When GOP Senator Howard Baker announced his retirement in 1984, Gore ran for Baker's seat and handily won it. In the Senate, Gore continued to work on his reputation as one of the best and the brightest members of Congress. He made headlines by digging up proof that NASA had cut back on its quality monitoring of booster-rocket O-rings after the Challenger blew up in 1986. He went to Brazil to check out the destruction of rain forests. He supported the Reagan incursion into Grenada, thus styling himself as a centrist on national security. Democratic operative Ann Lewis gave him this back-handed compliment to the Washington Post, "What is most characteristic of Gore is that he takes a highly technical issue, masters it and promotes it with a view toward maximizing its potential for media attention."

Moving into the role of up-and-coming politician, Tipper also courted attention from the media after hearing some highly sexually-charged lyrics in her daughter's music collection. In 1985, she got together with other Washington wives to found a group called the Parents' Music Resource Center (PMRC), which launched a crusade for voluntary warning labels on sexually suggestive music. The crusade so rattled the music industry that it volunteered to put "Explicit Lyrics—Parental Advisory" labels on certain albums. At first, Tipper's group rejected the offer, not wanting the industry to control the labeling process. But after music moguls painted the group as overly censorious, the PMRC agreed to the deal.

Tipper also wrote a book, Raising PG Kids in an X-rated Society. She felt that she had found a cause that could cross ideological lines by appealing to moderates and conservatives concerned at the over-sexualization of the rock scene, and to liberals concerned about the misogyny of rock lyrics. What's more, the issue allowed her to reinforce her strong feminist leanings without offending the men or women who distrusted the National Organization for Women.

In September 1985, the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on the issue, which allowed Tipper and Al to work as a tag team. The Los Angeles Times' Sara Fritz later wrote, "To those who attended, the hearings will long be remembered as one of the most brazen efforts of the past thirty years to generate news coverage." While Al was attacking entertainment types for being "really irresponsible in promoting suicide and all the other things we have heard about here," Tipper testified that her group did not want to censor Hollywood or pass laws regulating Hollywood, but simply wanted voluntary labels. In his appearance, rock musician Frank Zappa called the PMRC a "cult" and questioned the appropriateness of Tipper testifying before a committee on which his husband served. Gore left his wife twisting in the wind as he fawned over Zappa, telling him, "I have been a fan of your music, believe it or not. I respect you as a true original and a tremendously talented musician."

Continued on page 7

Confusing the Swoosh with the Swastika

Sweating it

by Scott Rubush

Students at the University of North Carolina had a rude awakening when about 75 student protesters occupied an administrative building on the school's main quad and demanded stricter guidelines for the labor code governing the school's apparel contracts with Nike. The night before, signs had gone up and slogans had been scribbled in chalk on the campus's red brick sidewalks: "No More Sweatshops" and "This is the beginning of the end of global capital." A female activist stood in front of the building with a bullhorn and outlined the protesters' goals while sleepy students marched across the misty poplar-lined quad to their 8:00am classes.

"This movement is the voice of democracy," she cried. "It is the voice of moral conscience. And it is the voice of workers' rights."

It was also the voice of the cause du jour on campuses all around the country. As a time when race and gender are yesterday's news, the alleged use of foreign sweatshop labor by apparel companies who manufacture athletic uniforms and collegiate merchandise is definitely in. It is an issue that allows an attack on campus administration, a show of sympathy with American workers, and a solidarity with the anarchists opposing globalization.

Protesters' anger stems from the companies manufacturing collegiate apparel—Nike, Reebok, Adidas, and the like—who also dangle multi-million dollar licensing contracts to major universities. These companies provide cash and apparel to schools, and in return, the schools agree to allow a "Swoosh" or other corporate logo to appear on athletic uniforms. Apparel companies also gain the right to manufacture replica jerseys bearing the school name and logo. It may sound like a good deal, but left-wing students have found a fly in the ointment.  

Continued on page 11
ANIMAL RIGHTS

Pursuant to a recent item in Reducto ad Absurdum: It might not be such a bad idea to yield to the animal rights eliminism and grant chimpanzees full legal status, provided this is done solely on the grounds—pet by pet—by the lawyers themselves—that chimpanzees share over 98% of their DNA with humans. Follow the logic: Once granted full rights on this basis, animals will be in a position to argue that baboons, who share 98% of their DNA with chimps, are similarly entitled. Baboons, in their turn, will bring 3-seated sloths into the mix, who in their turn will establish the Australopithecus boehmi, then the 3-seated sloth, the Indian handcuff, ... until eventually the common cockroach will find himself eligible to vote. OK, so far not so bad—but hear me out. Cockroaches' numbers humans by a factor estimated to be somewhere between 50 and 2,000. The implication is, in a society where the democratic principle of equal suffrage is obvious. And, since it is a provable fact that lawyers, who share only 97% of their DNA with cockroaches, fail to meet the established 98% criterion, well, I think you can see for yourself that the long run benefits of such a policy would outweigh any interim upset to our established societal norms.

Mary Burks
Via Internet

SENIOR HILLARY

As a Democrat, I nonetheless enjoy reading heterodoxy and not only because it gives me a glimpse into the money they have in our country. Believe me, I am sure enough with some of your positions, such as your stance on the political correctness that infects college campuses. But, I've never quite been able to figure out the apathy of the Right's instead of the Clinton's, with which the recent article by Kathlyn Jean Lopez, "Senior Hillary," is such a distantly striking example. It seems odd that it has always been women who dislike Hillary the most, and while I can't explain the psychological roots of this phenomenon, I have seen and heard enough of the "insightful" writers that Leo is referring to that there is something deeply disturbing, disturbing, disturbing. As for Lopez herself, I know nothing of her other than her authorship of this article, but once again, her resentment makes me wonder. What is it that eats us so corrosively into the houses of these women? Can it be explained by something so simple as jealousy? Hell hath no fury, etc. and perhaps that is the real explanation after all. Fundamentally, however, what bothers me most about these happenings is their lack of the real seriousness that characterizes. I have nothing against a good political debate but what little Clinton hate engenders is not in political debate, it's good old-fashioned inhuman character assassination. We are seeing our children and schools and Social Security and the rights of communists and abortion and foreign policy and health care and the environment and no one, and the solutions to these issues are not simple but complex and engaging. By all means let us engage in spirited debate, but let us also focus on the arguments—other than the takers—of the solutions and not on the issues themselves. I feel that, in order to accomplish and distinction in the larger powers, we must focus on these issues and not on the takers themselves. I feel that, in order to accomplish and distinction in the larger powers, we must focus on these issues and not on the takers themselves.
REDOXIO AD ABSURDUM

GUN SAFETY: Helen Keller Elementary School in Green Bay, Wisconsin, recently had a violent shooting. An 8-year-old student was sent to the office for showing his key chain shaped like a gun. The Green Bay Public Schools Superintendent suspended the third grader to "emphasize the importance of safety." The child's mother said she plans to appeal the ruling and have it removed from her son's record. "It's a key chain, she said. "I think it's a little exaggerated. How far will this policy go? The key chain, bought in a restaurant vending machine, has a plastic toy gun that measures 3 3/8 inches across. The mother should have felt lucky to get off lightly. "We're being a pretty strong state in terms of replicas," the Superintendent said. "And the police could have been called."

BLAIR'S BRITAIN: The Pussycats club in Hove, East Sussex, recently complained that the strict no touching clause in its current license discriminates against the blind. Kenneth Moody, the club's owner, said that "the need for the disabled was brought to our attention by a blind woman who complained that she was denied entry because of our policy." The case was taken to court, but the club's policy was upheld. "The club takes the issue very seriously," said Mr. Moody. "We have been working with local authorities to ensure that our policies are clear and fair to all customers." The club now offers a special discount for blind customers and is planning to install a separate entrance for them.

LUNA BEACH: By Carl Moore

record first, ha, ha, ha." ("Kill 'Em While They're Young"); Apache, Apache Ain't Shit, 1993, Tommy Boy Music, Time Warner, USA.) "Niggas in the church say kill whitey all night long... the white man is the devil... the Crips and Bloods are soldiers. I'm recruiting with no disputes... driving by shooting on this white genetic mutant... let's go and kill some rednecks... Menace Chan ain't afraid... I got the JROTC; the whites think I'm crazy because I shoot a white boy. I said; I said; kill whitey all night long... a nigga dumping on your white ass; fuck this rap shit, nigga, I'm gonna blast... I

BLAIR'S PENNSYLVANIA: A strip club near Pittsburgh has something new for those who can't stop in for lap dances - driven through nudity. At the Climax Queen, motorists pull around a window at the back of the club, show proof they are 18 or older and pay $6 per minute. Then they pull up a few feet to a second window, where nude dancers make dance for the amount of time they paid for. A 25-year-old Climax stripper who would identify herself only by her stage name, Barbie, said most customers pay for two to three minutes, but one man paid $10 to $20 for 20 minutes. "That can be tough. After a while, you run out of things to do," said Mr. Lyon, spokesperson for the Free Speech Coalition. The Climax Queen, managed by Sable Township motorists, has attracted controversy for its nudity and the proximity of the dancers to passing motorists. Mr. Lyon explained that the club is in a "hot zone" area, where nudity is legal. "We have been working with local authorities to ensure that our policies are clear and fair to all customers.

GRAMMY RACISM: The Grammies are always fun: weird hair, weird clothes, weird people. But there are also some weird ideas celebrated at these awards ceremonies. Here are some of the "awards" who either won awards or were praised from the podium. (Joe Lieberman and Al Gore take note the next time you make a fundraising trip to Tinseltown and reassure your donors that you don't mean what you say about the deck of the entertainment world.) "Kill the white people; we gonna make them host; kill the white people; but buy ray beat a white boy to the backlighting ground." ("Kill Whitey"); Menace Chan, Da Hood, 1995, Rap-a-Lot Records, Nyo Tribe Records, subsidiary of what was called Thron EMI and now is called The EMI Group, United Kingdom.) "Devils tear this brand new shit... I bleed then next time I see them... I pray on these devils... look what it has come to; you gonna run to us when we get to mobbing... fill me body up with lead; ya crackin' in my way; slitting, slit his throat; watch his body shake; watch his body shake; that's how we do it in the motherfucking [San Francisco] Bay... sitting on the dock of the day with my AK. ("Heat-Featuring Jet and Spice 1"); Paris, Unleashed, 1998, Unleashed Records, Whirling Records.) "These devils make me sick; I love to fill them full of holes; kill them all in the day time, broad motherfucking daylight; 12 o'clock, grab the Glock; why wait for night." ("Swatin' Bullets"); Brand Nubian, Everything is Everything, 1994, Elektra Entertainment, Warner Communications, Time Warner, USA.) "A fight, a fight, a nigger and a white, if the nigger don't win then all we jump in... smoking all [of] American white boys." ("A Fight"); Apache, Apache Ain't Shit, 1993, Tommy Boy Music, Time Warner, USA.) "I kill a devil right now... I say kill whitey all night long... I stab it me body up with lead; ya crackin' in my way; I would kill a cracker for nothing, just for the fuck of it... Menace Chan kill a cracker jack 'em even quicker... catch that devil slipping; blow his fucking brains out." ("Pick a Record Deal"); Menace Chan, Da Hood, 1995, Rap-a-Lot Records, Nyo Tribe Records, subsidiaries of Thron EMI, called The EMI Group since 1997, United Kingdom.) To all my Universal Soldier's stay at attention while I strategize an invasion; I'm about to fire. We're hunting Cossacks with semi-automatic shots heard around the world. My plot is to control the globe and feed the world hostages. So, I got a war plan. A big dealer (IX: Hitler... a lyrical specialist, underworld terrorist... keep the unity thick like mud... I pulling out guns [handguns], launching death attacks. ("What the Devil"); Killah Priest, Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars, 1997, Wu-Tang Records, Priority Records, The EMI Group, United Kingdom.) "Won't be satisfied until the devils... I see them all dead... my brother is sending me more guns from down South... pale face... it's all about brothers rising up, rising up, standing up our situation... you be fucking with my turf then you be fucking with my roof; now face your maker and take your last breath... it is half-past death... it's the Armageddon... go into the garage... find that old camouflage... cracker-shooting sight..." ("What the Devil"); Brand Nubian, Everything is Everything, 1994, Elektra Entertainment, Warner Communications, Time Warner, USA.) "But a Glock; devils get shot... when God give me word me hand like the buffalo through the neighborhood; watch me blast... they killing more crackas than Bonnie-Herzegovina, each and everyday... don't beat until you see the whites of his eyes, the whites of his skin... Louis Farrakhan... Bloods and Crips, and little old me, and we all getting ready for the mothership..." ("Elesey"); Ice Cube, Lethal Injection, 1993, Priority Records, Thron EMI, now called The EMI Group, United Kingdom.) We could go on. AADAP, which forwarded this information, did.

SHALLOW BREADTH: In late September, administrators at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee circulated an official announcement informing the faculty of a change in policy that would require all students to take an English course taught by an English professor, satisfies the University of Wisconsin Breadth of Knowledge requirement.

AL GORE, THE MOVIE: Not only did Al Gore look like a sad parody of Ronald Reagan in the first presidential debate (looks like a semiprivate, heavily rouged makeup, jerky head motions), but he revealed himself as a pathological liar once again. The New York Times, embarrassed by the fact that he got caught again, may call it "embellishments," but what Gore does to the truth is more violent. He lies. There was the claim that he was with FEMA in Texas when it was there; there was the other claim in an attempt to tug at our heartstrings, that some poor little girl was forced to stand in a Florida classroom because of overcrowding when in fact she stood because expensive new improvements were taking place. The Vice President seems to make himself up as he goes. The Bush campaign compared him to Zelig on the day after the debate. But Gore doesn't just slip more than insert himself into historical situations where he wasn't (at the floods in Texas, at the creation of the internet, etc.). The movie figure he does remember who isn't Woody Allen's or Woody Guthrie's Zelig but Tom Courtenay's Billy Liar, who sought relief from his prostate self by constructing extravagant and ridiculous fantasies about his heroic persona. We can well imagine such a fantasy: Al Gore with a hand on the Bible taking the oath of office with his pants on fire.
Counter on Christian Credulity

Missionaries' Position in China

by Mark Tooley

Earlier this year, leaders from the China Christian Council and its relief arm, the Amity Foundation, toured the U.S. to chat up their financial patrons. They were hosted by smiling officials of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the Episcopal Church, the United Methodist Church, and, of course, the left-leaning National Council of Churches (NCC). In New York, they visited the Riverside Church, which is America's most famously liberal congregation. They even paid their respects to Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. And later they sampled the food in Chinatown and even accepted tickets to "Phantom of the Opera."

The grand tour also included Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. Everywhere they went, they were beseeched, thanked, and thanked for their fine work on behalf of the Gospel in China, summoning up a haze of nostalgia for those romantic times before the Communist revolution. But, during the best and brightest among American missionaries, they heard their hearts and souls to China. The folks from Amity did too—in fact, they heard that the best missionary prospect for China was to become the Chinese people as the Chinese government. Their mission to Amity had two objectives: most obviously to raise money, and more subtly to dispel any concerns about maintenance of Christians by its communist government. This second message was just what their audience wanted to hear.

"There is no massive persecution of Christians in China today," said the Rev. John Bao. "A lot of what is being reported as persecution of Christians could better be termed religious persecution," because it is directed towards ethnic groups and activities. "By 'ethnic,' the Rev. Bao was not talking about the Falun Gong. He was referring to church groups not recognized by the Chinese government. These unrecognized churches almost certainly include the vast majority of Chinese Christians. "Alleged" persecution in China surely involves sanctions against non-believers, such as closure of churches who violate the country's regulations, Bao asserted his supportive audience. If the same things were happening in the U.S., he said, "the media would say it's a law and order issue.

Church officials who hosted this vaguely signed agreement with the China Christian Council and Amity Foundation officials pledged "consultation and dialogue" so as to avoid any future "misunderstandings" about persecution in China. Then they returned to China with a sense of mission accomplished.

The Amity Foundation is the relief organization in China through which most U.S. Protestant missions fund their doctors. This situation is almost completely unique in the world. U.S. church workers seamlessly cooperate with a wide range of local church groups in almost every other country. But in China, there is just one church partner: Amity. Why?

In the years following the 1950s and 1960s, the Chinese government used to eradicate religion in China. Having been unable to do so, the PRC decided that regulating—and promising—religious groups because of its interests in national security. Amity and its affiliated religious groups in China are the result of that decision.

With its $6.7 million annual budget, Amity seems capable of performing many admirable relief projects. But it also defends China's restrictive policies against religion, and it serves as a tool for Chinese government oversight of church activities. Although it is the official social service arm of China's legal Protestant church, Amity's religious intentions, as expressed through its publications, are usually vague.

(The Catholic Patriotic Association, which has no ties to the Vatican, performs a similar function for officially recognized churches.)

Founded in 1985 as an officially sanctioned arm of relief, teaching, and publishing activities for foreign churches, Amity's ties to the Chinese government are widely recognized by its foreign church supporters. Almost all of Amity's financial support comes from U.S. and other Western churches. In U.S. terms to Amity include the United Methodist Church (through the General Board of Global Ministries), the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Church of Christ, and the United Methodist Church, the National Council of Churches, the American Baptist Church, and the conservative Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

The Southern Baptist Convention once cooperated with Amity. But the Chinese government disavowed that cooperation because of Southern Baptist support for unofficial evangelical projects.

Support of Amity has brought it to public criticism of 23 million titles, to its language-teaching program, health care and other social services. Indeed, more than 10,000 foreign (including more than 100 from the Netherlands) and local students have worked in Chinese schools through Amity.

Some point out that Amity is a partner in the Chinese Christian Council, which was founded in 1989 as the Chinese government's official organization for Protostants and now, in the opinion of many, Chinese Christian leaders, that organization is in the forefront of a Chinese government's campaign to control religious activity in China. And Amity, they note, that Amity does not actually have any religious activities or religious purpose. "Our work is not religious, but to serve China's needs," explains one Amity official.

Some of its employees claim a Christian affiliation, but others do not.

Amity's chairman is also a Chinese government official. Bishop Ding Guangzong, who is vice-chairman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, is Amity's founder and chairman. And he, chairman of the Chinese Christian Council, is Amity's founder and chairman. And he, chairman of the läbies-Self Petition Movement Committee of the Protestant Church of China, another government-controlled church in China, is Amity's chairman.

Amity's general secretary is Were Yue, who is president of the Chinese Christian Council, as well as head of the Protestant Church of China.

Amity forbids its foreign volunteers from evangelizing, urging them to express their "love through service rather than proselytizing."

Although there are still some volunteers who do share their faith discreetly, The Chinese government is not required to this. It prefers to retain some control over these activities and channel the foreign tourists' efforts to religious activity in relief work, which it can help the ONG.

Chinese law forbids Amity activities not only from evangelizing, but also from imposing religious materials "whose content is harmful to the public interest." They may not form their own religious organizations, or participate in any unrecognized organizations, or publish any materials without official approval, and they may not appoint or ordain clergy.

The Southern Baptist Convention attempted to work through Amity while continuing to depopulate missions through unilateral channels. This "two-track" policy was a device allowing Southern Baptists to minister both to official churches in China and also to unofficial others. But it is more than just a way to avoid association with the Chinese government's control over the Southern Baptists in the Southern Baptist Convention, and also to avoid objections from members who are not affiliated with the Southern Baptists.

The Amity News Service, which is based in Hong Kong and is aimed at Western readers, is a faithful defender of Chinese government policy towards religion. It regularly publishes denunciations by official Chinese religious leaders of various religious persecutions.

"Western propaganda" against China is a major activity for Amity. For example, the Amity News Service brings articles to pass a statement by Bishop Ding Guangzong, then head of the China Christian Council, that condemned U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright for urging increased U.S. government attention to religious persecution around the world. Bishop Ding of Albright's concern to a "prospective day of rebellion, the 19th century and 20th century trends." He said it clearly, "I am not that any government intervention as 'Protector of Religion' is not in the name of religious liberty that can only justify what we have been doing ourselves and...not only is it our duty to stop religious persecution around the world. Bishop Ding of Albright's concern to a "prospective day of rebellion, the 19th century and 20th century trends."

Another article in the Amity News Service likened Chinese imprisonment of a apostate preacher to the 19th-century U.S. practice of "cruel and unusual punishment" and said it would be "saddening" to see such decisions occurring in unchurched societies. "Illegal activities in the name of religion should be restricted," the official warned. "This is the practice everywhere in the world, so why not in China? He also complained about reports of persecution against house churches, which he dismissed. Further, instead of sending fellow believers suffering for their faith, official Chinese church leaders encourage them and even deny they are Christian.

Amity News Service has carried a defense of Chinese policy towards the Falun Gong, stating in "peaceful" liberation by the Chinese Army, and defending the rights of the Chinese government to reject a new Pandut Lumpur. The Dalai Lama, it stated, was "out of India" and was "inaccurately representing the religious leaders of Tibet by trying to identify his own successor - Pandut Lumpur. The Dalai Lama should be "canonized," the article declared.

Amity News Service, which has 14 million readers, is a tool which vaguely signs agreements with the Chinese government and some independent observers estimate there are more than 70 million evangelical believers in China. In its public statements, Amity ignores the existence of house church Christians, except to deny their persecution or harassment by the Chinese government.

"It is an irony that U.S. organizations that like boss of their "national" churches also have no official relationships with China, i.e., no evangelism, limited Christian education, and sometimes no "theological" connection with other groups. It is partially due to the fact that the Chinese government allows the Amity Foundation to present a "Pentecostal village" view of religion in China to China and shield the Chinese government from blame for impending independent minor activity by U.S. churches, which represents another another and larger and the long history of U.S. church action as agents for communist regimes, which offer an unbridled hand and a smile.

Mark Tooley works with the Institute for Religion and Democracy in Washington, D.C.
The Lessons of Hiroshima Yet Again
Remembering the Bomb
by Jamie Glazov

This August 6 and 7, the world once again marked the anniversary—the 55th this time—of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The demonstrations were less well attended this year. The revisionist rage was muted from what it has been in the past, particularly five years ago on the 50th anniversary. Yet the professional anti-Americans around the world made it an occasion to engage in the usual venomous denunciation of the United States and its “genocide.” As usual, they accused America of having dropped the two atomic bombs for vague and sinister reasons (imperialism, a warning to the Soviets to behave, etc.) This is an argument that will never end, but, like Holocaust revisionism, must be confronted every time it rears its head.

It is true that the tons of thousands of Japanese citizens who suffered cruel and agonizing deaths in the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were victims of their own war machines. As difficult as it is to imagine their torment, it is also difficult to imagine the excruciating decision that President Truman and his aids had to make under the circumstances they faced, seeing that one of the atomic bombs was the only alternative left to them. The horrifying truth is that a major campaign against the Japanese home islands was still necessary to end the war in the Pacific if the atomic new technology was not employed. No amount of “revisionism” condoning the use of the bomb will ever change that historical fact.

By August 1945, the war with Japan still showed signs of continuing indefinitely. As American forces advanced toward the Japanese mainland, the Japanese refusal to surrender did not diminish but increased. In the summer of 1945, Japan had more than 2 million soldiers and 30 million citizens WHO were prepared to choose “death over dishonor.” This point had already been established by the kamikaze pilots and Japanese soldiers who fought at Okinawa and Iwo Jima. The painful reality was that the Japanese view of war was quite different from that of the American view: death in war was not something to be avoided, but to be sought. The suicide, for example, which possessed a radical concept of self-sacrifice, taught that suicide was glorious, while surrender was an unforgivable disgrace. It was at Iwo Jima that even Japanese civilians committed suicide by jumping off the cliffs on the northern tip of the island rather than surrender.

At the battle of Okinawa Island, thousands of Japanese had drawn themselves up in a line and killed themselves by hand-grenades, rather than surrender.

The Japanese leadership never disguised its resolution at the idea of surrender. It repeatedly made it clear that its intentions were to the last man, woman, and child. The Japanese bitter-end slogan called for “the honorable death of a hundred million”—the entire population. Allied intercepts of communications revealed that Japanese military leaders were obsessed with vindicating their emperor’s honor, and their own, in a bloody, to the death battle over the home islands. Thus, in a press conference in May 1945, while Japan simply had no realistic hope of victory, Prime Minister Suzuki stated that “if our hundred million people fight with the resolve to sacrifice their lives, I believe it is not at

too impossible to attain the great goal of preserving the essence of Japan.” Such defiance explains why at this very time the Japanese military was rapidly building up defensive forces on the southern island of Kyushu, where by wares and there were 16 divisions and 730,000 troops ready to sacrifice themselves in battle.

As late as June 1945, following the devastating bombing of Tokyo, the entire Japanese civilian leadership, who had felt born of eternal loyalty as our inspiration, we shall—thanks to the technologies of our terrain and the unity of

to end the war with the lest casualties on both sides.

Revisionists have ignored the political realities of the war. More than likely they have ignored the psychological realities as well. For nearly six years there was the attack on Pearl Harbor, America had watched its soldiers being killed by often rabidly Japanese troops. And now, every day that the Japanese refused to surrender, the death toll on both sides rose, and Allied POWs and civilian internees in Japanese concentration camps were being tortured and executed. Americans knew that if an invasion were carried through the 100,000 Allied prisoners of war would die. Tokyo had publicly ordered that the moment the homeland was invaded, the POWs were to be tortured, and executed on mass. At many POW camps, many prisoners had already been instructed to dig their own graves. (Fifty thousand had already been tortured, starved, and imprisoned.)

Any American President who had decided to invade Japan at that time, and undertaken such a bloody, expensive war instead of taking a chance on a weapons that would bring the war to an end, would have been guilty of criminal negligence. We would certainly have faced impeachment proceedings when the implications of his refusal became clear. Unleashing the atomic bomb was the lesser of two evils that faced the President.

Many critics of Truman still argue that the U.S. could have devised a way to “democratize” the awesome power of the bomb and make the Japanese surrender without large scale loss of life and property. It is said, for instance, that the Americans could have dropped the bomb in some built-up area, after giving notice to the inhabitants to evacuate. This scenario sounds very “moral,” but it was totally impossible. It was not clear that the bombs would actually work. A failure under those circumstances could have done significant if not fatal, damage to American military credibility.

There were only two bombs available at the time, and the actual bomb devices were new and scarcely tested. Americans could not ignore the psychological boost the Japanese leaders would be given if the bomb did not work.

To broadcast a “warning” was to risk the operation in other words. It would have been easy for the Japanese to interpret an incoming bomber on this demonstration as a signal that they should blow up too. But if they knew where and when it was expected, Truman and his officials agonized over the fact that the Japanese could end such an endeavor abruptly, after all American POWs into the “announced” target area.

It is also said that a “surgical strike” could have been carried out, in which the bomb dropped on some relatively uninhabited stretch of Japanese territory where the Japanese high command would witness first hand, and finally accept the futility of their struggle. The argument was that the Japanese were not going to make negotiations at the time that advanced an expectation at night over Tokyo Bay, which might have served as a satisfactory example of the destructive power now at the Americans’ disposal. Still another proposal that the bomb could be detonated not on Japan but in some remote corner of the world, and that this would have been enough to scare the Japanese into surrender.

All of these scenarios have an element of creativity, but in the context of the realities of that time, they are absurd. No known military target

in Los Angeles, Cleveland, Dallas, and Chicago. Some argued that the bomb could be detonated not on Japan but in some remote corner of the world, and that this would have been enough to scare the Japanese into surrender.

All of these scenarios have an element of creativity, but in the context of the realities of that time, they are absurd. No known military target

in Los Angeles, Cleveland, Dallas, and Chicago. Some argued that the bomb could be detonated not on Japan but in some remote corner of the world, and that this would have been enough to scare the Japanese into surrender.
had a wide enough compass to contain the total destructive capacity of the bomb—and to allow it to show what it was capable of doing. No one could suggest, or even be sure, of a way in which the bomb could be used in so convincing a manner that it would frighten a leadership that worshiped “death before dishonor.” Indeed, the very idea of “demonstrating” the bomb ran counter to its very purpose: to shock the Japanese out of their will to sacrifice their nation in a suicidal cause against invasion.

No one, nor even the scientists who made the atomic bombs were fully certain about the destructive potential of the bomb and its radioactive fallout. A test in a remote area, therefore, even if successful, could have proven little more than an academic exercise. If the demonstration had taken place on neutral soil and the Japanese could have dismissed it as a false, accomplished with a massive amount of ordinary TNT.

But, in May 1945, four distinguished physicists who served as advisors to the Interim Committee met in Los Alamos to consider the proposed “demonstration” proposals. They were Arthur H. Compton, Enrico Fermi, Ernest Lawrence and Robert Oppenheimer—one of them warmongers or sadists. After the meeting they concluded: “We can propose no technical demonstration likely to bring an end to the war; we see no acceptable alternative to direct military use.”

Truman gave the orders to drop the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. The bomb killed 80,000 immediately and an additional 60,000 by the end of the year from radiation and other injuries. The Japanese leadership still refused to surrender. On August 9, 1945, a bigger bomb was dropped on Nagasaki. The bomb killed 35,000 immediately and another 30,000 by the year’s end. Even after Nagasaki, many senior Japanese military and navy officers still argued for a massive confrontation with U.S. forces on the beaches of Japan, a strategy they called “The Decisive Battle.” The Japanese cabinet was still deadlocked and could not agree on the Allied terms of surrender when the Emperor intervened and gave his sanction to the acceptance of the Allied terms.

The bomb did involve the U.S. in a slaughter of the innocents. But it was a guilty war from the beginning, and this was hardly the first time the innocents had suffered. Even before Japan’s surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese warmongers had deliberately bombarded Shanghai, Chungking, and other Chinese cities, killing tens of thousands of civilians. The infamous Nanjing massacre, if not exceeded, the casualties of Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined. The forced prostitution of Korean “pillow women,” the Bataan death march, the terror of the Kowastu, and the Japanese concentration camps for the civilian population across occupied Asia all manifested the barbarity of the Japanese regime.

The Allies had added some of this ferocitylessness too. And while the death and destruction caused by the bomb was great, it was considerably less than that visited upon Tokyo in the firebombing raids of March 10, 1945, when more perished that would die at Hiroshima. More people died as a result of U.S. firebombing of Japan’s three major urban areas in April-June 1945 than in the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined. World War II was hell. Fifty million people perished in it, and about one half of one percent of this number—about 200,000 people—died as a result of nuclear explosions.

On this regrettable 55th anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the question remains why those who rededicate themselves to the United States for the heart-breaking decision to drop the bomb remain profoundly indifferent not only to the better, real-life alternatives that U.S. policymakers faced, but also to the suffering of others, and more numerous, victims of the Second World War. Indeed, how does one explain these critics’ exclusive focus on Japanese victims, while ignoring Japan’s brutal aggression during the war, an issue that factored into Truman’s decision?

That the Japanese bore the brunt of the first weapons of mass destruction, that tens of thousands of innocent and helpless Japanese civilians died during those tragic days of early August, 1945 is history. They deserve our memory, as well as our sorrow. But we must remember too, as these anniversaries continue to the future—each one of them yet another opportunity to show America—all the bodies, well over a million of them, Japanese and American, that did not lie buried in the redundant battlefields of war Japan’s mainland because those bombs were dropped.

Jamie Glazier is the author of 15 Tips on How to be a Good Liberal and a regular contributor to FrontPage (www.frontpagemagazine.com).
Gore, Continued from page 1

(How much of a fan was Gore? Years later, The Times of London would report that Gore had been asked by his valet to remove the clock and his watch from his room when he was staying at the Waldorf Astoria. Gore had saved them as souvenirs from his time in the hotel.)

In 1988, at the age of 39, not yet having completed his first term in the Senate, Al Gore announced that he would run for the presidency. Tipper may have been the only person who was truly surprised. When her husband told her of his decision, she was in a car on her way to a meeting, not quite sure what to make of all the hoopla, but she knew that she had won him, and that he was...
His own history included writing Earth in the Balance, an effort to work through his angst over politics, life and himself. "I began to doubt my own political judgment," he wrote about the old Al Gore, "so I began to ask politicians and policy makers what they thought I ought to talk about." The new Gore who began to take shape in the pages of his book, not only promised to be a committed environmentalist, but also said he would not stick his neck out by challenging new issues by polls again. Just as his father had been too good for Tennessee voters in 1970, Gore emerged in Earth in the Balance as better than they were because he beat him in 1988. He decided not to run for the White House in 1992 because, he said, because he wanted to spend more time with his family.

Gore's new interest in environmentalism merged with his old interest in psychology. As a student at Harvard, he had read American history's anti-communist psychology "a psychological malady--the case of national madness." In Earth in the Balance, he listed abuse of nature and overuse of natural resources to "sociopathic pain." As Vice President, continuing this psychological approach to life and politics, he gave friends and reporters copies of The Drama of the Gifted Child by Swiss psychoanalyst Alice Miller--a book that dwelled on the hardships of being an overachieving child--and routinely asked job applicants if they had read it.

Tippett, who's gotten a master's degree in psychology, had a shorter take on Gore's drama. Asked about her husband's relationship with his father in a 1987 interview, she quipped, "You know what daily life?"

Most politicians were wary of introspection, seeing it as a cauldron where ambition got lost. But Gore made the rather public soul searching he used to resolve his midlife crisis part of his political repertoire. When he began his campaign for president in 2000, critics ridiculed his too-obsessive attempt to play the role of "sensitive male." But they missed the extent to which his obsession with psychology seemed tied to his belief that the United States had a special mission--a mission almost to lead. He told a friend in San Francisco that God sometimes talked to him and that he had a "special relationship with Jesus Christ." As a Vice President campaigning for the presidency, he admitted that he frequently asked himself, "What would Jesus do?"

In its catalog to his father, he spoke of the former Vice President's "fear of establishing a Christian lineage." He went into the world with peace. He held fast to that which was good. He rendered his judgment of God. He strengthened the heart of God. He supported the weak. He helped the afflicted. He loved and served all people who came his way.

Gore had tried to please his father by running for the presidency, and he had failed. Gore had tried to be a good father himself, but his son landed in the hospital. As he was recovering, Gore began writing a poem about the wreckage of these tragedies, he wrote a book about a world in chaos, a world in need of rescue, a world in need of a savior. It was a role that his father had described as a hero's role, with the task of political defeat and personal tragedy, eagerly embraced.

Gore's decision to spend more time with his family in 1992 evaporated when Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton asked him to be his running mate. Gore was not the obvious choice for the Democratic Presidential nomination. Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis, whose Texas Senator Lloyd Bentsen because Bentsen brought geographical, as well as generational balance to the ticket. A fellow southerner, Gore was unlikely to attract new votes for Clinton--and he was younger than the already young Democratic nominee.

The balance he brought had to do with character and the reputation he had cultivated as a thinking man's politician. When Clinton was smooth, Gore was earnest. Clinton excelled in empathy, Gore embodied the intellect. Clinton was slick, Gore was reserved. Where Clinton was instinctive, Gore was profound. Bill Turque writes that Clinton picked Gore in part because "Gore reminded him, both intellectually and temperamentally, of his most important political partner, his wife." Gore also fit with Clinton in that he too had fashioned himself in the New Democrat mode, as evidenced in his vote in favor of U.S.

Quayle brought the GoreDisconnect into full public view. During one exchange, for instance, Gore exoriated the Bush administration for using tax dollars to subsidize the moving of U.S. fantasies to other countries: "When are you going to stop spending tax dollars to shut down American factories and move 'em to foreign countries and throw Americans out of work?"

Quayle replied, "You know well full the Caribbean Basin Initiative, you've supported that."

"No," Gore replied, adding later, "I voted against it."

To which Quayle responded, "You voted for it and your record--"

"No," Gore insisted.

It simply wasn't true. Senator Gore voted for the program on April 24, 1990.

"At another point, Quayle asserted, "At one time, and most of the time, in the House of Representatives, you had a pro-life position."

Gore replied, "That's simply not true." But it was true. Once again, Quayle had elicited the Gore Disconnect, although it was not the same clear until eight years later how right he was on this issue.

Pro-Life and Pro-Choice

In 1977, during his first term in the House of Representatives, Congressman Gore, who had learned from his father's defeat that he needed to appear in tune with Tennessee voters, supported a bill that would have denied federal funding for abortions even in cases of rape or incest unless the abortion was necessary to protect the life of the mother. In 1980 he voted in favor of a measure to prohibit health insurance payments for federal employees to cover abortions. In 1984, as he was running for the Senate, he voted in favor of the Siljander Amendment, which defined "unborn children from the moment of conception" as legal "persons" with civil rights protections. The National Right to Life Committee credited Representative Gore for voting pro-life 94 percent of the time.

The pro-life group that rated Gore for voting against abortion 50 percent of the time. According to the National Right to Life Committee, Gore made 27 anti-abortion votes while in the House, five pro-abortion votes and abstained once.

When Gore made it into the Senate and began thinking about a run for the White House, his vote began to change. In 1988, running to the right of Michael Dukakis for the Democratic nomination, Gore said he supported abortion rights, but opposed federal funding of abortion unless either the abortion was necessary to protect the life of the mother, or that the abortion was done in instances of rape or incest.

When Gore ran against Michael Dukakis for the Democratic nomination, he said he supported abortion rights, but opposed federal funding of abortion unless either the abortion was necessary to protect the life of the mother, or that the abortion was done in instances of rape or incest.

When Gore ran against Michael Dukakis for the Democratic nomination, he said he supported abortion rights, but opposed federal funding of abortion unless either the abortion was necessary to protect the life of the mother, or that the abortion was done in instances of rape or incest.

When Gore ran against Michael Dukakis for the Democratic nomination, he said he supported abortion rights, but opposed federal funding of abortion unless either the abortion was necessary to protect the life of the mother, or that the abortion was done in instances of rape or incest.

When Gore ran against Michael Dukakis for the Democratic nomination, he said he supported abortion rights, but opposed federal funding of abortion unless either the abortion was necessary to protect the life of the mother, or that the abortion was done in instances of rape or incest.
stuck to his story. In May of that year, the National Journal asked defendant campaign chairman Marla Romash, "Have any aspects of his stance on abortion changed over the course of his career?" She answered, "No, he has always supported a woman's right to choose." In an October interview with Sam Donaldson and Colle Roberts on ABC's "This Week," Gore falsely claimed that his support for the Sijabner amendment was "a procedural vote," adding, "And I've always supported Roe v. Wade," even though giving the fetus civil rights would have seriously undermined that Supreme Court decision.

In January 2000, when Bradley hit Gore for changing his position, Gore responded that he had "always supported a woman's right to choose." Even when the case finally began reporting on Gore's abortion record he still stonewalled, refusing to admit to a change.

I witnessed Gore's detailed explanation of his vote in an editorial board meeting at the San Francisco Chronicle in June 2000. Gore was masterful. He explained that he had always supported Roe, but felt it was unfair to characterize his position as solidly pro-choice because he had a vote that he normally opposed. The government should have no role in the procedures, and in privatizing the procedure or in subsidizing the procedure, the way I thought in the past. Gore said, "I changed that view when I came face to face with the practical realities that resulted for many of my constituents who could not exercise the legal right to choose if they did not have the resources with which to make the choice. And so quite some time ago, I came out in favor of public funding. That's still the minority position in the country, but I feel it's the right position. Gore also noted that in those days many in the pro-choice politicians opposed federal subsidies for abortions.

For those who didn't know better, it was not only a smooth performance, but a perfectly plausible explanation. It explained why Gore could claim that he had changed his position, even though newspapers reported that he had. Better yet, it allowed Gore to seem supremely thoughtful on an incredibly difficult topic.

The only problem is that if Gore had supported Roe before he was elected to the Senate in 1979, he never bothered to inform the public. When Douglas Johnson of the National Right to Life Committee heard this version, he responded, "Can he point to any statement he made in his Senate career where he explicitly opposed Roe v. Wade?" I haven't seen that. Not like the question didn't come up. When the 95ers asked about this, the best Gore said Chris Lebans could do was point to his boss's refusal to support any proposed constitutional amendments intended to gut Roe v. Wade. This in pages of documents, even Team Gore could not produce one pro-Roe statement made before Gore won his Senate seat.

Pro-lifeers, on the other hand, had copies of Gore letters to constituents that spoke of Gore's opposition to abortion and federal funding. There was a 1976 vote in the Nashville Board of Education where Gore said, "I don't believe a woman's freedom to live her own life, in all cases, outweighs the fetus's right to life." There was the Sijabner amendment.

Mary Shanor, president of the Tennessee Right to Life in the early 1980s, recalls meeting with Gore twice. She said that Gore told her he had been pro-abortion until the case of a notorious abortion doctor opened his eyes. Gore also told her that he was forced to reconsider his position when a national magazine showed a non-fiction focus on her case and his infant daughter kept pointing to it saying, "baby, baby." At first he tried to explain to her that the photograph was a focus. Then, he told Shanor that he finally said, "No, you're right, this is a significant issue."

GORISMS

We all know about George W. Bush's troubles with "subliminal." The mainstream press trumped this blunder in its news sections and has been slow pages for sanity Bushes. After punching them with [and] to make sure that the reader gets the picture, The Editors of Saturday Review feel that in the interest of equal time, readers ought to encounter the formidable intellect of Al Gore through Gornis, continuing not in the progressive pages of the Washington Post or the New York Times, but in the democratic medium of the internet. You Beaux, eat your heart out! 

"Democratic understand the importance of bonding between a mother and a child." 
-Vice President Al Gore

"Gore is essentially in the same orbit. ... Gore is somewhat the same distance from the Sun, which is very important. We have seen pictures where there are comets, we believe, and water. If there is water, that means there is oxygen, and oxygen, that means life can breathe." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 9/10/94

"The Holocaust was an obscene period in our nation's history. I mean in this century's history, but we all lived in this century. I didn't live in this century." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 3/2/95

"I believe we are at an irreversible point toward more freedom and democracy that that could change." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 3/2/95

"One word sums up probably the responsibility of any vice president, and that one word is 'prepared.'" 
-Vice President Al Gore, 12/95

"Youthful minds, you're in a great situation, you're in a great country. You're in a great time. You're in a great country, a great country." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 12/95

"I'm going to have the best educated American people in the world." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 12/95

"People that are really very weak can get into sensitive positions and have a tremendous impact or history." 
-Vice President Al Gore

"I stood by all the statements that I've made." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 9/10/94

"We have a firm commitment to NATO, we are a part of NATO. We have a firm commitment to Europe, we are a part of Europe." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 8/10/94

"Politics is pretty straightforward." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 10/94

"A lot of people turn out at an indication of fewer people going in the polls." 
-Vice President Al Gore

"When I have been asked who caused the riot and the killing in L.A., my answer has been direct & simple: Who is to blame for the riots? The victim is to blame. Who is to blame for the killings? The killers are to blame."

"Inequality is something we should talk about in terms of not having it." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 8/10/94

"We are ready for any unforeseen event that may or may not occur." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 8/10/94

"For NASA, space is still a high priority." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 8/10/94

"Quite frankly, teachers are the only profession that teach our children." 
-Vice President Al Gore, 8/10/94

"The American people would not want to know of any inadequates that Al Gore may or may not make." 
-Vice President Al Gore

"We're all capable of mistakes, but I do not care to enlighten your on the mistakes we may or may not have made." 
-Vice President Al Gore

"It isn't pollution that's harming the environment. It's the impurities in air and water that are doing it." 
-Vice President Al Gore

"It is time for the human race to enter the solar system." 
-Vice President Al Gore
President Clinton gave Gore more power than any past president had ever given to his second in command. As Dick Morris put it, Clinton made Gore his "junior president." Speaking to the environment, Gore targeted Russia, telecommunications, high tech and space to Gore. Just as Clinton had left the family business to his wife, he left the governance of business to Vice President Gore.

Gore's assigned areas of responsibility fit with his view of himself as a modern Renaissance man. He once spent a Fourth of July downloading pictures from Mars. As a Senator he had introduced The Critical Trends Assessment Act that would have created a $5 million per year Office of Critical Trends Analysis in the White House. Its purpose would have been to report "critical trends and alternative futures for the next 20 years" and to study economic, technological, political, environmental and demographic trends and their consequences. (Amid his grandiose schemes, Gore has been a well-known fan of futurist Alvin Toffler, and Toffler has reciprocated, once gushing that Gore's most important contribution to the administration "will be to make America up to the fact that the world is changing.

Gore spent much of his second term trying to woo Lighthouse Marin and impress them with his own scammers. Silicon Valley venture capitalist John Doerr told the Los Angeles Times, "When you walk into a meeting with Gore, you're not sure exactly what is going to be the future Java? And he knows it's not a cup of coffee." On the 2000 campaign trail, Gore would show off the rest of the group in the same way that he would be able to point to them in the future as proof that he had expressed doubts about the pro-life position. Their case was rather legalistic. Gore would want to stress that the belief of the true believer in the fervor present in his pro-choice rhetoric today.

In one stock letter, Gore wrote that abortion was "arguably the taking of a human life." A true opponent of abortion wouldn't use "arguably." In 2000, Gore set up the case with the purpose of his argument: that he was not sold on pro-life in the House. Shown the letter, he told reporters, "I didn't write that. I didn't." He added, "I used the word 'arguably.'"

You have to credit Gore for thinking ahead. All those years ago, for four terms while he was in the House, he let pro-life constituents believe he shared their views. He made sure that he never signed a letter that said he opposed legalized abortion itself. If you read his lettres eventuellement—and you ignored his vote on the '92 amendment and the more recent ones—some reporters have done—you could believe it was reasonable to characterize Gore's position as anti-choice having been limited to opposing federal funding.

Gore insisted to Dan Quayle in 1992— and has continued to insist since—that he was not engaged in his responsibilities as just another politician whose position “evolve” according to expediency. Yet his position on his positions on abortion show that he was nothing short of a true public figure, with the deepest level of perception of sexual relations, was not the only master of deceptive language in his administration. It turns out that Al Gore was 20 years ahead of his time.
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That's because in recent years, these companies have begun using American's increasingly astute labor codes and labor laws by manufacturing these shoes, boots, and uniforms abroad. In third-world countries like Indonesia and South Korea, factory labor commands a lower wage than in the US, so by contracting this overseas work to firms offshore, apparel companies save on their manufacturing costs. This raises the issue that the arrangement amounts to "exploitation" of workers in the third world. Accepting the generous licensing contracts "costs" a university the brand loyalty of its students and faculty. The schools receive more "manufactured in sweatshop conditions." That is, the students and faculty who own the university's apparel departments, like the bookstores and Snack Shops, are paid by the companies. These fees also help to support the university's academic programs. And most importantly, as Apple Inc. has learned, the university's students are consumers of its intellectual property. That is, the students are the owners of the "sweatshop" labor that produces their apparel. As The New York Times reported in May 2010, "a popular" worker in a Nike factory in Indonesia "made $20 a month," which is the average minimum wage in the country. The article also notes the low turnover rates in these factories—a rate that is below 20 percent per year. Independent auditors from the labor rights group Workers Rights Consortium, among other groups, have documented the low turnover rates in these factories. The students may offer American students, but they remain popular among other people who plan to major in business.
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The Mainstream Press Goes Alternative
by Mark Gauvreau Judge

A couple months ago, there was an interesting column written by Father Richard John Neuhaus, a conservative priest and editor of First Things magazine, about the long march the American Left has taken through the institution of journalism. It was written on the occasion of the paleo-lip Village Voice going up for sale. No one seemed to care who bought the old hippie paper, a fact that Neuhaus found unremarkable. Why, he said, in a nutshell, is that with the "mainstream" media—the New York Times, Washington Post, etc.—listing farther and farther left, papers like the Voice have become irrelevant.

That is right, of course. Or, issues like homosexuality—witness the Times' recent correction admitting that virtually everything in a story about a company that fired a woman because she was a lesbian, transvestite, etc. was wrong—abortion, feminism, the police, even hip dancing—who can forget the Times' editorial defending stripping as sexual harassment by the Times has become the height of standards. It's clearly matched by the Washington Post, although politically the Post is more steeped in a wishy-washy Colby Way tradition exemplified by the paper's middle of the road columnists, Molly Ivins and Charles Krauthammer. Columnist of course, of course, the Times, covers hip hop, punk rock, gay whatever and everything else that was once the province of the Voice and other "alternative" papers. So where is the conversion of the mainstream press leave the "alternative" press, which is deepening its own hip? Mixed in a kind of feminism, if a very unpleasant recent event that happened to me is any indication.

One of the most respected alternative weeklies in Seattle is The Stranger. What you'd expect from a free weekly, Seattle weekly, with coverage of everything gay, rock and roll and hip. I was astonished to discover that when the Stranger decided to run an article I had done on Ace Powers, the rock critic for the New York Times, Powers is the author of the book Weird Like Us: My Bohemian America, a song, very tiresome and very nasty letter to on his right-wing, armament and forward-looking are the kind of people who listen to punk rock music, refuse to "sell-out"—whatever that means in the year 2000—and who, well, read the Stranger. I called Powers to make, recalling that I had once been like her but had mercifully grown out of it. I also noted that while her "radicalism" had led her to the New York Times and a contract with Simon and Schuster, my conservatism had barred me from those same bohemian enclaves. Indeed, I'm writing a book about a topic that could have earned me a decent advance and maybe a grant or two had I simply not insisted on pointing out that black communities in pre-60s America were pretty progressive, not only against racism but moral renunciation.

As I would later learn, the fact that the piece on Powers ran in the Stranger was a blunder. The piece was written at the last minute for the New York Times, a weekly in Manhattan. I'm known for my eclectic mix of writers and desire to run anything as long as it's well-written and interesting. The New York Times had run several of my essays—many are part of my book It Ain't Gonna Swing: The Birth of Cool-Ups—Culture—and the author who ran the piece on Powers knew that I was coming across George Schuyler, America's first black conservative. In going back through Schuyler's writings in the 1930s, 40s and 50s, I ran across a passage that started at his usual, trenchant, pan-African, and in a page old style he was able to use to express himself. One of my favorite passages is a piece from 1938 where Schuyler—writing in the Nation—writes about the nation of negroes, that they were the backbone of a new and distinct Africanism, that Africanism and the black American was a different from the rest of America. This was a book written by Schuyler.
stop short when he's faced with the possibility of running a conservative writer. As a rea... on the virtues of the Constitution and Planned Parenthood vs. Casey? Yeah, right. They did give me a full page, but that's the city's oldest black theater. Unsurprisingly, when I mention that the theater had gone downtown during the moral and cultural collapse of the 1960s, my language was changed to read "the social upheaval of the 1960s."

This is the kind of thing you'd expect from the Village Voice, whose style is known throughout the upper floors of the mainstream press. We now get stuff like this from the New York Post. To have "Postscript" column for the Washington Post, Liz Mundy, who started it as an editor at the City Paper, offered a piece that is so bizarre, hysterical, and cumbersome, that one has to wonder about Mundy's mental health. The column was about Rudy Giuliani's hypocrisy. A year ago Giuliani went before Congress and explained the concept behind the "broken windows" theory of crime prevention—a theory that, when put into practice in New York, has been responsible, or so the Mayor claims, for that city's staggering drop in crime. As Mundy notes, the broken windows theory holds that by preventing smaller crimes—subway farecheats, panhandling, public drunkenness—an atmosphere of chaos never takes hold and larger crimes are prevented. A crime rate this is the lowest in forty years implies that the approach is working.

Mundy explains all this—except for the crime stats, of course, which might hurt her argument—then comes up with what she no doubt thinks is a very clever idea. She accuses Rudy of contributing to sexual chaos through the collapse of his marriage. Mundy then takes a shot for the upper stratosphere: "Now, I know what you're thinking. You're thinking that we can't nurse just because Giuliani describes his new nurse friend, Gail Naftalin, as 'a very good friend.' That he committed adultery. But the thing about aggressive policing is that you don't have to be sure. You can just act on the rumor. Look at Patrick Dornermond, the security guard killed during a marijuana sweep. Look at Amado Ilario.

Mundy then leaves orbit and heads for Pluto: "Now, I know what you're thinking. You're thinking: The man had been diagnosed with prostate cancer, he looks awful. His father died of it, can we let thisiddlelet stuff slide? But the other things about aggressive policing is that you can't feel sorry for people. Harmless people might be drug addicts, therapists might be mentally ill, but that doesn't make them any less threatening to public order."

Then passes Pluto and heads for interstellar space: "And so it is, Giuliani himself who proves the validity of his central tenet, showing that when you focus around with a woman not your wife, and you are not put in handcuffs, or thrown in jail overnight, then pretty soon you start to feel invincible, to the point where you are marching with a woman not your wife in a St. Patrick's Day parade, and letting yourself be photographed with a man, I can't imagine anything more disgusting."

Mundy then concludes that it was based on that "incremental action" that Rudy left the race: "Small things matter! If the people who express this view most vehemently apply it to themselves (did anybody mention Newt Gingrich?), American politics would be as clean and transparent as the new, Giuliani Times Square.

Did somebody mention a sedative? There are, of course, several easy ways to refute Mundy's argument. You could simply note that the blacks who swept for for for were in far more danger of being beaten, robbed, raped, and shot by cops under Giuliani's predecessor, the very liberal David Dinkins. You might add that Mundy, like too many "compassionate" liberals—and for far too many Washington Post editors—lives in a comfortable suburb with her husband and kids (her very precious and very annoying column is usually not a jeremiad but a paean to motherhood) and would have kissed Pat Buchanan on the lips before venturing to Times Square with her kids in the pre-Rudy Phase.

You could mention these things—and even add that Mundy writes like a low-spirited high school sophomore—but there is a much deeper questions about the irony of the repression of the enlightened elites that run America's nannies. A few years ago Richard John Neuhaus, who noted the absolute irrelevance of the Village Voice's profile, noted that "the culture war is not between the moral and the immoral parties. Rather, there are moralities in bitter conflict. One of the worldviews is "based on moral truth, aspiration, and forgiveness." The other Neuhaus calls "moralistic." It "detests ideological claims with unforgiving rigidity." Neuhaus then sums the difference up: "The nature war is in large part a conflict between morality and moralism. The former evidences a sense of humor, an awareness of the fragility of the human condition, a readiness to bear with one another in our imperfections, and the heart to aspire toward the excellence with which we are capable. The moralism of the politically correct, on the other hand, is humorless, relentless, demanding, deadly. It is a glancing familiarity of our time that such moralism claims a monopoly on the term 'compassion.'"

No doubt, the editors of the Stranger, the Washington Post and the New York Times consider themselves very compassionate people. Anyone who feels differently simply won't be heard. Indeed, it's no wonder the Village Voice's being sold was no great worry.

Mark Gussman, Judge is author of If It Aint Got That Swing: The Rebirth of Grown-up Culture (Spencer Publishing, August 2000).
Mr. Rogers' Military
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The Kinder, Gentler Military
by Stephanie Gutman
Scribner, 2000, 300 pp., $25.

O ur military may have met its Waterloo. It has all but surrendered—not to a superpower of greater prowess—but to history's oddest enemy: the confused ideology of radical feminism.

Not that this brand of feminism has prevailed by offering the more coherent argument (or much, in the way of logical argument at all). Making sense of its belief that women are strong enough to withstand the hardships of combat, but too fragile to endure the slightest off-color remark is no easy task. Ditto for its view that women are so similar to men as to be essentially interchangeable, yet so different that they must have special workplaces designed to be "female-friendly.

How a movement so steeped in contradictions managed to become such a formidable opponent has been a story waiting to be told. In The Kinder, Gentler Military, journalist Stephanie Gutman proves herself more than up to the task. Her highly readable prose vividly brings to life the triumphs and trials of women in the military. What is apparent is that the military's unprecedented effort to "gender integrate" its ranks.

Gutman is admirably blunt in her assessment of the military's brave face. She lambasts leaders who "embrace their soldiers to social planners in love with an unachievable (and in many cases undesirable) vision of a politically correct utopia." That perfect world is one in which "men and women will side by side, equally good at the same tasks, interchangable, and, of course, utterly unthreatened by sexual interest."

Such sentiments like those all but guarantee that Gutman will be vilified as an apologist for an institution that many see (quite wrongly) to be the epitome of sexism. But she is nothing of the sort. Her message is that females have no place in the military, she recognizes that women have served with distinction, and so should always be treated with the utmost respect.

What concerns has are two issues sorely in need of honest debate. The first is a familiar one: whether women should participate in direct combat. But the second will be new to most. It is whether attempts at "gender integration" have so backfired that the military is having trouble attracting and retaining personnel.

Military leaders generally acknowledge, albeit apologetically, their opposition to allowing women in direct combat. But on other aspects of gender integration, they rarely utter a discouraging word. There can be little argument with Gutman's interpretation for their silence. It is today's politically correct curriculum, expressing the slightest doubt about current policies is a "career killer."

Unfortunately, Gutman has little patience with those who traffic in nibility. She tells it like it is, revealing "gender neutrality" to be a classic example of doublespeak. Policies described as "gender-neutral" or "gender-blind" are, in fact, precisely the opposite. Our military is not indifferent to sex, but beholden to it.

Actually, the military's inability to treat the sexes equally is hardly surprising—not necessarily to its benefit. It is the precise of great success that is so troubling. Like the feminists whose wrath they fear, military leaders have greatly overestimated their ability to deal with Mother Nature.

Nowhere is this more obvious than in Gutman's first-person accounts of life in today's military force, at sea and in the boot camp, and later aboard a Navy ship. Here physical differences between the sexes play out in realities too compelling to ignore. Army experience, for instance, shows that if trained to the same standards long-expected of males, females suffer disproportionate rates of injury. Similarly, although training for the world's tank crews has been able to alter fundamental realities of human physiology, those who run the fastest, throw the farthest, and have the least difficulty with the heavy lifting remain overwhelmingly male.

The logic is simple: to deal with these realities is to train the sexes separately, as the Marines still do. But to the rest of the PC Pentagon, this approach is now unthinkable. Even the Army, which tried gender-integrated training years ago and abandoned it as a failure, has brought it back to feed off its feminist tormentors.

As a result, today's gender-integrated boot camp is a barely recognizable version of its former self. Physical demands have been dumbed-down to a point that males often find slow and unsatisfying. Competition is discouraged, lest anyone's self-esteem be damaged. And despite official denial of the contrary, double standards abound.

How female recruits feel about gender-integrated boot camp is not clear from Gutman's account. But she has to wonder how they benefit from being forced to train with males, who, as a group, clearly have better physical abilities. The possibility that their best interests are being sacrificed to satisfy the ideological whims of gender activists seems too real, as does the likelihood that males are also denied optimal training.

With less emphasis on physical conditioning, more time is spent on sensitivity sessions and, of course, the requisite harangues about sexual harassment. The rape-prevention curriculum, in particular, is Orwellian. According to one guidebook, such harassment need not be sexual at all. "A preconceived notion associated with gender" will suffice.

But if such notions are harassment, the brass itself has some explaining to do. Preconceived notions about gender define the New Age Navy. Its leaders see the female psyche as so fragile that it must be protected from war and death. It is to laugh at such a reality. For, if gender neutrality is a real condition, female suicides should be far more common than the actual one, which is near zero. No matter—sailors apparently cannot even tell about the raped youthful indiscretion of their nation's first commander-in-chief. The TRF invoked is one of the unmentionable list.

Accompanying the policing of language is an in loco parentis scrutiny of behavior so stifling that one sailor describes it as "Mommy's ship." It is so stringent that Gutman herself writes:

"The memory ship imagery, the image of the 'New Navy' as feminized, specifically, as a nurturing-to-the-point-of-infantilizing Mommy...who corrects your language, who takes away your books, who slaps you if you've got a bad attitude, who is a dirty joke, who worries overbearingly about dress and prescribes lots of fire-songs that come up again and again from disgruntled sailors."

Yet, for all the policies that assure females to be readily and readily offended by what it record tells a different story. Unbelievable as it may seem, many make and females in the military are clearly like each other. They prize. They live. They fall in love. They have comes of praise. And as a result, unplanned pregnancies are a uncommon—especially when the sexes are deployed together in isolated environments. (Asked about this phenomenon, the former defense secretary reportedly replied, "What else there to do in Iceland?")

Whether due to pregnancy, the reason bilities of motherhood, or other interests, the record also shows that females have higher attrition rates than males. While at sea, they are twice as likely to require release from duty. To put the record, the case, Gutman's view that the services show make "good use of the relatively small numbers women" attracted to military careers seems too ready realized. But politics has gone for a change. Recruiters are under intense pressure enlist almost any female, even if more promising males must be released as a result.

Ultimately, the picture that emerges of a military led by men courageous enough enough the beach, yet strangely incapable of saying no to feminist fantasies. And in Gutman view, the bill has been paid. She asks, "Has the battle put political correctness before mission as a major cause of manpower problems now plaguing the Navy, Army, Navy, and Air Force. In recent years, have experienced staggering recruitment, accession, attrition, or both.

The official spin attributes these problems to the booming economy and other causes beyond the military's control. But Gutman's doesn't buy. She is pointedly ecological, the same circumstances quite well. She believes resistance to feminist-style gender integration explains its success at maintaining its forces.

This is a compelling argument. It strengthened by her intuitive understanding of role's hardships, militarily or admissions—many—and how political correctness created this appeal. Reflecting on her experience aboard the naval ship, she captures the essence what she believes has gone wrong.

The fact is, the kind of guys who are capable and willing (under the right conditions) and even eager (under the right conditions) to pursue and demolish an enemy have some very hot stuff in their veins, and on a long cruise—especially one in a war zone, where one can be primed for action... people build up a lot of steam. In the old days, said F-14 pilot John Godshalk, who left the service at thirty-three, "we built up a lot of steam and went off a lot of steam. Now with all the valves blocked off, the only way to let off steam is to walk right out of the Navy."
stop short when faced with the possibility of raising a conservative writer. As recounted in the New York Post last year, I frequented the City Paper for a few weeks in 1998, until the art editor said I had tired of my "score-setting" with liberals and hipsters. I invite anyone to read the pieces I did for them—many were recorded reviews—and see if my score settling was any worse than the kind the City Paper and the Stranger die on a weekly basis. When a submission from a conservative comes over the transom, it either gets rejected or the most insidious kind of censorship takes place. I live in Washington and occasionally contribute to the Outlook page (the op-ed Sunday page), but the only staff they take is lightweight slice-of-life fluff. Anything political I come up with is sent back. A piece on DC's black underclass, comparing them to my Irish ancestors who escaped poverty through hard work and the Catholic Church? Sorry, too "historical." Anti-abortion argument detailing the absurdity of the Supreme Court and Planned Parenthood vs. Casey? Yeah, right. They just gave me a full page when a writer about the city's oldest historic black theater. Unsurprisingly, when I mention that the theater had gone downhill "during the moral and cultural collapse of the 1960s," my language was changed to read "the social upheaval of the 1960s."

This is the kind of thing you expect from the Village Voice, whose ethos is known entrenched in the upper floors of the mainstream press. We now get stuff like from last June in the Washington Post. In her "Postmodern" column for the Washington Post magazine, Lisa Mundy, who started as an editor at the City Paper, offered a piece that is as bizarre, nonexistent, and incoherent as you'd expect. One thing you have to wonder about Mundy's mental health. The column was about Rudy Giuliani's hypocrisy. A year ago Giuliani went before Congress and explained the concept behind the "broken windows" theory of crime prevention—a theory that, when put into practice in New York, has been responsible, or so the Mayor claims, for that city's staggering drop in crime. As Mundy notes, the broken windows theory holds that by preventing smaller crimes—subway turnstile jumppers, panhandling, public drunkenness—an atmosphere of ceaseless never takes hold and larger crimes are prevented. A crime rate that is the lowest in forty years implies that the approach is working.

Mundy explains all this—except for the crime stats, of course, which might hurt her argument—then comes up with what she did not think is a very clever idea. She accuses Rudy of contributing to social chaos through the collapse of his marriage. Mundy then takes a shot for the upper stratosphere: "Now, I know what you're thinking. You're thinking that we can't be sure, just because Giuliani describes his new nuptial companion, Judith Nathan, as "a very good friend," that he committed adultery. But the thing about aggressive policing is that you don't have to be sure. You can just strike the most probable. Look at Patrick Dorsett, the security guard killed during a marijuana sweep. Look at Anthony Diallo."

Mundy then leaves orbit and heads for Pluto. "Now, I know what you're thinking. You're thinking: The man had been diagnosed with prostate cancer, he looks awful. His father died of it, can't we let this infidelity stuff slide? But the other things about aggressive policing is that you can't feel sorry for people. Homeless people might be drug addicts, loiterers might be mentally ill, but that doesn't make them any less threatening to public order."

She then passes Pluto and heads for interstellar space: "And so it is Giuliani himself who proves the validity of his central thesis, showing that when you feel around with a woman not your wife, and you are not put in the stocks, or thrown in jail overnight, then pretty soon you start to feel invisible, to the point where you are marching with a woman not your wife in a St. Patrick's Day parade, and letting yourself be photographed with her, looking all goofy and happy."

Mundy then concludes that it was because of such "incidental actions" that Rudy left the race: "Small things matter! If the people who express this view most vehemently would apply it to themselves (did somebody mention Natale Kligeltch?), American politics would be as clean and unremarkable as the new, Civilianized Times Square."

Did somebody mention a sedative? There are, of course, several easy ways to refute Mundy's argument. You could simply note that the black man went for years in far more danger of being beaten, raped, shot by cops under Giuliani's predecessor, the very liberal David Dinkins. You might add that Mundy, like too many other "pro-choice" liberals—and far too many Washington Post editors—lives in a comfortable suburb with her husband and kids (her very precious and very annoying column is usually not a jenrudian but a guest to motherhood) and would have kissed Pat Buchanan on the lips before venturing to Times Square with her kids in the pre-Rudy 80s.

You could mention those things—and even add that Mundy writes like a love-spurned high school sophomore—but there is much deeper question about the irony of the repression of the enlightened elites that run America's newspapers. A few years ago Richard John Neuhaus, who noted the absolute irrelevance of the Village Voice sat, noted that "the culture war is not between the moral and the immoral parties. Rather, there are moralities in bitter conflict." One of the worldviews is "based on moral truth, aspiration, and forgiveness. The other Neuhaus calls "morality. It "presses ideological claims with unforgiving rigidity." Neuhaus then sums the difference up: "The culture war is in large part a conflict between morality and moralism. The former evidences a sense of humor, an awareness of the fragility of the human condition, a readiness to bear with one another in our imperfections, and the heart to aspire anew to the excellence with which we are capable. The moralism of the politicically correct, on the other hand, is humorless, relentless, demanding, deadly. It is a glaring anomaly of our time that such moralism claims a monopoly on the term 'compassion.'"

No doubt, the editors of the Stranger, the Washington Post and the New York Times consider themselves very compassionate people. Anyone who feels differently isn't likely to be well received. Indeed, it's no wonder the Village Voice is being sold was no great worry.

Mark Gussertau Judge is author of If It Aint' Got That Swing: The Birth of Grown-up Culture (Spree Publishing, August 1999).
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The Kinder, Gentler Military
CAN AMERICA’S GENDER-NEUTRAL FIGHTING FORCE STILL WIN WARS?

O ur military may have met its Waterloo. It has all but surrendered—not to a superpower of greater prowess—but to history’s oldest enemy: the confused ideology of radical feminism.

Not that this brand of feminism has been prevailed by offering the more coherent argument (or much in the way of logical argument at all). Making sense of its belief that women are strong enough to withstand the hardships of combat, but too fragile to endure the slightest off-color remark is no easy task. Ditto for its view that women are so much like men as to be essentially interchangeable, yet so different that they must have special workplaces designed to be “female-friendly.”

How a movement so steeped in contradictions managed to become such a formidable opponent has been a story waiting to be told. In The Kinder, Gentler Military, journalist Stephanie Gutman proves herself more than up to the task. Her highly readable prose vividly brings to life the triumph of ideology over evidence that hasprompted the military’s unprecedented effort to “genderize” its ranks.

It is admirably blunt in her assessment of a military brass gone bonkers. She lambastes leaders who “handed over their soldiers to social planners in love with an unworkable (and in many senses undesirable) vision of a politically correct stopgap.” That perfect world is one in which men and women “toll side by side, equally good at the same tasks, interchangeable, and, of course, utterly undistracted by sexual attraction.”

Sentiments like these all but guarantee that Gutman will be painted as an apologist for an institution that many assume (quite wrongly) to be the epitome of sexism. But she is nothing of the sort. Her message is hardy that females have no place in the military; she recognizes that women have served with distinction, and do not always will. What concerns her are the issues surely in need of honest debate. The first is a familiar one: whether women should participate in direct combat.

As so fragile that it must be protected from words and deeds that, if traumatic at all, pale in comparison to the realities of combat. Accordingly, they have sworn vows to women hear regularly without meaning (and actually use themselves). No matter—women apparently cannot even talk about the against the potential indifference of the nation’s first commander-in-chief. The fruit involved is on the unmentionable list. Accompanying the policing of language is an I can detect scrutiny of behavior so stifling that one sailor described his vessel as a “Mommy ship.” It is a sentiment that Gutman bears repeatedly.

The men ship imagery, the image of the “New Navy” as feminized, specifically as a continuum to the polls of feminizing Mommy, who corrects your language, who takes away your bonuses, who slaps you if you gawk at a woman or tell a dirty joke, who warns you about danger and prescribes tons of time-consuming safety procedures—comes up again and again from disgruntled sailors.

Yet, for all the policies that assume females to be readily offended by males, the record tells a different story. Unremarkable as it may seem, many males and females in the military actually like each other. They play, they flirt. They fall in love. They have moments of passion. And as a result, unplanned pregnancies are not uncommon—especially when the sexes are deployed together in isolated environments. (Asked about this phenomenon, one former defense secretary reportedly replied, “What else is there to do in Iceland?”)

Whether due to pregnancy, the responsibilities of motherhood, or lesser interests, the record also shows that females have higher attrition rates than males. While at sea, they are twice as likely to require release from duty. This being the case, Gutman’s view that the services should make “good use of the relatively small numbers of women” attracted to military careers seems eminently sensible. But policies have given leg to a discharge. Recruiters are under intense pressure to enlist as many as possible, even if more promising males must be refused as a result.

Ultimately, the picture that emerges is one of moral by men courageous enough to storm the beaches, yet strangely incapable of saying no to feminist fantasies. And in Gutman’s view, the bill has come due. She sees policies that posit political correctness before mission as a primary cause of manpower problems now plaguing the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In recent years, all have experienced lagging recruitment, excessive attrition, or both.

The official spin attributes these problems to the booming economy and other causes beyond the military’s control. But Gutman doesn’t buy it. The Marine Corps, she points out, has weathered the same circumstances quite well. She believes its resistance to feminist-style gender integration explains its success at maintaining its forces.

This is a compelling argument. It is strengthened by its intuitive understanding of why, despite its hardships, military life has long attracted many—a respect for political correctness having eroded this appeal. Reflecting on her experience aboard the naval ship, she captures the essence of what she believes has gone wrong:

The fact is, the kind of guys who are capable and willing (under the right conditions) and even eager (under the right conditions) to pursue and dismantle an enemy have some very hot stuff in their veins, and on a long cruise—especially one in a war zone, where one has to stay primed for action...people build up a lot of steam. In the old days, said F-14 pilot John Gladzinski, who left the service at thirty-three, “we built up a lot of steam and we let off a lot of steam. Now with all the valves blocked off, the only way to let off steam is to walk right out of the Navy.”
Naturally, how the military became such a willing vehicle for social experimentation is a question that begs to be answered. Gutman cites a variety of factors to explain the new military mindset: the dwindling numbers of elected officials with military experience; a pervasive, but erroneous belief that technology has rendered physical strength irrelevant to combat; and, of course, changing roles of women. Still she sees an obvious last straw: the 1991 Tailhook convention that rocked the Navy to its core.

Gutman revisits the infamous event. While hardly a whitewash, her version is not nearly as lurid as press accounts. Yet in a sense, it is far more chilling. She presents evidence that harrowing tactics were used to exaggerate the extent of misconduct at the convention. Moreover, she believes, was political: a perceived need by naval leaders to present themselves as change agents committed to creating a female-friendly Navy. She makes a strong case that careers, as well as an environment receptive to reason, were destroyed in the process.

Since then, thousands of combat support positions have been opened to women. Some have taken advantage of the new opportunities, but the response has hardly been overwhelming. There simply aren't very many women whose idea of a dream job is in the rapid-fire, high-pressure environment of combat. In fact, women in the ranks seem far less preoccupied with "gender-neutrality" than senior female officers and gender-neutral civilian advisors.

In her final chapter, Gutman lays out her own vision for restoring sanity to military policy. Again, she offers the common sense that the brass apparently lost in battle. Among her recommendations is single-sex basic training; the abolition of sex-based recruiting quotas; job-specific standards independent of sex; and a formal apology to those unfairly punished by unsubstantiated allegations at Tailhook. Her justification is clear: "Our freedom and prosperity," she writes, "depend on having the best people for the job. There are enough women in the [military] pipeline that sometimes a woman will be that best person. But the best person for the job will usually be a man."

This is the one point where I felt the book could have been stronger. Gutman amply documents the physical differences between the sexes that affect their ability to perform certain military tasks. Yet, significant psychological differences are mentioned only in passing, or not at all. For example, there are well-documented differences in values and interests that make males more likely than females to find satisfaction in military careers. Similarly, certain cognitive differences are especially relevant. Males are heavily overrepresented among those with high levels of mechanical aptitude and navigational skill — abilities that matter enormously in many military occupations.

This, however, is mere quibbling. The Kinder, Gentler Military is one of those rare books that addresses an issue of great importance in a witty and engaging style. It's simply too good to leave on the shelf.

Patricia Hannan is a behavioral scientist and owner of LakeSide Consulting in Amoudale, Virginia.

REPARATIONS

Some African-American leaders are calling for reparations to be paid to American blacks by the rest of America—Europeans, Asian and Hispanic. Blacks in America are the richest and most prosperous black people on earth. The average standard of African blacks in America earns between 20 and 30 times as much as the average black person in Africa, whose ancestors were not kidnapped and enslaved. Why should a Vietnamese or Iraqi refugee, a Mexican migrant worker, or a Polish escape from communism pay reparations for an injustice committed 300 years ago?

Why do African-American leaders want to separate African Americans from other African blacks as America before the Mayflowers? Who are more American than the descendants of African slaves? For African Americans to demand "reparations" against European, Asian, and Hispanic Americans is a divisive and self-defeating idea.

A leader of the reparations movement, Randall Robinson, has written a masterful... The Debt: What America Owes to Blacks—which is a model of what is wrong with the reparations cause. Anti-white sentiment and anti-American feelings leap out from every page of Robinson's book to humanity devoted to proving Fidel Castro, one of the world's longest surviving and most effective dictators. A tragedy for Fidel Castro's Marxist police state would seem a bizarre irrelevance to a book on reparations for American blacks, except that Robinson, Castro, is a quintessential victim of American "oppression," and therefore a hero regardless of his crimes.

In the eyes of Randall Robinson, Thomas Jefferson, the author of the declaration of "all men are created equal," was merely "an slave owner, a racist and— if one accepts that consent cannot be given if it cannot be denied—a rapist." (Robinson is referring to Jefferson's affair with his slave Sally Hemings.) In Robinson's view, the fact that Americans have not found it necessary to declare the Declaration of Independence and make his personal sins an archetype that afflicts America itself. "Does not the continued unremarked American distillation of Jefferson tell us all how profoundly contemptuous of black sensibilities, American society persists in being? How deeply, unaccountably, poignantly race our society to this day remains?"

Blind the reparations idea is, finally, an irrational fear and hatred of America. It is about holding America responsible for every negative facet of black existence, as though America were God, and God had failed. Above all, it is about denying the gift America has given to all of its citizens, black as well as white, through the inspired genius of its founding.

This hatred for American blacks Robinson—and those who think like him—is a much more important than Jefferson's dealings with Sally Hemings, which may or may not have been unwilling (consent obviously cannot be given if it cannot be denied). For it is the words Thomas Jefferson wrote: "all men are created equal"—words that white Americans died for—that accomplished what no black African did; they set Randall Robinson's ancestors free.

For all America's failings, African Americans have an enormous asset in America and in the heritage of black individuals like Thomas Jefferson. Robinson helps us to recognize that an American is defined by the precedents and traditions and ideas to which one gives rise, is what is really under attack in the reparations movement. This attack on America, led by racial separatism and the political left, is not only an attack on white Americans, but on all Americans—on African Americans especially.

American black citizens are the richest and most privileged black people alive—a luxury that is a direct result of the heritage that is under assault. The American idea needs the support of its African-American citizens. But African Americans also need the support of the American idea.

-David Horowitz
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Former Beauty Queen Charges Physician with Harassment

by Judith Schumann Weizner

Dr. Steven Arzut, chairman of internal medicine at the New York West Side Medical Administration Hospital, has been charged with harassment by a former beauty queen who had sought his advice about weight loss. If he is found guilty, disciplinary action would most likely include the loss of his chairmanship as well as the possible loss of admitting privileges.

Dr. Arzut's case was referred to the full Medical Administration Committee on Doubtful Behavior when sufficient evidence was found in a preliminary hearing to suggest that he had made hurtful remarks to Peggy Heft, winner of the 1997 Miss Globe Contest, during a consultation last summer.

Specifically, Miss Heft complained that Dr. Arzut had made no justification for bringing up the subject of her weight during an appointment she had made solely for the purpose of learning the cause of her increasingly frequent bouts of arrhythmia.

In last month's preliminary hearing before the Medical Administration Panel on Questionable Judgment, Dr. Arzut explained that while he appeared to be true that Miss Heft had not mentioned either weight or diet when scheduling her appointment, he had raised the subject during the consultation when she asked him whether he thought her addiction to diet soda could possibly have anything to do with her palpitations.

Citing Section 385.51 of the Medical Administration Physician's Code of Ethics, he explained that once she had mentioned an addiction, not to regular soda, but to the dieter variety, he had been free to initiate a discussion of her weight without violating the Federal Guidelines Relating to the Treatment of Potentially Sensitive Individuals.

He stated that he had been so accurately aware of Miss Heft's problematic disposition with the subject that he had not even weighed her, hodling the warning on page 33,345 of Stein's' Trusting the Non-Non-Patient. Subsequently he had raised the matter of her weight in an obvious way, first commending her for her vivaciousness in having correctly assessed the relationship between the palpitations and her intake of thirty to thirty-five diet sodas daily, before asking her why she had continued to drink diet soda once her suspicions had been aroused. He said she answered that it was the only way she could think of to keep her weight under 300 pounds, and asked what he would propose as an alternative.

Miss Heft admitted that she had been the first to use the word "diets" and that she had specifically requested the opinion as to a substitute for diet soda, but said she had been met with at his not having understood that question in the context of caffeine beverages, and by his remark that her heart would benefit if she were to lose 150 pounds or so.

The Panel on Questionable Judgment concluded that good judgment would have prompted him to anticipate her possible offense at his advice, and ruled that he should have suggested a substitute for diet soda without staking or implying that her weight was too high.

There is some disagreement among legal-medical circles as to whether Dr. Arzut should even have suggested that weight loss would benefit her, since she had clearly stated a wish to maintain her weight below 300 pounds, and had not referred to a specific lower weight that she considered desirable.

Her first legal victory occurred when she won Dietkraft, Inc. a $200,000 verdict in her suit against Dr. Arzut. Her present case has been pending for almost a year, and she is seeking damages in the range of $500,000.

In next month's preliminary hearing before the Medical Administration Panel for Questionable Behavior, Dr. Arzut's case will be referred to the full Medical Administration Committee to determine whether he should continue to practice medicine at the West Side Medical Administration Hospital.

The case has attracted national attention, with the American Medical Association issuing a statement expressing concern about the medical profession's role in the weight loss industry.

The American Medical Association has called for a moratorium on the use of diet plans and weight loss programs in the medical field, citing concerns about the potential for harm to patients.

The case has also sparked a debate about the role of weight loss in medicine, with some arguing that weight loss should be considered a medical necessity, while others contend that it is primarily a personal choice.

The case has also highlighted the need for better education and training for medical professionals in the area of weight loss, with many calling for more rigorous training in this area as well as the development of more effective weight loss programs.
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