The good news is that the election of 1996 was a vindication of conservative principles—smaller government and greater individual responsibility. The bad news is that Republicans so bungled the political battle—before and during the campaign—that the electorate didn’t trust a conservative to preside over conservative programs. And so, instead of a satisfying victory, the best conservatives can look forward to is four years of schadenfreude as the Clinton Administration attempts to cope with a national inquiry into its vulgar venality and penny-ante larceny.

It should have been otherwise. Instead of an ambiguous interregnum, these should have been the best of times for the conservative movement. After something close to a two hundred years’ war with the Left, the Right has won a verdict so complete that (with the exception of some hermetically sealed offices of the American university) Marxism has disappeared as a political, economic and even intellectual rival of free market individualism. With the exception of Havana, Pycmyang, and a few other blighted precincts around the globe, the principles of private property, individual rights and the economic market—cornerstones of the conservative worldview—are everywhere triumphant, in principle if not always in practice.

Conservatism is so clearly victorious in the battle of ideas that the only frisson of interest in liberal circles is how to plagiarize conservative policies and still present what seems to be a choice rather than an echo. So discredited are the programs of the Left that its candidates compete, as if in a Saturday Night Live routine, for the title of who is least liberal. They can contend electorally only by posing as tough on the criminals their orthodoxy views as socially oppressed rather than personally guilty, faithful in defending the nuclear family they would like to implode, pessimistic about the principles of social entitlement and economic leveling that always have been and still are at the core of their social engineering project.

Conservative ideas are calling the tune so insistently on the basic issues of our civic and political life that even the hardcore liberals have no choice but to do the dance. Yet instead of the dance of the dead, the left-wing corpse does the macarena. The skeleton smiles!

And this raises the question: How does the Left appear to win battle after battle even though its war is lost? Why do conservatives so often feel like losers even though they’ve won? Or, as the old Bessie Smith song asks, what did we ever do to get so black and blue?

Continued on page 12

Feminists Still at War with the Navy
The Question of Pilot B
By K.L. Billingley

On March 7, 1994, Lt. Carey Lohrenz, known in the voluminous documentation of what is now called her "case" as Pilot B, took off from Miramar Naval Air Station in San Diego at the controls of an F-14 Tomcat, a formidable fighting machine. The $38 million twin-engine jet is capable of Mach 3 speeds, altitudes above 50,000 feet, and can track 24 targets and shoot down six at once with its Phoenix AIM 54A missiles and Vulcan 20 mm cannon. During the 1980s, U.S. pilots flying this plane splashed two Libyan MiGs without breaking stride and easily chased down the Achilles Lauro hijackers, who ran but could not hide. For obvious reasons, not everybody gets to fly this awesome package, and its pilot seat has not, until recently, been considered a venue for affirmative action.

Navy pilots land the F-14 on carriers all over the world, in all kinds of weather and seas, day and night, during wartime and in peace. Those who cannot land the plane on "the boat," as aviators call the carrier, are of no use to the Navy. And this plane is not like the nimble trainers in which new pilots get the macarena. The skeleton smiles!

Continued on page 8
The J-School Blues

Linda Rawlings's report on the Berkeley Journalism School ("News Slanting 101," October 1996) does not check out. She refers to her J200 instructor as a she, while it really was a he. She refers to her J248 instructor as an African-American, while he was in fact a retired Caucasian publisher. She has misspelled the name of the building where she studied for two years. Readers can decide for themselves whether they can trust her memory of what other people said. She refers to a conversation with the former Dean that the Dean says never took place. Ms. Rawlings's exclusive source is herself, a practice she cannot have learned in our School. Perhaps we deserve a good kick now and then. While Ms. Rawlings was a graduate student, we hosted a critic from Accuracy in Media, an engineer of Gov. Pete Wilson's election victory in California, the CEO of the nation's most bottom-line newspaper chain, and a spokesperson for California's prison guards. Our Felker Magazine Center is a showcase for entrepreneurial talent.

We want people in the School who challenge beliefs about the content and the form of news. All we ask of our critics is that they arm themselves with the facts.

Thomas C. Leonard
Associate Dean, Journalism
University of California
Berkeley, CA

Linda Rawlings replies:

First: J200 was taught, with some instructors leading discussion groups, others guiding the publishing of the school newspaper and others teaching copyediting. My discussion group leader was female, but I wrote my J200 story for the school newspaper under the guidance of a male instructor.

Second: J248's lead instructor was indeed a "retired Caucasian publisher," but he was only one of many lecturers for this course. An African-American instructor gave the lecture regarding the ethics of racial reporting and Jesse Jackson.


Finally: My conversation with the Dean regarding the Jason Kidd incident did take place in his office. I gave him my lecture notes, which I wrote up in a draft entitled "What's Good for the Goose—" I still have a dated copy of it, and two other instructors at the school received copies of it between the time of my meeting with the Dean and my editorial class, which took place on Wednesday, February 8, 1995 at 4:00 pm. I refuse to involve myself in a face-off with the former Dean but facts are facts.

I am glad I have a chance to offer additional comment about my journalism education. There are many fine professionals at UC Berkeley's Graduate School of Journalism, and Tom Leonard is one of them. I do not understand why those journalism professionals who value objectivity, balance and fairness condone insidious violations of these values.

Libertarianism vs. The Drug War

Since you gave libertarians the entire airport panhandlers—whose dimensions are so limited and familiar that to hear their arguments pro and con two or three times is to know once and for all everything of note that's ever been thought or said on the subject.

In my opinion, libertarianism vs. the drug war is such a topic.

O.M. Ostlund, Jr.
State College, PA

Political Cross Dressing

David Horowitz, in his devastating review of Michael Lind's Up From Conservatism ("Political Cross-Dresser," September 1996), left Mr. Lind stark naked outside the gates of rational discourse. I am an evangelical preacher of the Christian faith tired of the brainless and malicious notion that serious Christians must be anti-Semitic. I thank God for Mr. Horowitz, himself a Jew, for exposing this common lie along with the equally fallacious contention that "right-wing" political and religious conservatives all walk in lockstep with one another. Lind's stereotypical representation, like all prejudice, owes its currency to ignorance; and, in the case of Lind, egregious ignorance, at that.

Don C. Glover
Monroe, LA

Before reading David Horowitz's review-essay eviscerating Michael Lind in the September issue of Heterodoxy ("Political Cross-Dresser"), I had seen a few tepidly critical articles on this charlatan in other conservative magazines. None of these articles succeeded in utterly discrediting Lind, as Horowitz did. I suspect that they really didn't try. It's a civility thing.

The zeal and effectiveness with which Horowitz dispatched this second-rate opportunist reminded me of Horowitz' comment elsewhere that "I feel too responsible for the destructive acts I committed as a radical not to recognize the need to defend conservatives, who are often too-detectable to respond in kind to radical attacks."

Mark Pulliam
San Diego, CA
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DUMB DOWN IN MICHIGAN: A report entitled... Michigan Public Universities" published by that state's Mackinac Center for Public Policy doesn't pull any punches. It says that the state universities of Michigan are "suffering from a general corrosion of academic standards and a... patterns leave millions of... Racist LA.

BORDERLINE MADNESS: Despite Clinton Administration claims of getting tough on the border... illegals continue to stream into the United States with the encouragement of Mexican officials. "The... were put in newspaper... is inviting Mexican consular officials to set up an office in the U.S. port of entry near San Diego. "A lot of people think it's a wonderful idea," said INS District Director Mark Reed. Those people are seeing... border... from a general erosion of academic standards and a... a favorite among teenagers. "We... the world by rig... on... of the movement he led back in... Savio supported in the days... borders between... the movement... the movement... on those preferences. "Don't bring that white boy bullshit around here, motherfucker," and one telling editor... Mike Coleman... Berkeley City Police consider it a death threat, but Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien, never bashful about Berkeley City Police consider it a death threat, but Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien, never bashful about...
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Political Correctness is out of style. The worldview it protects—relativistic, deconstructive, obsessed with higher education’s holy trinity of correctness as an in-your-face commitment—is out. Professors now somewhat smirkingly refer to it as they did the Communist threat during the Cold War—as a faraway, sometimes naughty bogeyman existing mainly in the imaginations of neurotic conservatives. It is true that the witch trials of conservative dissidents and the speech codes and brutal fundamentalism of sensitivity training sessions now seem like part of a vanished past, in the museum of college high-jinx that includes swallowing goldfish and spitting in clothes dryers. But it is also true that PC has not so much disappeared as become intrinsically—part of the institutional apparatus of university life, embedded in procedures such as the selection of texts and authors; the curriculum, the retrospective hiring process which integrates new students into the university community; in the organizations and activities to which the University gives funding, access, and official sanction; and, most importantly, in the sclerotic range of opinions which one cannot hold without being marginalized. Increasingly colorless and odorless, the PC ecosystem in most universities is nonetheless something incidentally bodied forth by some chance event that makes the dark forms momentarily visible. Something like this happened last year at my alma mater, Princeton University.

It all started in September of 1995. To introduce the first-year students (‘freshmen’ is now extinct) to life at the University holds orientation seminars during the first weeks of school on topics such as diversity, sexual health, sexual harassment, racism, and homosexuality. The seminars, which are as mandatory as anything is at Princeton, were conducted by student ‘peer educators’ from various campus organizations and presented either to the entire class or as smaller groups. The presentation entitled ‘Reflections on Diversity’ particularly caught his eye.

‘It didn’t seem to present any kind of traditional backgrounds, any kind of orthodox beliefs as part of the diversity on Princeton’s campus,’ remembers Horn. ‘Diversity’ did include race, gender, and religion. However, there was also specific attention given to the homosocial community at Princeton. But the diversity they showed us didn’t seem to include any kind of Orthodox backgrounds or conservative types of beliefs.

Horn wasn’t moved to protest the orientation, but the experience was on his mind when he read an article in the September 20 edition of the school newspaper, The Daily Princetonian (known on campus as the ‘Princeton’), reporting on a student’s research which purported to show that 38% of the students on campus were ‘homophobic.’ According to the study, conservative students, people who attended religious services regularly or belonged to a religious organization, and those who played team sports posted some of the highest levels of homophobia, measured on a 1-to-10 scale with higher numbers indicating ‘more anxiety’ about homosexuality (and) about being at close quarters with gay people.”

The article accepted the findings without question—no contrary or skeptical opinions were included, despite the accursory nature of the study—and intimated that the numbers would probably have been higher if people’s actions and not just their beliefs could have been measured.

To Horn, the article read like the orientation seminars, part two. So he sent an e-mail to the editorial offices of the ‘Princeton, objecting to the article’s use of the term “homophobia” to describe all quintas about homosexual behavior. Showing his freshman naivete, Horn, who intended the message as a private note, was surprised when his letter appeared in print.

As was the rest of the Princeton community, Horn’s words were unexceptionally blunt and decidedly against the grain. “The article... was not on the editorial page, but perhaps it belonged there,” he wrote. “Despite the best efforts of the politically correct and homosexual-ity advocacy groups on campus and elsewhere, the gay lifestyle cannot be elevated to a natural or acceptable trait. By grouping homosexuality with racism or sexism, one equates a behavior—which many people, like myself, find offensive—with human characteristics which are not chosen. Likewise, by characterizing those of us who are sickenied by homosexual behavior as prudish or afraid, your report on ‘homophobia’ discriminate against our opinions.”

Horn, nonchalantly a fairly apathetic place, woke up in a hurry. As expected, a few students wrote to the ‘Princeton protesting Horn’s comments. The most significant rebuttal, however, came not from one of Horn’s peers in the student body, but from the highest levels of the university administration. In a letter to the ‘Princeton, Dean Ellen Lisak, ‘director of Religious, Rights, and Responsibilities’ guidelines which stipulated that the University ‘attaches great value to freedom of expression on this campus,’ that it ‘also attaches great importance to mutual respect, and it deprecates expressions of hatred directed against any individual or group.’

She closed her letter with a summons: “I invite all members of the university community to join me in a reaffirmation of our support of the liberal, gay, and bisexual community and all of our campus communities.”

A backlash against Horn—exemplified in an ad taken out in the ‘Princeton by a student-theater group denouncing Horn through campus. But there were also some quibbles about Dean Lisak’s words. For instance, one reader, a student, felt that Horn’s letter “could have been a starting-off point for good open debate. But then Dean Meenour jumped in with the heavy hand of the University.” The fact that Horn’s fellow students showed they were perfectly able and willing to vigorously protest the views expressed in his letter did not seem to matter to the Dean of Student Life. “It almost seemed like she was trying to silence this freshman before he got any ideas,” said Pavlis. “It was like, ‘hey, don’t you get off, all of a sudden stirring up trouble. Don’t get the idea that in your four years here you’re going to be able to write any kind of letter you want.’”

That was exactly the conclusion I reached after graduating from Princeton: don’t get any ideas. My experiences paralleled those of Patrick Horn, and I have realized in the short space of years how far the University has come from the spot that despite its rhetoric to the contrary, Princeton is not beyond political correctness. It’s not the aggressive PC which we have come to expect—no fiery persecutions in the manner of Mount Holyoke, no marginalization of campus organizations, a uniformly liberal faculty, dissembling administrators, Ivy League don’t-rock-the-boat gentility, and Princeton’s steadfast aversion to self-examination, unimaginable, a part of the air students breathe.

Wide-eyed freshmen, ready to learn about life and the importance of homophobia, the mythical campus of 10-12 years ago; serving as the prerequisite for inclusion in the politics anxiety and paranoia of the University. It’s not the white-collar PC, the PC that is not beyond the politics of the University, but the white-collar PC which is not beyond the politics of the University. It’s not the white-collar PC, the PC that is not beyond the politics of the University, but the white-collar PC which is not beyond the politics of the University.

Worse, the University, for all its pretentions to intellectual honesty, ignores the fact that the PC of the University is not beyond the politics of the University. The University, for all its pretentions to intellectual honesty, ignores the fact that the PC of the University is not beyond the politics of the University. The University, for all its pretentions to intellectual honesty, ignores the fact that the PC of the University is not beyond the politics of the University.
tion that it would be normal for your roommate to come home and sleep with a different girl every night, maybe that means it would be normal for you,” Wallace said. “Because they put so much emphasis on what you are going to do when everyone else is drinking, people come into Princeton thinking that everybody else drinks. And I think that’s damaging.”

The peer educators were particularly concerned that students were going to use the seminars to suggest other risks. The organizations designated as arbiters of campus policies and culture are uniformly the same in outlook and politics despite all the earnest talk of diversity. The Women’s Center is a case in point. Though its leaders have always insisted that the Center is a resource and advocacy center representing all women at Princeton, the Center’s Statement of Purpose identifies it as a “feminist organization” and there is little doubt that this does not include moderate or conservative feminists.

Not surprisingly, as far as the Center is concerned women at Princeton can take only one position on the issue of abortion and still be considered a female in good standing. During my time at Princeton, the student pro-life group invited then-Governor of Pennsylvania Robert Casey to speak, and three women asked the Women’s Center if it would co-sponsor the event. No, they were told, not unless Princeton Pro-Life paid for a pro-abortion speaker as well.

One wonders even if that would have been enough. Mary Meany, a 1993 graduate and recipient of both the Rhodes and Marshall Scholarships, wrote that as a freshman she was startled when Princeton Pro-Choice advertised its first organizational meeting by saying, “Help Shape the Women’s Center Agenda for 1989-1990.” But when she visited the Center, Meany found its walls plastered with newsletters from Princeton Pro-Choice, NOW, and the National Abortion Rights Action League. One particularly crude example read, “Not every ejaculation deserves a name.”

The message was clear: women with differing opinions about abortion were not welcome at the Center.

The Center’s support for Marxism, bringing a host of pro-autoritarian speakers to the campus where James Madison once studied, has included a speech by Magda Enriquez Caffieiras, the Sandinista’s official representative to the United States and Canada, and a talk entitled “Struggling for a New Nicaragua and Our Future Nicaraguan State Farm.”

An article appearing during my sophomore year in the leftist student publication, The Progressive Review written by then-director of the Center, a woman who never stopped kowtowing to male Latin American dictators, provided perhaps the best summation of the Center’s ideology. Strost wrote that Cuba was a wonderful place for women—arguably preferable to the United States—because of its liberal abortion laws. Tellingly, her article appeared just as Hispanic students and Cubans were arriving in Miami, preferring to leave behind everything they had and risk a 100-mile float through shark-infested waters in makeshift inner tubes rather than remain in Castro’s feminist paradise.

If the Center’s first loves are abortion and Marxism, its favorite hobby is pornography. X-rated films brought to campus by the Center include Gonad the Barbarian and the Venus Flytrap: The Sexually Charged Orgasm, and Danned If You Don’t, which featured “a young nun’s struggle with her desires.”

A narrow band of opinion is also the rule of thumb in the Princeton classroom. The course I took on 20th-century U.S. foreign policy was dominated by one of the few professors I encountered who actually attempted to bring conservative viewpoints into her class. She actually pasted in her lectures to introduce the opinions of “post-revisionist” historians. But such gestures were overwhelmed by the rest of the course: lectures, readings, and films which tilted to the left. Why, for example, would it be offensive to see dogmeat on the menu when satellite? Because the hostile U.S. gave him no other choice. (No mention, of course, of evidence that Castro and Fidel had also been in bed with the Soviets.)

Writing first that the Reagan-Bush Nicaragua policy “had not succeeded,” the authors of the main textbook discussed the Sandinistas’ crushing defeat. And the authors of the ancillary texts described Violette Chamorro as if she were unrelated, and even implied illogically that the Sandinistas’ ouster was only a temporary phe-
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Writing first that the Reagan-Bush Nicaragua policy “had not succeeded,” the authors of the main textbook discussed the Sandinistas’ crushing defeat. And the authors of the ancillary texts described Violette Chamorro as if she were unrelated, and even implied illogically that the Sandinistas’ ouster was only a temporary phe-
portrayed as having come very close to losing the Cold War with his "venomous rhetoric [which] poisoned the diplomatic environment." Courageous for his views, he was the target of "shallow impolite rhetoric [which] was regarded as some kind of moral equivalent, perhaps we should take the gulag, the mass starvation of Ukrainian farmers, and other Soviet atrocities into account. A roomful of eyes rolled, Soviet crimes both domestic and international having almost nothing to do with Mr. Gorbachev's foreign policies, just as American belligerence. This tone ran throughout most of the course, as key facts which would have disrupted the liberal construction were brushed over or omitted entirely.

This trend seems to be reflected both in the makeup of the faculty, which in a given year includes at most a handful of conservatives, and in the rest of the course catalogue. Professor of Politics Robert George, a former member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission who for years has been the most conspicuous conservative on the faculty, comments that "in the curriculum as a whole students are going to have a lot of trouble learning what is to be said on the conservative side of moral, cultural, and political issues, because there's just not that much out there. And where conservative points of view are incorporated into courses, they're often margin-aliized."

Perhaps because viewpoints which compete with the politically correct line are regarded as somehow illegitimate, Princeton tends to be a fairly aseptic place—if there is only one correct approach on social issues, what is the point of strong feeling?—and liberal moral and political views are accepted by default rather than with enthusiasm. Strident views of all sorts, and particularly those which go against the grain, are generally looked at with suspicion. This of course, is most acute for those students who take their religious seriously. According to Carey Waples, a member of the Princeton establishment, traditional students here, who's challenging their professor's is, I think, a free speech issue most people don't want to engage with. When I pointed out that many religious students feel compelled to keep their beliefs to themselves, he responded, "That's a little mysterious to me," and said he remembered a conversation which he seemed to think was indicative of these students'.

"I had one student say last year that he shouldn't allow people with those beliefs on campus." He was an evangelical pastor referring to other groups who didn't subscribe to his perspective. "I just don't feel comfortable with those people, and it's up to the University to make me comfortable."

Whether or not this conversation ever occurred, what Shapiro gave as his response to the student was interesting: "I said, 'That's not the University's perspective. In fact a certain amount of discomfort is a symptom of growth. We all feel some discomfort as we grow and meet people with different ideas.'"

He goes on to say that the College should be a time when students' beliefs and assumptions are chal- lenged, but it seems that only religious and conservative students are forced to endure this ordeal. "What is the University doing to make sure that the beliefs about sexual morality, which are overwhelmingly liberal, that students bring when they come to this university, are being respected?" He asks. "I think effective acceptance of religious beliefs, for example?" asks Professor Robert George. "This is pathetic! So the beliefs that he's talking about who should be challenged is a minority who come in with conservative opinions about morality and the sanctity of human life. . . . You've got a great mass of liberal students here, who's challenging their beliefs?"

Patrick Horn's controversial letter and Jeanine Montero's equally controversial response caused a minor flurry on campus and prompted several efforts to make intellectual diversity acceptable at Princeton. In particular, the exchange in the Prince attacted the attention of Thomas Pyle, a member of the class of 1976, who at the time was serving as an Alumni Delegate to the Council of the Princeton University. Pyle wrote a letter to the university president, Robert Lee, expressing his concern about the need for a more diverse intellectual environment. He thought Montero's letter "seemed a little heavy-handed for Princeton" and had a "chilling effect" on campus dialogue. Pyle said, "I don't feel that a kid expressing his opinion should be policed by the University and denned to be a free speech violation. I think the University should be in the business of stimulating individuals who hold unpopular viewpoints. . . . The only way to combat hate speech is more speech, not less."

When other students voiced their frustration with the anti-religious atmosphere at Princeton, Pyle introduced a resolution to the Student Senate in November, 1996, suggesting that the College might consider creating several spaces where students could practice religious expression. He suggested that the University's perspective. In fact a certain amount of discomfort is a symptom of growth. We all feel some discomfort as we grow and meet people with different ideas."
HETERODOXY

advocacy for groups whose actions may strongly offend" those holding such beliefs.

Pyle hoped that the resolution would at least lead to meaningful discussion, but his efforts were blocked by Professor of Politics Alan Ryan, also a member of the CPUC, who proposed an amendment to the resolution, which in accordance with parliamentary law, sent the bill to a vote without any discussion. The resolution passed, but as the Prince reported, Ryan's amendment gutted it of all specific content, "effectively reversing" its purpose.

As usual, the CPUC administrators and leftists generally supported Ryan's maneuvers, but some students were soured by the process. "I think it's appalling you people can't even discuss it and vote on it," said senior CPUC student-delegate Matt Manthik. Student Government Chairman David L. Calone also expressed dismay with the CPUC's disregard for the resolution.

A little shaken by this hostile reception in the CPUC, Pyle submitted a second resolution in February. The language was particularly mild, stating that since the tolerance issue had not been substantially debated, the CPUC would convene a "Select Committee," chaired by President Shapiro, to examine University policy and report back to the Council. In his proposal, Pyle cited students' letters in the Prince and complaints about the RA group seminars as evidence that the University needed to take a long, hard look at the way it treated traditional views and the students who held them. The faculty and administration delegates in the CPUC were unmoved, and the resolution was defeated.

Meanwhile, members of various student organizations formed the Coalition of Princeton Students for Tolerance (CPST) in hopes of creating some breathing room for religious and conservative students. Alex Fulks, a member of the class of 1998 and chairman of the CPST, identified the orientation seminars and Montero's censuring of Patrick Horn as two reasons for the creation of the group. "If the University can't tolerate a student's opinions in this case," he explained, "what's going to happen later on?"

The CPST quickly established itself as a presence on campus, circulating petitions, appearing before the CPUC, participating in campus debates, and generally becoming abutt in the saddle of the left-wing power structure. In February, Fulks and the members of the CPST board sent letters to several University administrators, including Dean Montero and SECH Director Brian Zuck, requesting information about Princeton's funding procedures, RA selection, Orientation Week seminars, and admission policies. Although Montero's replies—she answered all of the letters herself—were characteristically vague, Fulks said that the CPST planned to continue these requests for full disclosure, and to continue "working toward an atmosphere at Princeton where anyone—and that goes for liberals, conservatives, homosexuals, and heterosexuals—who has an opinion can voice it without fear.

Princeton administrators were disturbed by these politically incorrect activists, and the school year ended with another episode of persecution. In late March, Alex Fulks saw an advertisement for a University-sponsored "Joint Peer Education Conference" which invited "those interested in becoming peer educators to attend." Since the CPST was considering holding religious tolerance seminars and workshops for ill-oriented Fulks called Janet Waronker, the director of SHARE and one of the organizers of the event, and she told him where and when to show up. When he called back 20 minutes later and told him that after talking with other organizers she had decided that it would be better if he didn't attend, Fulks concluded that he had to find out "what was so secret about this conference that they didn't want me there."

Fulks took a seat at the back of the lec.
shaving, naked dancers, and drunken aviators groping women mobilized the politically correct forces in Congress, led by Colorado Democrat Patricia Schroeder, a senior member of the Armed Services Committee who was concerned that revelations about the 10 percent pregnancy rate on the submarine-tender Acacia, dubbed "The Love Boat," would stymie the advance of women in the military and their deployment in combat units.

For Schroeder and her comrades in arms, Tailhook was heaven-sent. "The Loadmen," as writer Peter Boyer showed in "Dancing With the Enemy," had been part of it, as the Navy's confidential press report on Tailhook in the aftermath of the mishap. Many pilots, almost all of them sympathetic to Hultgreen, nevertheless claimed that she had been given special consideration. Schroeder's lawyer, Elaine Donnelly, head of the Center for Military Readiness (CMR), received training records which showed that Hultgreen had committed four serious errors in training, known as "downs" or "pink sheets." One or two downs or SODs, depending on the circumstances, is usually enough to get a pilot dismissed from the program. Donnelly also published records showing that Lt. Hultgreen, whom she called "Pilot B" to guard her privacy as much as possible, had received seven downs, with the last not counted, before being allowed to move on to the fleet.

On May 30, 1995, her Commanding Officer (CO) removed Lt. Hultgreen from flight status. On October 11, 1996, her VF-213 squadrons moved to Miramar. "It was a home base on the East Coast," Hultgreen, now married and pregnant, remained behind in a staff job, from which post she has recently cut loose a heat-seeking missile of a lawyer, Elaine Donnelly and the Center for Military Readiness; the Washington Times and the San Diego Union-Tribune (which reported Donnelly's findings); and "John Does one through 100" who Hultgreen says defamed her with false information, thereby causing her to be removed from flight status on the day before her squadron was to begin flying combat missions over Iraq.

"It's almost as if they saw that I was improving, and they said 'We've got to stop her now, or she's going to be able to keep flying," she said on "Top Gun?" a Dateline NBC segment broadcast this summer. "They convicted me on grounds of improving."

Was it "gossip" that clipped the pilot's wings? Had a prtraiton guard of chauvinists deliberately quashed her career to preserve a bastion of male privilege? Or was her performance to blame? Navy aviators, officers, and LSOs knew the story but weren't talking lest they lose their careers, the price for candor in the post-Tailhook era. Before the current string of sex-crimes charges at the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland and Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri, whose numbers are daily inflation to military leaders, Tailhook pre- vailed as the military's sexual harassment inferno. The Tailhook flyers had been folding their annual briefs for years, but in 1991, pilots came from the Persian Gulf ready to party hard, and the Las Vegas affair quickly escalated into a kind of spring break on steroids, in which many Navy women willingly participated. The tales of leg
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weapons employment and maneuvering. As her own trainer put it, Lohrenz "seemed to have lost her grasp of basic tactical concepts." Trainer 2 called the performance "worthless, to put it mildly," and says he would not have advanced anyone with her overall grades, male or female, to the fleet.

The record indicates that Lohrenz was given extra simulator periods and one-on-one tutoring plus extra training whenever she had problems. However, the account given in the press does not give a complete picture. The story mentions a "wrench" rather than "weapons employment." The word "wrench" is often used in military jargon to refer to "acrobatics," which is a term used to describe maneuvers that are more difficult than routine flight. In this context, "wrench" suggests that Lohrenz was performing acrobatic maneuvers that were beyond her ability.

Lohrenz is adamant that her record indicates otherwise. After all, "wrench" is "the extent of her experience," and Lohrenz is described as "an accomplished pilot who had been trained at the highest level." The record indicates that Lohrenz was given extra simulator periods and one-on-one tutoring plus extra training whenever she had problems. However, the account given in the press does not give a complete picture.
Left-Wing Intellectual & Left-Wing Labor Stage A Get-Together
Solidarity for a Little While

By Max Green

His portraits of the lives of working Americans today are what he calls "snapshots from hell." Sweeney, and the trove of left-wing intellectuals who mirrored his analysis, implied that the labor movement had lost its way under the previous leadership of Lane Kirkland, and that it had somehow drifted rightward, requiring this dramatic mid-course steering correction. Yet this was a rhetorical shell game. In fact, although few political analysts might have been paying attention, the AFL-CIO had drifted far to the left on a whole raft of economic, social, and political issues during the Kirkland years. And although fancied up with new rhetoric, Sweeney's analysis of the American condition is the same as that given by Kirkland at the end of his reign, when he was blaming corporate, anti-corporate, and statist ideologues that in some cases triumphed Sweeney's. Why then didn't the attempted rapprochement with the intellectuals take place during Kirkland's reign? It was a question that came up frequently at the conference. The answer offered most often was that there had been an intellectuals-labor alliance from the 1930s through the 1960s, when it collapsed, in part, because the labor movement dragged its heels on civil rights, but, more importantly, because the AFL-CIO had squandered labor support, particularly the Vietnam War, which progressive intellectuals had opposed.

Not that all the intellectuals drawn into this new venture are or were anti-Communists. New Yorker writer Paul Berman actually paraphrased the historical role of labor in the struggle against dictatorships of both the right and the left. Berman argued that while labor support of the Vietnam War was disastrous, its anti-Communism was last as correct as was its opposition to fascism. Not only did Berman say this at a well-attended session on "Labor and the Intellectuals," but to my surprise, no one took specific exception to his claim; there was not even an isolated hiss or boo.

Yet it was also true that while Berman was given a safe-conduct pass by the audience, he was clearly in the minority. The co-chairs of the conference, Nelson Lichtenstein and Steven Fraser, have portrayed anti-Communism as reactionary in their books. In his biography of labor leader Sidney Hillman, for instance, Fraser writes that "By 1940 anti-communism was bidding fair to become the new civil religion of American politics, a black box of all the fears and resentments about what the New Deal had done and might still do to a mythologized American republic; an obsession that despite the putative object of its wrath, had precipitated a lockstep to do with the Socialist Unity. "The answer of anti-Communist stalwarts in the AFL-CIO, like ILGWU president David Dubinsky, are described as "obsessive." Fraser calls the effects of anti-Communism a "deadweight" and a "fostering sore." At the end of his book he concludes that one of the prime victims of this anti-Communism was the labor movement itself: "The labor movement," which had spoiled the equanimity of the American political and social order since at least the Civil War, had at last found its answer in the insatiable cravings of mass culture and consumption and the phobic repressions of anti-communism.

Similarly, in his book about Walter Reuther, Nelson Lichtenstein refers to the AFL's anti-Communist views (which would soon be those of the merged AFL-CIO) as an "obsessive" vision of "anti-Communism" which undermined "his claim to the vanguard role he had staked out for his union in American politics." Piven and Tepperman report that Lichtenstein argues that the "bipolar orthodoxies" of the Cold War had "suffocated social reform," in supporting LBJ in Vietnam, Reuther had "squeezed out a real chance to link at least one important institution of the working class to the goals of men and women energized by the movement against the war." Although Fraser and Lichtenstein themselves were more on those theories from the beginning, their critiques of the AFL-CIO's anti-Communism, or "anti-Communist" taint, is very much in line with the view that the unions that elected Sweeney actually opposed, had it been free to replace by new leadership that was free of the "anti-Communist taint." Sweeney's group clearly pressed for the vote that called for defense cuts years before the Berlin Wall went down.

There was gestural leftism in this vein all during the teach-ins. Ron Blackwell, named by Sweeney to head the new Department of Corporate Affairs, revealed that he had spent time in prison during the Vietnam War, presumably for draft resistance, and Bob Wolf, who was a Negro analyst, said during the conference Sweeney's that he had opposed the war and had for that reason participated in a "Dropping the Bomb" movement in 1968 to deny Hubert Humphrey the presidency. Among the intellectuals, Joel Rodgers voiced his support for the new staff, especially Barbara Shailer, new director of the AFL-CIO's Council of International Affairs, whose anti-war credentials, according to Rodgers, were impeccable.

While the anti-Communist of American labor goes some way towards explaining the split between left intellectuals and the AFL-CIO during the post-war era, it is not by any means the...
whole story. What no one at the conference admitted was that starting in the 1960s, the Left developed a growing contempt, not just for labor leaders, but for labor itself, particularly those who belonged to unions and suffered from the fatal ideological disease of false consciousness. The Left had been deeply ambivalent about labor because it believed in the intellectual superiority of intellectuals who might serve as the agents of radical change. But starting in the 1950s, left intellectuals began identifying workers in the most heavily unionized industries as the prototype of the American establishment, which in a significant sense they were. Walter Reuther had boasted that labor was creating a new and vast middle class. And the more that the workers benefited from the system, the less interested they were in radically changing it and, indeed, the more committed they were to protecting it from the schemes of its alienated critics and enemies.

So those who wanted radical change were forced to search elsewhere for a substitute proletariat. During the last 30 years, the intellectuals of the Left, many of them academics, have reached an audience of various groups for this role. First it was blacks, then students, then, more recently, homosexuals. But an underlying assumption of this event—although no one would have admitted it for fear of offending the etiquette of political correctness—was that "identity politics" hadn't worked. As one of the speakers understood, even if they didn't admit it, the country is now more conservative than it has been at any time since the Depression. So now, the left intellectuals, battered by self-inflicted wounds in the long and strange journey leading from the '60s, have come full circle back to what we used to be known as class politics.

No one less than Betty Friedan, godmother as it were of the modern feminist movement, argued that it was time to transend (but not to retreat from) "identity politics" with a politics that emphasized "the common good." In a particularly coherent set of remarks, Friedan went on to cartigate corporations for downsizing, which, she claimed, had led to a 30 percent decline in the wages of college-educated white males. She said that the closing of the wage gap between men and women, therefore, could be attributed to falling salaries. But the fact is that international competition has had a profound effect on the strongest of the industrial unions, which is why the Left is focused on the free-trade issue. Moreover, international competition is not anywhere near as important as domestic competition.

Consider, for example, the fate of International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Long before clothing factories began to relocate overseas, the union's negotiating strength dwindled as factories moved out of the heavily unionized urban areas like New York and Chicago. As a consequence, the ILGWU shrank. For the same reason did the other needle trade unions, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Textile Workers. All three are now mere shadows of their former selves. The ILGWU was founded in 1903; it had a not particularly coherent set of REMARKS—bought by corporate lobbyists, sold by the Republican Gingriches, whom he described as a "gang of thugs." This sort of talk was music to the radical intellectuals' ears. Nonetheless, one sensed a certain skepticism, particularly on the part of the ultralike Katha Pollitt and Francis Fox Piven as they went to labor to really labor intends to "transend" its own narrow self-interest. For them, a raise is not going to cure the disorders of the American system which, in their view, are terminal. They suspect that if Sweeney got his raise, he would likely ditch the intellectuals and their schemes for social revolution, as Walter Reuther did.

There is some reason for their caution. To Sweeney, the 1950s was a great decade in American life; a time when labor not only had a seat at the table but was at the head of the table. And for the likes of historians Lichtenstein and Fraser, the '70s was the nadir of recent history. These contradictions were papered over by the frenzy of mutual need that underlay the Columbia teach-in. But the fact is that Sweeney seems to want nothing more than to take up where the union left off. As if to suggest that, in the unlikely event that it ever obtained power, the re-alliance between labor and the Left would immediately head toward a crack-up.

Clearly, labor very much wants the support of left intellectuals. It wants them to serve as organizers as they did in the 1930s by turning out propaganda for the labor agenda. That is why all three AFL-CIO officers and most of the top staffers spoke at the conference. But the problem is that what has been the economic radicals attempting to capture an alliance with them: the status quo was endorsed in 1996 because the electorate feels that the economy is healthy and that there is "nothing wrong" on the part of the power structure to push welfare reform, reduced unemployment benefits, social security reform etc. In short, they are attempting to force more people into the labor market, which would increase the supply of labor and, thereby, force wages down. Co-chair Steven Fraser denounced the "corporate Madison Avenue style," but the evidence is that this was an attempt to lure liberal politicians over the public sector unions over the past three decades, the trade union movement would have to reclaim the prize of the Left.
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Building That Bridge to the 21st Century

Conservatives are not unaware that a cultural Conflict is under way. Nor do they fail to understand, for the most part, that it is often more subtle than the one envisioned by Pat Buchanan involving pitchfork populists marching on government and taking potshots at the black helicopters overhead. In fact, conservatives talk constantly about the cultural war, often quite knowledgeably. But while they may think that they feel comfortable when it comes to walking the walk. Even more disastrously, they don’t pull the trigger when it comes to challenging the extremely powerful impetus—the desire of the Left to destroy the liberal civilization and to deconstruct all social institutions and to implement its social redemption, and the family is the last bulwark against the power of the state. And thus, in the rhetoric of the Left, the strategy is the enemy of progress and progressives everywhere.

Moreover, the egalitarian principle in itself would not explain the anti-white sentiment that pervades the thinking and rhetoric of the Left, the attack on the culture of “dead white males,” the preference for Latin American—Indians, blacks, Hispanics and “Pacific Islanders.” These, of course, are the former subjects of the very alienic force through which the Left intends to implement its social redemption, and the family is the last bulwark against the power of the state. And thus, in the rhetoric of the Left, the strategy is the enemy of progress and progressives everywhere.

The Left’s hardy survivorship comes almost wholly from its recognition that, in an ideological age, politics is war conducted by other means. And that’s why the Left, in the narrow of its bones but the Right understands it only with the tip of its brain. The Right mobilizes an army only during elections, and not a particularly good one at that (remember showing oneself in the foot ranks as a warlike act). Otherwise its troops are like the sunshine soldiers of a bygone day—doomed from the start. Some even annually with the National Guard every summer and otherwise enjoying the case and freedom of civilian life.

Indeed, despite lip service to the idea of a culture war, conservatives do not believe that we live any longer in an “ideological age.” (“Would that it were!”), one conservative magazine commented upon reading a draft of this article. “By now, aren’t we post-post ideological?” To which we replied, “Would that it were.” Conservatives have so unconsciously absorbed the post-ideological Fukuyama’s “end of history” that they fail to see that history is happening right at home in the paradox of their own movement, unquilted and out of power after the victory has been won.

A part of the reason for this failure of vision is that the Right is taken in by the Left’s most subversive stratagem (which can be seen in Clinton’s ‘96 campaign)—which is to join the ranks of the hated opponent, to pose as the Other and cover your tracks by calling yourself “liberal.” The Right doesn’t seem to believe that its opponent is the Left in all its antagonistic and alien malice, shape-shifting like a creature from an episode of X-Files. Instead, conservatives think of America’s consciousness of present ills as the result of liberalism gone overboard, not a liberal subverted.

This is the argument, in fact, of Robert Bork’s protégé, and other (indispensable) book, Slouching Towards Gomorrah, which explores the unending dimensions of the national plight. “The enemy within,” writes Bork, “is modern liberalism. Her greatest weapon is a very different mood and agenda than that of classical or traditional liberalism.” He sees the country’s mood as one in which there are no restraints on individualism in the marketplace; the agenda is that of equality without limit.

But in this really all that is going on? The transformational crucible of liberalism, Bork rightly observes, was the ‘60s, “a politicized decade... whose activists saw all of culture and life as political. The consequence is that our culture is now politicized... We have a new, extremely divisive... politics of personal identity. We have invented a range of new or newly savage political-cultural battlegrounds.” But this mentality has a name: it is identity politics.

Liberalism has a long and honorable pedigree, but since the 1950s it has just not been able to shake itself free of the straitjacket in which it first itself stuck in the political equivalent of a fugal static, supporting anti-American and anti-democratic ideas such as racial and gender preference and the integration of the former South Carolina into the American political system, and as a political system that is—or is to be in theory be—wholly at odds.

Unlike traditional liberals, even those who have sometimes embraced its excesses, the Left, the Left, you see, is an American today and day out, in and year in and year out, on every front and everywhere, even in the way it must do so, but as it largely does so quietly, its aims, nor how modestly it announces its objectives. The Left’s agenda is to consolidate its parasitic hold on the liberal host and then to create a world in which conservatives and conservative quarters did not see a grace concession, nor an acknowledgment that the people had spoken. Instead, they recorded her confident dismissal of the outcome as “only round one” in the larger war, as she and her supporters vowed never to accept the voters’ decision.

Judge Bork is right in saying that the radical break in our political tradition that occurred during the ‘60s is at the root of our present moral chaos. In opening his book about America’s troubles with a memory of student activists burning law books in the Yale law library thirty years ago, he draws the appropriate parallel between the student fascist of the ‘60s (and ‘90s) and the radical totalitarianism of the 1930s. He could have gone further. He could have drawn the parallels between an earlier socialist defeat in 1914, and the birth of “identity politics” (the cult of the nation) midwifed by one-time Leninist, Benito Mussolini. He could have shown how the radical rebellion against traditional liberal values and “bourgeois society” is a recurrent theme of the modern history of the West, and how these revolts have regularly erupted in episodes of Communist and fascist tyranny. But in his attempt to see the destructive developments as an outgrowth of liberal rather than left-wing ideas, Bork fails to grasp the movement he depicts as a logical extension of radical totalitarianism and its destructive agendas into the domestic arena, and portrays it rather as the development of philosophical tendencies inherent in the liberal tradition itself, specifically liberty and equality.

There is a way, of course, in which this presentation makes sense. The ideas of Rousseau and Marx which lie at the root of modern totalitarianism share many Enlightenment elements with liberalism. But to make the one a mere extension or exacerbation of the other is to deny the two hundred years of civil and cultural conflict, culminating in the Cold War, that have shaped our world.

The radical passion goes far beyond extremist forms of egalitarianism and individual values have no place. What it envisions is the political equivalent of an ethnic cleansing. And so the Right fundamentally misunderstanding the situation it faces when it accepts the Left’s public self-image as a fragmented, disorga- nized and ad hoc revolutionary elite in private retreat, the Left views itself as an army—one that may temporarily have its back to the wall, but is still the proud bearer of a code that forbids surrender. What the Right regards as a victory in the battle of ideas, the Left sees as yet another contested ground. A small but potent illustration of this mentality was given on the morning after the California election, when conservatives were savoring the victory of their anti-racial preference initiative, Prop 219. Television cameras turned to feminist Eleanor Smeal, in the “No on 219” headquarters, who announced the re-election of Proposition 219, in the aftermath of the ‘60s, in a desperate effort to find a host that would support their political aims, that radicals having spent the decade tormenting liberalism and provoking it into a deep crisis of faith, appropriated the liberal identity. By succeeding in this audacious political sex-change, radicals were able to fool others into thinking they shared the same agenda with the liberalism they had dis­placed. But it makes no sense of the American narrative. To understand the pecking order of grievances reflected in official affirmative action policies, it is necessary to enter the Left’s world-view, and ultimately its vision of history and nation.
Partially because they believed that their opponents’ philosophy was somehow related to the liberalm of Harry Truman and Hubert Humphrey, they expected their opponents to obtain a favorable judgment and respect an obviously qualified nominee. Conservatives didn’t understand they were in a war that for the other side was total; and, taken together, the events that followed don’t permit them to be justifiably classified as a formable foe. Reason and experience are neutralized by the Left’s preening assurance of its own rectitude and of being on the side of the angels. It is their second-best efforts to create a "economic" justice; and plan social abundancement blighted the lives of hundreds of millions of human beings as a result of insensitivity on an almost planetary scale. The radical has outlined "the end of history" and the fall of the Berlin Wall. The ideas that inspired its odious schemes continue to thrive because those on the Right have not understood the Left obligation to trace a law on which its survival is based: don’t look back. Reactionary in ideology, immune to evidence, impervious to logic, the Left still sees itself as underdog and thus its opponents as regressive and "mean spirited." The remarkable aspect of all this is that it has succeeded in getting American culture as a whole to tolerate this view of itself as idealistic and "progressive," and to forget about its past. The ultimate proof of the Left’s success in dominating the culture and hiding its memories can often be seen in the fact that for all intents and purposes there is no "Left" in American politics. On that side of the spectrum, there is only a group of well-intentioned but poorly working and therefore blunted intellectual affect and the appearance of the selflessness and greed of the unlightened Right.

The Left has colonized and conditioned the media to their point of view when describing Republican politicians, conservative academics, Christian evangelical, libertarian publications, redneck militias, or crackpot radio; the label "right-wing" is used literally to describe them all. But of course no Democratic politician, radical agitator, "progressive" publication, or environmental terrorists is ever labeled "left-wing." To the copy editors of the New York Times, The Nation magazine with its 70-year history of supporting Communist causes is "liberal." The Los Angeles Times refers to the knobby New Left extremist Noam Chomsky, someone so committed reverse Willie Hortonism. It is guilt-by-association-McCarthyism with a vengeance.

The moral high ground often seems, in fact, to be the last thing the Republicans want to do. Recently, for example, Pete Wilson, noted Janice Brown to California’s state Supreme Court, Daughter of an Alabama sharecropper, and the Left’s first African-American woman ever appointed to the post. Did Republicans gain any political capital from this choice? If they did, where is it? Not in the polls. Newt Gingrich used the electoral defeat of Senator Helms are often personal, the Left seems a little embarrassed about pinning the tail on the donkey; they actually almost seem to enjoy the stigma that are applied to them by the Left. Thus a Republican is nominated, whereupon the Left will once again unleash the dogs of war.

The recent response of some Republicans to the Democrats’ blitzkrieg against the Speaker of the House, shows the persistence of the Left’s success: in American politics. Because somewhere in their own psychologies, the Left has imposed the Left’s idealistic and "mean spirited." The remarkable aspect of all this is that it has succeeded in getting American culture as a whole to tolerate this view of itself as idealistic and "progressive," and to forget about its past. The ultimate proof of the Left’s success in dominating the culture and hiding its memories can often be seen in the fact that for all intents and purposes there is no "Left" in American politics. On that side of the spectrum, there is only a group of well-intentioned but poorly working and therefore blunted intellectual affect and the appearance of the selflessness and greed of the unlightened Right.

Every day, the Left’s warriors go into battle in a war that for them is not about this particular bill or that particular issue, but about the total transformation of existing social institutions, values, psychology; about transforming “human nature,” which the post-modern Left believes is in need of a “socially reconstructed” for the greater social good.

For the Left, it is permissible—even inevitable—to their opponents to opt out of the game. For the Right, war interfers with commerce.
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Davis and Herbert Aptheker, the old time cry for "social justice," meaning a Marxist redistribution of individual income, is louder than ever. Consider an echo which sounded recently in The New Republic: "Rape of the表决s. In the course of reviewing the Republican and Democratic con-
ventions, the left-wing critic Garry Wills (notice how resonant the adjective can be) dropped the following bombshell: "By the standards of any other society, or of reason itself, the great and growing disparity of wealth in America is a form of suc-
ceeding. But it is not easy to feel confident that such preparedness will occur. Of all the portents suggesting that the Right just doesn't get it, consider a recent event at the Reagan Presidential Library. As the fall campaign was just starting to heat up, the Library announced that it would hold a day-long "fun-in" at the Library to celebrate the opening of a new exhibit titled "Back to the '60s." (And yes, the zero in the decade was defaced into a peace symbol.) Of course, was the moment it all came together and came apart for America, a decade-long losing battle continues to plague us today. No one recognized this better than Ronald Reagan himself, who first ran for governor of California by running against "Berkeley"—that symbol of the revolutionary decade that had seized the day. That was then, this is now. Events at the Reagan Library during this "fun-in" dealt with the '60s as if it were some more American graffiti, betraying an amnesia about Reagan's positions and statements during the decade that made it seem that the former President's Alzheimer's had spread to the curators as well.

Jon Wiener, an unreconstructed '60s radical who covered the fun-in for a Los Angeles paper called the LA Weekly, recalling Reagan's famous 1964 speech nominating Barry Goldwater and warning of the tide of socialism that was steadily destroying America, Wiener wrote: "Any serious exhibit about Reagan and the '60s, would put the 'speech' at its center, on a big screen in a dark­ened corner. Instead, Reagan's speech runs on a TV (the volume turned so low that no one was paying attention) in a room where visitors are greeted by a gigantic 'Love' poster...The room is dominated by a VW Beetle painted pink and decorated with yellow flowers and butterflies, surrounded by life-size, white-plaster figures wearing hippie garb, posed working on signs for a demonstration. That sign reads 'Vietnam is Vietnam,' "Hey, Hey LBJ—how many kids did you kill today?"" Even in the room of the exhibit focused on Vietnam, the amazing Wiener finds no domi-
inating imagery of POWs and MIAs; no commentary about the long totalitarian night that fell in Southeast Asia despite the fact that Hanoi conquered the South. Instead, he finds a text that speaks of "a wireless war...that weakened America's confidence and resolve," which, as he notes with pleasure, "mirrors the anxiety away from what Reagan was saying in the '60s." And so it was. And so it goes.

The Reagan administration, cast as a shrine to America's victory in the Cold War, is now rented out as the venue for a festival of feel-good memories about a decade that nearly destroyed America on its own. With a Right like this, who needs a Left?

—Peter Collier and David Horowitz
Becky Scribner, a three-year veteran feature writer for New York’s Times-Tribune, has filed suit against the paper seeking reinstatement to her duties. Scribner says that after a disagreement with her editor she was told that if she wished to remain on staff she could work in the research department but that she would never see her name on another story. In reassigning her, management cited her “inability to grasp the emotional essence of a story and failure to meet basic journalistic standards.” Scribner claims that she is being punished for attempting to portray events and personalities accurately.

Scribner’s problems began last July 16 when she was told to cover the crash of TWA Flight 800 on the first day of Hart’s annual convention. In reassigning her, management cited her inability to grasp the emotional essence of a story and failure to meet basic journalistic standards.” Scribner claims that she is being punished for attempting to portray events and personalities accurately.

Scribner’s assignment was to describe the ways in which various people affected by the tragedy were coping with it. The first piece she submitted dealt with the problems encountered by many of the victims’ family members as they sought coverage for psychological counseling from their HMOs. Diminished as “routine sob-sister journalism unfit for the greatest newspaper in the world,” the story was spiked. Editor Barbara Amenditt says she told Scribner that she would have to look for a more unusual angle and to a front-page article by Paloma Piccione-Taube as an example of what she was after. (Piccione-Taube’s article, which is reportedly under consideration for a Pulitzer Prize, described the heroic rescue of several kittens in Manhattan’S Upper West Side.

But it was Scribner’s third story that resulted in her demotion and reassignment. When the alleged bomber was finally identified as one Ali Farook Mohammed, Scribner quickly sought background information and discovered that he had worked as a doorman in an upscale store, carrying 40 pounds of nitroglycerin into the store under the voluminous skirt he was wearing. In the sale basement, he was jostled and touched off the fire that raged for two days.

Scribner was assigned to cover the explosion and fire in Hart’s department store, an event which was overshadowed in the news by the crash of TWA Flight 800. Scribner was assigned to write a human interest series dealing with the aftermath of the catastrophe at Hart’s in which 543 people perished, most of them trampled to death in the panic following the huge explosion that demolished the century-old building on West 31st Street.

There was quick determination that the explosion, which took place at noon on the first day of Hart’s annual 60 percent off sale, occurred when a male suicide bomber, disguised as a woman, carried 40 pounds of nitroglycerin into the store under the voluminous skirt he was wearing. In the sale basement, he was jostled by avid shoppers and the bomb was detonated. The explosion caused the entire eight-story building to collapse and touched off a fire that raged for two days.

Scribner argues that without an understanding of Mohammed’s religious beliefs, readers would find it difficult, if not impossible, to comprehend his emotional state, and that if done correctly, the piece might have the effect of increasing, rather than decreasing, tolerance. She received a go-ahead on condition that his religion not be mentioned by name.

Research for the article proved difficult because Mohammed family refused to be interviewed, vehemently insisting that their statements might result in another member of the family being chosen for a similarly glorious end. Scribner’s efforts to speak with Mohammed’s friends met with identical objections, and she was on essentially anonymous sources and indirect quotations. Despite these hurdles, however, she managed to write a compelling account of the alleged bomber’s daily life for the two weeks before his suicide mission.

While conceding that the slant was acceptable and that she was not too put off by the heavy reliance on indirect quotations, Amenditt suggested a rewrite in which Mohammed would be referred to only as “M,” as mention of his name might lead readers to believe that he was a practitioner of a religion founded by a prophet of the same name, and cause the public to become inflamed against its adherents.

Scribner balked, explaining that Mohammed’s identity was already a matter of public record. Amenditt spiked the story.

Citing Scribner’s inability to meet basic journalistic standards, Amenditt recommended that she be reassigned, noting that on a previous occasion Scribner, in a piece about a slain rap artist, had refused to describe the young man’s short hair. Scribner argued that without an understanding of Mohammed’s religious beliefs, readers would find it difficult, if not impossible, to comprehend his emotional state, and that if done correctly, the piece might have the effect of increasing, rather than decreasing, tolerance.

Scribner is confident of regaining her position as feature writer despite the apparent bleakness of her situation. "I believe that the time I have spent the past few years has been well spent, and that over the years I have come to have a better understanding of Mohammed’s religious beliefs,” she says. “One of the first things you learn in J-School is that there are going to be times when something you write may offend someone, but regardless, you must be willing to call a spade a spade.”

Times-Tribune Feature Writer Sues to Regain Job

By Judith Schumann Weizner

Journalist Becky Scribner
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