel they must be stamped out."

Not all the practices of the ancient Greeks are currently out of favor on campus. Officials at the University of California at Los Angeles, for example, confirm that the school caved in to the demand of speaker "Anna R. Kissed" on campus. The administration didn't know who was there, so they punished all of them," says Jed Davis. "Then the school told them they were free to come forward and prove they weren't there. So much for the presumption of innocence."

Davis and others contrast Colby's heavy-handedness in dealing with fraternities with its reaction to the appearance of the self-styled radical "Anna R. Kissed" on campus. The school caved in to the demand of speaker "Kissed" and her feminist allies in the student body that men be banned from club activity on their own time some 30 miles off campus. The college promptly suspended 25 juniors and sophomores for one semester and denied 19 seniors the right to participate in commencement.

Three Dekes: David Easlick, Teddy Roosevelt, and Gerry Ford

You can't expect gender feminists to be reasonable." David Easlick, a New York attorney who has devoted his career to defending fraternities because he sees their struggle as "cutting edge First Amendment stuff," sees fraternity boys as the last free men in the increasingly uniform setting. "Fraternities engage students' attention and absorb their energies in ways that distract from the inculcation of guilt and anger," Easlick wrote in To wean students away from fraternity activity, Colby administrators engaged in a sort of pacification program, building a student center where they offered free booze. "There was free beer and tequila, all you could drink," says Chris Cotter, who was expelled in a conflict at Colby. "Once the fraternity ban was in effect, however, they cracked down on drinking with the zeal of Carry Nation."

Colby authorities now require students to sign the equivalent of loyalty oaths promising that they will observe the no-fraternity mandate. Like other schools where fraternities have been banned, Colby administrators knew that such a ban would spark an underground and that they set up a network of informers to help them penetrate it. "They reward the snitches, the students who hang out with dean," says Mastrangelo. And attorney Jed Davis cites a case in which Colby officials entered the room of a student and, while searching through his belongings, found a list of freshman pledges that read: "The school then called them in, one by one," he recounts, "with faculty members grillling and threatening them."

Davis subsequently notified Colby President William Cotter that the student whose belongings had been rifled would bring criminal charges of theft. Cotter put the issue in the lap of Dean Janice Kassman, who denied that informing or

Dean Janice Kassman, who denied that informing or

interrogation takes place. But Davis believes that Kassman and other school officials must have spies in place, because someone told them that a group of 61 students, primarily members of the football team, had engaged in secret fraternity activity on their own time some 30 miles off campus. The college promptly suspended three young men who could not have been present at the rites because they were away studying in England. "The administration didn't know who was there, so they punished all of them," says Jed Davis. "Then the school told them they were free to come forward and prove they weren't there. So much for the presumption of innocence."

Davis and others contrast Colby's heavy-handedness in dealing with fraternities with its reaction to the appearance of the self-styled radical "Anna R. Kissed" on campus. The administration didn't know who was there, so they punished all of them," says Jed Davis. "Then the school told them they were free to come forward and prove they weren't there. So much for the presumption of innocence."

Davis and others contrast Colby's heavy-handedness in dealing with fraternities with its reaction to the appearance of the self-styled radical "Anna R. Kissed" on campus. The school caved in to the demand of speaker "Kissed" and her feminist allies in the student body that men be banned from attending her talk, in which she reportedly said, among other things, "If a man was dying on the side of the road, I wouldn't help him." Dean Kassman acknowledges that the school approved the ban against men attending the speech but says the incident sparked positive discussion.

Colby Dean Janice Kassman contends that students are attracted to her school's "fraternity-free" environment and as a result of it are the happiest students in the country. As Kassman describes it, anti-fraternity administrators are simply following the will of the campus masses. The students, she says, were upset that underground fraternities existed at Colby and wanted the off-campus frats to be expelled, not merely suspended.

"It's bullshit," says attorney Jed Davis who has gotten to know many Colby students.

At Bowdoin, another upper-crest college in Maine, there has been the same sort of accord among those regards to underground fraternities as at Colby. Over the last several years, Bowdoin has become such a PC stronghold that even faculty liberals feel compelled to protest. In February of 1992, Professor Chris Potholm appeared on WCBB-Channel 10, a Maine PBS affiliate, decrying the school's "thought police" and "ridiculous..."
rules." Potholm argued that "diversity" was PC-speak for conformity and, as proof, pointed out that the chairman of Bowdoin's diversity committee had stated that it was wrong for an 18-year-old to be a Republican.

But when Bowdoin fraternities were the object of a PC campaign, they had no campus defenders. The fraternities routinely drew faculty flak for a series of activities, among them, setting up a chapel on campus. And in 1988 Bowdoin gave its fraternities an ultimatum: Go co-ed or disband. The fraternities chose the latter course.

"The crux of the matter was that the faculty wanted to control the students," says 1985 Bowdoin alumnus Phineas Sprague, who remains in close touch with the campus. Sprague makes the obvious point that placing women with the men only increased a sexually charged atmosphere.

A testament of criticism of the school followed its decision. Students appeared on public television claiming that the fraternities had been "railroaded." Nor were the women particularly pleased with the outcome. Student Leslie Morse complained that in the co-ed houses "women don't have the same standing" and undergrad Iris Rodriguez said simply, "It's time for the college to stop playing favorites for us."

The PBS station's coverage of the controversy also included some rather startling footage: hundreds of students hoisting placards that denounced Bowdoin's anti-fraternity policies, which they claimed violated not only time-honored traditions but mainstream American rights and values as well. As administrators filed by, the camera caught students breaking into a spirited rendition of "God Bless America."

Vermont's Middlebury College, which has now banned "freshman" in favor of "first-year student" and applied the term "women's" for its all female campus organizations, is another once fraternity-friendly school that reversed itself and attempted to ban the voluntary organizations as "incompatible with student life."" Leading the charge was Fraternity President John McCardell, ironically a faithful Lambda Kai Alpha brother during his student days at Washington and Lee, whose fraternity membership was one of the factors that prompted his rise to a school presidency.

His efforts to prevent students from enjoying a version of his own college experience led him to a carrot-and-stick approach vis-à-vis fraternities, with the emphasis on stick. "We'd get dragged into the Community Council based on anonymous rumors," says 1991 Middlebury graduate Josh Sarkis, a "Deke" vice president in his student days. "There were a dozen of these, and each time they took a poll and found that 62 percent were the women particularly pleased with the outcome. Student Leslie Morse complained that in the co-ed houses "women don't have the same standing" and undergrad Iris Rodriguez said simply, "It's time for the college to stop playing favorites for us."
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But many other Middlebury alumni took the opposite view. "Why this asinine witch hunt continues seeking to purge the campus of any heterogeneity continues to mystify me," responded one 1979 alumni to Middlebury's questionnaire. Said another: "I am tired of these snobs using sexism and prejudice as an excuse for their own weaknesses. If the college needs to improve the social and/or intellectual atmosphere for this minority who feel left out, then do it, but don't destroy what has been so positive to so many of us over the years."

Another Middlebury grad said: "Fraternities are elitists! In one of the ten toughest schools in the country to get into, what does elitism mean?"

But conflicting opinions did not stop the school from going ahead with its eradication campaign. Last year, President McCardell wrote that the fraternity issue "has gained the inflexible establishment of the PC ethos. If political correctness is empirically true that fraternities are despicable. That is, it justifies the repressive means.

Although fraternities are not a priori despicable, it is empirically true that fraternities are despicable. That is, it is possible that fraternities are not populated by despicable people engaging in despicable behavior (which, by the way, is the point of a fraternity)."

Last spring, a Vermont court ruled against the DKE's private fraternity on the grounds that the Middlebury was a private institution and could ban fraternities if it so desired. So the DKE's are not only banned at Middlebury but are forbidden to enter the house they own on campus on pain of immediate suspension. Asked what other offenses drew the same penalties as fraternity activity, Middlebury administrator John Buttolph cited cheating on exams and doing "anything criminal" as carrying comparable penalties. Attorney Jed Davis, who defended the DKE's on their graduation gown, says that the banned brothers enjoy meeting off campus or on other campuses, in restaurants, safe houses, or even in foreign countries. "They teach us how to do things. You make it clandestine and don't let people know. Fraternities will outlast the PC movement."
The NEA exacts a commitment to a very specific agenda, a putsch for its support, and at the very top of this agenda is opposition to school choice. We've got a monopoly," one delegate joked at the New Orleans convention, "and we intend to keep it that way.

Power politics has become the forte of the NEA—a form of high-powered lobbying in an era when other unions have seen their clout evaporate. But its current aggressive personality is actually a relatively new one for the union. In its earlier incarnation was that of a genteel association of self-defined "professionals" who pushed their policies with delicacy and were at-justly the idea of being confused with blue-collar trade unionists.

First called the National Teachers Association, the NEA came into being in 1857 as "a kind of educators' discussion club. In 1870, the group changed its name to the National Education Association and opened its ranks to anyone concerned with the educational system, then enjoying rapid expansion in America.

In 1905, the association setup shop in Washington, D.C., where it built an image for itself as a kind of unofficial ministry of education, encouraging change through a free and open discussion of the issues. It was the sweetness and light generated by the NEA, in fact, that led Congress to offer the organization an informal charter, which the organization gladly accepted in 1907.

In the ensuing decades, American public education became increasingly bureaucratized and successful. The NEA presided over this triumph with an avuncular pride. Yet it could show its teeth when dissenting, and critical opinions about the public educational system appeared. When the best-seller Why Johnny Can't Read by Rudolph Flesch appeared in 1955, for instance, NEA brass attacked the book with an intensity and vehemence that dismayed even NEA members: "Keep negotiations going until 2 or 3 in the morning. Wear down the board [of education] physically and psychologically. Remember to apply pressure tactics on the board team or board members subtlety, since open public evidence of the tactics you are using will have the disastrous effect of unifying the board, and you don't want to do that."

Another tool recommended for local use is an NEA manual called Ally to Teacher Organizers: "Know the enemy, divide the enemy, conduct the action on several levels," the manual advises. "Personalize the conflict. Don't let your people fraternize with the enemy... Personalize it so you fight a person rather than the system. ...Build all strategies and tactics around conflict Use confrontation to buy a piece of the power."

The reference to 1960s community organizer Saul Alinsky in its title makes this manual sound somewhat quaint, but it still circulates, although the NEA's J. Michael Brittan, who authorized it 15 years ago, explains that they don't really use it that much any more. When a reporter asked him why, Arisman replied, "For one thing, we became powerful."

In the 1970s, the NEA did indeed come of age. George W. Fisher, then president of the organization, said, "I think, however, the NEA fights parent ideas of teacher certification process because "they don't want to free up grading scales and teach marksmanship nationwide."

The NEA's effectiveness as a political juggernaut is no surprise that it is easy to lose sight of the way in which the union has defined the educational culture in this country. But there too the situation of an office managed to have its way, or something like a hermetic seal around questions of public policy where education is concerned and exerting a control that is near totalitarian.

In 1970, NEA President George Fisher said the organization was on the edge of finally realizing its "113-year-old dream of controlling who enters, who stays, and who leaves the profession." Since then, it has crossed over into the promised land. The NEA's mantra for control has been nowhere more evident than in the way it has colonized education departments in universities across the country, defining who teaches, how and what they teach, and where. NEA guidelines have been instrumental in defining the fiercely independent teacher who was almost an American folk figure at the turn of the century as a "certified person," a result of a course of study in the educational credential which dumbs down prospective teachers and imbues them in "educando," the bureaucratic patron that refers to libraries as "learning resource centers" and grades as "student outcomes" and "mathematically insists that "goals and objectives" be "prioritized."

Joe Orton of Michigan's Mackinac Center for Public Policy has noted that the NEA is determined to the certification process because "they don't want to free up school boards to make choices." Without a teacher's certificate, of course, students would not be allowed to teach in public schools. With certificates, people who are definitely not Einstein or Edison's have come to monopolize the teaching profession.

While insisting on its ideas of teacher certification, however, the NEA fights parent ideas of teacher accountability. The NEA is against merit pay, one way of deal by giving the NEA, in effect, its own federal agency, the Department of Education. (To get a better sense of what this means imagine Ronald Reagan or George Bush rewarding the National Rifle Association for its success in establishing a federal Department of Firearms in Washington to promote weapons sales and teach marksmanship nationwide.)
addressing the initiative and resourcefulness of teachers who manage extraordinary achievement against the grain of the system. The common position is that such merit pay increases would be "political," involving school administrators in judgments about which teachers or groups merited inclusion, thus weakening union bargaining power for teachers en bloc. A position such as this has led to the NEA to the preposterous notion that just as there is no such thing as an incompetent teacher, so there is no thing as a bad one. Union reps make a local school board's life miserable when they attempt to get rid of even a grossly incompetent teacher. A file of several years' duration documenting the ineptitude must be established. Even then, it costs an average of $5,000 to complete the negotiations that characterize a dismissal process.

Many teachers are frustrated by the opposition to merit pay. Some feel victimized by what they call the "forced union two-step." The NEA pressures for state laws that require all teachers in a bargaining unit to accept even unwanted union representation. Once they have accomplished this goal, union bosses complain that they must represent those who don't want their representation and whom they shun and castigate as "free riders" in the NEA equivalent of Catch-22.

While the NEA has made sure that it is practically impossible to fire incompetent teachers, it has successfully pushed laws now effective in several states, that allow for the firing of teachers who refuse to pay union dues. Anne Park's, a Detroit teacher who was fired for refusing to pay agency shop fees, says, "If union officials—who function outside the control of the public—can determine who has the privilege of teaching America's youth, where is democracy, where is academic freedom? We can't surrender our schools to the dictates of union bigwigs and then expect our children to respect individual human rights."

In 1983, Charlene Sciambi of Fremont, California, was named best foreign-language teacher in the state. But when union officials demanded that she pay dues, she refused. After a bitter fight, the non-union teacher resigned rather than be "reduced to playing the role of a bagger at the union's back door." Said Sciambi, "I didn't need the union for anything. I stood on my performance...[In resigning] I told the student/employer intended to confiscate my wages without my permission and that was the status of a slave."

It is not as if NEA members are under illusions about their product. Increasingly, they send their own children to private schools while obeying union leaders demands to block voucher plans that would enable inner-city blacks and Hispanics and many others to escape the clutches of the NEA-controlled system. The NEA also functions as an insurance and life insurer founded in 1945. Horace Mann provides liability insurance for NEA members, which further increases union control over the rank and file. When then-Gov of Tennessee Lamar Alexander proposed that the state provide teacher's liability insurance, the NEA went ballistic—possibly the first time a union has objected to an employer providing benefits—and even accused the governor of "union busting."

The National Education Association's offensive of the past quarter century has not only won it a vast domain over their report card from unionized American educators, who visited several poverty dissidents and continued to mark the USSR by a lower standard than their own country.

During the 1960s, the NEA appeared to indulge every anti-corporate, anti-American propaganda blitz, at one time going so far as to allow the nuclear-freeze campaign to operate from NEA offices. In 1971, Richard Daley of the Daily Worker, a Communist Party organ, attended the NEA's annual convention in Minneapolis and liked what he saw. "None of the main documents of NEA, in their resolutions or new business items, are there any anti-Soviet or anti-capitalist positions," he wrote. "It has chosen a position in opposition to transnational corporations, to racism, to the Pentagon, and to the Reagan doctrine...so it will increasingly beRight shoulder-to-shoulder with fellow trade unionists as the class struggle intensifies.

The NEA's infatuations once drew fire from the rival American Federation of Teachers, which did not regard the USSR as a model to be admired. "The Communist government considers it a great propaganda coup to have their phony 'unions' accepted around the world as true representatives of the workers," says an AFT pamphlet. "When the NEA establishes ties with these groups and agrees to have official exchanges with them, it plays right into the hands of the totalitarian governments."

But the days when the AFT could be considered a possible counterweight to the NEA are long since vanished. Presently, the two unions are negotiating a merger.

With the end of the Cold War, the NEA has become a classic example of how the traditional left-oriented organizations have redefined their strategy. Once devoted to the hold up as "political," involving school administrators in the new agenda, union leaders have moved on to "multiculturalism" and "diversity."

The union's institutional leverage enables it to disguise PC as educational reform through vehicles such as the controversial California Learning Assessment System (CLAS), about which CTA boss Del WEBER wrote, this is almost exactly what CTA has been urging for more than a decade. The CLAS tests, largely designed by CTA "development teams," have been designed to replace objective examinations. They include essays on such "political" issues as race, recycling, gun control, and non-traditional marriage. Children are instructed to write down their "feelings" and encouraged to base their answers on group think exercises. (One test asks: "How does your group feel about the treatment the Chinese received from the Americans? Below is a great propaganda coup to have their phony 'unions' accepted around the world as true representatives of the workers.""

In addition to being "examined" within this framework, students are urged to become politically active, particularly through protest letters to politicians. In Maryland, teachers refused to write college recommendations for graduating students unless the kids also wrote to local officials urging tax increases that would benefit the union. And Thomas Sowell cites a California case in which students, after prompting by teachers, wrote to officials saying: "I hate you. I would like to kill you." and "I'm going to set your house on fire and get my homies to beat you up."

With both conservative and liberal parents protesting the CLAS tests, the union became extremely agitated. "The right-far network in California has a long-range goal of discrediting public education," it said in a joint declaration of 1994 with the left-wing lobbying group Public People for the American Way. "Its attacks on CLAS are designed to undermine reforms that are essential to improving the quality of public education in California."

The California Teachers' Association defense of CLAS is not dissimilar to the NEA's defense nationally of the Outcome Based Education models, which also indulges politically correct values. "The National Education Association through its Center for Innovation is gagged over OB," wrote Richmond Times-Dispatch columnist John Holland, who, in a series of articles, exposed OB as "fake reform—PC junk—that profits no one except the consultants peddling their wares to gullible educators.

Educator Linda Page agrees with this characterization, charging that OB, the opposite of a standards-based system, is "an attempt to come up with an
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Gay and Lesbian Task Force of the Washington, D.C., area Tony Summers of the D.C. Coalition of Black Lesbians and Gay Men and Bisexuals was quoted in the same story as expressing "concerns [. . .] that those of Hispanic and southern Hispanic homosexuals as well as transvestites might not be well represented" at Stonewall 25. Just who was standing at the gates keeping them out? After all, the quota-minded Stonewall 25 crew appointed a Latino drag queen as a co-chair spokesperson for the event, so if gays of color didn’t participate in sufficient numbers perhaps they should blame themselves.

Speaking of hurting gay white males, Ron Medley, a lawyer and former member of ACT BLACK (the African-American caucus of ACT-UP) wrote a June News letter op- ed in which he gave as an example of gay white male supremacy (as well as the gay white community’s "conspicuous consumption") the IKEA commercial featuring a gay white male couple buying furniture. "That ad was the culmination of 25 years of . . . de facto segregation by the gay white community," he wrote. "Our culture is so cohesive and, indeed, narcissistic minorities,” Medley wrote in a sentiment that could put the worst gay-bashers in the country to shame.

In July, Eric Steven Booth, who described himself as "a middle-class black gay man," wrote a letter to the New York Times in which he came to the astounding conclusion that “since AIDS, white gays have endured the same discrimination that blacks have!” According to the Times, "some eastern Hispanic families may be better off than they were before the epidemic." But true "diversity" and "inclusion" isn’t really what really matters, is it? Perhaps, Secretary Diane Ravitch, now at New York University, was referring to the third world when she wrote in the NEA’s powerful position virtually assures that these guidelines—like the revision of American history, but a version of history infusing a spirit of equity and including a critique of injustice in its curriculum and pedagogy. We need to view sexual harassment as an instrument for inequality and treat it with sustained and multidimensional education efforts." They insist that those subjected to training should include cafeteria workers, bus drivers, teachers’ aides, janitors, adjunct music teachers, driver’s-ed teachers and coaches.

The NEA’s powerful position virtually assures that these guidelines—like the revision of American history, but a version of history infusing a spirit of equity and including a critique of injustice in its curriculum and pedagogy. We need to view sexual harassment as an instrument for inequality and treat it with sustained and multidimensional education efforts." They insist that those subjected to training should include cafeteria workers, bus drivers, teachers’ aides, janitors, adjunct music teachers, driver’s-ed teachers and coaches.

Gay conservative and libertarian dissidents, such as A Place at the Table at the article Bruce Bawer, are regularly excluded in the left gay press. There has been a concerted attempt to silence these individuals. As lesbian feminist Sara Miles recently huffed in Our magazine, "Their criticisms of existing gay politics and subculture are rooted in the same backlash against feminism, multiculturalism, and affirmative action that fuels the broader neo-conservative movement.”

Gay conservative and libertarian dissidents, such as A Place at the Table at the article Bruce Bawer, are regularly excluded in the left gay press. There has been a concerted attempt to silence these individuals. As lesbian feminist Sara Miles recently huffed in Our magazine, "Their criticisms of existing gay politics and subculture are rooted in the same backlash against feminism, multiculturalism, and affirmative action that fuels the broader neo-conservative movement.”

The result of all this radicalism in the gay and lesbian community is clean polarization between moderates interested in gay rights and radical leftists and feminists.
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Gay conservative and libertarian dissidents, such as A Place at the Table at the article Bruce Bawer, are regularly excluded in the left gay press. There has been a concerted attempt to silence these individuals. As lesbian feminist Sara Miles recently huffed in Our magazine, "Their criticisms of existing gay politics and subculture are rooted in the same backlash against feminism, multiculturalism, and affirmative action that fuels the broader neo-conservative movement.”

It’s the National Education Association that is right in the middle of this battle. President Keith Geiger gives the game away when he says, "It was my growing sense of unease with all this that eventually led me to step back from the gay rights movement." In 1992, 23 percent of those gay Americans, on one hand, and militant Afrocentrists on the other; or between moderate women and radical feminists. Yet when it comes to gays, we’re all painted in the same colors. These same conservatives have no trouble distinguishing moderates interested in gay rights, and other than the NEA’s most outspoken foes, despite an expenditure of some $2 million in behalf of Engler’s opponent. Nor could the NEA’s massive spending on behalf of friendly Senate and Congressional candidates prevent the conservative tide from sweeping the nation in November. In its recent post-election "Portrait of the Electorate: Choice initiatives are not going to go away, and sooner or later the NEA will lose one of these battles—and the kids will escape for good. “The Berlin Wall analogy is appropriate,” says educational researcher Joe Oliver. “All it takes is one crack. Once it’s open, no one can force the poor people who have suffered all these years will pour through.” —The Editors
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Speaking of hurting gay white males, Ron Medley, a lawyer and former member of ACT BLACK (the African-American caucus of ACT-UP) wrote a June Newslet...

**Summary:**

- Gay male characters are given more attention in modern society.
- Efforts to disempower gay white men and lesbians are ongoing through political and social means.
- The National Education Association (NEA) is criticized for not fully representing the diversity of the gay community.
- The discrimination against gay white males is highlighted through events such as the IKEA commercial.
- The NEA is accused of not fully addressing concerns of black and Hispanic individuals.
- The NEA's influence is significant, as it is regarded by professionals and even its leaders are critical of its actions.
- The NEA's agenda is seen as being against the interests of gay white males and lesbians.

**Analysis:**

The passage discusses how gay and lesbian organizations are not always representative of all segments of the gay community, particularly in terms of race and gender. The NEA, which is powerful in the educational field, is criticized for not fully addressing the concerns of black and Hispanic individuals. The text also highlights the discrimination faced by gay white males, such as the example of the IKEA commercial. The NEA is seen as having a significant influence on educational policies, which can affect the representation of different groups within the gay community. The text suggests that the NEA's agenda is not always in line with the interests of gay white males and lesbians, and that efforts to disempower these groups continue to be made. Overall, the passage argues for the need for greater representation and inclusion within gay and lesbian organizations.
1974 should not be allowed to dwindle away without a final goodbye to the event at which the Sixties generation looked back this year with nostalgia—Woodstock 1969. That hyper-trophied happening was something of a joke at the time (and even more in retrospect), but no other event from that destructive decade more clearly indicates The Way They Were.

The film Woodstock—re-released this year as a "director's cut" in time for the event's 25th reunion concert—presents an image of peace, love, and music. One sees the mosh pits, the performers, and the crowds. Interviews with revelers are interspersed with townspople who seem drawn from the painting "American Gothic" complaining about strange goings-on. Here are, of course, anecdotal stories of a "bad trip" or lines for the bathrooms. In one sequence, Army helicopters are seen unloading a few victims of drug overdoes. But overall, the film, produced by the same businessmen who promoted the Woodstock concert, is more a promotional infomercial than a documentary. And, above all, it presents only a tiny slice of the truth of the event.

For those who took the opportunity to look back to the original news accounts, it is clear that Woodstock was not the peaceable kingdom portrayed in the film but rather an orgy of lawlessness, violence, and nihilism at a cold and miserable location, which was tolerable presumably only because of the drugged condition of the concertgoers. In the popular myth, the concert was supposed to display the love, cooperation, and communal good feeling at the heart of Sixties utopianism. A close look at what happened at Woodstock shows quite the opposite. The murders at Altamont were already foreshadowed at Woodstock by thefts, assaults, drug sales, and at least two reported meaningless deaths.

If Woodstock had been a General Motors car, Ralph Nader would have demanded it be recalled as a defective product. Instead, because it was "politically correct" for its time, its promoters and mythologizers ignored the nightmare realtity in much the same way that they and their kissing cousins among the politicians of the era painted out the gagals of the Soviet Union. Woodstock had in it all the horrors of the ghastly '60s, and this was well known at the time.

Yippie leader Paul Krassner wrote about a famous violent incident at Woodstock in his aptly titled autobiography, Confessions of a Raving Unconfined Nut. He recalled: "While The Who was performing, Abbie Hoffman went on stage with the intention of informing the audience that John Sinclair of the White Panthers was serving ten years in prison for possession of two joints, that this was really the politics behind the event, but before he could get his message out, Pete Townshend turned his guitar into a tennis racket and smashed Abbie in the head with a swift backhand. And my yellow leather fringe jacket that I was wearing for the first time was stolen from the "Movement City tent."

Yet the film Woodstock does not contain this scene, or any reference to this scene, an omission no doubt intended to further the myth of nonviolence that surrounds the gory memory of the concert to this day. Pete Townsend's bashing of Abbie Hoffman was an act of violence—assault and battery, to be precise—and might have been both a criminal offense and grounds for a civil suit in another circumstance. But in this case, more than simple violence underlay the assault on Hoffman. For Abbie had apparently broken an agreement by "politicizing" the concert.

New York Times writer Richard Reeves noted in a profile of concert promoters Mike Lang and John Roberts in the September 7, 1969, New York Times that accepting payoffs was a part of Abbie's reason for being at the festival. As Reeves wryly pointed out: "Neither rain, nor garbage, nor Students for a Democratic Society could provoke the kids. SDS and other radical groups, however, were paid well not to start trouble. Yippie leader Abbie Hoffman received $100,000 from Woodstock to act as headquarters for assorted radicals." That is probably equivalent to $100,000 in 1994. No wonder Townsend smashed Abbie with his guitar when he tried to stir things up. And no wonder Abbie didn't press charges. He probably didn't want to return his payoff. That Hoffman had accepted "hush money" was reported in the New York Times, but it has yet to be integrated into the mythology of the event.

If violence and corruption were features of Woodstock, so was crime. The Hog Farm Commune was supposed to help police the event. Richard Reeves noted that "some festival organizers were dubious about calling them security officers. "They stole everything that wasn't nailed down," one man said. [Concert organizer John] Roberts has no idea who took what, but he does say: "Everything was taken. The jackets we planned to sell. Our walkie-talkies. Even the jeeps disappeared."

And what about the supposed anti-commercialism of Woodstock and of the communal "counterculture" that was more interested in spiritual enlightenment than crass profit? On August 17, 1969, the New York Times reported that $13.5 million worth of tickets had been sold in advance, and $140,000 had been taken in at the gate by Woodstock Ventures. The company spent $200,000 on advertising to promote the concert. And who were the event's promoters? The film Woodstock shows some longhairs in work clothes. But the New York Times reports of the day saw another side—a side that prefrares Gordon Gekko and the so-called "decade of greed" of the '80s.

Here's how Richard Reeves described the impresario of Woodstock at the time: "There is John Roberts in his apartment on East 85th Street. Same age as Mike, horn-rimmed glasses, Rogers Peet suit. At 25 he's inherited the first million dollars from the Polident trust fund, Outta sight," And here is Reeves talking about Roberts' partner for Woodstock, Mike Lang: "I knew it was going to happen," Mike said the other day as his white Porsche stopped in front of the Plaza.

Now the film Woodstock, for some reason, never showed us Mike Lang's Porsche pulling up in front of New York's fashionable Plaza hotel. And it never showed us Roberts' fashionable Upper East Side apartment, or his trust fund, for that matter.

And how, precisely, did Roberts spend his time at Woodstock? The film didn't show us, but Richard Reeves did. "He spent the weekend far from the madding crowd," says Roberts. Now the film Woodstock, for some reason, never showed us Mike Lang's Porsche pulling up in front of New York's fashionable Plaza hotel. And it never showed us Roberts' fashionable Upper East Side apartment, or his trust fund, for that matter.

And how, precisely, did Roberts spend his time at Woodstock? The film didn't show us, but Richard Reeves did. "He spent the weekend far from the madding crowd," says Roberts. Now the film Woodstock, for some reason, never showed us Mike Lang's Porsche pulling up in front of New York's fashionable Plaza hotel. And it never showed us Roberts' fashionable Upper East Side apartment, or his trust fund, for that matter.

And how, precisely, did Roberts spend his time at Woodstock? The film didn't show us, but Richard Reeves did. "He spent the weekend far from the madding crowd," says Roberts. Now the film Woodstock, for some reason, never showed us Mike Lang's Porsche pulling up in front of New York's fashionable Plaza hotel. And it never showed us Roberts' fashionable Upper East Side apartment, or his trust fund, for that matter.
perform. These scenes are not in the film, either. But Richard Reeves was there, and he described them in the New York Times: "At one point a few of those creditors, unimpressed by the slogan 'three days of peace and music,' managed to get into Mike's trailer, behind the throbbing one-acre stage and begin hassling them for their bread. 'We don't have the cash right now,' Mike said softly, smiling; no one can remember ever hearing him raise his voice. 'We didn't plan it this way, but this is a free concert. There is no gate. There is no cash. It's a beautiful thing. Have some faith!' Bull—' screamed the manager of one of the top groups that played at Bethel. 'You say you have $40 million behind you. Then get up $5,000 cash—now!'"

Another group manager, John Wolff of The Who, knifed in with 'cash or certified check or we don't go on.' Such was the anti-commercialism of Woodstock! But this side of the concert was airbrushed out of the film because it didn't fit in with the mythos surrounding the moral superiority of the youth culture to the crude commercial system it was pretending to overthrow.

And how did John Roberts remember the peace and love of Woodstock? "It was a nightmare—I wrote a lot of bad paper that weekend," Roberts said later as he sipped a Seven n' Seven in the Cavendish, a private club which his father belongs to on Central Park West. "My family is scurrying around getting the collateral to make the checks good. Everyone will be paid in 60 days."

Expenses totaled $2.7 million, and the revenues were $1.4 million. In other words, the concert was a media event designed to generate a long-term revenue stream from the film and album that would more than make up the short-term shortfall. Even the temporary loss was an absurdity. The proposition, engineered in part by Roberts and Lang's two other partners, Artie Kornfeld, a contemporary music executive at Capitol Records, and Joel Rosenman, a Yale Law School grad. Woodstock was Big Business—Wall Street, in fact—selling itself as something else. Jimi Hendrix was the highest paid performer at Woodstock. He got $36,000 for his gig. The film won the Oscar for best documentary. A year later three Woodstock performers were dead: Hendrix, Janis Joplin, and Al Wilson of Canned Heat. Was this just one of those Jungian synchronicities? No. At Woodstock there had been not only an endorsement of the drug culture which led to their deaths, but also widespread selling of drugs—surely the most pure form of capitalist exploitation imaginable.

In the aftermath of the event, the Times convened a panel of kids who had been at Woodstock to conduct a postmortem. The interviewers—including Joseph Llelyveld, who is today managing editor of the paper—said the kids "all were from comfortable middle-class backgrounds."

Here were some of the voices of Woodstock from the August 25, 1969, article: "JUDY: 'I never made it to the concert. I never heard any music at all.' BELL: 'I mean, when I saw the helicopters landing and picking up the wounded, it reminded me of Viet Nam.' JIMMY: 'All my life I've had just about everything I want. And I have to have whatever I want for the rest of my life, except from now on I have to begin to think about how to provide it for myself. And I don't want to work because I can't have anything I want if I have to stay in the same place from 9 to 5.'"

Most important, one must remember the two reported deaths at Woodstock. One casualty had fallen from a tower and was reported to have suffered a drug overdose. The Times noted: "One other youth was reported killed. The police identified him as Raymond R. Mizsac, 17, of Trenton, and said he had been run over by a tractor yesterday morning." Mizsac was not remembered in the film of Woodstock, no doubt because the excruciatingly violent way he met his grisly fate might have cast a pall over the positive image the promoters wished.

According to the New York Times, injuries were suffered by 5,000 of the concertgoers. On August 19th, 1969, New York City Councilman Joseph Modugno, a Republican, complained that his son became ill after attending Woodstock. The Times reported he "called yesterday for a Federal investigation of what he charged was "deliberate misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal negligence" on the part of the festival's promoters and organizers."

"They advertised three days of peace and music," Mr. Modugno said, "but instead, hundreds of thousands who attended faced suffering, illness, injury, and even death."

Apparently nothing came from Councilman Modugno's request. All that is left of the event is the myth of its beauty and its embodiment of the pristine possibilities of the Sixties.
Liberalism’s Orwellian Perversion


Reviewed by Glynn Custred

One would expect a conservative Republican, a backer of right-wing causes and a supporter of politicians such as Jesse Helms and Pat Buchanan to tell us that double standards, quotas, and political correctness represent “retrograde tribalism or wrong-headed moralism.” Nor would we be in the least surprised if such a person were to say that multiculturalists in our schools and universities “want all heritages and all groups to be equal,” yet like “Orwell’s pigs” they want “some to be more equal than others,” or that there is “a growing recognition that something besides racism may be to some degree responsible for their problems.”

Yet these pronouncements were not made by a staunch Republican at all, nor for that matter, even by a political conservative. Instead they were written by a Pulitzer prize-winning critic for Time magazine, a self-identified Democrat, a card-carrying member of the American Civil Liberties Union, a donor (in his own words) to “left-of-center social causes” whose boyhood heroes were Hubert Humphrey and Martin Luther King Jr., a man who actively supported opponents of Jesse Helms, and who boasts that he once crossed the road at a Washington party to avoid the disagreeable possibility of having to say hello to Pat Buchanan. What’s going on here? Is a journalist with all the right credentials, a bona fide liberal, writing an anti-liberal book?

Indeed such courses are a “sort of feel-good sense of victimology among assorted self-proclaimed native Americans, he says, are “dinosaurs and skunks.” Thus, “losers on the basis of merit should be shielded from thinking their losing is merited,” while “winners who win fairly should be barred from feeling comfort and pride,” a notion so absurd, says Henry, that you feel as if you had “ventured into Cloud-Cuckooland” when you encounter it.

Since “education is both the mirror and maker of modernity, reflecting the values of contemporary culture and instilling them in the succeeding generation,” the state of public education is a good indicator of the kind of general corruption which has attracted Henry’s criticism. Instead of teaching discipline, self-denial and kind of general corruption which has attracted Henry’s criticism. Instead of teaching discipline, self-denial and psychological deficiencies of some parents, the ignorance and bone idleness of others, the economic aggravation of others still and the myriad lankiness of nature. (One recent illustration is apropos by a school board member in Half Moon Bay, California, to abolish homework because it demands too much of the students.) It is no wonder, then, that academic performance has suffered. And if students cannot meet the levels which were, until not so long ago, the expected norm. Rather than a place of learning, schools, he says, have become “rehabilitation centers obliged to make up for social and psychological deficiencies of some parents, the ignorance and bone idleness of others, the economic aggravation of others still and the myriad lankiness of nature.” (One recent illustration is apropos by a school board member in Half Moon Bay, California, to abolish homework because it demands too much of the students.)
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In a startling press conference this morning, Regina Piscopo, the new President of the Confederation Internationale des Echecs, announced the first modifications of the rules of chess since the fourteenth century.

The announcement followed months of negotiations between traditionalists and post-traditionalists (known as the Fianchetto Sinistro), which have been conducted with a degree of secrecy rivaling the Manhattan Project.

The Fianchetto Sinistro had long maintained that chess, in its 600-year-old present form, had not only become irrelevant, but was also exerting an increasingly pernicious influence on society with its sexist, royalist, religionist, and violent concepts. The organization holds that certain post-traditionalist innovations will bring the game into harmony with 20th-century thinking.

Changes in the appearance of the board and pieces will become official concurrently with the revisions in the rules. The prototypes unveiled at today’s news conference elicited gasps and low whistles of appreciation.

Because the old chess sets symbolically promoted interracial strife, the checkerboard of the new boards eschew the traditional black and white in favor of a handsome combination of light chartreuse and deep purple squares. (Post-traditionalists point out that the contrast between dark and light still enables the color-perception-challenged to enjoy the game.) It is believed that the new designer colors may also induce more girls to take an interest in chess, although there has not yet been conclusive research on the subject.

The figures themselves are of a simple style reminiscent of Stanton but with minor alterations. The King and Queen have been replaced by the President and the Spouse, virtually indistinguishable from one another in unisex dress.

The Knight has been supplanted by the Bodyguard. Traditionally, the Knight was represented by a horse, but animal-rights activists had pointed out that the knight’s move, due to its convoluted nature, was deemed too dangerous for a large animal with thin legs. The new Bodyguard sports a suit and sunglasses.

The Bishop has been displaced by the Journalist, a thin figure in a raincoat. The Rook or Castle has become the Homeless Shelter, a two-story square figure, and the Pawn has been replaced by the Taxpayer, a stooped figure of indeterminate sex.

All figures are either light chartreuse or deep purple except for the Journalists, which are either very light pink or dark red depending on whether they play chartreuse or purple.

The need to update the game became apparent several years ago when a spokesperson for the National Organization of Women pointed out that the Queen’s subordinate position to the king, despite her supermobility, was a very poor role model for women.

Studies undertaken subsequently under a grant awarded by the National Endowment of the Arts demonstrated that the traditional game of chess influenced children to become aggressive and bellicose.

“Children were being exhorted to ‘crush’, ‘trap’ and ‘repulse’ their opponents,” Ms. Piscopo explained. Such phrases as mating net and queening square were also found to be deeply offensive to many people.

After the new board and figures were introduced at the news conference, copies of the new rules were distributed to journalists following the news conference. A summary of the most important changes follows here:

- The President can make unlimited horizontal and diagonal moves, the Spouse unlimited vertical and diagonal. If one is in check, the other must come to his/her rescue. Should this not be possible within two moves, a Taxpayer is sacrificed. (Formerly, the King could move only one square at a time, while the Queen had great power, being able to move an unlimited number of squares in any direction. After extensive consultations with NOW, the roles of the President and the Spouse were equalized so that neither is subordinate to the other.)

- The Journalist moves only to the left.

- The Bodyguard retains the old Knight’s move but may compensate for the Journalist’s leftward bent by moving one square to the right when the Journalist is stranded at the edge of the board.

- The term casting has been supplanted by sheltering and takes place when five Taxpayers have been exhausted.

All other moves have been retained.

At the close of the press conference, Ms. Piscopo expressed her appreciation to Hillary Clinton and the leadership of NOW, PETA, NEA, and ACT-UP for their significant contributions to this epochal change in chess and its rules. She noted that next year her organization will begin discussions with the American Crossword Society.