The impeachment trial of William Jefferson Clinton may be a spine-tingling drama of law and bad feeling, but it is also a story of another sort: the implosion of our very first feminist government—the first of its kind in our national history—as it cracks under the strain of its own constantly regendered deviance. In this bizarre spectacle, the feminist male is revealed as a serial abuser, defamer, and groper of women; the feminists denounce their own laws and precedents; and the First Lady—hailed at the start of the administration as the apotheosis of an empowered Strong Woman—is adored now as an old kind of feminine victim, and seeks a new path to redemption and power as the most mistreated woman in the world.

Make no mistake about it: ‘feminist’ is the only political label Bill Clinton has ever consistently earned. Elsewhere, his place on the political spectrum has been both diffuse and ambiguous; he has been both a New and the oldest of Democrats; on different sides of many tax issues; in theory at least for both big and small government. His “issues,” such as they are, have been small, feel-good measures, poll-tested so as not to offend anyone. The divisive, definitive, emotion-charged and hot button parts of his governance—abortion, Joyceelyn Elders, gays in and out of the military—have all been gender-based. Similarly, the one thing that gives Clinton his interest is his wife and his marriage, which gives his story its tension and texture. Many big books are in the works about Hillary Clinton, and why not? By himself, Bill is a bore; but she is allusive and provocative and evocative. It is she who gives the story a plot. It is she who connected Bill from the gender norms of the good old boy.

Clinton ran in 1992 on Anita Hill’s ticket, surrounded by stars of the “Year of the Woman,” and buoyed by his feminist wife. “I believe Anita Hill,” said then-Governor Clinton, clasping hands with Carol Moseley-Braun, Patty Murray, and Lynn Yackel, who ran a one-note jenius campaign against Arlen Specter for expressing doubts about Hill. (Doubts, as it worked out, that were far milder than what later came out of Clinton’s White House about the women who had challenged him.) All agreed in 1992 that exploitation of female employ-ees deserved rigorous censure. Who was to know that, one year later, a woman would claim that, in May of 1991, Governor Clinton had sent his state troopers to bring her—then a clerk making less than $5 an hour from the state of Arkansas—to his hotel room in Little Rock, where he exposed himself to her? Or, that another woman would later charge that on November 29, 1993, when she, an unpaid White House aide, had gone to the president to ask for a paid job because of grave financial and personal problems, her friend the president had grabbed her, and forced her hand to his crotch?

**The Anti-War Movement Had it Wrong**

**The White Papers Reappraised**

by Stephen B. Young

Last year, a series of momentous thirtieth anniversaries from the Vietnam era were marked—Tet, LBJ’s withdrawal from seeking re-election, and the riots at the Chicago convention. The war, once so contentious, has now receded into memory, even into nostalgia, as a generation congratulates itself once again for doing what the North Vietnamese never could have—defeating the United States. History, as they say, is written by the victors, and the victor in this conflict was the American anti-war movement. It is no wonder, then, that our national re-collection of the war matches that of the New Left. It is no wonder too that certain questions are no longer asked, chief among them the question, a central one thirty years ago, of whether the U.S. involvement resulted from a tissue of lies.
COMMUNIQUÉS

A Tale of Our Times

When I was in the armed services, I found what I believed to be the only truly equal society, at least as seen from the "belly of the beast." These many of my superiors were minorities. They were provided with the training and tools that were needed to succeed and they did so with pride, hard work, and enthusiasm. They accepted the responsibility for the training and lives of their fellow members. Even though many still chose to associate with their own race, there was an understanding that we all depended on each other and needed to work as a team in order to succeed regardless of race or gender.

Returning home after my active duty, I found that my county job had not been held for me. I began attending college at the State University of New York.

I later needed help understanding my math and found that there was an organization, Educational Opportunity Program, on campus to help the students. I saw many white helping minorities but there were no whites being helped. I asked the man in charge if I could get help with my math. He told me that the help available was for students with low income and (just looking at me) I did not qualify. After telling him what my income was, he admitted that it was certainly low enough, but I did not come from an "ethnically deprived" background. This was determined without any consideration to the fact that I was below the poverty line, married with a small child, and had been on my own for over ten years. It was clear he was not judging me as just looking at me without completing any paperwork showing my income, or that of my parents. He determined that I was not eligible. He did not have to say it was based on race, it was obvious.

After graduating I started my first "professional" position with a small company in the purchasing area. There, I was in charge of purchasing and receiving. At a whopping $145 a year, my salary was such that the uneducated employees in the plant earned more than I did. I was proud of what my wife and I had ever come with a lot of hard work, dedication, and responsibility. Our family had lived through some very hard times, we knew there was no where to go but up.

A few years later, the hard work and the responsibility which I had accepted paid off for me again when I was promoted to materials manager. In this position I was responsible for purchasing, inventory control, shipping/receiving, and material handling in several additional locations. I continued my work ethic which in turn provided me and my family additional rewards. After five years, I decided that it would be a good time to look at other opportunities with larger organizations. My search lead me to an opening with a large utility company headquartered in Rochester, NY.

As a candidate for the position of purchasing agent, I was asked if I had the following qualifications:

1. A four year degree in the field of business management
2. Three to five years previous experience in the field of purchasing management
3. National Association of Purchasing Management Membership
4. Certified Purchasing Manager certification
5. Previous experience with computers and purchasing software.

I exceeded the above requirements, and began work as one of two corporate purchasing agents. During the interview process I was told by the senior manager that we were also looking to promote me into his supervisor's position within the next year.

My work went well until I made several recommendations to my female supervisor to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the department. She snapped back at me saying that I should forget all that I had learned about the business and purchasing would soon cease if none of it was applicable here.

Shortly thereafter, I was passed over for promotion for my supervisor's position as she was promoted out of purchasing into human resources. My new supervisor was another very intelligent lady, but she did not know anything about purchasing or business practices. My past supervisor and I worked very hard with her to prepare her so that she could get by in her new position. She was a quick study, but it was impossible to provide her the years of experience and training which I had. It was found that she did not have a college degree and did not meet any of the requirements above.

Then I met with the other purchasing agent to discuss the hiring and promotion discrepancies at the company. He confirmed my suspicions by pulling out of his desk the company publication showing the promotions for the previous six months. It appeared that about eighty percent of the promotions were women and minorities. This certainly was not representative of the company employee population and documented the problem.

A few months later, the other purchasing agent retired. He was replaced by a woman who also met none of the five requirements I was asked to meet. She was a college graduate and knew it. It was a tragedy. Again I worked, along with the retiring agent, to give her some information from which to work.

Shortly after she was brought on, I became known as "the one who was given to me by my supervisor as I was the only male in the work group.

This title was used frequently by my supervisor and subsequently by my colleagues. Additionally, I also became aware of wide differences in the way I was treated. Perks such as a new larger office, newer computer and telephone equipment, and less accountability were given to the female employees. Interestingly, it appeared that giving the opportunities, women and minorities exploit employees at work like those they complain about.

I continued to work hard and this was ultimately noticed by the management in other departments. Working with other department personnel, and the end users in product standardizing, I slashed hundreds of thousands of dollars from the costs of purchasing equipment and supplies. When word of my success reached the vice president, they decided to give me a award for my outstanding performance. This was the highest award given to an employee with the company but when I received it I was somewhat surprised that it was just what I would receive a promotion in the department. I started to thinking about moving to another department would make sense.

In mid-1973, I was transferred to internal audit to enhance my opportunities for promotion. In early 1973 a new audit director was appointed. He brought with him new objectives from senior management, a department and company. My perception of this and promotion objectives were now clearly outlined. The company's primary priority was to quickly enhance the diversity of the company. At first the employee supported this policy, until we learned that managers were looking to replace some of the current white males employee to accomplish this objective. This made our approach even more serious to make sure that I would not be promoted to another position.

Recently, my case came before the Federal Court. The judge opened the discussion by stating that my case appeared to be a case of a reverse discrimination. He said that it was his duty to make sure that no one was hurt. I am not sure what civil rights legislation gives us the right to hire someone because of his race. It is a double standard to hire someone because of his race and to fire them because of their race. When will we demand equal treatment for everyone, regardless of race or gender.

I am not sure which way to go, but I hope to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change. Perhaps it will be easier for others to find the right path to make a change.
REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM

TEACHING PC? Is there any subject that can’t be taught in the PC university? Apparently there is. Sanford Plunker of Franklin and Marshall writes about the case of Bowling Green University sociology professor Richard A. Zeller, who, after a poll of students revealed that they thought courses were filled with left politics, decided to teach a course called “Political Correctness.” The course would involve the study of PC concepts—perhaps because his book list included works such as Diane d’Souza’s Judicial Education, Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray’s The Bell Curve, and Christiane Hoff Summers’ Who Stole Feminism? Professor Zeller was turned down flat—first by his own sociology department, then by the American Studies, Ethnic Studies, and Psychology department. No matter that Mr. Zeller doesn’t happen to agree with everything these authors propose—most important, that he is committed to teaching about PC correctness in a straightforward way—his colleagues would have none of it. The course was deemed illegitimate, although in another department, Bowling Green once offered a course in the roller-coaster—complete with field trips. Plunker called Gary Lee, chairman of the BGSU Sociology department, who liked Zeller’s proposed course as “judicious,” one that would end up with taxpayers footing the bill for advocates rather than education. (As if this were not already standard operating procedure.) He also believed that Zeller would grade students on the basis of how much they agreed with his politics, although no student or administrator is ever complaint about Zeller in the more than twenty years he has taught at Bowling Green. As it stands, Zeller may be the only professor in BGSU history who has been so systematically sanctioned. Even his offer to teach “Political Correctness” as an “overload” (not counting against his teaching requirement) and without compensation got Zeller nowhere. Perhaps he should try again sometime. He could title his next course offering “PC Unmasked.”

VICTORIAN HOOTERS: Posted on the Internet is the report of Ball State University’s English Department as a call for papers to “Victorians planning to attend the MLA conference. The special section is to be called ‘Victorian Broads: Prostitution and Pornography.”’ Among the topics suggested are “erotic breast; erotic breasts; erotic breasts; Imperial and/or colonized breasts; militant breasts; breast and the breast; breast; medical breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; breast; b
What Happened to John Goode
Black Quotas
by Marc Levin

When John Goode received notice that his contract to sell food during special events at the Austin, Texas, Convention Center was terminated because he did not qualify for a racial quota, he was outraged and determined to fight back. It was the same reaction displayed by countless others who have been the victims of reverse discrimination. Why me? What racial act have I been guilty of to suffer this injustice? But there was something different about this case. John Goode is black. The racial quota, which was intended to work in his favor, has destroyed his life. And this destructiveness, he believes, is the essence of that pathology which goes under the name of affirmative action.

The 53-year-old Goode should have been a local hero, instead of a victim of Austin's municipal racial bureaucracy. His is an "up by the bootstraps" story. When he was born in Austin after the war, his father was 14 and his mother was 16. Since his parents were kids themselves, Goode was raised by his widowed grandmother. She taught him not to look to his past for reasons to fail. For bar, the road to success was always under construction. Even at a time when blacks were still second-class citizens, the mad his grandmother believed the American Dream, although incompletely realized, was still spacious enough for him.

"I was always very entrepreneurial," Goode says. "I had a newspaper route beginning in the third grade, delivering over 100 different papers every morning at 5 A.M. It grew to the point that I had to hire two other kids to help me. I had a custom pinto and body shop. I had a pasture business. I have three grandchildren who I taught this is good right to me. It is in my blood. I guess. I have the original bill of sale from my great-grandfather who bought 35 acres of land in 1865 in Texas. That was the year of the Emancipation Proclamation. If my great-grandfather could buy land in 1865, why can't a black man accomplish anything he wants? That has always been my inspiration.

Goode's first love was the restaurant business. After working as a waiter in nearly every Austin restaurant, he went to San Francisco, where he started a French restaurant.

After selling that enterprise, he returned to Austin to start Jacob's Restaurant and Jazz Bar in 1965, which soon fell victim to the Texas oil bust. In 1989, Goode opened Mr. Bones Barbecue in North Austin. He was soon approached by a company called Volume Services and asked if he would be interested in setting up a barbecue stand at Palmer Auditorium, the City Coliseum, and the Convention Center to self-feed during special events. Goode jumped at the opportunity, and entered into a contract with Volume Services in which he had the exclusive right to sell barbecue at the city facilities in exchange for giving Volume Services a share of his sales.

In 1995, Volume Services took the concession contract for city venues away from Volume Services and gave it to the Fine Host Corporation.

"This was at the City Council meeting the night they were awarded the contract. I was approached by either an attorney or lobbyist for Fine Host who had been the lobbyist for Volume Services. He said they had heard a lot of good things about me. He said we hope you will consider or staying on. I will never forget their exact words." Fine Host tried to squeeze 30 percent of his sales out of Goode, even though unlike Volume Services, they refused to pay for his required one million dollar cumulative liability policy. (They ultimately came to an agreement on a one year contract providing Fine Host with 25 percent of Goode's sales and requiring him to carry his own insurance.) But then, early in 1996, the Austin City Council passed an ordinance implementing racial quotas for city contracting. The law requires contractors with the city to give a certain percentage of their business to certified minority subcontractors. In the case of the concessionary services at city auditoriums, Fine Host had to meet a 25 percent quota of minority subcontractors. It used the program to test if a contractor who is found to be in compliance with these "goals" can be barred from city contracts for up to five years, assessed fines, or denied for breach of contract.

Fine Host began asking Goode to certify himself as a minority owned business shortly after the Council's action. "I explained to them that I did not believe in set asides and affirmative action," Goode says. "Also did not want to certify because the program was invasive into my personal life. It required us to submit three or five years of my financial records and tax returns, a list of all my assets, employee data, and all kinds of personal information. I didn't see the purpose of it. That confidential information doesn't do anything to determine whether it is minority owned. I told them you all know I am black and that I own the business. I told them I wouldn't do it, that I would never certify." Goode's problem was as much what he believed as it was what the Austin City Council believed. "I am definitely and openly a black conservative. I am a lot of social programs as doing more damage than good. The only blacks that seem to benefit from affirmative action are upper-income black professionals. The blacks in the slums and projects don't benefit from it. For example, I used to do nothing but destroy the black community. What the NAACP and other organizations need to do is demand better teaching materials and schools. He believes that "affirmative action will come back to haunt future generation of young blacks. They don't feel they really have to try hard anymore because they think they will get in because of affirmative action, but you can't sell that argument to our so-called black leaders."

Speaking of black leaders, Goode believes there hasn't been a real one since Martin Luther King. He says, "A lot of blacks don't understand. Jesse Jackson is one of the biggest poverty pimps to ever set foot on the ground. He promotes the Texaco and Denny's lawsuits, but has anyone ever heard of a working class black getting one? Who gets all the money? The poverty pimps. As a result, many bright black kids end up selling dope. They don't see a future. It is not the white man's fault, it is the leadership in the black community."

In August of 1996, Fine Host sent a letter to Goode canceling the contract. Goode was shocked by the letter and didn't want to see Fine Host and asked if his contract could be transferred under the Specialty Business category instead of the "Minority Owned Business Enterprise" category. Fine Host responded, "This would not benefit us," meaning that it wouldn't help them make their racial quota.

The termination came at a very bad time for Goode. The North Austin branch of Mr. Bones Barbecue was doing well, but he was in the process of building another Mr. Bones in South Austin to take advantage of increased traffic to the new airport. He was counting on the profit from this stand during the remainder of 1997 to help finance the expansion. Goode says, "I was paying for everything as I go. I had no loans from institutions. The termination caught me at a point where I was totally financially wiped out. The months between September and December were the busiest ones at the city facilities. I had counted on those four months for $25,000 to carry the new location. Timing is what killed me."

Goode was forced to decide which location to keep. Even though the original Mr. Bones was established and making good money, the new one had the best chance for long run success, because of the new airport and an option to buy the property at a very good price. He was offered from the original location—which he had put $100,000 into—for a year. He could not afford the rent. He managed to keep the first location open for a year. "It did real well for the first five months," he says, "but it died down when winter came."

After receiving word of the termination by Fine Host, John Goode sought legal representation. He first approached former Democratic Congressman Craig Washington, who expressed interest in the case, but demanded a substantial retainer which Goode could not afford. Goode then tried University of Texas Professor Lino Graglia, a well known opponent of racial preferences, who had been slow to respond to the state and national media for his politically incorrect remarks on affirmative action in connection with the Hopwood case at a 1997 press conference. Graglia's experienced assistant Goode that Graglia no longer accepts cases.

Goode finally got in touch with the Institute for Justice, a Washington, D.C. public interest law firm that lobbies against federal and state economic regulations, restrictions on free speech, and racial quotas. The case wound up at the Texas Supreme Court, a San Antonio based non-profit group that provides free legal assistance to plaintiffs fighting for economic freedom, religious liberty, and equal rights. This past March, Austin attorneys Tom Whitlock and Keith Larrour, working pro bono, filed suit against the City of Austin, alleging the city's contract with Fine Host was violates the equal protection clause of the US Constitution, and a superior state court in Austin.
Austin and Fine Host Corporation before the United States District Court in Austin. However, Judge Sam Sparks dismissed the action in December, flippantly declaring, "The plaintiff does not have standing to assert his discrimination claims against the City and Fine Host because he suffered no injury in fact."

Goode was deeply troubled by the outcome: "I was disappointed not for losing, but for what I viewed as his dear lack of understanding of what the program is, how it worked, how it functioned, and how clearly discriminatory it was. It has caused me to question my faith in the legal system." He points out that white-owned businesses did not have to go through any certification process, and while Judge Sparks pointed out that he had an equal opportunity to compete with non-certified white businesses, the fact is that Fine Host replaced him with a certified minority business that got a free ride.

Sparks did rule that Fine Host was guilty of a breach of contract for not giving Goode 30 days notice of his termination, which was required by a clause in their contract. However, Sparks refused to award Goode any damages for this, because he claimed that it could not determine exactly how much money Goode would have made from the barbecue stand during this time.

Observers were not surprised by the bizarre reasoning. As one Austin attorney says, "Sparks has made a name for himself as a left-wing activist from the bench. He is the judge who dismissed the Hopwood suit challenging racial quotas at the University of Texas Law School." In this historic case, the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals overruled Sparks, which declared the Law School's quota system unconstitutional.

Goode is hoping for a similar result in his case. When, on January 15, Sparks refused to reconsider his dismissal of the case, the Houston based Campaign for a Color-Blind America began the process of finding additional counsel to assist Goode in handling Goode's appeal to the Fifth Circuit. But even if he is vindicated somehow down the road, this case has already taken its toll. After losing his entire barbecue business, partly as a result of the termination, John Goode was no longer able to employ his two grown sons in the enterprise. "The situation drove them to where so many other young black males are—in prison," he says sadly. "One is still there. It was for drugs. They worked hard, seven days a week, for my barbecue business. After I was forced to shut it down, they said there was the whole business of trying to get respect from white men by working hard. I never thought my sons would sell drugs."

Goode had to sell his home after losing his business. He can no longer afford a car, which is a necessity in the spreading Texas landscape. He scrapes along to take care of his eight-year-old son and the 81-year-old aunt who lives with him. He now fights high blood pressure and is a borderline diabetic. To add insult to injuries which have come to resemble a Biblical plague, Judge Sparks ordered him to pay $3,000 in legal bills for the City of Austin and Fine Host Corporation after the dismissal of his suit. Goode says bitterly, "From 1989 to 1990, the City of Austin and Fine Host received $70,000 from me as a percentage of what I made at the barbecue stand, and now I get the bill for their legal fees."

But John Goode is still optimistic about his ability to claw a path for himself through this toxic landscape of bureaucratic rules and regulations. He was recently invited by Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to testify about what had happened to him. (Goode recalls, "A black lady sitting next to me who owned a computer consulting company in San Jose seemed very uncomfortable at my presence. She was there complaining that minorities were not getting enough contracts when her company was making over $3 million a year. I thought to myself, why does she need a preference anyway?) He is now working as a temporary employee 12 hours a day, six days a week, for the Westinghouse Motor Company. They have offered him a permanent job. But that old dream of entrepreneurship still lives.

"I will either get back in the barbecue business or open a Mexican restaurant," Goode says. "My plan is to start out with a mobile trailer. I figure if I don't get back in the business they will have defeated me. I will not let that happen. I'll kill myself working, at least I'll finally know I was working."

Marc Levin is Publisher & Editor of the Houston Review and Editor Emeritus of the Austin Review.
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I, Rigoberta Menchu, Liar
by David Horowitz

The story of Rigoberta Menchu, a Quiche Mayan from Guatemala, whose autobiography catapulted her to international fame, won her the Nobel Peace Prize, and made her an international emblem of the dispossessed indigenous peoples of the Western hemisphere and their attempt to fight against the oppression of European conquerors, has now been exposed as a political fabrication, a tissue of lies, and one of the greatest intellectual and academic hoaxes of the 20th Century.

During the last decade, Rigoberta Menchu became a leading icon of the university culture. In one of the more celebrated “breakthroughs” of the multicultural left, a demonstration of student solidarity and students at Stanford University, led by the Reverend Jesse Jackson, had chanted “Hey, hey, ho, ho, Western culture’s got to go!” The target of the chant was Stanford’s required curriculum in Western civilization. University officials quickly caved before the demonstrators, and the course title was changed simply to “CIV.” Works by “Third World” (nearly always Marxist) authors previously “excluded” were now introduced into the canon of great books as required reading. Chief among these was an autobiography by an indigenous Guatemalan and sometime revolutionary, I, Rigoberta Menchu, which now took its place beside Aristotle, Dante, and Shakespeare as the Stanford student’s introduction to the world.

Published in 1982, I, Rigoberta Menchu was actually written by a French leftist, Elisabeth Burgos-Debray, wife of the Marxist, Regis Debray, who provided the “foco strategy” for the Guatemalan insurgency. The focal point of that urban insurrection was the creation of a guerrilla cell in Bolivia in the 1960s. This type of the foco strategy was successful in the 1980s in Bolivia, and it could become a forceful military front, domestic social oppression, and the catalyst for revolutionary change. Debray's misguided theory of a foco strategy for an indigent population of Bolivia's peasants killed, and as we shall see, is at the root of the tragedies that overwhelmed Rigoberta Menchu and her family, and that are (false) chronicled in I, Rigoberta Menchu.

As recounted in this autobiography, the story of Rigoberta Menchu is the stuff of classic Marxist myth. The Menuchs were a poor Mayan family, living on the margins of a country from which they had been dispossessed by Spanish conquistadors. Their descendants, known as ladinos, try to drive the Menuchs and other indigenous people off their land. Thus they had cultivated. As she tells her story, Rigoberta is illiterate and kept from getting an education by her peasant father. In 1978, Menchu was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. However, it was not for her writings or her activism, but for her role as a spokesperson for the cause of social justice and peace.

As told by Rigoberta, the tragedy of the Menuchs is “the story of all Guatemala’s people.” The author of I, Rigoberta Menchu, this makes this linkage explicit: “My personal experience is the reality of a whole people.” It is a call to people of good will to help the noble but powerless indigenous peoples of Guatemala and other Third World countries to gain their rightful inheritance. However, the book’s success has been a source of controversy and the linkages it makes. In 1982, Rigoberta is now head of the Rigoberta Menchu Tum Foundation for Human Rights and a spokesperson for the cause of social justice and peace.

Unfortunately for this political fantasy, virtually nothing that Rigoberta has written is a lie. There lies, moreover, are neither accidental nor accidental. They are lies about the central events and facts of her story, and they have been deliberately connected to shape its political content and to create a specific political myth. This myth begins with the very first page of Rigoberta’s text:

When I was old, my father regretted my not going to school, as I was a girl able to learn many things. But he always said: “Unfortunately, if I put you in school, they’ll make you forget your Spanish; they’ll turn you into a ladino. I don’t want that for you and that’s why I don’t send you.” He might have had the chance to put me in school when I was about fourteen or fifteen but he couldn’t do it because he knew what the consequences would be: the ideas that they would give me.

To the trusting reader, this looks like a perfect realization of the Marxist paradigm, in which the ruling ideas become the ideas of the ruling class, which controls the means of education. But, contrary to her own assertions, Rigoberta was not uneducated. Nor did her father oppose her education because he feared the schools would indoctrinate her in the values of the indigent class. In fact, her detailed account of herself laboring eight months a year on coffee and cotton plantations and organizing a political underground are also probably false.

These and other pertinent details have now been established by anthropologist David Stoll, one of the leading academic experts on Guatemala. Stoll interviewed more than 160 Guatemalans, including relatives, friends, neighbors and former teachers and classmates of Rigoberta Menchu, over a ten-year period, as the basis of his new biography, I, Rigoberta Menchu: And The Story of All Poor Guatemalans... To coincide with the publication of Stoll’s book, the New York Times sent reporter Larry Rabin to Guatemala to attempt to verify Stoll’s findings, which he was readily able to do.

Perhaps the most salient point of Stoll’s findings is the way in which Rigoberta has distorted the sociology of her family situation, and that of the Mayans in the region of Usamant, to conform to Marxist prerequisites. The Menuchs were not a ruling caste in Rigoberta’s town or district, in which there were no large estates, or fincas, as she claims. Far from being a dispossessed peasant, Vicente Menchu had title to 2,750 hectares of land. The 227,000 land dispute described by Rigoberta, which is the central event in her book leading to the rebellion and the tragedies that followed was, in fact, over a tiny, but significant, 151 hectares of land. Importantly, Vicente Menchu’s “heroic struggle against the landowners who wanted to take our land” was in fact not a dispute with representatives of a European-descended conquistador class, but with his own Mayan relatives, the Tum family, headed by his wife’s uncle.

Vicente Menchu did not organize a peasant resistance movement called the Committee for Campesino Unity. He was a conservative peasant landowner as he was political at all. More importantly, his consuming passion was not any social concern, but the family feud with his in-laws, who were small landowning peasants like himself. It was his involvement in this family feud that caused him to be caught up in the larger political drama enacted by student activists and professional revolutionaries, that was really irrelevant to his concerns and that ultimately killed him.

At the end of the Seventies, coinciding with a global Soviet offensive, Cubas Communist dictator, Fidel Castro, launched a new turn in Cuban foreign policy, sponsoring
and arming a series of guerrilla uprisings in Central America. The most significant of these were in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala, and followed lines that had been laid down by Regis Debray and Che Guevara a decade before. The leaders of these movements were generally and Indian peasants but urban Hispanics, principally the disaffected scions of the middle- and upper-classes. They were often the prey of contra training centers in Moscow and Havana, and of terrorist training camps in Lebanon and East Germany. (The leaders of the Salvadoran guerrillas even included a Lebanese Communist and Shi'ite Muslim named Shafik Haikal.)

One of these forces, Guatemala’s Guerrilla Army of the Poor, showed up in Uspantant, the largest town in the region. Rigoberta’s village of Chimil, on April 29, 1979. According to eyewitnesses, the guerrillas

The most famous incident in Rigoberta’s book is the January 1980 occupa-

The fiction of life of Rigoberta Menchu is a piece of Communist propaganda designed to incite hatred of Europeans and Westerners, and the society they build, and to orga-
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who dominate the American academic community have wrote. While recognizing that something has gone amiss, the Times concludes that it would be wrong to tarnish the entire cause because of the excesses of Rigoberta’s book. “After the initial lies, the international apparatus of human rights activism, journalism and academia pitched in to exaggerate the dire condition of the peasants when a simple recontacting of the truth would have been enough.”

But would it? If a simple recontacting of the truth would have been enough, then Rigoberta’s lies would be unnecessary. So why tell them? If there was any truth in the myth itself, the Guatemalan guerrillas would not have had to launch a bluff to secure a two or three years. The fact is that there was no social ground for the armed insurgence that these Castroists tried to force, any more than there was for Guevara’s success in Bolivia, years before. Ultimately, the source of the violence and ensnaring misery is Rigoberta describes in her destructive little book is the leftist intelligentsia itself, for whom this Guatemalan peasant was a Marxist heroine waiting to happen.

Rigoberta Menchu, the Nobel Prize-winning Guatemalan author and human rights activist, was murdered in 1988. The investigation into her death remains open. According to her friends, she was killed by right-wing death squads. Rigoberta Menchu’s legacy as a symbol of resistance against oppression and exploitation continues to be celebrated around the world.
Could this be happening? It could. The feminist president broke feminist law, and damaged, and endangered, and their allies, with his tools they had used to win power. Fewer women were ever so sweet, or so fitting. Fewer dramas had ever had their dramatic persona so scrambled.

Bill Clinton

Bill Clinton is our "first female president." I mean, Mary Gordon said at an anti-impeachment rally in New York. (This was at about the same time fellow fiction writer Toles Morrison said he was the first black President.) This might be stretching it. But if not quite a feminist, he is the next best thing to us, our first feminist, even a feminist president, of course, to censorship and feeling, so alert to nuances that may become currents of opinion. Few ever stepped out of the "prison of gender" so much as Bill Clinton, the man's boy, sheltered by so many strong women, and so secure in their protective circles that at times he seems to be one of the girls. In many ways, most of his traits seemed to be feminales. He cried. He moaned. He lunged without reason. He never stopped talking. His m.o. was seduction, not conquest. He tended to whites, and not threat. He seemed to dislike, even fear, the armed forces. (His physical presence appealed even to androgyny. He had a weight problem. People made fun of his thighs.) True to form, he followed the feminist line on all points of theory. He gave them a Clinton that looked the way they thought that America ought to, not only of people with varying color, but of dree-looking women and tanno-looking men.

But all was not peace in this feminist Eden. This man, who won feminist hearts when he married the plain girl in glasses, was also drawn to the "wrong kind of woman—all thick clothes, thick makeup, big hair. As it turned out, our wman was in no way a problem, and now they had dealt with before: like the women in the New Republic, New York, the New Yorker, in which "women have the same number of sons as men," the New Yorker, and where the feral woman's effect was that of a mother, "one of the best sons a man could have.""

First Lady Hillary Clinton

while, came in for a good deal of astutely bashing.

How could she stay? How could she stand it? How could she campaign for him? "Her conduct," wrote Ann Granger in Knighting Men, her book about the wives of candidates in the 1988 elections, "was questioned by many and counterbalanced by few.

...her faithfulness in the face of infidelity, and her husband's hollow words—"She has always believed in me, and she has a remarkable ability to detach her relationship to me from my role as a candidate—"hit women especially in the gut."

Granger quotes a feminist who said that Lee Hart, like Janet, Jackie, and even Eleanor Roosevelt, could not be blamed because they had been brought up in backgrounders to be dumpy, domestic, and housewives, unlike such luminaries as "Gerry Ferraro [and] Eleanor Smead." Such indignation, the writer implied, could not happen to a Smale or Ferraro because their feminism would prevent it. Or, to a Hillary Clinton, who would burst on the national scene four years later, and now is defended by both of them. Such things could not happen to a Hillary Clinton, who demanded, and got, such respect from her husband. But they did.

Hillary Clinton—strong woman, ex-president—first met the American public on Super Bowl Sunday in January 1990. "She was his wife and supporting her husband as he (falsely) denied an affair with Jennifer Flower, one of the many, many women with whom Clinton never had sex in his lifetime. Now he was back again, on January 26, 1998, talking about the Today Show, and all the rest of us, that if her husband had had an affair with an intern in the White House that would truly be "extremely serious," but "that will not be proven to be true." Clinton was credited at the time with having rescued her husband's marriage

presidency, but almost immediately his image started to change. Angry pictures appeared in the New Republic, New York, the New Yorker, in a such glossy monthlies as California Style and George. She was called an "enabler," a bittered wife, and "feminist heart," allowing her husband's lies and abuse other women. Her credentials and the gains were called into question.

"Hillary's power seems derived largely from her ability to calculate him and her own due," wrote Mary Jacobi (who once worked for the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock. "Hillary has been playing second fiddle for a long time." Nine left-wing writers attacked "her.""Somehow, this woman that the first time a wife stands up for an allegedly adulterous husband, everyone thinks she's a saint. The second or third time...a woman begins to look disturbingly like Barbara Ehrenreich. And the redoubtable Andrea Dworkin complained, "Being a feminist isn't easy. You don't use your intelliess and your creativity to protect a man exploitation of women."

But if Hillary lost ground among female writers, she also gained ground among friends. Among them were the witty with Southern accent; once strongly distanced both of the Clintons, but now found chase in their hearts for three reasons. One is, of course, he fooled around—as they would Mary Mcgrew reported. Of course, he lied—as they would. "'Then Hillary come out and defends him. Every man should have a wife like that...Hillary Clinton once regarded as an ugly looking Yankee shock has become something of a heroine among the Babushkas, who relate more to Barbara Wyntke than to Eleanor Roosevelt. The once thought of her as...too smart for women, but now she's got a good girl, who stands by her man, and understands 'unions' before they thought."

She also gained ground among other women—the traditional housewives: the case had disappeared, who bore along lines of suffering. As conservative Maggie Gallagher wrote, "Homemaking woman...identified with Hillary and...began to swing to Clinton's side when she made her remarkable defense of 'my own husband,' understanding too well what I meant if we could rely on a philosopher's promise..."

Gallagher traced to the Clintons's support to "the same underclass that led to the Victory double standard," in which "we were granted: special sexual license," while wives of politicians attacked "other woman" as tramps and con wivies, and otherwise turned a blind eye.

Hillary's numbers, which rises with her water defense of "my husband," really took off after his August 17th non-confession when it at last became clear to the country that at only had her husband cheated repeatedly in their home (or Easter, and on their anniversary) with a girl young enough to have been their own daughter, but had also sent her out to lie for months or end. Now twice the victim, and played for a nap (Hillary's politics fell) heights of appeal), yet was victimized squared. At the same time, what ever her role as a backstage advisor, her public profile had shrank to the worst kind of First Lady figure: golfer on meaning "harrumph" or putting small children to classes, editing children's letters to her cat and dog. And pos for Vogue, looking stunning and gritty, alone side a nature picture toasting "her dignified" with little notion of what this dignity has been called upon to overcome. "Her approval rating of is a record high; even as political achievements less of her." said Wendy Williams at her used to adore her. "Hillary is moving at breakneck speed away from even the appearance that she doing something meaningful for the lives of Americans," wrote an undaunting Andrea Peyser. in the New York Post. Instead, she's chosen to cast herself in the image of a sad, abused, misunderstood, and, above all, glamorous princess, "shorter, less attractive, Princess D."

Even her recent November successes, when she helped to elect some favorite
Democrats—Chuck Schumer in New York, against her old enemy Al D’Amato; and her in-law and favorite, Barbara Boxer—were less an assertion of feminist power than odd re-assertions of this dynamic. Demagoguery in the和服务 Bill Clinton could rally to her as his consort and surrogate. But people appalled and repelled by his conduct could register against him, not his party, by supporting as his single most visible victim—a win-win formulation all around. No First Lady so abused by her lord of a husband could have had such electric and staggering impact, the portrait of weakness as strength. Not this high dynamic will weigh in again, should she decide to seek elective office. This killer-lady-co-president, if she were so unchecked, would be raised higher, than as an icon of feminist weakness. “Mrs. Clinton has gone from seeming too controlling for some to seeming unable to control her own husband,” says the New Yorker’s Janet Malcolm. “Thanks to Monica, Hillary is, finally, one of the girls.”

Who ever guessed that Hillary Rodham, who came to town as the empowered gender-avenger, would end up (for the time being, at least) as the stiff-upper-lipped matron, standing up once again for her men? No wonder Wendy Wasserstein says mournfully that “her current popular images are more a pastiche to the past, rather than a promise for the future.” Wasserstein’s cause is the story of Hillary’s acrobatics, as it moves from uncommon feminist promise to the conditions of modern reality. Is it possible to chronicle the essential stage in the canary’s story?

The Feminists

Bill and Hillary Clinton will probably hang on in office, however diminished, but whether they do or not, their allies in the feminist movement have taken a hit.還沒去 to both of the Clintons, they have smashed their own codes to follow the First Couple’s gender guidelines. Lynne Abraham have ended up in one of the two stereotypes they once opposed—the clinging, forgiving, Victorian doormat; and the compulsive and assaultive takeover. Practicing as a tail to the Gomorrah feminist, is not a feminist to the hopeful. How could to explain how harassment, which they once saw under every bed, was not always what it looked like, and why some abused women were actually just taking their analyses. Clinton has been described as a feminist without a cause—a feminist without a vision. The toxicity in which assault was not harassment, and not real crime, as long as it stopped short of rape. Meanwhile, she would not deign to judge Mr. Clinton, as she was not inclined. How could she hold him to a higher standard than herself?

What is a transformation. “There is no room in the job description for Chief Womanizer,” Ellen Goodman once wrote during the Gacy Hunt scandal. Betty Friedan—then-agreed. “This is the last time a candidate will be able to attract women as bimbo,” she told Time in 1987. “There’s an incredible chance here to educate women, to make them think about their values.” But “So what?” she says now. “What’s the big deal?” Here is Ellen Goodman again, in 1987 during the Haiti affair: “Is sex the only issue? Of course it is not, but to pretend it isn’t makes the problem bigger. …. Much has been changed, … the boy’s-club tolerance of defiance—men will be men—has been changed by the admission of women into the political system: the genuine sexism of discrimination—men’s roles are to be men, while women’s—has become a common sensibility. We are more willing to admit the importance of something called ‘gender’ than we were willing to accept it at a time that split between public and private life.” But things haven’t changed, quite as much as she thought. “Compartmentalization” is now better known, but it will be rare, Garth Ferraro told Rep. Tillie Fowler, asking her not to vote for impeachment. And Friston describes the Jones and Willey episodes as part of Clinton’s private life.

Likewise, the girls have turned car-wheels, trying to keep up with them evolving (devolving?) First Lady. What was repression and shame in Lee Harvey and Rose Kennedy is maturity and strength in her. “She demonstrated what a partnership is in a marriage,” says a spokesman for the Feminist Majority, incredibly. “The public sees a woman who is stronger with herself with dignity and strength and courage in the face of adversity, and their respect for her will only increase.” And maybe it will, but around March, respect for the family will be cooling like a stone, and still has not recovered. They will always retain the support of core members, but respect for them as supporters of women—all women, not just their own—all women. Clinton has no longer have the automatic support of the mainstream, the attentive non-members, who once assured that all women shared the same interests: equal pay, equal rights, abortion on demand, and keep your big hands to yourself. Now, questions on the Sunday talk shows appear largely focused on the duplicity of the feminist movement, and feminism talking heads often find themselves opposed not by guilty males but by disgusted conservative women. Gloria Steinbahn bailed. Richard Cohen defected. In Nadya Fair, Marjorie Williams, a self-confessed feminist and Democrat, railed the sisters over the coals for an unseemly defense of their president. Even Margaret Carlson was moved to speak out: “If Clarence Thomas has done one good thing he has done it. He’s shown to and end to, each with a public hair on top of incipient to discredit the Capitol, his behavior would have been as offensive as the Governor of Arkansas, inviting an employee to his reactor to show him his trousers, and asking her to kiss it,” she said.

This is what happens when a group loses its moral authority, and sits itself on the status of cause to that of that of interest group, predictable paranoia. In this case, the feminists have lost the ability to speak out for the interests of women in general, to carry their case to the general public, and to attract further harassment cases without fear of looking ridiculous. Probably, they have been like this for a very long time—in 1987, it was more frank and more sustained. Men were still discussing the far less frequent concerns. They are more often attacked by, or are silenced by Senator Patrick Leahy. Clinton’s name has often appeared on Senator Patrick Leahy’s, on their silence in 1996 upon the discovery that Dick Morris, Bill Clinton’s top political, was also doing work for one of the really big law firms—even one-time took fugitive, now convicted for several racketeers. But it wasn’t brought to light so vividly until this year. “It took a Hillary to raise a president,” said Carol Siedel, meaning to point out that she had to go out to whip her boy into shape. And it took a Bill Clinton to bring down the feminists. Always look gift for your friends.

Their face is not the only thing feminists have lost in their alliance with Bill and of Hillary Clinton. They have shot holes through the harassment statutes—their signature issue—as well. This may be good, or bad, or perhaps both and neither, but it is certainly beginning. How can they enforce laws upon those, Dick and Harry, when they waive them on behalf of their Bill? What they have been doing throughout this scandal in defense of their hero has been to have leave to break the laws that they sponsored, and more, that they urged him to sign. It was their idea to make harassment law, this important, their idea to give women the right to the right to the male defendant all those niggies, petty, invasive questions about aids and/or interns, and who touched who. Frederic Prince, implying, all about privacy, was more harmless fabric. “To say … that’s for later to the defendant to lie about sex in a sex harassment case is to trivialize and ultimately delegitimize sexual harassment claims,” said Howard Lerman in the Wall Street Journal. “If … Mr. Clinton should be excused from perjury and obstruction in these matters because the disclosures would have been embarrassing … to him, the law should be standard to apply to embarrased businesses and … to the workplace relationships that are either embarrassing or consensual are therefore deemed ‘private’ and thus Criminal Code, if you please, about, their sexual harassment law as written it will be far a go.

The more days after the scandal, the harassment case had started to crumble, as men started to realize it was all right to lie. “I can row reverent to my old, bigoted form,” said one cheerful executive. “The current scandal might send men a new signal,” ran a New York Times story, “a sign that the time is now ripe for a more relaxed, less rigid climate.” The Times quoted a harassment consultant as having said of his clients, “They are looking at this case as a case at least in the same groups that pushed sexual harassment polices on the agenda are now giving the president a pass. ‘You may have something that changed. ’ "Bill Clinton has been bad for women," wrote Sonoma Fields in The Washington Post. "He's brought back the old stereotypes: the smart, the commiser, the vamping, the seductress, the avenger, the manipulator, the victim, the quiet, the patient wife, who will accept anything but public admission that her husband's a cheat, the vulnerable ingénue on the casting couch, who will accept any kind of degrading behavior to keep an awkward marrying man, and the hissing of the feminists made it their calling to change all those images, Clinton hurt them most of all. He restated the Victorian model of the chaste man and long-suffering sensor. He shed their laws, tarnished their image, and reduced their role model to a brawny little wife.

But if it took a Bill Clinton to damage the feminists, it took the feminists to tarnish their Bill. Without their work over the course of a generation there would have been no scandal; no trial. They would not have existed. Bill Clinton could be more embarrassing, and President Clinton would not be impeached. How did this happen? Connected to the harassment issue after the Hill-Turner hearings, feminists, with two friends in the House, the Chellie Pingree and many more in the Justice Department, began to press for large expansions in harassment law. People were now fired, or fired, for what some considered to be or acts of, harassment, or corruption. A chance remark, or an off-color joke, could be considered harassment. A picture that someone disfigured was considered harassment. So was the ‘wrong’ magazine, a chance remark, that was in favor of plaintiffs including one that made it possible for a woman’s attorney, on the grounds of taking a pattern of conduct, to investigate all the concomitant sexual contacts with people, language, life style. It was this provision, a recent departure, that gave Paula Jones’s lawyers the right to seek and to find on those grounds that the focus case gained its legitimacy. "These are principles embraced by not the enthusiasts of Ms. Jones,’ wrote Philip Tezian, ‘but by the president’s friends and colleagues in the academic world.” - And so they were. The complaints uttered by feminists against the “sexual terrorism” used by conservatives in the Jones case were a little bit specious, as they had in large these tactics, and approved of them heartily when they were used against their enemies. Their real complaint was that these measures were used on all the wrong people. They rose up in large numbers to catch pro-life judges, not their own weepy Bill. They are like terrorists whose bombs have blown up in their own face. Their critics were designed to trap a William Miller or a Clarence Thomas. "Bill Clinton is not Barbara Amitl. "What feminists never anticipated was catching one of their own.”

But they did. One of the arguments made by Clinton’s and his defending, Arthur M. Saperstein, among them, was that Clinton had the right to lie to the lawyers, as those were questions no one had the right to ask him. But they did have the right. He gave them a chance. He, and his friends. Never has justice been so sweet, or poetic. Whatever the outcome before the Senate, - to Bill Clinton, at the urging of his wife and their allies, managed to impinge himself.

Noam Emery wrote “Rationehel Left” In the October 1998 issue of Horodotory.
war. The White Papers were portrayed as propaganda—a calculated campaign of disinformation to detract attention from Vietnamese actions. Destroying the credibility of these White Papers was a chief objective of the anti-war movement and the first step in its ultimate victory over U.S. policy three years after the fact, it appears that the government view was one of those truths that are the first casualty of war.

The 1961 White Paper put it boldly: the Viet Cong were not independent freedom fighters; Hanoi was behind a growing guerrilla war in South Vietnam: "... the refusal of the Communist Party to engage in democratic elections in Vietnam makes it certain that the movement will be continued by the Communist Party. It is not the movement of the "liberated" people. It is not the movement of the people. It is the movement of the Viet Cong."

The 1965 White Paper concluded: "if [the movement] is to be continued by the Communist Party. It is not the movement of the "liberated" people. It is not the movement of the people. It is the movement of the Viet Cong.

U.S. Department of State Office of the Spokesman Press Statement

March 23, 1998

Release of Foreign Relations Volumes

The Department of State released today Foreign Relations of the United States: The Gilano Years, which is the final volume in a series of 12 volumes that were published between 1961 and 1966. The volumes, which contain the official documentation of U.S. policy in Vietnam during the Vietnam War, are available for purchase through the U.S. Government Printing Office.

The volumes contain the documentation of U.S. policy in Vietnam during the Vietnam War, including secret communications, cables, and intelligence reports. The volumes will be available for purchase through the U.S. Government Printing Office.

STATE DEPARTMENT PRESS RELEASE

is carrying out a carefully conceived plan of aggression against the South... Hanoi continues to garrison its aggressive patrols into South Vietnam. This aggression violates the United Nations Charter. It is directly contrary to the Geneva Accords of 1954 and of 1962 to which North Vietnam is a party."

The leaders of the anti-war movement not only rejected the conclusion of the White Papers but boldly replaced the government's argument with their version of events in South Vietnam, the intellectual equivalent of anti-matter meant to annihilate the substance of the Johnson Administration's call-to-arms. Simply, the anti-war leaders denied the fact of North Vietnamese Communist aggression in South Vietnam, in order to take Vietnam out of the war. The argument was made as follows:

"The war was described by journalists and academics in teach-ins and in congressional hearings, but it was described as a struggle of indigence against the United States."

L.F. (Lars) Stone, later revealed to have been friendly to the Soviets, wrote that the war was "a war of all against all, with no winners or losers."

The 1965 White Paper stated: "South Vietnam is fighting for its freedom against a brutal enemy. The war is an attack on the Viet Cong, inspired, directed, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi. This flagrant aggression is an unprovoked attack on the United States."

Stone accused the 1965 White Paper of "withholding all evidence which points to a civil war in South Vietnam. Stone accused the State Department of not presenting the war as a "rebellion in the South, which may owe some men and material to the North but is largely dependent on popular indigenous support for its manpower, as it is on captured U.S. weapons for its supply."" Stone then blamed South Vietnam's first President, Ngo Dinh Diem, for the war: "It was this campaign [to win over opponents] and the violent repression used in the process that the fake land reform, and the concentration camps Diem set up of political opponents of all kinds, which stirred ever wider rebellion from 1962 onward in the great room before North Vietnam gave support."

Stone's sole source for his view of the origins of the war was a 1962 article by Philippe Davil Hanoi, who had sympathized with Ho Chi Minh since 1946. Other critics of Johnson's Vietnam policies that began to speak out as the war became a major issue. In December 1965, Saigon News and Tom Hayden visited North Vietnam. They found Hanoi's Prime Minister Pham Van Dong to be "part of an 'other side', but part of that great cross-section of humanity that today is emerging from misery to independence."

The struggle of the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam, Lynd and Hayden felt, had strengthened the traditions of community and democracy that were rooted in Vietnamese history. They explained the Resistance to the South Vietnamese government as arising from this cross-section. "There is a sense of social destiny that is a guiding force in Vietnam. It is simply the aspiration to rise above misery, because people have realized that misery is not inevitable."
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that strategy. "The illusion that the war in South Vietnam can be decided in North Vietnam is evidently a result of listening too long to our own propaganda."

"Our government has insisted so often that the war in South Vietnam is, in President Johnson's phrase, "a violent and illegal aggression across this little nation's frontier" that it has come to believe itself that the war was started in Hanoi and east of the Yalu."

In 1967 Cornell Professor George Kahin, along with co-author John Lewis, contributed a seminal text to the anti-war movement, entitled The Vietnam Victory and the Agitprop Game. Although the Viet Minh and NLF were not in control of the battle fields of South Vietnam by 1965, their material had been extensively used in the teach-ins, and events had escalated anti-war sentiment from fringe protests to a respectable part of the public protests.

Kahin passionately believed that: "In sum, the insurrection in Southern Vietnam...it arose at Southern insurrection in imitation of the Southern demand. The Liberal Front gave political articulation and leadership to the widespread resistance against the harshness and the heavier-handedness of Diem. Not surprisingly, they [southern former Viet Minh cadres] lost patience with the Communists North and finally took matters into their own hands. Hanoi, true to their principles, was not able to substantiate the Southerners' actions or risk involving all classes of influence over the course of events in South Vietnam."

Kahin presents this: "Contrary to U.S. policy assumptions, all available evidence shows that the revival of the civil war in the South in 1958 was undertaken by Southerners at their own...not Hanoi. If the insurrection in Vietnam is in the South, there is no evidence to support that, as does the U.S. White Paper of 1965, that the 'liberation Front for South Vietnam...was formed at Hanoi's orders.'" This assertion is merely a formulation of anti-communist essay and the actual foundation as Secretary of State Rusk's dependent assumption that the civil war could and should last 24 years....if these people in Hanoi decided to do this because they...are not going to try to seize Vietnam and Laos by force.

The book event in which the anti-war critique culminated was Fire in the Loko, published by Frances Fitzgerald in 1972. A national best-seller that won the Pulitzer Prize, the National Book Award, and the Brandeis Prize for Social Science. The book probed a view of the war that was actually derived from the writing of Paul Mus, a French colonial educator and scholar. Mus had been a contributor to the magazine of the Dutch government, Ho Chi Minh in 1945 and 1946, when DeGaulle's Free French party had attempted to use Ho Chi Minh in the interests of a renewed French colonial empire in Vietnam. Through his work in those years (1945-1950), Fitzgerald saw all things Vietnamese through those erudite, French colonial eyes.

The book's derivative position was that the Saigon regime was "intransigently" Vietnamese. She made the following reference to the 1965 White Paper: "In this paper, State Department spokesmen said that the NLF was now no more than an instrument of North Vietnam working against the hopes of all the South Vietnamese for peace, independence, prosperity and a better way of life. The official claim has been that they would have delineated a situation not very different from civil wars in Nigeria or Pakistan...But the Vietnam War was not a civil war; it was a war of national liberation.

With the NLF's dramatic victories in the 1968 Independence Day and then the Tet offensive, the entire country since 1945...the leaders of the NLF worked in close cooperation with the north...but it was not until the intervention of America that the communist troops that became dependent on the north for war materials and for men...it is difficult to imagine that with its own resources and material, the NLF had no influence in Hanoi...if the north was indeed trying to conquer the south, it was doing so by politics and culture but not by force."

She described the NLF, or Viet Cong, as a "national movement" with appeal for the greatest masses of the rural people. She said: "The NLF was the counterbalance without which the society would not have been complete—the yang to the yin of the government." She concluded her book with the thought that victory for the Communists would be "the only way the Vietnamese of the south can restore their country and their history to themselves."

It is interesting to compare the anti-war movement's attack on U.S. policy in Vietnam, and the NLF's 1975 attack on Diem and his government, with the "Summary of Facts" about the war completed in 1987 by Hanoi's Military History Institute. A hand-written presentation copy of this Summary was given to the Vietnamese Veterans' Association. The document was published in March 1990, as General Giap's official history of the Vietnamese Campaign for the New China. The Korean War was later given to me in 1995. This document of several hundred pages describes key decisions made by Hanoi regarding South Vietnam from the Geneva Conference of 1954 until the final conquest of Saigon by the Communists on April 30, 1975.

General Giap is still the great military hero of the Vietnamese Communists for his 1954 defeat of the French in the mountain valley of Dien Bien Phu. That defeat had broken the will of the French and earned the Vietnamese Communists. The French then agreed to the partition of Vietnam between the Communists in the north and the non-Communists in the south, as had been the French and the North Vietnamese in 1954 until the final conquest of Saigon by the Communists on April 30, 1975.

General Giap, the leader of the Vietminh in the North Vietnamese Communist Party from 1941 to 1975, was the party's military leader. He played a key role in the North Vietnamese military campaigns that led to the fall of Saigon in 1975.

The Summary confirms the NLF as the original force in Vietnam, andrefutes theposition of the anti-war movement that Hanoi decided to forsake a war in South Vietnam and then, again and again, to restate that conflict without regard for casualties.

In September 1954, after the Geneva Conference had divided Vietnam, the NLF faced two indepen- dent fronts in the South, one in the north and the other in the south. While the North would build socialism, the South needed a new kind of struggled appropriate for new circumstances, he stated, that political leadership would express itself. "Promplo la, the people's elections, liberate the south and unite the fatherland." (p. 10)

So, right from the start of South Vietnam's existence, Hanoi was resolved to crush its autonomy and bring its people under Communist rule.

According to the Summary, the initial efforts to conquer the South then developed in a single phase, the liberation phase one, from 1954 to 1956, was a political effort to implement the Geneva Accords phase one, from July 1954 to 1956, was a political effort to implement the Geneva Accords phase two, from 1956 to 1958, was continued political struggle with the addition of armed pro- paganda and armed self-defense, phase three, from 1959 to 1960, saw the revolution in the South move to the offensive, implementing regional uprisings to overthrow the political strategy of the Americans.

The Communist Party's efforts in the first phase of purely political activity were a failure. From 1954 to 1956, the NLF was engaged in a rapid and successful fighting in the South. The American military forces were up in 503 villages. (p. 22) Then, in 1960, revolutionary forces fought 1692 engagements in southern South Vietnam and 70 in the central province. Liberated areas were established in the mountains and jungles, and bases for guerrillas were secured in the midst of government territory.

The Third Congress of the Vietnamese Communist Party convened in September 1960. To build on the success of the regional uprising strategy used after 1956, the Congress decided to organize all the people in the South to resist against the Americans and make uncompromising war to overthrow the Ngo Dinh Diem government. (p. 23) The Congress decided to establish the Central Office for South Vietnam to directly lead the revolutionary struggle in the South.
The 1965 White Paper asserted that: "A special infiltration unit, the 70th Transportation group, is responsible for moving men from North Vietnam into the South via infiltration trails through Laos. Another special unit, the maritime infiltration unit, sends weapons and supplies by sea into the South. . . . since 1959 nearly 20,000 VC officers, soldiers, and technicians are known to have entered Vietnam from North Vietnam by orders from Hanoi. Additional information indicates that an estimated 17,000 infiltrators were dispatched to the South by the regime in Hanoi during the past 6 years." (p. 3)

The 1965 White Paper relied upon interviews with Communist soldiers such as Tran Phong, Tran Hoang Dan, Vo Tran Su, Tran Van Thao, Nguyen Viet Le, Nguyen Tu, Nguyen Can, Nguyen Cong Thao, and Tran Ngoc Linh. These men reported that they had received military training in North Vietnam for fighting in the South, and were then given official orders to fight in South Vietnam. Finally, they were taken into the South by an organized structure of camps and transportation facilities.

The 1965 White Paper, backed by the force of a declared troop and troop infiltration from North Vietnam by peasant numbers, had been reported in the International Commission as having been made in Communist countries outside Vietnam. Thus, to diminish its significance, the 100 troops of war sinking south found on just one ship, Stone point out that 12,000 vessels were searched in the South Vietnamese Navy each month by the military control and coast guard. Stone also noted: "The case of a whole shipload of arms puzzling, leaving an inference that the United States had planted the evidence to justify its policy."

But regarding supplies for its war in South, another newly acquired table of U.S. Defense Force revealed that in 1963, 1964, and 1965, the U.S. had supplied the Vietcong with U.S. equipment in the forms of weapons, ammunition, and transportation equipment. The supplies sent via Lian appeared to have constituted 55 percent of weapons material Communist forces used in South Vietnam theater of operations.

Unlike the two other Hanoi documents, this table does not give information on supplies sent south prior to 1965. But we have noted that shipments originating in Laos and the sea from 1959. We may assume that the U.S. had been providing the Vietcong with a substantial amount of weapons and ammunition in Vietnam up to April 1975, when Hanoi imposed its rule throughout South Vietnam once and for all, these words turned out to be prophetic, not propaganda.

Stephen B. Young is a Minnesota attorney and has written extensively about Vietnam.
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lied was it, that in very dawn to be alive. Setting foot on an American campus in the 1950s, according to one professor, was like "entering into paradise." But there are few among us who would dream of waxing so loyally about the American academy in its present incarnation. But then, the professor who spoke so nauseously about the American academy of yesteryear was Jacob Neusner, the pretentious Judaic scholar who would have been all too aware of the destruction of freedom within the German university at the hands of the Nazis. Surely for Neusner, as for the many scholars who actually sought refuge from the hell that Germany became on this side of the Atlantic, the American academy was indeed paradise—a citadel of open-mindedness and light. And the high regard in which Neusner and others held the American university is, I believe, still shared by many today. For most Americans are still content in their assumption that our colleges and universities are dedicated to the task of educating students in an objective, open-minded way—that is, in an enlightened way, in the way that is open to the light.

Alan Kors and Harvey Silverglate would disagree with them of this assumption. For, in fact, the erstwhile citadel of light has become, as they call it, "the shadow university." Kors and Silverglate are concerned not with the inchoate and politicized curriculum currently offered on so many campuses, though Kors fully recognizes the "intellectual catastrophe" that booms above all, the hummings. Rather, their focus in The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses is on the Kafka-esque ways in which university administrators impose politically correct thought and behavior on the students under their care. In this, one of the most impressive works in recent times on the academic front, scholar and sociologist Kors and Silverglate mount a wall of evidence that displays a most sinister side of contemporary academic life. They trace a maze of speech codes, sensitivity seminars, Freshman indoctrination, and innumerable other means of controlling students' minds. And their analysis is devastating.

Kors, a professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania, is a specialist on the intellectual history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. To say the least, he is also one of the nation's most eloquent speakers. In 1995, Kors' commitment to student activism manifested itself in his own campus with his involvement in the cause célèbre known as the "water buffalo" affair.

This convoluted incident began when Penn freshman Ehud Jacobowitz, attempting to write a class paper, was disturbed by a boisterous group of female students celebrating in the early hours beneath his dorm window. Escapandus, Jacobowitz threw open his window and shouted, "Shut up, you water buffalo!" Because the revelers were black, he was soon hauled before Penn administrators on charges of racial harassment. He was excommunicated with expulsion, even though the words "water buffalo" were not shown to be racist. (More exactly, as the New York Post recently noted in an editorial that showcases The Shadow University, the term is a translation of "bebeusa," a word in Jacobowitz's native Hebrew used to describe someone as obnoxious.) After much-publicized hearings that brought a new wrinkle to the McCarthyization "McCarthyization" of the campus retreated and Jacobowitz was excommunicated. Throughout all this, Kors was one of his most stalwart defenders. Kors' co-author, Silverglate, practices criminal defense and torts law in Boston. He is also a civil liberties columnist and has been active throughout his career in the American Civil Liberties Union. As noted in The Shadow University, the two soon became close friends and undertook this work as a consequence of many years of collaboration in "defense of students threatened with the new tyrannies." Kors and Silverglate hope that the "water buffalo" incident was not an isolated attempt at repressing and punishing speech. Rather, it was part of a pattern of suppressing ideas on campus—suppressing ideas of any kind that do not conform to the left-leaning, multicultural smirking-jacket that constrains academic freedom and stymies debate. According to the authors, the hundreds of intense speech codes that hold sway on campuses share a common premise regarding what constitutes "unacceptable" and "acceptable" speech. Namely, that to ensure that "disadvantaged" students participate equally with "advantaged" students—all defined by blood and history—speech must be restricted. This underlying orthodoxy is quintessentially captured in the code at the University of California, Los Angeles. Such "exclusive must assume responsibility for becoming educated about racism, sexism, ageism, homophobia/heterosexism, and other forms of oppression."

Such "educational" in behalf of favored categories, anti-individualist in the extreme, frequently has sexual overtones. When the University of Maryland flogged College Park, for example, forbidden "unacceptable sexual behaviors." In ban extended to "sexual slurs, sexual innuendos," "provocative compliments," "sexual teasing," and "flirtation of a sexual nature." The "unacceptable negative sexual behaviors" banned at College Park include "licking lips or teeth" and "holding or eating food provocatively." Syracuse University bans "looking, ogling...[and] sexually derogatory jokes." The code at West Virginia University, or WVU, outlawed "insults, humor...and/or anecdoles that belittle or demean an individ...or a group on the basis of gender or sexuality...""DO NOT..." the code stated, "icate jokes which are potentially injurious to gays, lesbians and bisexuales." "DO NOT determine whether you will interact with a student by virtue of her or his orientation..." Rather, it commands, "Value alternative lifestyles and use language that is not gender specific..." And what kind of gender-neutral newspaper does WVU ordain? "Instead of referring to anyone's romantic partner as 'girlfriend' or 'boyfriend'; use generic terms such as 'friend,' 'lover' or 'partner'...Speak of your own romantic partner similarly..."

Many of the codes favor charging a student with sexual harassment even if his intent is innocent. As Herbert London, a dean at New York University, observes, "A violation is not as the word goes 'impulsive', not intentional, therefore, the accused is guilty. If the accuser believes him to be guilty..." Bowdoin College in Maine, for instance, provides for sexual harassment to be considered sexual harassment even if the alleged victim is a student of the opposite sex or the opposite sex..." If the accuser misinterprets an innocent reference to an article, a book, or a movie as sexual harassment even if the alleged victim is a student of the opposite sex..." If the accuser misinterprets an innocent reference to an article, a book, or a movie as sexual harassment even if the alleged victim is a student of the opposite sex..."

Not only students, but faculty members who express views in political disfavor become ensnared by the codes. In addition to the cases catalogued by Kors and Silverglate, fragile magazine describes an incident exposed by Daniel Shapiro, a professor of philosophy at WVU. Shapiro was reported to the campus' Office of Social Justice for using the word "white" in the classroom. He was informed that the word "white" is "exempt" and advised instead to use nonessential terms such as "nonwhite" or "other." Shapiro notes, however, that this code would not be seen as violative of the speech codes. It is weak and unprincipled administrators who bear primary responsibility for the codes, through acquiescent faculty and a public slow to anger: also slow to blame.

Speech codes with sexual overtones are just one means by which campuses mandate a panoply of "appropriate" views. Fundamental orientation, too, is expected to this end, and Kors and Silverglate show the vast extent to which the inti- nation of freshmen into college life has been transformed into a tool for imposing an official moral agenda. For example, in 1990, Smith College, every freshman a guided to "identity and oppression." Included in the cases of "oppressions" were "AGHESM oppression of the different and...who are not...AGHESM oppression of the young and the old, by young adults and the middle-aged...CLASSISM...oppression of the working class and non-propertied by the upper and middle-class...[and]LOOKISM...oppression through stereotypes..." of both those who do not fit "a...it or the other."

In admittance to many other programs, cam- puses intruder upon the private minds and consciences of students by exposing them to ideologi- on campus, at least not in their residential halls. A: Pena, from 1968 to 1990, such thought reform was set in motion in every residence via an initiative named "It's Time for Change." It consisted of the words of Kors and Silverglate, "a vivid expression of to ideological uniform indoctrination. Some of the topics to be covered in dormitory indoctrination sessions included "counter culture... racial superior groups...race as a social construct... definitions of heterosexuality and homosexuality... coming out...internalized homophobia... relig-ious stereotypes...abortion/birth control...extramarital..." and so on, and so forth..."
At Haverford College, in 1993, under the direction of the dean of the college, upperclassmen engaged in "games" (involving the trading and acquiring of chip) bearing on race relations in freshmen residences. The purpose of these exercises, according to organizers, is "to raise student awareness of racial and ethnic diversity." Their true purpose, according to Silvergate, "is to train students to believe that they are products of a "male-dominated, heterosexual, European, Eurocentric, and Christian" society that has "ruined the old classes and that these classes are entitled to redress for the historical wrongs that they and their ancestors suffered."

The "training" of campus residence advisors (RA's), who are to function as agents of moral change in the dormitories, is biased precisely along these lines. At the University of Cincinnati, at a mandatory "Cultural Diversity Workshop" for RAs in 1993, the "sensitivity facilitator" announced that "all whites were racist" but that white males, in particular, hold all power and control. And what is deemed to be the appropriate response—the response of white males—to this barrage of attacks against them is reminiscent of the Chinese Cultural Revolution "re-education" tactics. How does a diversity trainer know he has achieved his objective in sensitivity training? The following answer was provided by one such trainer to a reporter for Insight: "I know that I have failed in my mission if I can see male students feel guilty and cry."

Campuses have instituted a range of disciplinary procedures for punishing those student residents and faculty who refuse to conform to the codes and other rules that seek to censor their thought and speech. For instance, one group of students, taunted at a recent campus meeting by a gay student, was asked to leave the area and then "re-entered" the meeting, and the police were called. And what is the response of the campus officials to this type of behavior? They, too, are part of the problem. They are part of the system that perpetuates the discrimination and prejudice that is so evident on our campuses today.

Not surprisingly, as Korn and Silvergate also show, restrictive policies do not apply equally to all students. Although most speech codes focus on upholding freedom of speech and dialogue, they do not protect white students, Catholics, Protestants, evangelicals, and Orthodox Jews. Under many codes, a heterosexual male cannot call a gay person a "faggot" or use similar language. A white student can use impunity with a heterosexual male "a disgusting homophobic." The rationale given for this double standard, says Silvergate in The Washington Times, is that "homosexuals don't have the power to discriminate because they are minorities." In 1994, the University of California—San Diego, under pressure from students, each new student with an essay entitled "Combating Racism." It pronounced: "No individual can be racist in isolation from power... Blacks cannot be racist." In 1997, at Pennsylvania State University, Catholic students protested a campus exhibit of a quilt, "25 Years of Virginity," made up of 25 pairs of panties with crosses sewn into the crotches. Claiming that the quilt created a "hostile environment" for them, and that Penn State's speech code protected them too, the students asked that the quilt be removed. The University President's response was: "I can't imagine any circumstances under which this university would want to encourage censorship." This and many similar cases bolster the view of J. Stanley Gacesa, president of the Campus Crusade for Christ's International Leadership, that comments by Christian students and faculty members are commonly assumed to be "hate speech." However, the vilification and discrimination of Christians by other groups are not.

Nor do campus-inquisitors meet out punishment equally. The words of Morton Halperin in 1989, then of the American Civil Liberties Union, apply more than ever today: "There are no cases where universities discipline students for views or opinions of the left, while reciting comments against the right." Korn and Silvergate document the "pandemic" theft and destruction of student publications by publishers who object to one or more articles in them, frequently because these articles are at odds with multicultural nostrums. What a Dartmouth College spokesman said after a number of such incidents in 1995 reflects the reaction of many administrators: "Thieves are getting away with murder."

And what are the implications of this "slanting of speech in the academy? The aim of the Left, warns David Horowitz, is to "replace the American legacy, which is of molding freedom for the world, with a totalitarian regime, where the West students come out in Tianamen brand with a Statue of Liberty. It's a symbol of freedom everywhere in the world except on American campuses."

The conclusion of The Shadow University is equally uncompromising—and shattering. "Universities have become the enemy of a free society," Korn and Silvergate conclude, "and it is time for the citizens to recognize this scandalous excess of proportion and hold these institutions to account." Stalwart defenders of individual liberty that they are, the authors rightly abhor all forms of counter-censorship as a response to institutional violations of thought and speech. The best remedy, they insist, is public exposure—"sunlight is the best disinfectant." When asked, however, what actions society and those with institutional fiduciary responsibility might properly take toward campuses that refuse to ensure freedom of speech, Korn replies, "Society absolutely has the right to remove its subsidies from such institutions, and trustees absolutely have the right, within the law, and at the appropriate time, not to renew contracts of administrators who do not ensure such freedom."

The song of the peace bong soldiers dispatched by the Nazis to work until they died was, justly, "Thoughts are free." Free thought. Freedom of the inner self. Private property are the holy of holies of liberty. "No moral person," the authors proclaim, "would pursue another human being there." And no institution of higher learning should be permitted to do so.

Candace de Russy is a Trustee of the State University of New York.
Court Rules on Flag Display
by Judith Schumann Weizner

Judge Thomas Kleinckopf has directed the members of the Albany, Massachusetts Police Department to remove all American flag insignia from their uniforms. The order is a by-product of last week's trial of Jorge Bandera, the Albany car wash attendant acquitted of multiple felonies when jurors found him to have been justified in resisting arrest.

Six years ago, Bandera, a 28-year-old native of the tiny Caribbean republic of Pequaza Dominica, arrived in the United States in the hold of a freighter, intent on realizing his lifelong dream of becoming a major league baseball player. He hoped to follow in the footsteps of his older brother, Ernesto, a free agent reportedly about to sign with the Toronto Blue Jays. Within a year of his arrival, Jorge was pitching for the Albany Petrels, but because his fastball rarely topped thirty-eight miles an hour, he was let go at the end of the season. Discouraged, he went to work in a car wash to support the woman he had married during his journey to America, while in his free time working to improve his fastball.

Several months later, his wife left him for the Petrels' catcher, Chuck Bunting, and he began to harbor deep resentment toward the team, whose logo is a petrel with an American flag in its beak. That image, with all it had seemed to promise, mocked him. His humiliation increased daily as he imagined his wife rooting for his former teammate at Petrel Park on Saturday afternoons while he toiled in the car wash, unable to ignore the broadcasts of the games on his co-workers' radios.

Shortly after the start of spring training, he learned that his wife had abandoned Bunting and moved in with the second-string right fielder. When he overheard two of his fellow workers discussing the news, Bandera lost his composure and smushed the windshield of a Mercury he was simulating. After pulverizing the windshield, he calmed down and, according to eyewitness accounts, cracked jokes with his co-workers while waiting quietly for the police, but when they arrived, he again fell into a frenzy, clubbing one officer to the ground with his own nightstick before being subdued. He was charged with the attempted murder of a police officer, assaulting a police officer, resisting arrest and malicious destruction of property.

Bandera's attorney entered a plea of not guilty by reason of self-defense.

At the trial, one after another of Bandera's co-workers described the way Bandera had lost his temper upon hearing the news about his wife's new love interest, and how he had addressed the Mercedez's windshield with the bat he had kept with him constantly since leaving the Petrels. Several of them were able to repeat jokes and successful treatment extremely rare.

Dr. Penaiste reiterated that at the time of his brush-off by the Petrels, Mr. Bandera had suffered a grave diminution of self-esteem, subsequently compounded by his wife's having left him for a teammate. Furthermore, his patient admitted having entered the United States illegally, and, although he had been granted citizenship under the Courageous Immigrant Tolerance and Amnesty Act of 1996, he still perceived his immigration status as uncertain, thus, coupled with his inability to speak English, predisposed him to an unnatural fear of the American flag, the symbol of the authorities, making his case extremely difficult to treat.

Quoting from his book, "Negative Emotional Transference Syndrome and You," Dr. Penaiste told the court that during the treatment period it is of utmost importance that the victim not be subjected to negative stimuli, explaining that the American flag had been removed from the courtroom to avoid any possible provocation. He said it was not at all surprising that his patient had become enraged at the sight of the American flag patches on the officers' sleeves, and that in his opinion, Mr. Bandera had been convinced that he was acting legitimately in self-defense when he struck them, seeking only to preserve what remained of his manhood and to resist their attempt to impose their national outlook on him.

The jury found Mr. Bandera not guilty by reason of cultural self-defense, and, in a precedent-setting move, permitted the judge to direct the Albany police to remove the flag symbols from their uniforms.

In an unscheduled interview following the announcement of the verdict, Mayor Keith Boneharman declared his intention to establish a commission to consider whether, in the light of a recent three-fold increase in the immigrant population of Albany, it is not a form of cultural heresies to fly the American flag outside public buildings.

"When a tragedy such as this one occurs, it compels us to acknowledge that a lack of sensitivity can adversely affect people's lives in very serious ways, and we are constrained to question the wisdom of forcing our symbols on them," Mr. Boneharman told reporters as he left City Hall this afternoon. "It is to personally assure Mr. Bandera that I will do all I can to prevent what happened to him from happening to anyone else."
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