MODERN MATA HARI

Near where I live in New Jersey there are numerous retirement communities, all requiring that potential residents be 52 years of age or over. Hard to believe, but next year Bianca Jagger will be eligible to buy a home in Leisure Village or, perhaps, Holiday City. It's tough to imagine Bianca behind the wheel of a four-door Oldsmobile, waving to the guard as she pulls onto Route 70 for a trip to Home Depot or perhaps the A&P, especially when you consider that this is a woman whose charms are so great that they once made her an effective agent of the Sandinista regime as ambassador of the bono deo to certain U.S. politicians, and more recently, led to a restructuring of the CIA in a way that could gut our country's intelligence-gathering capabilities.

But perhaps she's not 51 after all. Perhaps she wasn't born in 1945 as one biography, a rather old one, says. Perhaps she was born in 1950, as the more recent articles about her state, such as a 1995 article from The New York Times Magazine. That article was all about her and beauty of the '90s, Robert Torricelli, who was then a congressman from a district in northern New Jersey. The 1950 birth date would make sense: it would make her just a year older than Torricelli. But six years older? That would make Torricelli look a bit foolish, like a man who was being manipulated by a woman far more savvy and experienced than he.

This is a feeling that many men have had, one would imagine. And Mick Jagger is only the most famous of these men, not the first. Before him, there was the British actor Michael Caine, who helped introduce the ingenuity from Managua to the jet set. After Mick, there was the Sandinista enforcer Tomas Borge and then 25/55ths of the United States Congress—first Connecticut Senator Christopher Dodd and then Torricelli.

Frankly, those of us who live here in Jersey were a bit shocked by that last move. None more than a friend of mine who lives near me but who, for various reasons, I cannot name. This friend by coincidence knew Bianca way back when. He used to have a job working for the Rolling Stones in the early '70s, when they were in tax exile in the south of France. He recalls the day Mick first returned from Paris with Bianca on his arm. "She was a nice enough girl," he says. "She had a lot of charm." But Mick Jagger was at that moment the world's most eligible bachelor, and no one in the Stones' entourage could quite figure out why he decided to marry an otherwise unremarkable woman from a backwater like Nicaragua—aside from the obvious fact that she was pregnant.

Continued on page 7

FALSE RAEPE OUTRAGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
A LAMB TO THE SLAUGHTER?
By K.L. Billingsley

When Ranidas Lamb opened the envelope, he found it contained no letter, only a scary pun on his name—a photo showing the bloody, severed head of a lamb on a plate. Another anonymous mailing yielded a clipping showing a hanged monkey with the words "resign," "reform" and "executed" circled in the text, with arrows pointing to the monkey. Similar messages also came over the phone and in untitled graffiti warning "Hearde Lamb."

Ranidas Lamb was once a popular professor of religious studies at the University of Hawaii, but became a pariah after being charged as a "serial rapist" who had abused his authority to force a married graduate student into no less than 16 sexual encounters in one month back in 1992. Lamb said none of it ever happened and, in addition to the death threats, found himself staring down the barrel of lawsuits and facing the end of his career. Since its eruption almost four years ago, the case—yet to be fully convealed—has drawn sharp fault lines on the islands and discredited a paper trail of more than a thousand pages. Nothing in Lamb's background had prepared him for this ordeal, which he finnished off with the adage that a person is only as real as the only one who learns.

Lamb has been on something of a quest all his adult life, although he had no idea that it would deposit him in such a precarious spot. He was born in Detroit in 1945 to a Jewish father, who worked in construction, and an Italian mother, who worked as a domestic. When he was a child, the family moved to Watts in Los Angeles, a tough 'hood even then. When Ranidas was 11, one of his friends took a bullet in the face, and that prompted his parents to move to more peaceful Orange County. A brief stint in the Marines convinced Lamb

Continued on page 10
COMMUNIQUÉS

DÉJÀ VOODOO

Had to write in order to congratulate January issue for having published the article "DÉJÀ VOODOO" by K.L. Billingsley in your December 1996 issue. So far as I know, no other media outlet has dared to reveal the true meaning of the misleading "drug smuggling" story told by the San Jose Mercury News and its literal definition of the word "smuggling." Gary Webb, and his origins with the leftist front group, the Christian Institute.

I first heard this story six years ago on a computer bulletin board called FidoNet. At that time, the only definition I had for the term "smuggling" was the one related version held by the Mercury News, that at the time, the story related the story of a (brain-dead communist) who had never been to Cuba. I also had no knowledge to tell that there exists a network secretly funded by the Christian Institute, as opposed to some courted L.A. drug dealer, as is the recycled version. When this story first aired some miscellaneous about all that has happened in the mainstream media, as well as many politicians, were in reacting to this silly piece of leftist disinformation. Thank you for getting the truth out. I had wondered when, or if, anyone would ever.

Kathryn K Myers
Hackett, TX

We all seem paralyzed at comprehending the illegal drug business in this country. The article "DÉJÀ VOODOO" by K.L. Billingsley pointed fingers at some useful directions, but never ended with a useful conclusion.

Let's get back and observe that every year an increasing number of billions of dollars of profits are made by the U.S. from the sale of illegal drugs. This means there are several American billionaires receiving the revenue end of this business.

Now come multiple agencies of the federal government. Even with the most sophisticated and intrusive technology available in the law enforcement, no agency has yet been able to do it. A recent article by the Wall Street Journal, featuring a drug case in Los Angeles, is a reminder that this information is too complex for the media to break down into a digestible format for the public.

I was just at a dinner and was asked to the question "What is the future of the war on drugs?" I had no answer, but I thought that it was important to share this information with everyone.

Kathryn K Myers
Hackett, TX

PILOT B

I once supervised a (female) U.S. Air Force intelligence officer who failed promotion in major and was forced out in short order; not a soul came to her defense in the name of female affirmative action, though her professional talents were undeniable. Perhaps the woman's political correctness is to excite leftist sympathy not as a realizing that overreacting in the same community, she is just simply not open to new ideas. She is not open to new ideas.

The most important thing is that we need to educate the government on the condescending property.

a) when related to a criminal prosecution, the situation of the Putnam for the prosecution.

b) when NO criminal charge is brought, the situation of the Putnam for the prosecution.

Albert Walser
Portland, OR

MAKE WAR

I wish to commend you on your article, "IT'S A WAR, STUPID!" in the November issue. Frankly, I feel it is not done quite of the article. The word "war," as it is used today, has lost its original meaning. It is, of course, as to your suggestion on how best to confront and carry the cold war and we need to work hard and not just accept.

My only question concerning the positions and conclusions assumed by you in the article is one of politics. You write about the political influence and the role of political leaders in Latin American politics, and have been included in this discussion. As one who has been involved in Latin American politics, I believe that the role of political leaders is indeed crucial.

Eliot Engel
State Department
Washington, D.C.

SCHOOL DAZE

I just wanted to write to compliment you on the interesting article that I have enjoyed reading in your publication. As a high school teacher at a time when I was teaching, I was particularly drawn to the two book reviews under the title "School Daze." E.D. Hirsch, Jr., is absolutely brilliant in his ability to write on the subject of education. His voice of reason is clearly not wanting by those who have "owned" education for decades and who perpetrate their self-willed ignorance on each new generation of teachers. I do not know how to break the stereotype that liberals have on education, but it certainly doesn't need to be done so soon at our school will be overwhelming with well-meaning illiterates who can hardly read, or do simple math, much less struggle with the pressing problems of the day. My 12-year-old son is an eighth-grader in middle school (usually "model" school would be more appropriate) and he has yet to have any grammar taught to him, a spelling test, or a vocabulary test. He has read no classic piece of literature to my knowledge but he has been subjected to many PC works of dubious value and unrecognizable authors. But they are all "politically correct" of that can be said.

At any rate, I think Dr. Hirsch is right on target, even as far as his claim that the roots of the "progressive" philosophy lie too back to the 18th and 19th century Romantics. As one who professor, I offer a master’s degree in Friedrich Schiller. I have read Retsens and Michael I have learned about education, and I can see the connection. Good read and good book, one that I shall certainly purchase.

Felicia Schreiber

LOVE LETTERS

I am delighted to report that I can not only enjoy the wit and wisdom of Judith Schermer Weinzer in her column, but to her frequent comments on the human growth atmosphere in the letters section of the N.Y. Post. I love her! Please forward to her if she is a bane, then I am single.

Ray McClure
Glen Oaks, NY

Correction: In "Justice Denied: The Fates of Prop 209," in the December issue, Mark Redstonen was misquoted. The quote should have read, "I think the government had a race card pulled from his desk." -Ed.
REDOCTIO AD ABSURDUM

THE BERKELEY PARKATAKARI: After a contentious 1991 decision to try to make Peoples' Park somewhat less scary by spending more than $1 million to build a volleyball court there, the then-patient leftist who ran Berkeley have now decided to tear it down, at a cost of another $50,000. "Park activists" (in Berkeley it is nearly always the people who do demonstrative become args) were never happy with the $1 mil lion decision. For Urban, Peoples' Park was holy ground they believed should be enjoyed primarily by the down and out, a social category that, in 1991, consisted primarily of deadbeat panhandlers, and heavy hitters who made walking through the Park a summer evening a sort of real life experience of Dungeons and Dragons & Crime control, by contractual agreement, at least passed from the University of California, which owned the land but was never quite able to abuse itself enough to satisfy the parishioner, to the city, the volleyball court was doomed. One of the Park activists, Eric Robinson, said that the Park's basketball courts were okay because basketball is an inner-city game. But volleyball, on the other hand, is "kind of an upper-class game and that's why it attracted a lot of people." But there was more than class struggle involved. The whole point of removing the volleyball court, said Frances Townes, founder of the Berkeley Exodus Chap lains to the Homeless, is "to make the park a place for everybody."

IMPOSSIBLE DREAMS: It was a busy year filling in the blanks for the left-wing Quixote Center of Hyattsville, Maryland. During 1996, the group filed an anti-censorship lawsuit against National Public Radio for barring the commentary of convicted cop-killer Mumia Abu Jamal. The group, based on the Christian Institute, also joined other conspiracy theorists pushing for a probe of the CIA's role in Central America drug smuggling. The Quixote "Friends for Equality" worked to construct "inclusive scriptures" along the lines of the Center's Inclusive New Testament. In seven painstaking years in the making, a translation in "not-assist, not-assist, not-classist language" that previewed the uncoming "inclusive Hebrew Scriptures" project. But it wasn't all politics at La Mancha, U.S.A. On the arts front, the Center now boasts 280-pound metal sculptures of Dem Quixote, Susan Fortier, and a third, (male), figure, Dulcehe. Nora. No. Nora, the finest piece of Foxtrot Quixote, shown. riding a unicorn and included for purposes of 'evoking gender equity,' Miguel de Cervantes, call your office.

JOY TO OTHER WORLDS: Students in their first year at Dartmouth College looking to fulfill their "freshman seminar" requirement have some interesting options for the spring semester. Those who opt for "Medieval Movies: Popular Culture and Historical Imagination," will be treated to showings of Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves, and Monty Python and the Holy Grail. Those of a more intellectual bent might prefer the seminar entitled "Exploring Strange New Worlds: A Sociology of Star Trek," which promises to "critically examine the structures, values, and practices of scientific, family, political, economic, and cultural institutions as depicted in such Star Trek series as Earth, Vulcan, Klingon, Q, Ferengi, and Borg." Appropriately enough, the course will also explore the concept of "silence." Other seminars offered this year include "Opening Lines: Women's Intercultural Friendships," "Performing AIDS," and "Offensive Art: Text, Image, and Performance Interpretation" of the Middle Ages, which promises to "expand knowledge of resistance to compulsory heterosexuality in a wide range of the globe's cultural areas, such as the Arab and Islamic worlds, China, and the pre-colonial Americas." The seminars to articulate the reasons why the Middle Ages have remained separate from far-reaching inquiries in lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender studies. While the seminar studies have made significant impact in the study of the early modern period, the Middle Ages have only sporadically been the object of "queering," as well as documenting, lives shaped by same-sex desire. This period plays a potentially critical role in current debates over the historical parameters of the construction of heterosexuality, offering a counterpoint to theories which deny the possibility of its existence before the modern age. The particularities of same-sex, non-heterosexual behaviors in the Middle Ages also provide rich material for a better understanding of many aspects of gendered identities. —Augh!

LUNA BEACH By Carl Moore

IT'S NOT JUST MY CLIENT'S WORD AGAINST HIS.

THERE IS A SMOKING GUN IN THIS CASE. A VERY UNUSUAL SMOKING GUN.

SHE'S SEEN YOUR SMOKING GUN, HASN'T SHE?

CHUNKS OF ART: Ontario College of Art and Design student Jethro Brown, 22, believes the world's artisitic masterpieces are oppressive and has a mission to "liberate individuals and loving creatures" from them by vomiting on famous works, each time painting in a different part of the canvas. His targets to date include Composition in Red, White and Blue by Dutch master Piet Mondrian at the New York Museum of Modern Art, which Brown sprayed with drops of blue gelatin and rice krisps. Brown believes his act of painting on painting itself constitutes an object "forall," a concept familiar to the Art Gallery of Ontario's failed to grasp when they cleaned his red upshot from Raoul Dufy's Harbour at Le Havre. When questioned by detectives, Brown explained his vomit performances, and officials declined to press charges or publicize the incident lest they inspire "copycat attacks," apparently fearing legions of puking arsines magnus.

BLOOD SISTAHS: The current issue of NOMMO, which bills itself "UCLAS PanAfrican Newsmagazine," is dubbed "The Sistahs Issue." Amidst Afro-feminist poetry and an article called "Blood Sister," a column entitled "Blood Sisters" offers advice on how to make menstruation less uncomfortable. Before offering practical tips on diet, exercise, and hygiene, author Nosieh Chinhongwa Kayes of Nandi Family Services identifies the real sources of women's suffering: "Some researchers argue that excessive bleeding during menstruation is a result of patriarchy where women have an inferior status, are subjected to sexual slavery and are subjected to oppression and exploitation." We shall with interest her analysis for the cases of dann-
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EDITORIAL STATEMENTS etc
Treason of the Heart

By David Horowitz

On February 10, The Free Press will publish David Horowitz's autobiography, Radical Son. This "generational odyssey" chronicles Horowitz's beginnings in the communist ghetto of his parents' political faith, his pivotal role in the feverish rise and fall of the New Left, and the doubts and revolutions that led him to turn back on his radical commitments and to "come home" to America. The following excerpt discusses two moments in the 1960s when Horowitz was offered the opportunity to commit the "treason of the heart" which was the cornerstone of the politics of that troubled era.

In 1965, I was living in London when The Free World Colossus (my book holding the United States responsible for the Cold War) was finally published. About that time, I received a phone call from a man with a thick Russian accent who said he was with the Novosti Press Agency and wanted to meet me. I remember him as that his first name was Lev because I immediately associated it with Trotsky. Later on, after the experience was over, I discovered that Lev was the third man in the Soviet embassy, a post usually reserved for officers of the KGB.

I was the only radical courted by Lev. I had seen him with a Marxist economics tutor at the LSE (London School of Economics) and discussed with him in a veiled manner with the editor of View, who had also been having lunches with him. Lev was the New Left Review crowd knew him, as did activists I was familiar with from the Labour Party left. How many had failed to reject him as I did? How many had become suppliers of information to the KGB?

After my stint in London, I returned to the United States to join Ramparts magazine. Beginning in 1966, a series of sensational Ramparts stories drew a national spotlight and expanded circulation to 100,000 readers, making it the most read publication of the left. The stories featured the CIA and its global intrigues. The first had come in Ramparts' coverage of an obscure assistant professor of economics at Michigan State, named Stanley Steinbock, who had participated in a CIA-funded program to train police in South Vietnam. Steinbock's story provided an explosive link between the campus and the war. When a student came to Ramparts with information that the CIA was funding secret funds into the National Student Association, a further connection was established. This scoop led to revelations about the Congress for Cultural Freedom and other liberal institutions that had been cradled to oppose the Communist forces. In the hands of Ramparts editor and Ramparts网点's moral equivalence between Stalin's police state and America's democracy was established. In the absence of similar stories about KGB operations, the revelations added new dimensions to the Cold War and the anti-war movement and the Communist forces in Vietnam, the Ramparts articles seemed to confirm the New Left view of the world.

Ode to the writers who worked on these stories was Sol Stern, whom I had met and gotten to know in Berkeley in the late 1960s. In 1966, Ramparts sent Sol to Bratislava, along with Tom Hayden and an SDS delegation, to meet Madame Blah and other leaders of the National Liberation Front. For the radical attendants, this was part of a fact-finding mission. The organizers allowed Sol to be present only after Ramparts agreed that he would not report on the "sensitive" political discussions taking place. Long afterwards, Sol talked about what these were: "The SDS held a seminar with the Communists on how to conduct their psychological warfare campaign against the United States." According to Sol, Hayden was particularly vocal in making suggestions on how to sabotage the American war effort. He also tried to get the group to publicly endorse the Communist line on the war, but Sol and the sociologist Christopher Jakes, who was also present, objected and
Hayden's proposal was voted down. Their distant ties and con-sequences. Following the Brezhnev elections, the group was scheduled to go to North Vietnam. Hayden had already been there, publicly proclaiming that he had seen "vive notre democratie" at work. As a consequence, he enjoyed the confidence of the Communist rulers and had become one of their protégés, screening American radicals for his hosts. To punish Sol and Jenkins, Hayden saw to it they were denied permission to go on with their work to Handi.

Hundres, maybe even thousands of similar occurred and went undetected. In March 1972, an attempt to link the Communist army during the Siachen war and the New Left continued. Memoires and historical monographs by New Left historians printed a virtual portrait of radical prototypes, revising the history of the period on a scale that would seem impossible outside the Communist bloc. In its own memoirs, Hayden includes pages of excerpts from his FBI file, interspersed with disingenuous presentations of his political career that he keeps hidden in the past about many of the far from innocent activities he was actually engaged in. The elitist is in a position to make the FBI’s surveillance seem both gratuitous and meagre at the same time.

In the summer of 1972, Hayden paid a visit to a Workers’ Office. He told us he had been to Paris to meet with the National Liberation Front and representatives from Haig, and he wanted us to publish an article he intended to write about the military situation. It was called “The Prospect of the Vietnamese Offensive” and was a detailed account of the situation in Vietnam and American involvement under President Johnson. He distin-

s his articles as Communist war propaganda. Peace negotiations had been in Paris and the terms of any treaty would be critical to the war aims of both combat-

nents. If the situation could be stabilized to preserve the regime in the South, the United States would have prevented the war. If the conditions facili-
tated a Communist “liberation,” the other side would win.

The Ninth Administration wanted a trueign to the North. A new election was held. It had launched a dramatic gambit to pressure the Communists into a stabilizing peace. After more than two decades of quarrel, Nixon recognized the long-term value of the arms and, with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, made visits to Moscow and Peking. They hoped to persuade the Communist rulers to pressure Hanoi into a settle-
mement that would be acceptable to both sides. The terms to be an offensive in South Vietnam to alter the facts on the ground. The role of Hayden and other New Left radicals was to intensify the divisiveness in America, behind enemy lines.

I listened to Hayden’s request with an anx-

ious feeling. There was a "gotcha" moment when- ever Hayden asked for a political favor. Once, he had summoned me to his Batman Street house. When I got there, he asked me if I would hide a

Black Panther is the shock behind my own house. It occurred to me that the Panthers might be wanted for an actual crime. But I ignored the thought for the same reason that everyone did—the Panthers were a vanguard under attack. Even more important was my desire to impress Hayden with the fact that I was not just an ideological streetfighter, but ready to put myself on the line when the need was there.

The same consideration underlay my readiness to serve Hayden’s purposes now. Because I had acquired a reputation for being critical of the Communists, I expected the party. I told Hayden I had heard about his desire to have a willing citizen at his side in his service, but he would also serve the Vietnamese people. At the same time, I stressed my own task as one of maintaining independence of any party line. Hayden eyed me with a cynical as Rampart’s expert on national security subjects. At first, I dismissed it as the work of a crack. The article claimed to be a top secret matter and contained a detailed account of intelligence matters and included capitalized words like COMINT, ELINT, RADAR, and SAVMP. I had no way of assessing the claims and was inclined to discount the witness without much thought. But before doing so I gave it to Bob Fitch, a writer who had replaced Jan Assim in when he left our staff to become a full-time member of the Red Family.

After reading the article, Fitch came back looking pale and frightened. It turned out that he had an extensive collection of material for a national intelligence operative in the East Airborne Division during the Cuban Missile Crisis. As a result of his training, he recognized secret signals codes in the text of the article—codes that he was under oath not to repeat. If we printed them, he said, we would all go to jail. Fitch had authenticated the document. Peter Cafliger and I arranged a meeting with Peck at a local Berkeley cafe. We learned that he had been employed by a top secret branch of intelligence called the National Security Agency, which encompassed 90% of the U.S. intelligence but was unknown at the time. How unknown was indicated by an anecdote Peck told us. He was present at a briefing with the President. Hubert Humphrey in 1967 when Humphrey asked a couple of pretty dumb questions that showed he didn’t have the foggiest notion of what NSA was and what it did.

Peck’s most sensational claim was that the NSA had cracked the Soviet Intelligence code. This meant that U.S. Intelligence could read Soviet electronic communications at will.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we know the whereabouts of any given time of all its aircraft, exclusive of small private planes, and its naval forces, including its missile-firing submarines... We know where their submarines are, what every one of their VLF is doing and, generally their capabilities and the disposition of all their forces.

Peck himself was stonewalled as a result of the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act and various provisions of the 1967 law passed by both sides without any real chance of getting it passed.

To print Peck’s article would strike a blow against the war machine. It would promote peace on all sides. Or so I told myself at the cusp of the moment. In fact, as I realized after the deed was done, we had revealed the most carefully guarded Intelligence information of all the knowledge that we had published. The Soviet Intelligence Agents were killed to prevent the other side from knowing what our side knew.

When I realized what we had done, I became anxious. There was no cradling of a code. The other side would always respond by creating a new one. By revealing to the Soviets that their security had been breached, we had merely insured that they would develop a new one. Despite this, I had understood the real significance of publishing Peck’s claims, I might have agreed to print his story anyway. For me, the overriding justification was one that was deeply personal. The political obstacles I faced made it important that America should lose the war. I did not believe that an NLF victory would mean “free roots” democracy, as Hayden had written, but I was convinced that America’s loss would be Vietnam’s gain. An American defeat would weaken oppression everywhere.

Tom Hayden: “He self-consciously served the Communists in Vietnam.”

Neither my piece nor Hayden’s was the most explosive piece of the August 1972 issue of Ramparts. Hayden’s, however, was an unsigned article by a man who called himself Window Peck. It was titled “U.S. Electronic Espionage: A Memoir” and, as we soon discovered, publishing it would violate a section of the Espionage Act.

The article had been sent over the trans-

sorm of our Berkeley office. It was pasted on to me

squint. I felt I had to warn him—since he was working directly with the Communists—that I was going to write an article in the same issue that would be critical of his work. His reply was that he had resigned. Hayden did not understand that there might be any conflict of interest between the Communist forces. Whether he actually believed he was just playing the political role he had assigned himself as a spokesman for Hanoi, I didn’t know and never found out.

My piece was much shorter than Hayden’s and was called “Non-Vietnam’s War: How It Was Launched Under the Aegis of Brezhnev and the How the Vietnamese War to Conquer it.” The Los Angeles Times ran a long article on its editorial page attacking what I wrote under the heading “Bloodthirsty New Left Wants War to Continue.” One Times reader wrote to the editor saying that an NBC reporter, also named David Horowitz, should be fired for expressing such views.
When Peter and I told Fitch that we were going to run Peck's article, he panicked. We would all lose our jobs, he feared, and we'd all be fired. I wisarded the decision, Fitch accused me of quitting the magazine. He was not about to grow up in flames with us. We enjoyed seeing this rhetorical manslaughter exploited out of us, however, but it did appear strangely a bit of witchcraft nonetheless. What if he was right? Both of us had families. Were we really going to jeopardize our future for a grand gesture like this? We began to argue about the matter.

Taking a step back, we decided to defer a final decision until we could consult a lawyer. I contacted the defense team for Daniel Ellsberg, the former Pentagon official, and I approached with Ellsberg's lawyer, the person who had been working on Ellsberg's case since he had written the papers. The attorney was able to help me understand the implications of the papers that had been released to the government. It was important for us to consult with someone who could provide us with legal protection. We finally agreed to use the papers to our advantage. We had learned from the government's actions that the papers had been used to undermine the government's stability. The papers were used to reveal the truth about the government's actions. In the meantime, we had to go on with the publication of the article.

To make its case in a court of law, the government would have to establish that we had indeed damaged national security. This would be necessary to reveal more than the government might want the other side to know. In fact, the legal process would certainly force more information to light than the government would want the world to know. By the time we had published the article, we had learned from the government's actions that the papers had been used to undermine the government's stability. The papers were used to reveal the truth about the government's actions. In the meantime, we had to go on with the publication of the article.

We published the article and it became our first front-page article in the New York Times. The Times' story was disappointing to me because it did not mention my name, nor did it mention the NSA technology, nor did it mention the influence of the government on the Times. Instead, it focused on the more pertinent question of whether Peck's claim that American agents had broken the Soviet code was accurate. Some experts were quoted by the Times to the effect that it was not. The account also revealed that the real name of the man we knew as William Peck was Peverell Fowle, a fact that the Times had not included in its initial story. The Times' story was disappointing to me because it did not mention my name, nor did it mention the NSA technology, nor did it mention the influence of the government on the Times. Instead, it focused on the more pertinent question of whether Peck's claim that American agents had broken the Soviet code was accurate. Some experts were quoted by the Times to the effect that it was not. The account also revealed that the real name of the man we knew as William Peck was Peverell Fowle, a fact that the Times had not included in its initial story.

The significance of this conflict derived from the role the left had played in the tragedies themselves. In 1973, Nixon and Kissinger negotiated a peace treaty that was designed to keep the South Vietnamese regime in place and remove America's military presence. I knew that the outcome was not going to be the "liberation" we had promised. But with American forces out of the picture, I saw no compelling reason to remain politically active in the war. But Hayden and others like him did. After the anti-drug movement deteriorated in 1970, Hayden and Fonda organized an "Indochina Freedom Campaign" to solicit American support for the regime in Cambodia and South Vietnam. For the next few years, the Campaign worked tirelessly to secure the victory of the North Vietnamese Communists and the Khmer Rouge. Accompanied by a church rally, Hayden and Fonda traveled to Hanoi and then to the "liberation zones" in South Vietnam to make a propaganda film. It was called "Introduction to the Enemy," and intended to persuade viewers that the Communists were going to create a new Asia in the South. Equality and justice awaited its inhabitants if only America would cut off support for the Saigon regime.

Asisted by radical legislators like Ron Dellums and Daniel B. Aula, Hayden set up a camp in the Capitol building where he met congressional staff. In June of 1972, he met with Representative Charles W. Diggs of Michigan. Hayden directed his attention to Cambodia, as well, lobbying for an accommodation with the Khmer Rouge guerrillas. When Nixon resigned over Watergate, it appeared that the leverage Hayden and his activists needed. The Democratic vote won the midterm elections, bringing to Washington a new group of legislators who were determined to undermine the administration that Kissinger had achieved. The aid was cut, the Saigon regime fell, and the Khmer Rouge marched into the Cambodian capital. In two years that followed, more destructions were killed by the victorious Communists than had been killed on both sides in all thirteen years of the anti-Communist war.

It was the bloodshed that our opponents, the defenders of the American presence in Southeast Asia, had predicted. But for the left, the war would be no looking back. Ba's appeal proved the furthest it was possible for them to go, which was not the furthest at all. The appeal did not begin to suggest that "anti-war" activists needed to reassess the role they had played in making these tragedies inevitable. Ironically, it was Hayden who eventually came closest to such self-recognition: "What continues to baffle me is the course of morality and judgment of those who wrote in Reunion, is that I could not even imagine that the worst stereotype of revolutionary madness was becoming a reality. . . . I did not know that the Khmer Rouge became the Stalinists and insurgents of my lifetime, killing hundreds of thousands of people for being 'traitors' or 'urban,' for attracting the paranoid attention of a secret police who saw conspiracies behind every fallen wall of the grand plan to be saved. Most Western estimates settle on 1.5 million killed . . . But having acknowledged these facts and his conviction over them, he could go no further. The terrible reality, which he had worked so hard to make possible, failed to prompt a reassessment of the policies he had opposed: 'None of this persuades me that Nixon and Kissinger were right.'

I had been having my own thoughts about the end of the war, attempting to place it in its historical context as a way of judging what had happened. As a student at Columbia, I had read, among other things, Edward强有力的"The Trojan Women," which was inspired by this country's conquest of the small island of Melos. Euripides intended his play to explore the moral and human issues that had been generated by the war and the suffering that had followed. Like the Athenians" play, our own was about the war they had conducted and the suffering they had inflicted. When the Athenians saw Euripides' play, they wept for the people of Melos. In the eyes of the American president, the show of compassion was a tribute to Athenian civilization. How much greater, I thought, was the civilized response of America's democracy to the tragedy in Vietnam? I could not think of a single historical instance where a nation had retreated from a field of battle it had dominated, became the conqueror and was considered a failure. But the left had both proven wrong, America's democracy was not the "shame" we had said it was. When the American people forced against the wall there was no greater power to make it con-
The New York Times is right, Bianca was then just 21. Impossible, said my friend. “When I met her, even then, she was no spring chicken,” he told me. “I’m 54 now, so she’s got to be at least 55.”

Whatever. Even given all the miles on her clock, she still seemed to be a bit above a mere consensus. The Standing Committee on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives is the dividend of the Standing Committee on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate. In fact, it is the Standing Committee on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate. I'm not sure if she is being an American or an allowed experience. They are always looking around the corner to see if the power, to which they have attached themselves so fecklessly, is doing something bad.

That is, I suppose, a charitable way of looking at the curious affair by which the directors of Bianca Jagger—through Robert Torricelli and Bill Clinton—ended up recently by a restructuring of the CIA. It was a remarkable event, something that would have been unthinkable for most of the history of our republic but which, in the Clinton era, was largely unnoticed in the media. This curious affair I am referring to had its reach in the ’80s; the decade in which Americans, under the leadership of Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, moved from the brink of nuclear war to the brink of détente. Torricelli was a student at Rutgers, which was founded in 1766 and was then a student at Rutgers University in New Jersey. I was a student at Livingston College, which was founded in 1766. He was my roommate for a year. I remember once when we were in a philosophy class and he said, “I don’t have the time to think about this.” I thought it was a great power structure, indeed, the most potent on earth. And this mutual self-fulfillment as well as self-destruction. For so many, being an American is an allowed experience. They are always looking around the corner to see if the power, to which they have attached themselves so fecklessly, is doing something good.

The marriage was, like those, a ’70s thing. By the ’80s, Bianca was divorced and expectant, but a lot of time back in Managua indulging herself, along with the gathering of American sandinistas, in the hip pursuit of the ’80s revolutionary politics. Around the time that the London rocker Elton John released his album “Candle in the Wind,” Bianca, in fact, was spreading a lot of time in the most odious of the sandinistas, Tomas Borge. Borge, of course, was the Lavrenty Beria of the sandinista regime, who ran the notorious secret police network that kept an eye on every house on every block in Nicaragua.

I once saw a collection of treasures in Managua and found myself close to face with Borge. I will never forget his gaze, though I went straight to a bar and started drinking in an attempt to do so. The gaze betrayed a mixture of sympathy and mirth. He must have greeted me at some point, but the war did not let me go. I spent the day previous interviewing a human rights official about the arbitrary arrests and torturers being instructed by the Inter-American Human Rights Office that Borge loaded.

The safest thing about Borge’s girl was not the Eichmann-like aspect of it, but the reflexive belief that I was a co-conspirator, that all Americans were so ambivalent that they could easily be recruited into an enterprise such as his. One American for whom this would be true, to bring this story of intrigue and intrigue to an end, was Robert Torricelli. He fit the sandinista mold so well as to be the perfect type: Harvard Law School graduate for a semester in life who drifted to Central America and is enthralled by the romance of the revolutionaries. Feeding a desperate urge to educate them, he found Americans with some reason didn’t appreciate the idea of a Marxist takeover of neighboring states. But Harbury decided to write a book about revolutionaries. But not just any revolutionaries. Women revolutionaries.

By the time she got involved in this enterprise, it was very late in the game for the world socialist movement. The Brezhnev world, and even the most thick-skinned professionals must have begun to realize the jig was up. A few short years before, it still seemed likely that El Salvador and Guatemala would be replaced by the new, go-go Marxists. But by now the guerrilla movements in those countries were doomed and isolated.

But Harbury hadn’t the sense of urgency and traveled to El Salvador in 1990. She met a guerrilla leader named Elvira Barahona. Barahona was a leader in a group called GRRA, which roughly translated as “Guatemalan Revolutionary Organization of the People in Arms.” To give credit where it’s due, ORPA was by far the most common-sensical of the Guatemalan guerrilla groups, and it tended to focus not so much on an intimidating force as on raising wages. Harbury found Barahona to be a charming fellow. The next year, Barahona asked her to be a member of a Meyca wedding ceremony, which she claims made her regularly married to tinman law. This may have been a bit of a stretch, but Harbury began using it to advance her reputations. When Barahona disappeared in the battle in 1992, she began holding hunger strikes in Guatemala City and in Washington, D.C., to force officials to choose what happened to her “husband.” By way of comparison, in 1965 the journalist Nick Blake disappeared in Guatemala while trying to link up with and interview guerrillas. Blake’s family began a campaign to find out what happened to him. They argued that the U.S. government should take a more aggressive role in finding out what happened to him.

I went to the site in Guatemala from.
which he disappeared, a cold and forbidding spot
in the mountains, where both the guerrillas and the
army played for keeps. It was difficult, if not
impossible, to get any useful information about
Blake's disappearance from the villagers, though
they hinted to me freely about how the guerrillas
had marched into town and put town officials up
against the wall. So I was somewhat sympathetic
to U.S. government officials who told me they were
done with the Blake case, but I felt the historian of
the American government to babysit every
American who decides to hike off into a place the
guerrillas call "Chi Max.""

Blake was an American citizen and non-
combatant. But Baramca? He was an armed guer-
ri l who would have, if he could have managed it,
killed DiVAe in Guatemala. Acknowledged as a guer-
ri l if they got him first, what business was it of
Washington's?

For a couple of years, Harbury carried on
her hunger strike to no great effect. Within the
the old sandalwood network, however.
Harbury became the center of a conspiracy
theory. The theory revolved around the idea
that the CIA was provoking up the
Guatemalan Army despite an order by
President Bush cutting off military aid in
1991. That order came because of the 1990
murders of the Guatemalan army in
Guatemala, a hotel in Guatemala.
The Americans, Michael DeVaite, was slain by
six soldiers who were questioning him.
The United States was not satisfied with
the progress of the investigation and therefore
aid was cut off.

The Guatemalan military seemed to have
been justified. I didn't know DeVaite, but I
remember meeting in Guatemala who knew
him. Mike Shawcross, an
affable Englishmen who owns a bookstore in
Guatemala, told me that DeVaite was not
only a nice guy but thoroughly apolitical.
Whatever banging fu to his death should have
been more hardly prosecuted by the
Guatemalan government, Shawcross said.
The Guatemalan army was wrong. But once the
conspiracy theorists get hold of it, the
whole affair took on an even more sinister
air than that of a murder which was sinister
enough. It was claimed that DeVaite had
been killed because he had knowledge of a
drug-smuggling operation run by the local
army commander. And the conspiracy theo-
rists also claimed that the CIA was secretly
providing aide to the Guatemalan military (and defying U.S.
policy) with under-the-table payments that made
up for the aid cut off. They shop together a num-
er of other related tales, all as imaginative as one
would expect when one combines Guatemalan
exaggeration with the general chauvinism of
American liberals.

Most if not all of this story was nonsense,
but it was good enough for Brian Jagger, who
brought all the disparate elements of this story into
harmonic convergence. She met with Jennifer
Harbury and, after hearing her story, relayed her
conclusions in a journal article. Robert
Torricelli began to look into the case. A White
House official by the name of Richard Naccio, who had
written a book on the subject, called. Torricelli
gave Torricelli classified information that
suggested that the CIA was withholding
information from the Harbury and DeVaite
case and specifically from a letter to President
Clinton in which he charged that the CIA was
withholding the information because a
Guatemalan army colonel on the CIA payroll had
been involved in the killings of both Baramca
and DeVaite. If that had been all Torricelli
did, he would have been within his rights and the
subsequent inquiry might have done no harm and could
have been done in a good light. But Torricelli
also released the letter to New York Times
reporter Tim Weiner. The letter contained not just general
allegations but specific information about the
colonel, including his name. Julio Roberto Alpande.

Until this point in American history, the
only people in the employ of the U.S. government
who had revealed the identity of CIA sources were
spies and turncoats. Torricelli was the first con-
gressman. There is a good reason other congress-
men have never revealed such information
(though simple patriotism should suffice): All con-
gressmen take an oath not to reveal classified
secrets. Torricelli, who was a member of the House
Intelligence Subcommittee, had also taken an oath
in keeping with his duties as a member of that com-
mittee. But after the article appeared in the Times,
with Alpande's identity as a CIA source unmasked,
Torricelli appeared before the National Press Club
on May 2, 1995. The event is instructive not just
because it shows not only how left wing the
Washington press corps is, but how incompetent.
Not a single journalist there asked a single tough
question of Torricelli, and few seemed to have the
most basic understanding of the enormity of his
act.

The transcript is fascinating in that it
shows Torricelli basically bought the entire con-
sspiracy theory without bothering to check it out.

Anti-CIA Activist Jennifer Harbury

Fortunately, his revelations caused President
Clinton to order his Intelligence Oversight Board
to review the entire affair. That panel released
its report on June 28, 1996. Through this is an
over-
sight board working for a Democrat president, it
seems to have done an impartial job of digging out
the facts. The result was that Torricelli's national
for leaking the information—a rogue CIA—was
reled on eight points. There was no conspiracy.

Torricelli had stated at his appearance
before the National Press Club, "When the presi-
dent of the United States learned from the
newspaper that the United States government has a
secret foreign aid program to the Guatemalan mili-
tary, no one can oncide that the intelligence com-
munity is under sufficient civilian control." Great
if one can make a case for the CIA. What
happened next is that the Oversight Board concluded the following: "Contrary to public alle-
gations, CIA did not increase covert funding,
but rather decreased covert funding for the coup of military
aid in 1990."

Another example: Torricelli maintained that
the press conference that despite the facts he took
not to reveal clear-cut information, he had a duty as
an American citizen to reveal criminal activity
when he became aware of it. But in this case,
according to the Oversight Board, there was no
criminal activity to be revealed. With respect to
criminal liability concerning these CIA nondisco-
overs, we have found no adequate basis to con-
clude that the conduct of any of the relevant CIA
officials violated any criminal statute.

At the press conference, Torricelli also
stated the CIA "maintained Colonel Alpande on
the payroll, continued financial payments to him,
and did nothing to bring him to justice, although
they knew he killed an American." But the
Oversight Board concluded the "widely pub-
cized October 1991 allegation that DeVaite was
killed on Colonel Alpande's base and that Alpande
was present was wrong. Reviewing the evi-
dence gathered by Carl West and by the
Department of Justice.

This last conclusion is perhaps the most
disingenuous to the Torricelli/Jagger/DeVaite
mess. The CIA was motivated to this act by an
American, a private investigator who has lived in
Guatemala for more than 15 years and who had
made a career of getting other Americans out of
difficult spots, such as kidnappings. He was hired
in 1990 by DeVaite's widow, Carol, to look into the
murder. I first spoke to him ten years ago, when he
did some work on the Blake case. Recently, I gave
him another call.

West informed me that though the
DeVaite case did indeed involve a brutal and sense-
less murder, it was no more serious than those
solved long before Baramca and Bel
Torricelli decided to stick their noses into it.
Six soldiers and one officer (not Alpande)
had been convicted of the killing in a
Guatemala court. The only connection
that Alpande had to the killing was that the
soldiers were staying at his base at the time of the
killing. They were not under his command, but were
staying there simply because they needed a place to
stay while in the area. "The investigation into the death
of Michael DeVaite has been done and com-
ed well before Torricelli came out with any
thing," West told me. "These fellows [the killers] in the DeVaite case have already been
put away. Torricelli's revelations have
absolutely no effect on the DeVaite case and
are still haven't as far as I know.

Torricelli purported to be exposing a
cover-up of DeVaite's murder, but West
said there was no evidence of any such
cover-up. I would be hard-pressed to believe
that any U.S. government agency had covered up
important knowledge concerning the death of Michael DeVaite. I propose that West had
never had any leading evidence of any
high idea that any U.S. agency had any meaningful
information regarding the death.

The reason the CIA lacked such
information goes to the heart of the prob-
lem with all the wilder conspiracy theories
in their minds, the CIA is both omnipotent
and omniscient: in the Third World, pulling strings to
manipulate the outcome of events that lead to
events. The Third World would not want function
a bit better that were true. But it's not. The CIA
is, when all is said and done, just another govern-
ment agency, one with limited funds and limited
personnel. To quote the Oversight report
"Embassy officials state that Mrs. DeVaite has
acces, through her private investigator, to
more detailed information, it was a day by day
how the information more often flowed from her
the embassy than in the other direction."

The Oversight report also contained the
sentence: "Our intelligence services are not all
knowing. Good point. You and I have no way of
knowing how many agents the United States has in
Guatemala, nor how much they have had
access to such information if they desired it. Only
a fool could believe that, with its limited resources
the CIA somehow was running a shadow opera
that was helping the Guatemalan military against
the U.S. army abroad."

I see the term "foul" advisedly because it
is one of Torricelli's favorites. That's what he calls
one in the one-on-one phone conversation I
had on the subject. I had called him in my capacity as
columnist for The Star-Ledger, New Jersey's large
newspaper, to explore some contradictions. New
Jersey's largest newspaper and one with limited
resources in America and as a congressman, Torricelli
has curated a reputation as one of Fidel Castro's
toughest critics in Congress. (Although this can
only be so after he acquired this anti-Castro cred
now.) But he also has consistently tended to the
loopy left on Central America. I'd never seen any
politician get votes from both the left and the right
in Latin America. I called him to find out how h
pulled off this rather difficult trick.

Before long, I located myself asking Torricelli, but that meant when he first made the accusations against the CIA, because he needed to uncover criminal activity. "Okay," I said. "But what was the law that was broken? Was it an American law or a Guatemalan law?" Torricelli had no answer. This was nine months after he had made the revelation, yet I was apparently the first journalist to ask that question.

"You are a fool," Torricelli sneered at me. "You could just answer the question," I offered helpfully. "I'll speak to your editor," he shouted as he hung up. That conversation took place early last year, and since then I've reported on all the various revelations concerning the case, little by little, it has become more apparent how difficult our assumptions were. But I haven't been able to ask key questions like the following. How much of a role did Bianca play in your decision? Don't you feel that your behavior is ineluctable and that it may be a prophecy of our intelligence-gathering apparatus? And most important: Don't you remember the Iran hostage crisis? That was, I'd reminded him, when a Democrat was president, having topped the CIA with British intelligence, had insisted on a surprise by a group of Middle Eastern madmen. Couldn't it happen again because of what has happened in the world?

The Torricelli Principle was first cited in an article in U.S. News & World Report. The article said that as a result of Torricelli's revelations about the CIA's lobbying for terrorist groups, the House Ethics Committee had been directed to recruit foreign sources who may be involved in civil rights violations. The article quoted disgruntled CIA officials as saying the new policy has given them a "false sense of welfare that American intelligence-gathering operations are as big as the globe."

After I read the article, I called a highly placed intelligence official in Washington. "This is really a dumb set of guidelines," he told me. "It says you can't recruit as a spy anyone who is not a nice person. What this does is to say to your case officer that he can find out what's going on in Lebanon, and let's find him recruits in churches and PTAs, but he can't recruit anyone in Hezbollah because everyone in Hezbollah is a right-wing terrorist."

The irony in all this is that while we Americans occupy ourselves with manufactured conspiracies about the CIA, there are plenty of enemies of America occupying themselves with real conspiracies. Eventually, one of those conspiracies may surprise Bill Clinton, the way the 1979 embassy takeover surprised Jimmy Carter. Of course, we can always hope we can penetrate the conspiracy despite the Torricelli Principle. It certainly makes sense to require that actual CIA agents observe human rights guidelines. But sources are not agents. They are people who are paid to talk. Pido Chator's No. 2 man, for example, is certainly a human-rights violator of the worst sort. But if he'd rat out the CIA, he'd certainly be allowed to talk to the CIA. John Dauth, the CIA director who promulgated these guidelines, was said to be widely deplored for engineering in to Torricelli on the Harder case. No director or otherwise dismissed a number of agents in Guatemala, but only one was guilty of any violation of agency rules, according to my well-placed intelligence source. The new policy seems to please The New York Times. After announcing the disciplinary action to a collection of officers, Dauth then called a plea- nary meeting in which he said he wanted everybody to understand that he didn't intend this to discourage other agents from taking risks. "The whole auditorium laughed out loud," the source said. After the meeting, the agents walked out without waiting for Dauth to leave, "a terrible insult," according to the source, because until then, it had been customary for all officers to stand up when Dauth walked into intelligence centers or left the room. Dauth abolished that custom rather than see it continued violently because of Simon for himself, the source said.

Despite the fallout, and Clinton has named as his successor Anthony Lake, who recently gained some notoriety by testifying that he was unsure whether Alger Hiss was a spy, The confirm-
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Faux Rape Charge Victim Randall Lamb

which threatened the sparkling 4.0 GPA she had been counting on to gain scholarships for advanced study. In early April, within a week of getting their grades, the three filed a complaint, charging that professor Lamb had created a hostile atmosphere in class and had called them "min hatters" for defending women who report rape. More seriously, they charged that he used tuition waivers and scholarships to extort sex from students.

The bizarre ordeal of Randall Lamb had begun.

The Watanabe, the campus equal opportunity and affirmative action officer, told the trio that they would have to sign and file their complaint, which would then be reviewed, then be shown to the accused. That technically disposed of the three who, after consultations with other campus officials, withdrew the complaint. With the accusers unwilling to openly confront the accused, the issue should have ended there. But, as on many an American college campus, the accusations took on a life of their own, thanks to an informal feminist network heavily invested in their success.

Ms Watanabe immediately took it upon herself to continue the trio's complaint, overruling department head George Tanabe that he, not Lamb, should conduct student evaluations and relieve Lamb of grading papers. This pressure tactic worked. In trial testimony, Tanabe said he had graded a paper of Michelle Greutinger that was "highly argumentative, very ideological, very much unbalanced, in terms of what I would consider to be academic objectivity or fairness." But Tanabe never gave it an A because he was dealing with an emotional issue. There were no charges made against Professor Lamb, there were questions about fairness, and I thought that the best way of handling it was to at least remove the area of grading from the circumstances, and did that by giving it an A."

As summarized by Thomas Angelo, an arbitrator who usually rules on the Lamb case, "Ms. Watanabe elected to treat the students' complaints as valid notwithstanding the fact that they were not supported by written statements. She then provided them with a 'summary of allegations' list of the students' statements even though such a substitution is not contemplated by the regulations. Finally, she merged the three complaints into a single 'class action' alleging that professors do not allow the joinder of claims."

But Watanabe did not act alone. Each of her actions was taken with the concurrence of the Student Affairs for sexual harassment, a key player in the island drama. This was Susan Hippesteiner, hired by the university in 1991 after winning a sexual harassment case of her own. She claimed that psychology professor David Wetson, her graduate school advisor, forced her with sexual suggestions and that he once kissed her on the forehead. This case not only became part of Hippesteiner's qualifications for getting the job but helped establish the new sexual harassment policies that Hippesteiner came to enforce. As her little implied, Hippesteiner's role was to aid and advise students who believed they had been harassed, but she also had the authority to act on her own.

In his first two years, Lamb nearly tripled the number of religion majors. He maintained an open-door policy, giving students free rein to SHARP and the book-lined office. His lively classroom discussions proved popular with students, so much so that there were waiting lists for Lamb's upper-level classes. Many students told the professor, who also served as an academic advisor, that they would not have been interested in a class showing the relationship between religious thought and current social issues. When the department ran out of money and was forced to reduce its budget, Lamb urged religion that "Religion, Politics, and Society," an upper-level course dealing with such explosive issues as abortion, war, control, and sexuality, which gay marriage, homophobia, and sexual harassment.

Lamb told students up front that the controversial and divisive nature of these issues demanded a leadership role. He told students that "if anyone has a problem dealing with and listening to other points of view, then maybe this is not the class for you." Seven males and 18 females signed up for the course featuring the text Current Issues and Enduring Questions, published by St. Martin's Press. When the professor dealt with abortion, he brought the perspective of both pro-life and Planned Parenthood and likewise explored all the facets of the difficult questions.

Lamb's custom was to assign three readings before class. The selections for the February 25, 1993, class on date rape and sexual harassment were from Ellen Goodman's The Reasonable Woman and Alice Kissinger's Date Rape: A Vicious Cycle and Katherine Maloney's "Sex and Violence, a Perspective." According to the thousands of pages of testimony his "case" has generated, Lamb encountered the view that feminists would be troubled with such a concept. This comment troubled student Tania Motsonok, sworn that "rape is rape," and that women never lie about these issues. Caucasian Shaneen Banger disagreed, citing the case of her brother, whose girlfriend falsely accused him of rape after he broke up with her. Other students shared Banger's views, but Motsonok, with backing from friends Bonita Ral and Michelle Greutinger, cut them off and domi-
Heterodoxy's angry monologue became the ideological seed that bloomed Michelle Greitzinger's charges against Ramada Lamb.

On June 18, 1993, Greitzinger upped the ante by filing a "detailed statement of sexual aspects of complaint," charging "gross physical overtures and sexual conduct" by Lamb. The professor, she wrote, compelled her to submit to "punishment of violent acts" he had previously committed and because he weighed her by 60-80 pounds. "I complied with Lamb's sexual demands out of fear of violence and damage to my future.

The statement detailed four incidents, ranging from "Lamb tried to kiss me" to "he began touching me, kissing me, massaging my back." He also told her to "rub my breasts and buttocks." On Monday, September 7, 1992, the statement said, he drove her home after class, unzipped her into the bedroom, pulled her pants down and forced her to perform fellatio, then turned her around, bent her over and kissed her from behind. Further, the professor "appeared to think he had sexual access rights" and "pulled off her jeans generally into a week until about the first week in October." All told, "we had intercourse approximately 16 times.

One occurrence was during the day. Monday through Thursday" and Greitzinger claimed to be "being threatened with complete disfigurement, from the incidents of "repetitive coercive sexual assault." Lamb was not notified of the sexual charges until late in April, and the evidence gave "the new insight into" Kalla's, "No investigation had been taken place but the indication was that I was guilty," he said. And his sight that his identity and his future—both a teacher and as a person—was threatened: "To call somebody a sexual harasser is bad enough. To call somebody a rapist is worse. And then to have an attorney get up and tell me a serial rapist. I have to list to the papers publish it. I don't think you can call anybody anything worse. I'd rather be called a murder.

The professor sought and received counsel from his faculty union, which provided him with an attorney despite pressure from political science professor Kathy Ferguson to support Lamb. Soon the rumors were flying and anti-Lamb graffiti was appearing on campus, including the women's restroom at Hemmey Hall, where Greitzinger said Lamb was a sexual harasser, leaving the name and number of Susan Huppertseal for reference.

Lamb's department, faculty union, and assorted students and professors stood behind him. But much of the campus followed the new myth of Huppertseal's ideology: accusation equals guilt.

In January 1994, University of Hawaii Vice President Madeleine Goodman dismissed Brian's Rais's complaint against Lamb. In April, Executive Vice Chancellor Feud Yuen did likewise with the charges of "Travis Mortensen. After a six-month investigation, Greitzinger's complaint landed with a panel of a professor, a dean, and a graduate student, whose Student Rule compliance concluded that Greitzinger's charge was more credible but that Lamb did not intentionally create a hostile environment. But Vice Chancellor Paul Yuen rejected the panel's findings and concluded his own investigation. In April 1994, he exonerated Lamb, citing lack of evidence and inconsistencies in Greitzinger's account, calling a blank of criticism from those who had already pronounced Lamb guilty.

Lamb then filed a grievance, charging that the University of Hawaii's sexual harassment policy had denied him his rights. The parties agreed to arbitration under labor arbitrator Thomas Angelo, experienced in handling sexual harassment complaints. In July 1994, after lengthy hearings, Angelo concluded that Susan Huppertseal's training and educational activities were "incompatible with University policy, incompatible with the nature of an educational setting, and incorrect as a matter of law." He further cited "a wealth of objective, reliable evidence to demonstrate that Dr. Huppertseal improperly used her status as a student advocate to advance her personal philosophies regarding the issue of sexual harassment." As evidence of her distress for facts, he cited this exchange:

Accuser: "With regard to this September 7th date, did you go down and look at your calendar and consider whether this thing could have even occurred as alleged?

Lamb: "I have been cleared of all sexual harassment." But the sexual inquisition continues, with the fault lines deepening.

Greitzinger died of being forsaken, on the process, but her "emotional colt's" did not prevent her from "tearing down" the hearts' of others and setting up the legal and cultural views and lovely university classes about Lamb's alleged misconduct. "The one thing that has kept me going," he told reporters, "is knowing that I am telling the truth and I am doing the right thing.

Cameraman, Felix Spence called him, two days after the arbitration award in his favor, "Lamb started getting death threats and was taking a beating in the press. News coverage tilted toward the accuser, recyling press releases from Greitzinger's lawyer and blowing up a headline "Lamb's lawyer wrote a letter to the University, I felt dirty, disgusted." Letter to the editor assumed the professor's guilt. But the arbitration ruling now gave Lamb solid grounds to bring a case against Greitzinger for filing false charges. But she decided to strike first.

In September 1995, Greitzinger filed a federal lawsuit seeking $1.5 million in damages and charging Ramada Lamb, the faculty union, and the university with sexual harassment. Before it came to trial, the university agreed to pay Greitzinger $175,000, but that left the accuser with little. This was a serious threat to her future, but it did have a positive dimension in that Lamb's attorney Tony Gill was at least able to pose the tough questions of Greitzinger, under oath, that Wanzke and Huppertseal, with their counsel particularly, had neglected to ask.

Finally, in August 1996, more than three years after the original charges, the Greitzinger v. Lamb case came to trial before magistrate Barry Karren. It quickly emerged that Greitzinger was an active member of a human rights group CORE (Creating Options for a Rape-Free Environment) and SHARP (Sexual Harassment Prevention), both operating on the Huppertseal doctrine that all men are sexually guilty and that women are sexually innocent. And it quickly became clear how badly Greitzinger had worked with Susan Huppertseal, the accuser's most ardent advocate, who found the sexual philosophy plausible even though, subsequent to the incidents described in her charges, Greitzinger continued to take classes from Lamb and even wrote a thesis on him.

Key honor society praising the professor as a "dynamite" lecturer always willing to listen to questions from students, whom he treated as peers, not numbers. "The Golden Key Maroon Chapter is certainly lucky to have a dedicated advisor like Dr. Ramada Lamb," he wrote.

In the blue lagoon between her first, "hostile environment," complaint and the later sensationalized version, Greitzinger admitted, she read such textbooks of the sexual harassment industry as The Lecherous Professor, Ivory Power, and Academic and Workplace Sexual Harassment. In her final statement, in addition to lurid sexual details, blemished with the requisite buzzwords: "fear of violence, "extreme duress." Lamb could either make or break my case at the University." Greitzinger also admitted that part of her purpose in filing the charge was to protect others from Lamb, a gentle way of saying she wanted to get him fired. She was not, in fact, more than a few in the eye, let us say, and yet unscathed and thus vulnerable, although the original charge of creating a hostile environment might not be enough to do the trick. She continued some tales that read, "Arla Hill's comments about public hair in Coles and Long Dong Silver. For example, Greitzinger charged that Lamb was manually unstable, and that he had claimed a Spaniard monkey god would speak through him—a charge that, found, had gone into news stories. But
had also said that he had given a name to his penis and that he had told her about having sexless as a member of a youth gang and wanting as a six-year-old girl was raped. The accuser also made aware of an affair that Lamb admitted to before becoming a professor.

But opening up past behavior turned out to be a double-edged sword. Lamb’s attorneys probed into his past during Rape Awareness Week. Gretzinger had written an article in Ka Leo, the student newspaper, about a rape she had suffered as an undergraduate at the University of the Pacific in Stockton, in which she charged that the attacker wielded a weapon, hid in a bathroom, and left her in a state of great distress. But a police report from the Stockton police department that the attacker had a weapon, hid in a bathroom, and left her in a state of great distress. But Gretzinger, a member of the Stockton police department, testified that she saw no weapon, and that the attacker hid in a bathroom. But when the officer developed photos taken by the alleged attacker, he testified that he found evidence of sexual assault but rather a smiling Michelle posing completely naked, in a raised pose.

It also emerged that, shortly after her marriage in 1991, Gretzinger had engaged in an affair. Further, her marriage had broken up not because of the alleged harassment, but because she had fallen in love with another woman, whom she was now in a “warm relationship,” according to her lawyer.

Gretzinger claimed that Lamb’s actions had inflicted much suffering that she needed to seek therapy, which helped her deal with the rebuffing of painful episodes. But it became clear in testimony that her troubles came when she realized that for the first time she would have to face, under oath, tough questions about the fact that her charges from clear-minded lawyers who believed in the presumption of innocence. Unlike female lawyers, which thrive on that last free voice layer beyond empirical verification, this material could be checked for veracity.

According to Gretzinger’s testimony, it was on September 7, 1992, that, after class, Lamb took her to the president’s house. “This day, however, was Labor Day, and there were no classes. Lamb spent the holiday at a picnic with his family and friends. The seventh incident she mentioned, when the president supposedly forced her to perform fellatio as “enlarged me from behind,” took place, she said, on September 11. That day, however, Hurricane Iniki slammed into the Hawaiian islands. The university and all the schools were closed, and everybody, including Lamb, was at home preparing for the worst.

In November 1993, when university officials questioned Gretzinger about this incident, she charged that she wrote the letter dated the 11th to the 15th, and said she was unsure about it. But that story only added another problem. From the 17th to the 29th, Lamb, his family and several friends were on the “big island” of Hawaii; to visit Tyagi Ji, a Hindu monk from India, for whom the Hindus provided a service as an interpreter in addition to witnesses. Lamb showed airline, video and car rental receipts to prove where he had been. Every one of the 16 incidents, Gretzinger said, were on the same day, Monday through Friday, never on weekends and never on Wednesdays. By her own estimate, that did not allow enough days for all the incidents to take place. At one point she claimed that her story “has to be at least” 14 incidents and said she might have happened in a different order. Then there was the weight discrepancy.

Gretzinger, who did not respond to interview requests for this story, claimed that Lamb used his 69-80-lb. weight advantage to terrorize her. But Lamb is a slight, alcoholic looking man who has weighed 140 pounds for decades, and Gretzinger weighed in at about 130. It was obvious to those who knew the pair that they were about the same size.

The meticulous testimony also revealed that Lamb had not called any student a “maniac” and had never lost control in class. Unlike Gretzinger, he had never changed his story. When it came time for closing statements, both sides were antes won but maintained their forces for a final charge. Lamb’s attorney Tony Gill went right for the Human Rights Commission.

“All right, folks, I’m here to tell you that if it talks, it can lie.” As for Gretzinger: “Okay, so here we’ve got a lady who will embarrassed where necessary, she’ll witness fiction where necessary, to make the story better.” Gretzinger, “said because the investigators sweep for Lamb.” After further deliberations, they awarded the professor $32,750 in damages.

“I’ve known the truth since day one,” a relieved Lamb said after the verdict came in. “My family and I have suffered a great deal—more than anyone can imagine.”

Gretzinger left the court without comment. But one of her supporters, women’s studies professor Meda Chesney-Lind, who had been a long-time activist, said that the case against Lamb, cited the verdict as more evidence that “women are not believed,” as in the Arcilla Hill case.

Lamb and his family showed up at the university’s faculty union to express his gratitude for their support. But as Lamb thanked his colleagues several women faculty walked out. There were no retractions from those who had written open letters accusing Lamb’s guilt. Feminist professor none of whom had sat in the trial, still attacked him in class, claiming that the jury was biased.

“Feminists were upset that I was found innocent because that would be hard for women to come forward,” says Lamb, still the campus unapproachable. “I was more revolted because I never came one of them, I am a man, and must be guilty.” Michelle Gretzinger has little trouble in locating high-powered lawyers who shant that belief. On December 24 Robin Daigle of the Los Angeles firm of Latham and Watkins filed an appeal of last year’s verdict with the Ninth Circuit Court. And as many feared the episode, about the general PC climate, has had a chilling effect on the campus.

Today, Rainbow Lambda, which once raised money, no longer maintains an open-door policy and has dropped Religion 348.

Reasonable observers might be justified in believing that a case in which an unqualified witness, who had a ridge, unfair process to draw age an innocuous party, poisoning relations on campus and stalling academic freedom while wasting thousands of hours and countless dollars is a waste of time. But while the trial that found for Lamb have tried to send a message that trampling false charges to silence someone is not acceptable minority in the upper reaches of the Honolulu campus since assumed to have it. There were no discipline cases or dis- minations over the Lamb case. Worse, says a faculty member who asked not to be identified, they are trying to promote the people who have screwed up the most.” Susan Hennessee not only retain the student advocate position, but is being courted for tenure, a move which will allow him to ride herd with more power and impunity. Milt Waiwaiole not only remains in place, but the university has rewarded his with assistants. In essence, those most responsible for the trial were rewarded. (Both women, citing an ongoing legal action against the University of Hawaii by Lamb, declined to be interviewed.) But although they were censured and said they were sorry, things will never be the same for Rainbow Lambda. The men who were once charged with disloyal misconducts has found his own unattractive status to be so below their former status that exactly what I feel. Even the last I have been found innocent is irrelevant to a lot of people. Campus have become a sexist, pervaded place. It is I didn’t have a marriage, found walk away.”

**Susan Hennessee: In spite of all—considered for tenure**
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The Empire Strikes Out

This was not the first time this had happened. Anyone who received the preliminary program of the January 1997 meeting of the American Association of Universities and Colleges had read that the main feature of the program was to be a debate between Lawrence Levine and four people among whom were two formidable opponents: Brad Wilcox, Executive Director of the National Association of Scholars, and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, author of *Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life*. Levine knew the caliber of his opponents—he backed out and the conference’s main panel was canceled. The problem here is not just cowardice; it’s also of the closed-minded betrayal of academic inquiry common on the politically correct campus that Levine wants us to believe is a figment of our imagination. It certainly does not fit well with the title of his book.

Open Levine’s book and you will soon see why he is worried about subjecting his ideas to trial by fire. The two major criticisms of *The Opening of the American Mind* are immediately obvious. First, it contains very little about the counter-arguments that Levine is supposed to be discussing; second, there is not a single argument in it that is not found in earlier loci to defend the PC campus—event the straw man he attacks are the same ones that his predecessors invented.

A book that aims to be the definitive defence of the current modern multicultural regime on college campuses, ought to have a good deal to say about campus feminism and *women’s studies* programs—the driving force in the opening of the American mind. The book gets barely a passing mention. There is not a word on the main figure—no exposition of their arguments, no assessment of their importance, and nothing about their critics. No mention of Columbia’s McKeon and her drastic redaction of rape to include consensual sex; no word about women’s ways of knowing and flipping figures such as Peggy McPherson (men are vertical thinkers, women lateral thinkers) or Carol Gilligan (daughters are browbeaten by their mothers); nothing on the silly feminist science of Sandra Harding (Newton’s rape mania: *The Principle*) or Donna Haraway (cyborg is militaristic). Nothing about the elaborate patriotic theories of such as Geri Lorenz, or the naïve Rousseauism of the “Goddess” feminists of Marilyn Gimbutas and others, not even about the anti-feminist antics of campus lesbians; and, of course, not a trace of the major critiques of campus feminism by Christine Simmons, Camille Paglia, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, or Daphne Fancher and Noreta Koertge.

A book about the campus culture war without any discussion of radical feminism is truly Italian cooking without pasta. But there is also nothing about the state of Black or Chicano studies programs cited. Not a word about Leonard Jeffries or Melinda Assante, nothing about the absurdities of the influence and very influentialPortland “baseless” essays—and of course not a word about Mary Loeffler’s critique of Afrocentricism. Nothing about speech code and campus inquisitions of the late 1980s—nothing about the kind of witchcraft created at CCNY by the politically correct policy of open admissions (even though Levine refers proudly to his own undergraduate education there); nothing about the kind of postgraduate “science fiction” that provided Alan Sokal to write the spoof that the editors of *Science* (the main journal in this field) printed without being able to tell the difference between a caricature and the real thing.

The only topics covered in this book are the college—multiculturalism as better for America than the “melting pot”—and immigration policy. But even here Levine stays well clear of hard questions raised by critics. He does not mention powerful critiques of multicultural social policy by Thomas Sowell and Shelby Steele, and so has no answer to obvious counter-arguments such as that multiculturalism leads to Bonhoeffer’s vision of a society where all immigration is based on the black proletariat, depressing its wages and restricting its employment opportunities. Levine just plays up the amorphous arguments that one has heard ad infinitum as if nobody had ever questioned them. A telling fact is that he never once cites anything in *Academic Questions*, the most important journal of its opponents. He agrees with approval the Modern Language Association which tried to show that traditional books (Shakespeare, etc.) are still the staples of college literature courses, if that study has never been questioned at all. The book is an unabashed attack that has no rebuttal arguments against his position because he does not know them. Levine was too lazy even to set out the argument of his main antagonist—Alan Bloom. His summary takes up exactly four sentences. He quotes on page six (two of which elaborate an analogy to Nazi Germany) and he only returns to Bloom on points of detail a few times later.

The press kit that comes with Levine’s book has a sheet entitled “A Brief Chronology of the Culture Wars.” There are two columns: On the Left and On the Right. In the right hand column are seven books, by Bloom, Roger Kimball, Dinesh D’Souza, William Bennett, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Richard Bernstein, and Lynne Cheney, with their dates: running from 1967 to 1985. The information on the left is empty space (no Stanley Fish, Gerard Graff, Henry Louis Gates, Paul Berman, Todd Gitlin, etc.) until we get to 1986 and . . . Levine. A clever touch, enter our hero again.

Is this, he says, or perhaps some combination, for although he may not know their works in detail, Levine borrows all his main arguments from those critics. We have heard a dozen times.

1. The canon has always changed, Levine says, and there have always been disputes on these changes, even, the debate between chauvinists and modernists. He goes on to say that even conservative should be included. This has always been a standard argument for the defense. The most developed version is by Gerald Graff, but though Levine repeats some of Graff’s historical material, he does not cite the work itself. In any case, every processor of literature knows that the canon has changed and is still changing. What is at issue here is the kind of change now being made (Kiplow mountains being transferred to intellectual content), the reasons for it (identity politics), and the character of the attack on the canon itself (it is racist and sexist). Levine evades all of these issues. I wonder whether he would defend the inclusion of Alice Walker’s Am I Blue, one long white man about the nastiness of white male treatment of women, minorities, and animals?

2. Criticism is due to the political motives of partisan conservatives.

Again, a standard PC counter-argument used by Wilson, Fish, and others. But among the “conservatives” cited by Levine are William Bennett, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a Kennedy liberal, and Page Smith, a populist left-winger who supported Jesse Jackson for President. Other leftists who have recently expressed concern about the works of the campus left are Todd Gitlin and Alan Sokal.

3. Criticism of the new campus order are fearful of change. Even more, a minaret—what—
tion begging—argument of race-conscious school choices is good and all fear of change bad?—then Levine has no way of criticizing, saying the rise of National Socialism in 1930s Germany, or of Gingrich's republicanism in 1990s America, is not really worth it. But it will have to be evaluated in each case by specific arguments, not by a blanket condemnation of resistance to each and any new development.

Levine's claim, of course, is the only one that counts. His own stance is not particularly strong or well argued. The book's argument is as follows:

1. The center of the debate is the concept of a "Western culture".
2. This concept is not as clear and unambiguous as many theorists believe.
3. The concept of Western culture is not necessarily a positive one.
4. The concept of Western culture is not necessarily a static one.

The book is written in a clear and accessible style. It is not meant to be a scholarly work, but rather a popular introduction to the topic. The author, Levine, is a professor of philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley. He is also the author of several other books on philosophy, including "Philosophy and the Internet" and "The Future of Philosophy".

The book is highly recommended for anyone interested in the topic of Western culture. It is written in a clear and accessible style and provides a comprehensive overview of the concept. It is highly recommended for anyone interested in the topic of Western culture.
Plumber Facing Trial for Child Neglect

By Judith Schumann Weinzimer

The trial of Thomas Kinder, accused of child neglect and abandonment following an incident last May in which he left his two children, ages eighteen months and three years, in the back seat of his car, begins tomorrow in Superior Court. Child welfare advocates will be following the case with great interest as they seek to gauge the effect of recent legislation designed to improve the lot of America's children.

Kinder, a twenty-nine-year-old plumber, told police he was driving on Lower Beaver Street in Maple Grove when he saw flames shooting from the roof of a house. Leaving his children secured in their safety seats, he ran to the house to see if anyone was inside. Police credited him with saving the lives of three members of the Hamilton family, whom he dragged into the front yard after finding them unconscious in a second-floor bedroom.

Later, after reviewing a televised broadcast in which Kinder told a reporter at the scene that he had no time to give a statement because he had left his children alone in the back seat of the car, the police arrested him.

Charlotte Childress, the Child Welfare Agency assigned to the case, told the judge that Kinder was arrested in his home as he and his wife were tucking the children into bed at nine-thirty-two p.m., even though both children were under the age of four. (Under the new guidelines, the recommended bedtime for children under the age of four is eight o'clock.) Ms. Childress noted that Mr. Kinder's explanation that his activities at the scene of the fire had altered the family's schedule seemed unbelievable. In light of the fact that he had not returned home by six forty-five, which would have given the Kinders plenty of time to put the children to bed by eight o'clock, Kinder was subsequently granted bail on conditions that he have no contact with his children pending a Level One investigation by the Office of Child Welfare.

Although witnesses and neighbors failed to produce evidence of regular sleep activity involving the Kinder children, Mr. Kinder's attorney told investigators that his client had more than once remarked that the children's demands for extra bedtime snacks made it impossible for him to see Law and Order with any regularity. In Maple Grove, Law and Order airs at nine, and this was prime time evidence that the children were often kept up late at night, according to Ms. Childress, who sought and received authorization to conduct a Level Two investigation.

The family's medical records revealed no injuries in which abuse was suspected, although Ms. Childress did inquire into the cause of multiple bruises sustained by the three-year-old some months earlier. According to the file on that investigation, Mrs. Kinder had been placing the child in his safety seat but had not yet secured the harness when her parked car had been hit by a pick-up truck. Pulling a test in which she was asked to score a dummy in a child safety seat within the recommended ninety seconds, Mrs. Kinder was ordered to attend a course in child safety, and, upon completion of this course, provisional charges of negligence had been dropped.

Similarly, provisional negligence charges had been dismissed after an investigation into treatment of the younger child for food poisoning revealed that the baby's food had actually been contaminated at the packing plant, where tests proved that Mrs. Kinder could not have been aware that the food had been spoiled, since it had not had any unusual odor or taste.

This latest investigation into the Kinder family has been cited as an example of the increased level of vigilance anticipated under the President's New Awareness Program (NAP), which was established to improve the lot of America's children.

Previously, such a detailed investigation as the one which established the Kinder's guilt would not have been possible in the absence of strong evidence of physical abuse. Several headline-generating cases in New York City spurred creation of the program because presidential advisors felt that the government was not acting actively enough in protecting children.

The NAP Guidelines, developed with input from the First Lady, various teachers' groups, the United States Association of Youth Psychologists, the Children's Protective League and other groups with expertise in child rearing, give parents invaluable help in determining what is best for their children at all levels of development.

When a survey of grade school teachers showed that a majority of them felt that children were coming to school without having had sufficient rest, suggested bedtimes for children of different ages were included in the program's guidelines. Dietary guidelines stress the consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables, although some parents report difficulties in getting their children to eat broccoli, and there have been several instances of overly strict enforcement of the dietary guidelines, including one in which two children were forbidden to attend their town's Diversity Play Group unless they ate their black-eyed peas. Their parents reportedly came to light when the Group Leader visited the parents to ascertain the reason for the children's absence. Using conflict resolution techniques, the Group Leader suggested that the children bring their peas to Play Group to be eaten at snack time, thus defusing the situation and insuring the parents in proper conflict resolution at the same time.

When the New Awareness Program was first created, child advocates were worried about a surge in the number of abuse cases, but as parents have become accustomed to referring to the Guidelines for answers to their questions regarding the upbringing of their children, the number of abuse reports has tapered off, and experts are confident that they will soon see a return to their former level.

If Kinder is convicted of the charges against him, he faces a mandatory ten-year jail sentence, but in the interest of maintaining the stability of the family, he would still be allowed to attend graduation, school plays, dance or piano recitals, and Little League playoff games.
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