HETERODOXY
ARTICLES AND ANIMADVERSIONS ON POLITICAL CORRECTNESS AND OTHER FOLLIES

PC PRESCHOOL

Where would you expect to hear a statement like the following: "Race is an invented system, . . . an arbitrary classification created by Europeans using themselves as the model of humanity for the purpose of establishing their power and privilege?"

Would it be a cultural anthropology class at an elite East Coast university? Perhaps a rally of Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam? Or a child care facility? The third answer, strangely enough, is the right one. Welcome to "Building Cultural Connections," a curriculum for licensed child care workers brought to you by the state of Minnesota.

"Building Cultural Connections" is the state's response to a 1990 law requiring "cultural dynamics" training for all licensed child care workers, from staff at large centers to moms caring for a few kids in their living room. After passing the law, the legislature handed off responsibility for designing a training curriculum to a public/private group called the Cultural Dynamics Education Project, which spent seven years in the effort. This fall, after using "Building Cultural Connections" to train 3,000 providers at pilot sites across the state, project officials asked Commissioner Christine Jex of the Department of Children, Families and Learning to approve the curriculum's final draft.

"Building Cultural Connections" portrays America as a truly horrific place to live. It depicts this country as dominated by a nefarious "non-disabled European American culture," which systematically withholds power from minorities and disabled people. (White people, it seems, "got the power first and then made sure they didn't have to give it up."

Non-disabled European Americans lead lives of privilege, defined as "an unearned entitlement to and attitude of superiority and advantage." They use their power to "perpetuate their cultural heritage and impose it upon others, while at the same time destroying the culture of non-European Americans."

According to "Building Cultural Connections," "European American culture in this country has defined 'normal, beautiful, right or able' with the help of powerful institutions (schools, media, business and economic institutions) . . . ." Accordingly, "bias has been built right into the development of all our identities."

Continued on page 12

THE MORAL FALLOUT OF CLINTONISM

The Party of Porn

by Noemie Emery

Last June, Ann Coulter, a stunning blonde lawyer and activist, wrote a short column for George magazine about the social life of that thereon in Washington, a place, she said, where traditional mores are reversed or suspended, where romantic lives are subsumed in ambition, and restaurants tend to empty out early so patrons can go home and do what they want to watch themselves and their friends on TV. In passing, she mentioned a few other oddities: that struggling staffers buy costly gifts for their rich, famous bosses; and that Washington men, instead of asking women to date them, try to get girls to ask them out.

As columns go, it was a pleasant bit of fluff and filler; perhaps too innocuous. It was a shock, therefore, to read the "response" to it that ran in Salon magazine. Titled "Ann of a Thousand Lies" (seemingly, on no grounds whatsoever), it offered to help her in her "quest for truth" with ten useful hints such as these: "Quit injecting yourself with your own urine," "Buy a vibrator," "Stop being a mean bitch," and "Get your head out of your ass." "I think you need to wrack up some quick orgasms," the Salon writer added.

"There's one called the 'rabbit' that gets you going from seven different angles at once, if you know what I mean." And what could have caused this explosion of sewage? Possibly, two different things. Ann Coulter is six feet tall and a size six; she has been called the "queen of the Rampaul." But how to explain all those expensive gifts? How does one get to them?

Continued on page 13
To Publish and Perish

To what degree is your average college newspaper enslaved to political correctness? Let's put it this way: even an innocuous advertisement for a book can be axed if it has the potential to offend someone. The PC virus is no longer restricted to separater editors examining copy, but it has also ravaged the business departments of collegiate newspapers.

In this instance, the advertisement was for conservative commentator David Horowitz's new book, Hating Whitey and Other Progressive Causes. It was a typical ad for a book promotion: a favorable endorsement from a well-known personality (Thomas Sowell) prominently displayed, the title in large type, the author's visage staring out at the reader. However, that was too much for the editors and business staffs at the Michigan Daily, the student newspaper at the University of Michigan. As an employee of Horowitz's Center for the Study of Popular Culture, it was my job to help place the ad in various student media nationwide. On October 18, I returned from lunch to find a message from Steve Jones, Display Advertising Manager at the Daily. He informed me in an unctuous tone that the business staff and the editors had discussed the ad, and that the Daily would not be running it because it would offend some of Michigan's students.

Finding this odd, and admittedly being still quite annoyed over the matter, I gave Mr. Jones a call the next morning and asked him why exactly the ad had been rejected. His response: The title, Hating Whitey, was a big factor. As he put it, "We feel that (the ad) may offend some students here."

"Which students?", I asked. "Any white females or males in the University," he responded. I asked him whether he had read Hating Whitey, and he responded that he had not, but that the Daily had checked it out online, and that "we did feel like it was promoting a conflict within races (in the paper)."

Finally, I asked whether he really felt that white students would be offended by the ad. "It has the potential of offending white students," he said.

If one takes the Daily's claims at face value, then its leadership is merely hyper-sensitive about white people's feelings. But it seems unlikely that the paper truly fears legions of enraged white students protesting the ad outside of their offices, writing stern letters to the editor decrying the paper's racial insensitivity, or threatening to park their Grand Jeep Cherokees atop the editor-in-chief.

What is more likely is that the Daily's leaders are simply unwilling to touch anything that might besmirch one of the left's sacred cows, for fear that the quoted anonymous source who cast suspicion on members of Alienia, a militant campus Latino group. That was more fodder for the radicals, who responded by descending on the Daily's office, holding an emotionally charged rally with 230 protestors out front. Soon, the Daily's editor called the entire incident a "misunderstanding," saying that the paper's story was "not as clear as it should have been."

It can't be enjoyable to see the product of one's hard work stolen and destroyed. But for these liberal editors, it must have come with a sense of disbelief as well. "What? We're racist?" the Daily's editors must have been thinking. And since the administration failed to support the newspaper meaningfully, it is now surely far less willing to push the envelope. Its editors shy away from controversy, and do not deviate from the party line. That, combined with their general liberal disposition, results in copy that is shallow, biased, and check full of support for racial preferences, ethnic studies, and other leftist dogma certain not to offend anyone of a certain racial or ethnic heritage—indeed, no one except College Republicans and sorority girls.

So the Daily has published, for example, a painfully sappy puff piece on a propagandistic Martin Luther King Day celebration and an entire supplement on the wonders of pornography. When the Center for Equal Opportunity published a report showing that Michigan blatantly used racial preferences, the Daily whitewashed the topic.

The hypersensitivity has reached paranoid proportions. The Daily has now rejected an advertisement because it might—not would, but might—have the potential to offend some readers. Its editors have the right to do that, but it suggests an intellectual enslavement to the radical party line. That in turn is a disservice to their readers and a sad commentary on the state of collegiate journalism—a medium that used to be able to flout convention on style, substance, and everything in between. Editors of mainstream student newspapers now find themselves kowtowing to a small band of student radicals—people who care nothing for anyone but themselves.

—Benjamin Kepple
TAKING RESPONSIBILITY AT NORTHWESTERN: The Northwestern Chronicle is reporting that new freshmen were forced to take three introductory seminars known as Responsibility 101, 102, and 103 before they were allowed to register for fall courses this year. The seminars were designed to emphasize the need for students to conduct themselves in a manner suitable for their role as students. Students who failed to attend the seminars would be unable to register for courses and would be required to retake the seminars at a later date. The seminars focused on issues such as campus safety, academic integrity, and personal conduct. Students who were found to be in violation of the policies outlined in the seminars would be subject to disciplinary action.

IT MAKES YOU GO BLIND: Jocelyn Elders, Bill Clinton’s first choice for surgeon general and advocate general for cancer, has been forced to step down due to charges of sexual harassment. Elders, who is a leading expert in the field of medical ethics, has been accused of creating a hostile work environment by making inappropriate comments to junior faculty members and encouraging them to have sexual relationships with him. Elders has denied the allegations and has filed a lawsuit against the university for defamation.

THE FAT POLICE: The American Obesity Association is calling for the government to tax high-fat foods and make insurers cover weight-loss programs, along with a five-fold increase in the amount of money spent to research the causes of obesity. Currently, the National Institute of Health spends $10.1 billion a year to combat obesity. Other experts have weighed in on the subject, and no less than Surgeon General David Satcher has said that obesity “is our public enemy number one.” Class action suits against butter producers, laws against second-hand food, and a new battle against Big Tobacco have all been proposed as solutions to the obesity epidemic.

SCHOOL DAZE IN MICHIGAN: Under a legal challenge by the federal government, the University of Michigan is forced to withdraw affirmative action plans. In a move that is likely to set a precedent for other schools, the university has agreed to new admissions policies that do not take race into account. The move is seen as a victory for civil rights groups, who have been fighting for years to end the practice of affirmative action.

OLSON IS BLACK AND THE BURKEs ARE WHITE: A rally was held to raise money for Olsson, and the community came together to show their support. The event was organized by the local community center, which has been working to promote diversity and inclusion in the area. The rally featured speeches, music, and performances by local artists, and attendees were encouraged to donate money to support the cause.

PULLING A LEWINSKY: Dr. Bernard Lewinsky, the father of President Clinton’s famous intern, is demanding that NBC television network apologize for referring to the president as a “Lewinsky” in a spin-off of its popular Law & Order television series. The good doctor is said to be very distaste about the implication that his daughter is just a part of the story. He has threatened to sue, but has not yet done so. The president, of course, is quite worried about the implications of the story.

THE FIRE THIS TIME: Campus radicals at the University of Michigan had a problem. When they held a rally to defend affirmative action, they were met with a counter-protest of athletes who were against affirmative action. The rally was held on the university campus, and it was a pretty lively event. The athletes were opposed to the idea of giving preferences to underrepresented groups, and they were clearly agitated. The campus radicals, on the other hand, were just as passionate in their defense of affirmative action.

COMMIE RERUNS: In an attempt to commemorate the ten-year anniversary of throwing off the Soviet yoke, public television stations in the Commonwealth of Independent States broadcast the Soviet-era television to the people in order to show just how bad it was. The Soviets used to put on Soviet shows, and it was quite a sight to see. The shows were completely different from what we are used to now. The American style shows would have the opportunity to watch such enlightening and interesting programs such as Festival of Political Songs and Russian Literature. The American style shows would have the opportunity to watch such enlightening and interesting programs such as Festival of Political Songs and Russian Literature. The American style shows would have the opportunity to watch such enlightening and interesting programs such as Festival of Political Songs and Russian Literature.
Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, is the sort of school where students are proud of their reputation. And for generations they have prided themselves on two pillars. With average SAT scores hovering around 1250, the students here have long been known for their first-class smarts. But they are equally known for their aptitude for high-ranking fun—of the drizzingly, drink-till-you-drop variety. When I told one of my old grad school professors, a Swarthmore alum who had played soccer against Lehigh back in his college days, that I was moving down here to teach, he told me deliberately—with a knowing smile and the gravitas of a deep German accent—that “these students are ace-ee-mail.”

The party circuit on “the Hill,” a small mountain behind the campus academic buildings accessible by a steep, snaking road overgrown by snapping oaks and elm, is legendary. Lehigh’s fraternities were once known far and wide for their bacchanals. Unlike other schools, where fraternities were bastions of exclusivity, at Lehigh some students—Johnson among them—were the rebellious high schoolers to the local shift-worker in search of a good time. Students here prided themselves on being partiers par excellence and, at the same time, making it to class, boots open and bright-eyed, first thing Monday morning. Sure, they were mostly upper-middle class or wealthy suburbanites from southern New Jersey and Mainline Philadelphia, but—at their own game of work and fun, at least—they knew they were as tough as the steelworkers where old and silent plant structures for miles along the river within walking distance of the Lehigh campus.

On a Friday night a couple of weeks ago, as a new faculty member, I decided at least to get a glimpse of the legendary Lehigh myself by driving down the Hill at 1 a.m.—peak party time—on my way home from teaching English in a class in Philadelphia. What I saw late on a Friday night at the “new Lehigh” launched by its recently arrived outsider, President Gregory Farrington, was even more shocking than I might have imagined. I saw ace-ee-mails, all right—two-fawe silently skittered across the road on the way to their nighttime haunts. For students, well, I saw more. Neither did I hear any trash blaring out of windows. I can’t say I saw anything that resembled a party. The Hill of Lehigh legend had completely disappeared.

On my way down the mountain, I did think I spotted one student just as I passed President Farrington’s stately house (the house where Catherine Drinker Bowen, the author of several famous histories of the Constitutional Convention, grew up with her father, himself a former president of Lehigh). This student, it turned out, was a freshman and was not especially tall. He was wearing a windbreaker, and a white shirt and blue tie, with a backpack slung over his shoulder and an open copy of James Henslin’s All In the Family in his hand. A knobbed-iron sculpture, it turns out, by Seward Johnson, new to campus and dedicated to coincide with the arrival of President Farrington and the new Harvard-funded public health plan for Lehigh students known as “Project IMPACT.”

As my late night drive down the mountain revealed, Project IMPACT has lived up to its name. The initiative—which grew out of the “binge drinking” panic whipped up a few years back by the Harvard School of Public Health—was supported by a multi-million-dollar grant distributed by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation aimed at changing the culture of drinking at college campuses across the country.

The “success” of Project IMPACT at Lehigh, in stopping on-campus drinking dead in its tracks, is a reminder in microcosm in the age of the Open Society that totalitarian social planning—when bucked by a system of pervasive and ruthless enforcement—can actually influence behavior. The progress of Project IMPACT from idea to implementation will be familiar to students of the history of ambitious late-twentieth-century planning. As with any such plan, first step is to present an intellectual vanguard to explain the purity nobility of the end to which the plans will bring society’s pursuit. In the early days of such plans, of course, that end was proletarian equality. Here at Lehigh (and at an increasing number of places around the country) that end is health.

After they have established the unbreakable nobility of the end, the vanguard’s second step is to present the case that the achievement of that end has, until now, been hopelessly blocked by a blinkered (or bourgeois) outlook that has been focused only on the behavior of individuals, each in isolation from others. The third step is to have an epiphany—supported by scientific research—that in reality everything is connected and that a holistic group approach is now necessary. All this will inevitably know change in the cultural climate only through the radical restructuring of the entire social environment.

Enter the “provenance” expert at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, where a cadre of policy intellectuals in recent years has put the “problem” of collegiate drinking squarely within its sights. According to the foundation’s newsletter, Advances, the “environmental approach” is the latest leg in progress in the prevention studies field. As a spokesperson for the foundation, Joan Huhnsollander, informs us, “No single factor alone accounts for alcohol abuse. Rather, multiple factors converge to produce an environment conducive to college binge drinking.” And, in turn, if you think deeply about it, college binge drinking indeed has a harmful effect on the total college environment. Forbidded by millions donated by the Johnsons, Harvard’s College Alcohol Project (CAP) has discovered that collegiate drinking wreaks all sorts of havoc that you may have never before considered. There is, for instance, a high correlation between drinking and parties and staying up late. Also, according to the Harvard study, parties cause noise. Those of you who were troubled by the Columbia massacre and disturbed by recent events in Don Worth might want to know that this very summer, Harvard’s CAP discovered that the total student who drinks a bit more is more likely to wield guns than their teetotaling peers. Want to stop the next Dylar Kheold? Then for heaven’s sake, stop college drinking, NOW.

Lehigh University, in conjunction with CAP and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, was one institution brave enough to stand up to toxicity and mass murder. Beginning this semester, Project IMPACT—an acronym for “Involving Multiple Partners to Effect Transformation”—went into effect with the aim of “upholding the highest moral principles and allowing only that behavior which is considered socially acceptable.” Henceforth, “deviate behaviors” (i.e., unapproved boozing) will entail “the strictest of penalties.”

Devotee Lehigh students were told this fall that no alcohol will be served at any social event not taking place between 4 p.m. on Fridays and 2 a.m. on Sundays. All such events must be registered a week in advance with the University police, who must be supplied with a complete guest list, accompanied by proof of age of all students aspiring to attend. These events—which, out of hold, some students still refer to as “parties”—are policed by university-approved security guards who are “in constant communication with the University Police Shift Supervisor.” At the parties, drinks (wine and beer only) are served by official university bartenders in caps (since stipulated by regulation) according to an elaborate mathematical formula which ensures that individuals over 21 receive one drink per hour up to a maximum of four per night—a system monitored by a punch-card compliance system. And to make sure the fun doesn’t spill over outdoors on the Hill, swarms of cops (regulars and undercover, they all wear shirts stamped “Lehigh Athletics”), now blanket every nook and cranny of the campus on weekends. Any student found to be tipsy is brought up on charges and tutored on to Moon and Dad by President Farrington. Two letters home from teacher and you’re outta here.

To complement the commando tactics deployed to tame the Hill, the university is now drawing its students in a summons of prudence. Project IMPACT has set up demonstration subcommittee check points in front of the campus chapel. The English Department has been dogmatised into weaving anti-alcohol themes into its writing assignments. And a special Project IMPACT Website (www.alcoholarmy.org) has been created, which alternates chirpy, low-wage pop psychology quizzes (“Are you normal—whatever THAT is?”) and recipes for “mocktails” (“Non-alcoholic doesn’t mean you have to go thirsty!”) with dire warnings about the links between alcohol and everything from date rape to conspicuousness (“A daily glass of wine increases your weight by 4 pounds a year.”). Undergraduates are being urged by campus professionals to join the cultural revolution by signing on to teams of student dry guards with names like “Scorched Earth” and “Healthy Traditions.”

The students of course, are dumbstruck. Lehigh students have always been an apoplectic
sort and seem to be at a loss for any strategy to resist the Cambridge-imposed clamp-down. So far, all they have been able to do is fight Johnson with Johnson (Robert Wood, that is, with Seward) by lashing out at the triangle pool sculpture of the clean-cut kid on the President's lawn with vandal-ism and the poison pen. Many students have vocally taken the sculpture, entitled Between Classes, as a symbol of everything that President Harrington dislikes the post-Project IMPACT Lehigh student should be. (In a comical but, alas, predictable misapprehension of the roots of the student loyalties towards the sculpture, Harrington earnestly testified that Between Classes did not represent his vision of the ideal Lehigh student, and went on to reassure folks here that Lehigh is "a diverse and multicultural community"—that is, "welcoming to people of all races, religions, and ethnic backgrounds.")

What the long-term effects of the visionary planning undertaken by Project IMPACT on the legendary Lehigh san-e-cool will be are, of course, uncertain. Some of the less obvious aspects of the plan will probably do some good—such as the effort to increase the array of on-campus weekend events that don't involve alcohol, like discussions, movie screenings, small-scale concerts, and coffeehouses. Project IMPACT'S hardly onerous requirement that non-alcoholic beverages be available at parties is also doubtless a good idea (though hardly one that could only have been arrived at through a multi-million dollar initiative). The totalistic everything-is-connect-ed-to-everything-the totality of the rest of the plan, however, has left Lehigh students demoral-ized under the all-seeing eye of hypertrophied ranks of the campus police. The new climate on campus, thanks to Project IMPACT, is chilling. As is usually the case when a mania for top-down order is nourished by outsted moral righteousness, presence in the first virtue to fall. And unintended consequences—the base of right-eous zealots everywhere—are already apparent. Widespread anecdotal evidence from the Lehigh campus suggests that instead of cutting back on boro students—in a very dangerous trend—they shifted their drinking behind closed doors. And, what's worse, reports suggest that the folks from Harvard have "transformed" Lehigh's culture overnight from an open beer-based culture to a furtive and deplorable culture anchored in hard alcohol and hard drugs. Because it's fast, efficient, and easy to hide, grain alcohol is more popular than ever. Just as disturbing are student reports that the campus consumption of cocaine, LSD, and ecstasy—traditional Hallmarks at the old Lehigh—has shot sky-high. And now, when they absolutely must down a cold one, Lehigh students simply head off campus. Many of those students are thus pushed into making long treks home on foot late at night through the thankful neighborhood that ring the relatively safe campus. Others, of course, drive. And no doubt it won't be long before students here start wrapping their SUV'S around utility poles as they flit the new police state on the Hill for the region's less rigorously regulated watering holes.

Maybe, after all, the pioneers are right; maybe anything, after all, is connected. The problem with the approach of ambitious policy intellectuals like those affiliated with Project IMPACT is that there is usually more in heaven and earth than they have dreamed of in their phil-osophy. That is, the problem isn't that everything isn't in some "real" sense connected, but that, pro-duced onwards by an outsted moralism, they are overreac-tant in their ability to anticipate all of the consequences of radical social action. The planners at Project IMPACT and the university probably didn't imagine that such a well-intentioned initiative might lead to a culture of drug use, coke scoring, and grain alcohol. Moreover, they probably didn't think that what may prove in retrospect to be a rather mortal school pride and spirit could be utterly destroyed by trying to force the undergraduates to live like paroled professors at the Harvard School of Public Health.

At the moment, the current Lehigh stu-dent—who more than likely enrolled here expecting to live the Lehigh of old—is something of a stranger on his own campus. The door to Seward Johnson's statue now sits the door. On the Hill, the bell is silent as the miles. The brown leaves rustle. And a chill wind blows.

Ken J. Korch is an assistant professor of political science at Lehigh University.
**Ethnic Politics Gets Nasty**

**When Hermandad Is Not Brotherly**

by K. Lloyd Billingsley

"W**e are going to get you, pinche cabron," said the voice on the phone, in the threatening manner of some ripped-off customer who was after the punch who had failed to pay off on a drug deal or gambling debt. But the recipient of the call was no small-time hood. He was Robert Cervantes, a former California assistant superintendent of education, with a Ph.D. in educational psychology. And he hadn't ripped off anyone. Quite the opposite, in fact. In the course of his duties as overseer of adult education programs, Cervantes had discovered that a group of so-called Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) could not account for how they had spent millions in federal funds. Some of these groups, slotted for English classes, had gone toward such educational items as jewelry and Mercedes-Benz automobiles. The fact that the receiving end of the millions did not appreciate the publicity, and Cervantes was soon to learn that those threatening him were not just pulling wind.

Colleagues tipped him off that a former National Guardian was being paid to find out where Cervantes lived. Gang types began hanging around his residence, and the rumors on either side of Cervantes burned to the ground, with across the probable cause. A graying, soft-spoken man who could pass for a high school guidance counselor, Cervantes began to be very "security conscious." But there were only part of his woes. His revelations ultimately got him fired, and what political decision to be reversed, even though he has been vindicated.

In July, California's state auditor, Kurt Sjoberg, confirmed everything Cervantes had said in a report that got little play from a sloppy press corps and brought to comment from either Democratic governor Gray Davis or State Superintendent of Education Delaine Eastin. Both Eastin and Davis had good reason to keep the issue quiet, because what the state's press corps had missed was a story that revealed the dynamics of the ethnic politics increasingly dominating the state and tapped a vein of California history bared from discussion under the current regime of political correctness. The back story, and its key player, a man named Bert Corrns, stretched all the way to the 1930s, to the heyday of the popular front. It confirmed that Democratic Party funding of the left is not history but news. And it was a case study of how a career path on the farthest reaches of the left can expect abundant rewards within the system.

The revelations of the July audit came layered in bureaucratic boilerplate that failed to identify the groups in question, even though they were matters of public record and, in some cases, the subject of ongoing FBI investigations. The ten CBOs involved are a kind of interlocking diaspora, with some serving as little more than front groups. The executive director of the narrow defeat of Republican Robert Duncan by Loretta Sanchez. Hermandad registered 721 people who were not American citizens, and 442 of them voted illegally.

The executive director of Hermandad, at the center of the CBO storming a Bert Corrns, occasionally referred to as "Humberto Corrns," hailed a Latino leader, a councilman of Corrns Chavez, an advocate of immigrants, and a friend of Bill Clinton who keeps a residence in Washington.

Corrns was born in El Paso, Texas, in 1919, and recalls that the high school he attended was integrated, including its sports teams. "I don't recall any racial tensions that accompanied playing at El Paso High." Corrns told his biography, Mario Garcia. Still, some teachers "held rigid versions of the Alaska." Though born in the United States, Corrns did not think of himself as an American or even a Mexican-American. "We as Mexicans also had a historic and rightful claim to El Paso and the Southwest," he has said.

Corrns recounts with delight stories he was told as a child of Pancho Villa's rebelling party into New Mexico in 1916, recalling "how yellow the Americans had been, of how they had begged for their lives, how they had cried and pined in their pasts, crying 'no me mates, no me mates, soy amigo de los revolucionarios.'"

In the mid-1930s, Corrns came to the University of Southern California on a basketball scholarship. Although he dropped out of USC, he learned to drive to 16th Street. "Socialism could solve many of the problems created by capitalism," Corrns sold his biographer, "The Communist Party always stressed the example of the Soviet Union and of the significant programs established after the Bolshevik Revolution." After leaving college, Corrns worked with Hurry Bridges, longtime boss and secret Communist, as the Venetian intercepts of Soviet intelligence traffic confirm. Corrns is unperturbed about his Party affiliations. "It is important to understand that a strong relationship existed between Mexican-American activists and the Communist Party," he said. Furthermore, the Communist Party contained many dedicated people...not solely interested in promoting the party but committed to advancing the cause of working and poor people." As an organization, he says, the CP played "a positive role in trying to build a democratic trade union movement that would be controlled by the rank and file."

Corrns's best was the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), and solidly Communist in leadership. The CIO developed a very important relationship with the growing number of Mexican youth gangs in the barrios," notes Corrns. "While some delinquency and crimes were associated with gangs, many gangs served as mini-communities for youth. Corrns would later cultivate similar relationships of his own.

By all evidence, Corrns stayed the course during the Nazi-Soviet Pact, when the Party picketed the White House, called Roosevelt a warmonger, and Party-backed CIO unions struck American defense plants such as North American Aviation in Inglewood, California. Roosevelt called in this group, Max Silver, a longtime Party boss in Los Angeles, identified Corrns as a CIO member before World War II, when Party members were given a leave of absence to be patriotic.

After the war, the mass revolutionary upheaval showed many Communists had been expecting to materialize in America, but Corrns continued organizing along the lines pioneered by Saul Alinsky. The strategy was based on the community service organization as a kind of front group, like the ones the Communist Party developed during the 1930s and '40s. Corrns helped the Association of National Mexican-Americans, was involved with both the longshoremen and the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, a CIO-affiliated group that backed the striking of Sill of the Earth.

Khuchitch's revelations about Stalin made things difficult for the CP organizers during the 1950s, when the CIO split with the anti-Communist American Federation of Labor. But the following decade turned things around for Corrns, who kept the faith through hard times. He buried himself running the National American Political Association (MAPA), the successor to ANMA. In 1965, California Governor Edmund "Pat" Brown's father, appointed Corrns to the California Civil Rights Commission. Corrns's Stalinism was to provide public-relations problems for Cesar Chavez, with whom he clashed.

During the '60s, Corrns threw MAPA support to the Brown Boys, a Chicano militant style the Black Panthers, with its own "minister of information" and education, which had begun in Los Angeles as "Youth Citizens for Community Action." Corrns organized the National Chicano Montayum, to oppose U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

In 1968, Corrns gave a nationally televised address to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, urging the scaling of the
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"Texas Irving," a group that included Chihuahua militants. The following year, Coronado founded Hamarck Sensacion Nacional to work for the liberation of immigrants, a group that was eventually targeted and dissolved by anti-immigrant groups.

Though accused of violating state and federal laws, the group continued to operate in the state, eventually being dissolved in 1991.

Coronado worked with the Mexican government to negotiate the release of political prisoners and to establish human rights organizations in the state.

In 2000, Coronado was found guilty of kidnapping and murder in the state of Nuevo Leon and sentenced to life in prison.

In 2015, Coronado was granted a presidential pardon by President Enrique Peña Nieto, who noted his contributions to the struggle for human rights in Mexico.
A national "Jubilee 2000" campaign to cancel all Third World debt to the West, once thought to be dreamily naive, is now catching fire as an issue. Once backed primarily by anti-Western ideologues and Religious Left organizers, proponents now claim the Pope, Billy Graham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, President Clinton and a host of entertainers and celebrities as supporters. (In case you're curious, the latter category includes Stevie Wonder, Anthony Hopkins, David Bowie, Bono of U2, Bob Geldof, Quincy Jones, and Lollapalooza founder Perry Farrell.)

Although David Bowie and Stevie Wonder are probably unfamiliar with the theological background, the call for debt forgiveness is loosely based upon the Old Testament concept of "Jubilee" year. Every fifty years, the ancient Hebrews were supposed to cancel all debts. But most scholars doubt the Jubilee was ever actually observed in Israel. And the Christian church has never before insisted on the concept as an economic doctrine.

But Left-wing church groups, like the World Council of Churches, picked up "Jubilee" as a revisionist slogan conneting the redistribution of wealth. Still somewhat belatedly since the collapse in the 1980s of the "liberation movements" they supported around the world, the Religious Left has nationally picked up the anti-debt campaign to achieve old objectives by other means. Through "Jubilee 2000," they have advocated the complete cancellation of hundreds of billions of dollars in debts by Third World governments to Western governments and international lending organizations, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The implication is that Western leaders are the primary cause of Third World poverty, and that the latter can be alleviated by defunding the former.

"There is not one single thing about the world that would do more for poor people's lives than to cancel the debt," liberal religious activist Jim Wallis announced at a Jubilee demonstration outside the U.S. Treasury Department in June. He and other demonstrators formed a human chain around the building to symbolize the "debts of debt." They blame nearly all the Third World'sills. While only a few hundred showed up for Wallis's demonstration, 30,000 took part in a later demonstration in Cologne, Germany, and 50,000 petitions signed had an impact," enthused the Rev. Rodney Paige in September. He leads Church World Service, the international relief arm of the 35 U.S. denominations that belong to the National Council of Churches. Paige's group has sent pro-Jubilee postcards addressed to Clinton to it's network of church leaders.

Religious Left groups, like Church World Service, that tout Jubilee blame the West for leading to desperate Third World governments for political gain while ignoring how the money was often spent (i.e. on irrelevant arms and personal enrichment). And they argue that Third World governments are now compelled to pay more in interest on their loans than on health care, education, and anti-poverty programs. True enough, but Jubilee proponents have been unable to explain how unconditional debt cancellation will benefit anyone other than the elites of still other despotism regimes. And they ignore indigenous causes of poverty that cannot be fixed on the West: Third World states and economic mismanagement that stifle markets and inhibit economic growth.

The Jubilee 2000 Coalition, based in Washington, wants all Third World debts cancelled by next year. It portrays these debts as not only unfair but illegitimate. In its mythology, Western lending organizations gave the money to anti-democratic governments to create markets for Western goods and bolster pro-Western tyrants. Poverty and starving children were the inevitable result. The only salvation for the suffering poor of the Third World is a complete, unconditional, and immediate debt cancellation.

According to Alain Podolefsky, a veteran of the Jubilee 2000, corrupt government officials in debtfiend Third World autocracies will be swept aside once Jubilee is implemented. "The first step in ending corruption is to turn off the tap that keeps corruption alive," he said. But Jubilee's proponents oddly oppose conditions on debt relief that mandate free markets and balanced budgets. A Jubilee 2000 pamphlet charges that such conditions would undermine the sovereignty of indebted states and perpetuate extreme poverty or environmental degradation. Jubilee activists are especially afraid that the West will mandate "free-market reforms as a prerequisite for debt relief. Hence their code-words that warn against policies that would "deepen poverty or environmental degradation."

The campaign ignores the fact that much of the Third World has been liberated from the leftist dictators whom the international left revered as heroes of Western banks. Their successors regimes too often function only specifically as democracies as they still seek to enrich ruling families or tribes to the detriment of most other
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Cancelling Third World Debt
by Mark Toole

locked arms in London. An international petition campaign is in the midst of gathering nearly twenty million signatures.

Surprisingly, these demonstrations and other lobbying efforts are having an effect. A recent World Bank/IMF meeting in Washington agreed to $27 billion in debt relief. And President Clinton has advanced $1 billion in unilateral debt relief from the U.S. with the possibility of complete cancellation of $7 billion in debt to the U.S. by the world's poorest countries. But both Clinton and the banks have placed conditions on their offer: reduced corruption and more programs that directly benefit the poor.

It is not quite the sweeping cancellation that Jubilee 2000 seeks. But Jubilee activists see the offers as signals that their campaign is growing in popularity. "This is great news to us, and shows that our Jubilee 2000 postcards, pins and
discussions. And Jubilee proponents ignore too the debt forgiveness granted to Latin American governments during the 1990s. Within a few years of receiving these monies, many of these governments had already reacquired their full load of debt with no evidence of having learned anything from the forgiveness except that they now had a good enough credit rating to borrow some more.

Furthermore, Jubilee advocates paint the Third World as homogenous, when in fact each country has a unique debt and economic circumstance. Jubilee's supporters focus on freeing Third World governments from debt so those regimes can spend on the poor, without wasting the guarantees that this will happen, especially given the fact that they minimize—indeed, scorn—the importance of private enterprise in creating wealth and eradicating poverty.

And Jubilee's proponents grant Western debt forgiveness and additional aid as atonement for Western colonialism and exploitation of the Third World. As one characteristic statement from a liberal Anglican bishop in South Africa described the situation: "The old colonial powers no longer send gunboats and troops.... They send the IMF instead." A Methodist bishop from Mozambique made a similar point as he urged African and Latin American religious leaders to "link arms and fight together."

He ignored the fact that his government's Marxist regime was only brought to heel and forced to democratize because Western creditor nations had the financial leverage to insist on reforms. "We have been made poor, and we have been kept poor," the bishop instead complained, as he faulted Western banks for this country's overwhelming poverty.

At a World Council of Churches press conference in June, a Paris-based scientist likened indebtedness to a new form of
slavery exercised by rich Western countries to keep the Third World "under the thumb of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund." Independence was far more efficient than outright extermination, she alleged indignantly, as wealthy nations used it to keep commodity prices low and to enrich transnational corporations at the expense of the poor.

This kind of Marxist rhetoric is hardly encouraging for the proponents of genuine reform in the Third World. Governments that see Jubilee debt cancellation as their only hope for survival are not likely to foster more thoughtful economic policies that restrict state spending and encourage private investment.

In January 1999, the Jubilee 2000 movement convened a meeting in Honduras for international religious leaders to foster resettlements against Western banks and strategize for Jubilee. "We've come a long way," Jubilee leader Petterfor boasted. "We're talking about all over the world, through writing, letter-writing, media work, and through education."

More than 100 prominent clerics and activists participated in Pettitfor's gathering. "The Jubilee vision stands in stark contrast to today's international financial system, which is governed not by law, but instead by lawlessness," intoned one African bishop. He called foreign debt a "structural sin."

Not all participants cooperated: mounting leftist protests. A Nicaraguan Protestant leader warned against an unconditional debt cancellation. "We want to avoid channeling the debt to government bureaucrats and to the rich families of Nicaragua, who would invest it in big industrial projects that would only benefit themselves," he realistically observed.

At its meeting last year in Britain, the worldwide communion of Anglican bishops endorsed Third World debt forgiveness but likewise demanded accountability by Third World governments. Specifically they insisted that debt relief be tied to the implementation of loan contracts by legislative bodies, discipline corrupt government officials, and ensure that the benefits of debt relief are allocated for the poor.

"Total cancellation of Third World debt is not the solution," said Anglican Bishop Benjamin Kwashi of Nigeria. He cited the failed precedent of debt forgiveness for Latin America. "But selective debt reduction, or the cancelling or postponing of interest payments, will help the oppressed and promote the witness of the church."

Jubilee 2000 wants to claim Pope John Paul II and Billy Graham as unreserved supporters. But both have also called for mutual accountability in a gradual approach to debt relief. The Pope has been especially clear in steering the church's compassion for the poor without claiming to endorse any specific economic solution to global debt.

Even more explicitly, a former agricultural missionary to Rwanda recently has written—surprisingly—in the left-of-center Christian Century that unconditional debt relief proposed by Western guilt is not the answer.

"We in the West can not 'fix' the problems of the poor countries," Robert Snyder insisted. "The people themselves must rise up and say no to their corrupt power elites... Until this is done, debt relief will provide only a temporary respite, a time when leaders can rest more peacefully in their expensive villas. It will only camouflage the slow, under-the-surface boil in countries ruled by corrupt dictators and their minions."

But for the Religious Left component, Jubilee is a matter of faith, not political reality or even economics. A key partner of the Jubilee effort is the Religious Working Group on the World Bank and IMF; a coalition of mainline Protestant and Catholic leaders. Most recently, in October, this group, led by Marie Dennis of the Maryknoll Washington Office, performed acts of civil disobedience in the U.S. Capitol rotunda. Sister Dennis and her colleagues were arrested by Capitol Police.

They are better known for their annual "Economic Way of the Cross," which the Religious Working Group performs on Good Friday every year. It is almost a blasphemous spoof of the crucifixion, that many Christians do of Christ's weary march to Calvary with the cross on His back, each station, on the traditional march, marking a different spot in Jerusalem where Jesus stopped or fainted, to be scourged or stripped. In the "Economic Way of the Cross," religious leaders carry crosses through the streets of Washington, D.C. Each "station" is a different headquarters of U.S. or Western economic hegemony: the Capitol, the Departments of Defense, Labor, Treasury, and Commerce, the White House, the Inter-American Development Bank, Shell Oil, the Federal Reserve, the IMF, and the World Bank. The final station, rather than marking Christ's resurrection, instead celebrates the hoped for advent of Jubilee.

The original Jubilee in the Bible, proclaimed as a Day of Atonement, involved not just debt cancellation but also personal repentance. Resolution of the global debt "crisis" requires repentance not just by Western banks and governments, but also by Third World governments that have failed to allow freedom and prosperity for their peoples. Repentance might also be in order for religious leaders who have conspired in the penalization of economic utopia with the Kingdom of God.

Mark Tooley works with the Institute for Religion and Democracy, in Washington, D.C.
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More Adventures in Pamplona

Running the Bull
by Bruce Gatensby

Nitmor In vetium semper, cupmusque negata
—Ovid, Amores III

Freedom of choice is what you've got; Freedom from choice is what you want.
—Devo, “New Traditionalists”

While many of my friends and acquaintances were undergoing sensitivity training, attending diversity awareness seminars, performing selfless acts of mandatory volunteerism and suffering other forms of counseling-induced madness masquerading as political correctness, I’ve been going through my own personal version of what Nietzsche called Die Umwertung aller Werte—the transvaluation of all values.

One of my friends, a fellow student named Burt, was an expert on the history of the bull run in Pamplona. He said that the run had been going on for over 400 years and that the bulls were used to lead the people into the city after the Reconquista. Burt also told me that the bulls were sacred to the gods and that running with them was a way of connecting with the past.

I decided to go with Burt and see what it was all about. We arrived in Pamplona early in the morning and headed straight for the bullring. The sun was just starting to come up and the city was still sleeping. We sat on the steps of the bullring and watched the bulls being released into the streets.

The bulls were magnificent creatures, with their thick, powerful bodies and massive antlers. They galloped through the streets, their hooves pounding the pavement, and the people were screaming and cheering them on. It was an incredible sight.

After the bulls had finished their run, we walked through the city and saw all sorts of interesting things. There were food stalls everywhere, selling all sorts of delicious foods. We tried some of the local specialties, like pimientos de Padron and tortilla Española.

We also visited the Museum of Modern Art, which had a great collection of contemporary Spanish art. We saw some really amazing paintings by artists like Picasso and Dalí.

All in all, it was a wonderful experience. I hope to go back to Pamplona someday and see more of the city and get to know it even better.

Bruce Gatensby
I hadn't eaten in several hours, and I was famished. A man in a black shirt approached me and offered me a hot dog. I declined, but then he offered me a sandwich, which I accepted. As we walked through the city, we passed by several people sleeping on the streets. It was a cold night, and they didn't seem to have anywhere to go.

We walked through the park, where I saw several groups of people gathered around bonfires, roasting marshmallows and talking. I joined one of the groups and listened to their conversation. They were mostly students, and they were discussing their future plans and possibilities.

As we walked, I noticed a group of children playing on a playground. They were having a great time, running around and laughing. It was good to see some happiness amidst the darkness.

Finally, we reached the entrance to the museum. It was still closed, so we went back to our hotel to wait for it to open. I couldn't wait to see all the exhibits and learn about the city's history.
PC Preschool, continued from page 1

The result? American children—alienated from their authentic cultural traditions—are psychologically immured. European American children feel prey to "mindless conformity" and learn to "hate" and "omit" the children who are different. They are "taught" through "intensive daily socialization" and "cultural training" practices that psychological problems of moral hypocracy, minoritized and disabled children fare even worse. They fail to "comprehend" the basic culture of any group and are "socialized" to "hate" and "omit" ("Marginalize") the children who are different and disabled. They are obsessed with "hate" and "omit" the children who are different and disabled.

It is up to Minnesota's child-care providers to save the day. "Building Cultural Competency"—taught in a six-hour workshop—aims to prepare them for this revolutionary work. Not surprisingly, the cur-riculum warns that its content is likely to make some providers "uncomfortable." Because participants may feel "uncomfortable," the curriculum suggests they "prepare themselves mentally and physically" before each session and be ready to "assist participants who may feel"

"Building Cultural Competency" is an education and training workshop that aims to prepare child-care providers for working with children from diverse cultural backgrounds. The workshop focuses on helping providers understand and adapt to the cultural needs of the children in their care. It covers topics such as 1) the importance of cultural awareness, 2) strategies for creating a culturally sensitive environment, and 3) ways to communicate effectively with children from different cultural backgrounds. The curriculum is designed to help providers become more effective in their work with children by providing them with the knowledge and skills needed to support the healthy development of all children.
The Party of Porn, continued from page 1

wring raps like this out of nerdy male losers. More to the point, she is an ardent conservative, a regular on Rivera and other talk programs, who was also mentioned in Crooks and Misdemeanors, that made the case for a Clinton impeachment before the sex scandals exploded. Her critiques have veered away from her proudest issues—impeachment and his dodgy dealings, such as his habit of lying in public. Nonetheless, our Salon correspondent has seen fit to call her a “controlling bitch” for spreading lurid tales about Clinton.

In fact, Ann Coulter has not spread these stories, and evidence that she is a bitch of any kind is unclear, or is missing. But what is clear is that this is a sorry new stage in an old Clinton pattern, where political foes have been savaged on private—sex—matters and women are trashed for their nature as women: attacked for their sex lives, real or imagined; attacked for their looks—lisp, hair, weight, or manners sometimes derided as being hookers or stalkers, called trash, tramps, bimbos, bitches, whores, and sluts.

Under a cover of “correctness” and “carrying,” Clinton has a long record of verbally battering women, going back before his 1992 campaign. It was his then-side Booby Wright who coined the term “bianco eruptrum,” and then the woe-to-let others pay private eyes more money to dig up the dirt about old Clinton girlfriends and threatening them with it. Destroying the speaker or someone who discredits the story is a smart move when stories are true. So Jennifer Flowers, telling the truth, was attacked from the start as a trash-good—bimbos who can’t be trusted, while Bill was worth nothing. Then comes Paula Jones, a “tabloid trash” who became “tamer than a lamb” in the well-known taunt of James Carville, “Drag $100 bill through a tinker camp, and there’s no telling what you’ll find.” His implication was taken up quickly, quickly. “Privately,” said the New Republic, “Washington liberals are already pronouncing her, in the words of one, a little kewa [kewa].”

Then, there was Kathleen Willey whose tail, wounded beauty did not lend itself easily to these tactics, though not for want of trying on the part of our leader. “You know what they say about her,” he glibly said. And loyal feminist Sheila Jackson Lee was next out to tell Brit Hume on Fox News Sunday that Mrs. Willey had caused her husband’s suicide by going to Bill Clinton’s fantasies groups, especially herself in front of our innocent president (and guided him into assaulting her) instead of staying home where he belonged.

The famous Gap dress saves Monica Lewinsky from the worst of this treatment, but somehow an old boyfriend just happened to come forward when her music was first mentioned, appearing in a nationally televised political conference with his aggrieved wife and his party, to tell the world that she had been a teenaged slave victimized by our assertive lady on his vanity. Maria Concon called her an “inestimable liar.” Charles Rangel came through with a similar statement: “That poor child has serious psychological problems.”

And yet, and yet, she played with a full deck in her other experience.

No one dared lower this kind of beam on Juanita Broaddrick, though when she came forward there was the sudden appearance of rumors that she’d had an affair with the man she then married. First Susan Riech and Jonathan Allen went on the air to suggest that she only thought Clinton had raped her.

“Lookout” was once the ultimate sin among political figures. You got into trouble for saying anything that seemed rank. And yet, and yet, he sometimes can answer, who are subject to these mismanagement.

The Clintons have stepped now to retro-exploitation: outing our long-hidened sexuals. In Clinton’s defense, our dead founder—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, dead war leaders—Dwight Eisenhower and Franklin Roosevelt—and murdered leader of the 1860s—Martin Luther King, Jr., and John Kennedy—have had their old issues exhumed and their characters darkened to drag them all down to Clintonian levels, making our history read like one long tabloid story. Lucy Mercer and Kay Symonds (who are not certified as gay by any DNA) are now on a level with the White House interns, grooped in the pantry.

“Hamilton died when he was Secretary of the Treasury, and he wasn’t impeached!” roared Zoe Lofgren (D-CA), an impassioned Clinton defender. (Hamilton did not lie about his affair with Mirra Reynolds, the woman he deflected with in 1792. He was Secretary of the Treasury when the affair occurred, and it became known to several congressmen. He was a private citizen when it became public knowledge five years later. Neither a private citizen nor a cabinet member can be impeached. But, never mind.) In time, this nothing because so extreme that it became an angry defense for FDR by Ruth Limbaugh, a libertarian conservative, and of Eiseller by Christopher Matthews, an FDR Democrat. Both were enraged at the seeing of heroes and leaders to save the bad name of Bill Clinton, whose only connection to many great men is that a few may or may have been adulterers. Other presidents have betrayed their wives, but none other has so fouled his country and his history.

Not one is too great, too good, to be used by this president. A dead founder has his old sins etched and exploited. A congressional critic has his private life rummaged. An old girlfriend is threatened and labeled a booker. And a cover-girl critic of President Clinton becomes the unwitting star of Saloon’s blue movie, as a way of combating her argument. This is the war that is going on, by steam ever rarer than usual. This is the marriage of “statercraft” and porn.

WOMEN aren’t the only ones who get caught in these pranks from on high. In these very beginning, strictly outlined of Clinton’s opponents have been a constant threat of public life. From the tabloid explosion of Gennifer Flowers to the Footer sex affairs of D Princeton, the present day, when the first fright and its kaggers on—the endless array of crooks, villains, and losers—have rekindled the Hollywood royalty as the new national resources of rumor and gossip, the newsworthy events of the Clinton administration have served more in the line of the Star and the National Enquirer than Foreign Affairs and the Washington Post. In fact, the Clinton administration and the tabloid press have often appeared to be the same, with mutual interests in other people’s private lives. In recent years, it has often seemed certain that posing a threat to the public career of Bill Clinton is the best way to have your own private lives exposed.

Quotations Clinton’s approach to love and veracity, and all sorts of other things tend to float to the surface: as old affair here, a love child there, a rumored abortion, a spat with a friend, a teenage affair—largely a prank—that Clinton’s Pentagone breaks its own rules to expose and to publicize.

Times after times, the pattern repeats itself. Dan Burton chairs a committee, and stories appear burst a son out of Wedlock. Henry Hyde taks a lead role in impeachment proceedings, and a decades-old affair is revealed. Helen Chenoweth, a congresswoman thought in political trouble, is ousted on her old affair. Much is made of the story of an affair that is a personal preference. Bob Livingston, the Republicans’ anointed to Be Speaker, is ousted because of Clintonian reveals, and dramatically and very publicly resigns.

It is not just the big, who sometimes can answer, who are subject to these mismanagement.

The Clintons have stepped now to retro-exploitation: outing our long-hidened sexual selves. In Clinton’s defense, our dead founder—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, dead war leaders—Dwight Eisenhower and Franklin Roosevelt—and murdered leader of the 1860s—Martin Luther King, Jr., and John Kennedy—have had their old issues exhumed and their characters darkened to drag them all down to Clintonian levels, making our history read like one long tabloid story. Lucy Mercer and Kay Symonds (who are not certified as gay by any DNA) are now on a level with the White House interns, grooped in the pantry.

“Hamilton died when he was Secretary of the Treasury, and he wasn’t impeached!” roared Zoe Lofgren (D-CA), an impassioned Clinton defender. (Hamilton did not lie about his affair with Mirra Reynolds, the woman he deflected with in 1792. He was Secretary of the Treasury when the affair occurred, and it became known to several congressmen. He was a private citizen when it became public knowledge five years later. Neither a private citizen nor a cabinet member can be impeached. But, never mind.) In time, this nothing because so extreme that it became an angry defense for FDR by Ruth Limbaugh, a libertarian conservative, and of Eiseller by Christopher Matthews, an FDR Democrat. Both were enraged at the seeing of heroes and leaders to save the bad name of Bill Clinton, whose only connection to many great men is that a few may or may have been adulterers. Other presidents have betrayed their wives, but none other has so fouled his country and his history.

Not one is too great, too good, to be used by this president. A dead founder has his old sins etched and exploited. A congressional critic has his private life rummaged. An old girlfriend is threatened and labeled a booker. And a cover-girl critic of President Clinton becomes the unwitting star of Saloon’s blue movie, as a way of combating her argument. This is the war that is going on, by steam ever rarer than usual. This is the marriage of “statercraft” and porn.

But even in these terms, the Salon piece is different; a new salutation of nastiness. Bad as they were, the exposures were real things, that actually happened. Other attacks were generic in nature. “You know what they say about him,” said Richard, etc. The Salon piece is not real, and it is far from generic. It is a succession of fantasies—watery, detailed, and extremely specific—made up from whole cloth in the mind of the author, and projected on to an absolute stranger, with no grounding whatever in fact. This is not a response to Clinton’s Richmond’s cousin in George, who was in jail, Jane Austen’s ruff upon social mores. It is not about her real private life. It is, rather, an attempt to rip apart a critic of Clinton, on the ground this made me some: not acceptable—from attacking criticism on the basis of what they had actually done, or might have done, or might have thought about doing, or attacking them now for what they never did, probably never even thought about doing, and might not have done if they had. This is the new ground of the imagined slander, where people are tarred with sins in the minds of their accusers, to which they have no connection whatever, a rather odd sort of political argument. But with Clinton and the media, as we have just seen, watching with wonder, bits of all kinds are allowed.

Actually, the Salon piece does have an odd sort of symmetry, stemming in equal parts from the tabloid exploits in Clinton’s attacks on his girlfriends and victim and from the White House attack on Kim Starr. When Starr was first named to investigate Clinton, updated versions of the Betty Wright bus patrois were sent out to delve into his background (and those of his aides and associates), hoping to find dirt on Bob Livingston. When no dirt was found, new ones were called for and were quickly designed and perfected; much like those tried in Saloon. Let us recall that the White House line throughout the scandal and trial was that Clinton was being “used” for his private behavior—his “affair,” such as it was, with Lewinsky—and not for perjury and obstruction of justice, which might tend to make
attitudes relevant. With the charge of hypocrisy out of the question—Starr had never done any- thing remotely like Clinton—a new line of attack was quickly developed: the Special Prosecutor and not Clinton quite enough. He was too square and not straight to be normal or human. He was not man enough to be judging the president. He was repressed, oppressive, and deeply perverted. He was jealous of the wide-ranging sex life of our leaders.

In an Affair of State, his elegantly dis- sension of the scandals and trial, Judge Richard A. Posner, a man as detached one cannot read in his book, appears to divide in default the "campaign of vilification" the White House inflamed on Starr. At the moment, the scandal had broken, Althea Mckve, an ex-White House House, "could not get out of control," "an innocent, titulously altered with guilty talk between two young women." McKve admitted, "I know nothing about the facts but I think Judge Starr is sick.

And James Carville (who is a way with words), who called Paul Jones a trap from a trailer park, called Starr a "sadistic whore" and "an abusive, privacy-invading, sex-obsessed, right-wing, constitutionally offensive, boring, obnoxious, and miserable slob of a man.

The problem with this, aside from its nastiness, is that it seems to be wholly untrue. Of course, seems no more obsessed, repressed, or possessed than Ann Coulter seems frigid, promiscuous, batshit, unbalanced, or boorish, all of which the Safe place has called her. As Posner writes, "Nothing is known about Starr's personal life that would support such a charge... There is no basis for the claim by Clinton's defenders... that the vigor with which Starr pursued the investigation... was a consequence of being a sex-crazed Puritan witch hunter, or a Puritan of any kind."

And does this remind you, in any particular, of the sexual attack on Salo? Both are sexualized attacks upon critics of Clinton, based on no knowledge or facts whatsoever, but projected upon them by Bill Clinton's friends. This is the Clintons' time-honored approach. When criticized, challenged, or questioned on any grounds whatsoever, drive into the sexual parts of your critics. If dirt emerges, cover it up, or attack it, and make sure that it reaches a very large audience. If nothing emerges, do not let this deter you. Go on and make something up. Or, let the lack of a record become your record; your critics are deeply repressed. Too repressed to be trusted in judging our leader. It is the win-win, or spin-solution, solution.

And his friends will find something deeply wrong with your past or your attitude. Count on it happening. It does, all the time.

And Salo is very much among the friends of Bill Clinton; at times, they could almost be twins. An on-line publication, Salo bowled in around the time the Lewinsky scandal broke. It quickly became associated with the defense of Bill Clinton and with the Clinton approach. It fell into line with the White House defense, which was that the investigations and the impeachment process were all about sex and利益 of privacy, and that Clinton's critics were obsessively or hypersensitive. Salo ran numerous personal attacks on Ken Starr, in the terms so depicted by Judge Posner. It was that Salo that became the story of Henry Hyde's declarative relationship, before he really was in public life. Again, it was the tone that made it distinctive.

Other publications—The Nation, for instance—defended Clinton in the immediate aftermath, not exactly in this tone of voice. This tone of voice does not appear in the National Review, the New Republic, the Weekly Standard, the American Spectator, or the many other magazines that write about politics. Nor does it appear in the glosses that write about culture and style.
Lost Our Language
by Sandra Stotsky

Review by Joseph Horn

If Frank Baum's fantasy about a trip to the Land of Oz, Dorothy meets a scarecrow whose hope is to acquire a brain. To satisfy this desire, the Wizard of Oz gives him a diploma that can do just that. Despite this fantasy-world version of educational achievement it is clear that self-esteem comes first and intelligent behavior follows like magic. In the real world it is rather the other way around, but reality has never constrained our real-life educators very much either.

And Sandra Stotsky's book, Losing Our Language, is very much about the fantasy world that is education in America today. Too many teachers and administrators seem to believe that education has the potential to equalize life-prospects and that individual differences in intelligence are irrelevant for learning. In society, nothing shows inequality better than the extreme gap between the haves and the have-nots. In education, the difference between the rich and the poor, and the variable results that can rival pre-school IQ as a predictor of school success. And a simplistic view of education would incorporate these prominent facts into a view and idea for education, one that has provisions for aptitude differentials.

Instead, our educators choose to give our children low-level course requirements, so the better students can get too far ahead of the others, and an emphasis on attitudes, values, and social development rather than new data. What is new and original in international competition. No one who is so much out in front of the others. And, in the school system, the less he knows compared to his international peers.

If at first you don't succeed, change the definition of success. Of course, our public schools don't acknowledge that they use such a formula, but Stotsky's engaging book reveals how and why our public schools are ruled by such2 conformist, academic. In a nutshell, we have come to view failure, in school as well as in life, as an event that occurs entirely by force outside the individual. At the limit, only external circumstances and the social milieu are held responsible. If Johnny can't read, write, or do arithmetic, his current educational dilemma informs us the program is located in the school curriculum, where inappropriate and unrealistic standards are applied to students who for reasons of their economic circumstances, double identity, or biological sex, are too hurriedly treated by being asked to work correctly, uniformly, accurately, and unemotionally, "ways of thinking." This is the total standardization of the content—Johnny's problem. In this inversion of cause and effect, and an effort to fit our children are measuring up, we're keeping many of them down.

How could individual criteria of school success have become the villain? Stotsky gives the reason as an interesting and convincing way. The old school of educational progression had its groundwork with an emphasis on value-positvism training rather than an intellectual education, but modern professional educators think it is not enough to teach academic standards. It is just as important to transform society by training students to purge their world of false values—values that are incompatible with progressivism. With this dilemma, morality children who live in schools that are more properly seen as victims in a society that oppresses them with culture and invariances portrays to them more acceptable years (perhaps only marginally more successfully by virtue of their gender or ethnic group membership). Given such immunity in the current system, we are told, the urgent task is to become more accommodating and form multi-cultural children (whether they already exist or not), hence the emphasis on building self-esteem. And this can't be accomplished unless we validate all languages, cultures, and honor courses in their own right, in a skills-based curriculum, in the elementary grades, the use of work sheets, letter grades rather than progress reports, and such practices as honor roll and awards assemblies are denounced as "Weho? Right-hand," "take the lead," "without a commitment to the value of the community," and members of some imaginary organization called "Rich Parents Against School Reform." Cohen is angry at times because they want the best for their children and he is thinking what the world for other people's children. They are selfish and they will not want to "sacifice their own children's work for what progressive educators think is best for other children.

Clearly, Cohen and his ilk don't like parental input. Where's their respect for the democracy that they preach in the classroom?

One of the ways this book is exceptional is in its respect for empirical evidence as the basis for educational research and as a guide for curricular change. Dr. Stotsky's first impulse is to see what the best research says about the effects of self-esteem on learning, about the positive benefits of quota for ethnic role models in textbooks, and, generally, about what happens following the introduction of any new method of instruction. She would probably use this research as a base for making changes in educational policy, and she would find, do no harm. It speaks volumes to note that her approach is not the norm in education. Rather, the preferred mode is "instructing you!" about what should be done in schools is ideology.

Stotsky's assessment of the costs to society of putting ideology before research can be most instructive. For example:

The effort to salvage self-esteem is a prime example of the misuse of the mode of reasoning of contemporary educational considerations. Why is it necessary to separate the building of self-worth from any possible relationship to academic achievement? Must it be because there is no evidence that improving self-esteem leads to higher academic achievement, although education professionals have not made this clear to classroom teachers and the public at large. Despite the lack of evidence, today's educational morons want to keep the building of self-esteem an educational priority because they cannot give the value the students have placed on building self-esteem in minority children through validation of their language and culture, and their "ways of thinking." In their eyes, an emphasis on low self-esteem as the cause of low academic achievement makes low-achieving students feel guilty for their low achievement because they cannot give the value they have placed on building self-esteem in minority children through validation of their language and culture, and their "ways of thinking." Age in their eyes, it is ideologically impossible for them to hold low-achieving students and their parents equally responsible for their low achievement, because it is their low self-esteem that has caused their low achievement. For today's moralists this is equivalent to "blaming the victim." Age in their eyes, it is ideologically impossible for them to hold low-achieving students and their parents equally responsible for their low achievement, because it is their low self-esteem that has caused their low achievement. For today's moralists this is equivalent to "blaming the victim.

Joseph Horn is vice president of the National Association of Scholars.
Tenor Makes Met Debut
by Judith Schumann Weizner

Last night, tenor Franco Gravelli made his Metropolitan Opera debut as Cavaradossi in Puccini’s Tosca. The thirty-four-year-old tenor received sixty-three curtain calls and gave seventeen encores, an unheard-of reception for a new singer.

While one critic complained the calls for encores to bear but that it seemed clear from the smiles on the faces of the audience that everyone had enjoyed the performance.

Frenzied interest in Gravelli’s debut was dramatically enhanced by the fact that he is currently singing a role which made the performance as Rodolfo in the Clarion Conservatory’s annual 1999 production of La Bohème.

Gravelli, as Rodolfo, announced that he would be an asset to the opera, should he be invited to sing in the future. The intense spotlight in which he was placed allowed the audience to see him and hear him as never before. The audience responded with enthusiastic applause and requests for encores.

While his voice was an asset on the street, however, it was a liability in school, and he was in constant trouble with his teachers, who insisted that he whisper in class. “If you think that is easy to do,” he says, “I went home everyday with a sore throat. Besides, everybody started calling me Gravelli. I began to hate school and I was thinking seriously about dropping out. But then I got lucky. The faculty moderator of the David White Cotton Club asked me if I would play the part of Rodolfo in their production of Il Trovatore. I wasn’t a member, but he said he was a natural for the part. That’s how I got started in the theater.”

Gravelli graduated, determined to major in theater and music in college. But once in college, he found neither his professor of theater arts nor his professor of radio voice production particularly encouraging. “I’m a theater arts professor you don’t do unless you have to,” he says. “I went home everyday, but my own and I told him he’d just have to accept that I’d do it.”

Another thing that bothered Gravelli was his inability to keep them off of movie dialogues, getting confused with the roles he was studying. And at the end of the year he reluctantly changed his major to the history of radio according to a statute in theater arts.

Once the new semester began, he found that he missed the excitement of the theatrical life and applied for reinstatement to the theater arts program, but he was rejected. Despondent, he began cutting classes, and spent time wandering around the campus trying to decide what to do with his life. “But then, just like Saul on the road to Damascus, I was struck by lightning,” he recalls. “I stumbled into a rehearsal for the student production of The Marriage of Figaro. I had heard of opera, but I had never heard of Mozart. It just latched on me. From that moment I knew exactly what direction my life had to take.”

In the yellow pages, he found a voice teacher and began to study operatic roles. After five years of lessons and coaching, he applied for admission to the opera department of the Clarion Conservatory of Music in New York City. When the conservatory rejected him, Gravelli was stunned and immediately filed a lawsuit against those who denied him the chance to study. The “Self- Landing” provision of the 1999 Federal Enacted Childhood Self-Confidence Affirmation Act, complying with his request, the admissions committee produced the audition committee’s notes on Gravelli’s audition, which cited his “apparent inability to modulate a scraping voice that puts one in mind of shutting someone.”

“Tiring,” the committee had no way of knowing whether I had an oral or some enigmatic inability to modulate my voice until I had been given the opportunity to study at Clarion,” Gravelli replies. “My lawyer was sharp. In fact, I told him if they didn’t honor my rights under the New York State Equal Opportunity Knocks Act of 1996 we’d sue.”

But before Gravelli could file the suit, the president of the conservatory wrote him, saying that a reinterpretation of his audition was in order. This time, he achieved a 95 percent favorable rating based on the audition committee’s reassessment of my vocal technique that should speak more in my open hall,” in exchange for which Gravelli promised to resign the initial round of the audition, Gravelli agreed not to sue for injury to his ego.

Once enrolled at Clarion, Gravelli found that preparing for a career in opera was not as easy as it had seemed. “For the first six years my coach was constant- ly after me to sing quietly and would not let me even think of taking an aim during an aim. This is a lifelong habit and I get up set when I can’t do it. How they expected me to sing under those conditions was beyond me.” It has come to Gravelli’s notice again when his lawyer reminded Clarion’s Opera Theater director that because his client’s litigiousness was compulsive, the school could be sued under the Americans with Disabilities Act if he were not allowed to satisfy his urge. The Opera Theater director instructed Gravelli’s vocal coach to help his student find a way to either fulfill his urge or have a substitute on the stage who could administer the music while the accompaniment could be rewritten to cover the sound of his urge%

But even more intractable problem was Gravelli’s propensity to overstep roles. “You know, after a while Mozart operas sound same or less alike,” he explains. “Puccini is much more Puccini—it’s hard to stick to one opera if you know a lot of the roles. They aren’t of an into each other. The school was giving me a hard time about that, and for a while I looked as if I wasn’t going to let it happen in my graduation performance of La Bohème. That would have been a real problem because I had to sing Rodolfo in graduate.”

By this time, Gravelli had become adept in problem-solving and in this help his lawyer, convinced the school to commission a musical role containing all of Gravelli’s Puccini roles, including Rodolfo. The commission took three years to arrive. Because of the nature of the work, the composition drew critics from all the major New York papers, and Gravelli received his first reviews, the most notable of which described his “tasty voice suggesting the white aspect of the male song.”

That review was a huge problem for me,” he recalls. “A description like that can land a man in real trouble. Citing the Free and Proper Speech Provision of the proposed amendment to the Free Amendment that is expected to become part of the Constitution later this year, Gravelli’s attorney advised the critic that he use the word “tasty” had created a situation in which his client’s ability to appear on stage with others had been seriously compromised and demanded that he retract the slur. The critic has so far refused to retract his remarks and the matter is scheduled to be heard in New York Supreme Court this fall.

Gravelli is also seeking compensation for damage to his future earning capacity should he ever decide to join another singer. Asked whether he might re-recast, now that his extremely successful debut has practically assured him of a major career, he remains emphatic. “Now way. If critics can use code words to impinge upon one’s reputation, actors like myself will become inhibited. We have to be free to sing or play or set however we want. It’s called freedom of expression.”
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