one of film’s most vivid contributions to the current National Dialogue on Race begins with, of all things, a car chase. To be sure, the chase scene that opens *Law of Desire* isn’t like any you’ve seen before. A police officer has finally cornered a white utility van when out leaps the driver, a young woman with frizzy blond hair, a black miniskirt, high-heeled boots, flowery rings on all ten fingers, and way too much lipstick. As “American Woman” by the Guess Who blares in the background, she pummels the officer into bloody submission. The crowning moment comes when she kneels over him and hawks up a loogie, letting it dangle in a goopy string over his face only to slurp it up time and again like a yo-yo as he screams at the torture. As a voice-over needlessly tells the viewer later on, “this weren’t no ordinary waitress.” Officer Bob, meet White Trash Girl, “inbred biological disaster turned superhero.”

*Amistad* it’s not, but just because *Law of Desire* won’t match Spielberg at the box office doesn’t mean the ideas behind it won’t have their day in the sun. Conceived and dramatized by Jennifer Reeder, a performance artist and faculty member at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, one of America’s most prestigious fine arts universities, White Trash Girl is perhaps the perfect mascot for the Art Institute of Chicago, one of America’s most prestigious fine arts universities. But as a voice-over needlessly tells the viewer later on, “this weren’t no ordinary waitress.” Officer Bob, meet White Trash Girl, “inbred biological disaster turned superhero.”

*Amistad* it’s not, but just because *Law of Desire* won’t match Spielberg at the box office doesn’t mean the ideas behind it won’t have their day in the sun. Conceived and dramatized by Jennifer Reeder, a performance artist and faculty member at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, one of America’s most prestigious fine arts universities, White Trash Girl is perhaps the perfect mascot for the academic Left’s newest contribution to the cultural mosaic—critical studies in whiteness, or more simply, whiteness studies. Its name sounds like something out of David Duke’s dream curriculum, but its core assumption—that acknowledging and eradicating white skin privilege is the key to racial harmony—makes whiteness studies a perfect fit for the multicultural university. Indeed, it can be seen as an attempt to fill the only remaining square in the color-coded chessboard of the modern academy, where ethnic studies departments are devoted to blacks, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans, but, until now, not whites. Promulgated at academic conferences and in journals, texts, and in a small but growing number of college classrooms, whiteness studies is poised to become the Next Big Thing on campus.

Whiteness studies borrows from critical race theory the notion that racial differences are in large part the product of institutional racism—resides from the segregationist past so ubiquitous and so ingrained in the fabric of society as to be invisible. Job networking, housing patterns, and educational achievement, for example, are largely determined by this unseen hand. Whites benefit from skin privilege whether or not they are aware of it, and whether or not they ever personally discriminate against anyone. In the words of the organizers of the first major academic conference on whiteness, held on Berkeley’s campus last April, whites are “the passive inheritors of a system of privilege and wealth,” a system which whiteness studies aims to bring to the world’s attention.

*Continued on page 10*
15 Tips on How to Be a Good Leftist

Tip 1. Don’t Blame Yourself. Society Did It

I t is very important to begin with an acute sense of alienation from your society and a simultaneous blindness to the real sources of this alienation. First, maintain a superior attitude toward ordinary human desires and affairs. These are governed by a “false consciousness” which will be removed when things are set right. At the same time, never look back at your own life or attempt to evaluate your impaired capacity for connecting with other people. Do not question why it is that almost every leftist you know did not, in their adolescent years, grow up “hanging out” with his or her peers in the normal sense . . . .

Tip 2. Hate America

T his is very important. If you are American, hate yourself and the country you come from. Purge yourself of your “Americanism” and take pride in doing so. Meanwhile, enjoy all the things that American society has to offer. Denounce your country and imagine that you are living in the most oppressive society on earth. Meanwhile, never leave America for long. Don’t consider what your life would be like in North Korea, where people are starving or in Iraq, where an individual can hardly breathe. This will confuse the issue . . . .

Tip 3. Be a Socialist, But Don’t Call Yourself One

I f you are not necessarily a socialist, but you are nonetheless of this opinion, do not consider yourself a socialist (it could be embarrassing). Instead, like: “Hey, have you read Chomsky’s latest?” Do this in a manner that suggests that anyone who hasn’t is suffering from serious character flaws. You should say things like: “Chomsky’s great, Chomsky’s great.” Say this over and over again, preferably with other leftists who are also saying this over and over . . . .

Tip 4. Take the Moral High Ground

T his is one of the key characteristics of being a good leftist. Distinguish yourself as one of the few remaining sensitive people on the planet, one of the few who wants goodness in the world. Say things like: “There are people living in cardboard boxes!” Say this with great indignation, as if others support this. Say it as if there is a simple cure for poverty. Do not consider that the myriad experiments to alleviate poverty through government intervention have failed and created more serious problems . . . .

Tip 5. Reject Free Will

Y ou must believe that everything people do is in a democratic-capitalist society is done out of submission to an imposed social structure . . . .

Tip 6. Go to Demonstrations

T his should ideally follow the softball game. Go to a university campus and get really angry. Get together with other leftists. Ask things like: “Hey, have you read Chomsky’s latest?” Do this in a manner that suggests that anyone who hasn’t is suffering from serious character flaws. You should say things like: “Chomsky’s great, Chomsky’s great.” Say this over and over again, preferably with other leftists who are also saying this over and over . . . .

Tip 7. Have a Death Wish

H ate your life. Block out anything that might bring you joy. You should watch out for music, since it is especially capable of relaxing you, and of making you feel at peace, often through the use of music that exhibits a lot of angst. Maybe this is okay, but check with the “line” your group of leftist friends have on this. Overall, you should definitely get mad if a female artist sings a sad love song and about not being able to live without a certain man. Don’t enjoy her voice, the lyrics, or the rhythm. Only envision exploitation. Condemn the female singer for seeing herself through the eyes of the Other . . . .

* Excerpts from the latest title in the Second Thoughts Books Broadsides series. For information on how to order this and all the other titles, please see ad on page 11.
**MEDICAL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STORY:**

When Gail Granscay heard about 7-year-old John Callaghan she wanted to do something. John is a first-grader in Walnut Creek, California, who is afflicted with a genetic disease called Adrenoleukodystrophy, a disease that was the subject of the movie *Lorenzo's Oil*. John is partially disabled and living on a fixed income, Granscay called the local branch of the Irwin Memorial Blood Bank and made an appointment for the bone marrow donor test. She asked if it was possible that the $39 test fee could be waived because of her financial circumstances. She was told to come back to the Blood Bank and make appointments at the time. When she said she was white, she was told that the fee could be waived only in the case of non-whites. This was policy, a way of increasing multicultural participation in bone marrow testing, and it was the policy of the American Red Cross as well. Asking for the rationale, Granscay was told that a far higher percentage of whites than non-whites donate bone marrow. Accepting the stigma of con-sciousness, she scraped up the money to pay the fee, took the test, and got her relatives in Florida also to see if any of them could provide a match for John Callaghan.

**A WHITE HOUSE DIVIDED:**

According to no less an authority than Time, the Clinton White House has been struck by divisions in the racial dialogue the President is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get going. Several of the white males lurking around this maneuver have bowed out, feeling they were not being called to task. Their absence is trying to get goi

**THE FACE OF ROE:**

McCorvey underwent a religious conversion in 1995, the NSF settled a previous lawsuit out of court and agreed to drop race-based qualifications from a summer group devoted to science.

**ECONOMICS 101:**

This is crucial to gay liberation. The latest contribution comes from Tony Valenzuela, the San Diego-based "sex activist" and gay porn star who recently organized the Sex Panic Summit, attended by activists and academics from across the country. In a profile in the current issue of The Advocate, the HIV-positive Valenzuela explains what his predilection for unprotected sex with multiple partners. "Sex with a condom is artificial sex," he says. A recent study with about 150 men last year and failed to use condoms about a third of the time. As to whether this might be a bit dangerous, particularly in light of health officials' warnings of a second wave of the AIDS epidemic, Valenzuela explains that while gay men should try to stay uninfected, "health isn't only biological. Health is psycho- logically, emotionally, and spiritually. We're so one-dimensional when it comes to health, saying that it has to be biological survival.

**THE FACE OF ROE:**

The national American Benefactor, anyone who donates at least $150,000 to the group gets to spend one night in a Nevada brothel with the entire 20-member Pretty Woman Committee, the council's fund-raising arm, which is made up of prostitutes. And yes, contributions are tax deductible.

**AIDS MADNESS:**

The debate in the gay community over AIDS prevention continues. As reported in last month's cover story, the battle began when moderates like Gabriel Rotello and Andrew Sullivan suggested that gay men should limit the number of persons they permit to become infected; since then they have been the subject of public attacks, most notably by Sex Panic, an organization of "queer theorist" radicals who insist that promiscuity is crucial to gay liberation. The latest contribution comes from Tony Valenzuela, the San Diego-based "sex activist" and gay porn star who recently organized the Sex Panic Summit, attended by activists and academics from across the country. In a profile in the current issue of The Advocate, the HIV-positive Valenzuela explains what his predilection for unprotected sex with multiple partners. "Sex with a condom is artificial sex," he says. A recent study with about 150 men last year and failed to use condoms about a third of the time. As to whether this might be a bit dangerous, particularly in light of health officials' warnings of a second wave of the AIDS epidemic, Valenzuela explains that while gay men should try to stay uninfected, "health isn't only biological. Health is psycho- logically, emotionally, and spiritually. We're so one-dimensional when it comes to health, saying that it has to be biological survival.

**THE FACE OF ROE:**

Ro's *Wade* turns 25 this month and to celebrate, the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL) is hosting an anniversary luncheon in Washington D.C., with the First Lady as honorary chair and Vice President Gore as featured speaker. As a supple- ment to these festivities, NARAL's website features an item entitled "The Human Face of Roe," which consists of short stories from women who have had abortions. One "face," however, is conspicuously absent: Ro's. For years, Norma McCorvey, the woman dubbed "Jane Roe" for the 1973 trial, had been silent. But in 1995, McCorvey underwent a religious conversion and publicly announced that she intended to spend the rest of her life working against abortion. NARAL doesn't think she should. "Abortion has been founded on deception from the very beginning," said McCorvey at a rally last year. "My little lie grew and grew and became more horrible with each telling . . . For this I will forever be ashamed."
Mussolini and Neo-Fascist Tribalism

Up From Multiculturalism

By David Horowitz

ike most of the destructive move-
ments of the 20th century—social-
ism, fascism, nihilism—multicultur-
alism is an invention of well-fed intellec-
tuals. It did not well up from the imm-
gress of the conquerors and the ethnic ghettos of
America as an expression of their cultural
aspirations or communal needs. In fact its
primary sponsor and most effective agency
has been the Ford Foundation, a
ten billion dollar tax-dodge cre-
ated to protect the fortune of
America’s leading industrial
bigot, Henry Ford. The
Indian Money, the
Carnegie Foundations, and their
clones, to shape
the multi-cultural front—and on so many other
fronts dear to the Left. How was this possible?

The Ford Foundation and its competition of
foundations has only grown. A crucial flexing of
power, the OSS turned to Rockefeller and later,
when it became the CIA, to Ford. Grants were
passed into the control of the
defensive intellectual
Left and its fellow-
travelers, the bureaucratic man-
darins and the parlor socialists of
the underclass elite.

Multiculturalism, as we know it,
would also not have been possible
without the catastrophe that has befell
our colleges and universities in the
post-’60s era. I am referring here to the
politicization of the academy and the
defacement of the curriculum, the
transformation of the liberal arts divi-
sions of the academy into a crude
indoctrination platform and recruiting
center for the American version of
Marxist left. This intellectual plague has
been described bluntly by Harold
Bloom as “Stalinism without Stalin. All
of the traits of the Stalinists in the
1930s, “are being repeated . . . in the
universities in the 1990s.” I am going to
make an emendation to Bloom’s
description a little later. The mentality
is Stalinist, but it is the particular
Stalinism of Antonio Gramsci that informs the
multicultural ferver in the academy. As I will
further demonstrate, the post-modern left owes more
intellectually, to Mussolini than to Marx.

But we need to pause, first, over the fact
that multiculturalism would not have been possi-
ble without the Ford Foundation and its tax-avoid-
large scale. When you think about it, the
American system of higher education in its own
environment is remarkably diverse. There are
more than three thousand institutions of higher
learning in this country, occupying a diverse
cultural geography. There are public and private col-
leges, technical institutes and schools of the arts,
land-grant schools and schools with denomina-
tional affiliations, and many others besides. It is
almost inconceivable that all these institutions
would adopt a single party line, and would do so
within the space of a decade or two, as they have on
the cultural front that has been thrust upon so many other
fronts dear to the Left. How was this possible?

Well, it is possible if you have a pile of
money larger than the discretionary spending
of the federal government in their three
and you are viewed as a benign force by the academic commu-
nity itself. The power of the Rockefeller, Carnegie,
and Ford Foundations, and their clones, to shape
American higher education, is not new. At the very beginning of the era of
the modern university, for example, Andrew Carnegie
decided that it would be a good idea to give col-
lege teachers pensions. A college president was
pretty hard-pressed to refuse such a gift, if he
wanted to retain the best faculty available.

Accordingly, the Carnegie Foundation attached
some conditions to its grants, and it is these condi-
tions that served to define the entire educational
era that followed.

The Carnegie Foundation began by
announcing that only colleges, as defined by itself,
would be eligible for the grants. The Foundation
then defined a college as requiring so many hours
of secondary school education (which are still
known as Carnegie Units), as possessing an
endowment of at least $500,000, as having at least
specialists in the particular geographical areas and
national units it had targeted for attention. For
efficiency reasons it wanted these specialists to
have an interdisciplinary approach to research
projects in question, a demand that the university as then
constituted could not fulfill.

The Ford Foundation re-shaped the uni-
versity, and so the OSS turned to Rockefeller and later,
when it became the CIA, to Ford. Grants were
offered for the creation of “area studies” programs
and area specialists. The Russians at Columbia and the Asian Studies Center at
Berkeley were prototypes of the new
academic curriculum. Naturally there
was powerful resistance from the con-
servative forces in the university,
the departments, and the scholarly disci-
plines, which regarded this as an abu-
sive intrusion into academic concerns
and a debasement of their intellectual
pursuits. But just as naturally the
money provided by Rockefeller and then,
during the Cold War, by Ford,
overrode these objections and the new
interdisciplinary area studies programs
flourished in schools all over the coun-
try.

Like the spies of the Central Intelli-
gence Agency, Trotskyists also favor the interdisciplinary
approach. Marxism was never about
“economics” but always about “politi-
cal economy,” a theoretical agenda
embracing all aspects of society and
culture in the service of mid-wifing
a new human cosmos. This is true.
Multiculturalism, and all species of post-mod-
ern radicalism, are totalitarian in their
ontology, their epistemology, and their
political agendas. Nothing escapes them. Like all gnostics, political radicals
are confident that they possess the the-
oretical key that will unlock the myster-
ies of humanity and society. Of course,
they don’t believe in any immutabilities like human nature which, in the prepos-
terous era, was the foundation of the uni-
versity, is “safely constructed.” Their
agenda, like that of Lenin and Hitler, is
to re-construct the world and to create the new
men and new women who will inhabit it (and think just as they do). Such an enterprise requires an
adolescent credulity, an amnesic towards the past,
and an interdisciplinary approach.

That is why the radicals of the ‘60s, when
their revolution in the streets came up empty,
turned to a vulnerable, open, and essentially
defensive institutionalism for a last act of desecration
and conquest. That is why they began colonizing the
university with spurious intellectual projects
that looked a lot like the CIA area-studies pro-
grants. Soon there appeared black studies (now
African American, of course), women’s studies,
queer studies, cultural studies, and even American
studies, the closest clone of the new
analytical agenda, like that of Lenin and Hitler, is
to re-construct the world and to create the new
men and new women who will inhabit it (and think just as they do). Such an enterprise requires an
adolescent credulity, an amnesic towards the past,
and an interdisciplinary approach.

That is why the radicals of the ‘60s, when
their revolution in the streets came up empty,
turned to a vulnerable, open, and essentially
defensive institutionalism for a last act of desecration
and conquest. That is why they began colonizing the
university with spurious intellectual projects
that looked a lot like the CIA area-studies pro-
grants. Soon there appeared black studies (now
African American, of course), women’s studies,
queer studies, cultural studies, and even American
studies, the closest clone of the new
analytical agenda, like that of Lenin and Hitler, is
to re-construct the world and to create the new
men and new women who will inhabit it (and think just as they do). Such an enterprise requires an
adolescent credulity, an amnesic towards the past,
and an interdisciplinary approach.

What made the routine violations of aca-
demic norms, and the subversion of institutional
traditions possible was millions upon millions of
dollars of bribes in the form of grants, subsidies,
and other awards to administrators, academics,
and institutions by the Ford Foundation and its
divisions. It is no exaggeration to say that
without the huge and constant subsidies from the Ford
Foundation there would be no African American studies,
women’s studies, or queer studies as we
know them.

What is multiculturalism? Well, in the first
place, as my partner Peter Collier has pointed out,
it is two lies in one word, since it is neither multi-
nor cultural. It is, instead, fundamentally political and, like Stalinism, allows only one party and one party line. The agenda is the destruction of the idea of American national identity in the service of the mindless, destructive, never-ending radical assault on the capital of the democratic world. Multiculturalism is the team banner of the hate-America Left.

From its inception as a nation of immi-
grants 200-odd years ago, America has been the inclusive multi-national, multi-ethnic society, unparalleled in all human history in its success in integrating diverse communities on the basis of an ideal of equality. This success has been predicated on an American culture (not a multicultural) that makes that integration possible and sustains that American idea.

Multiculturalism is a head-on challenge above all to the notion that there is an American culture, and, that this culture is superior to all other cultures in precisely the ambition to be inclusive and equal, and that, consequently, this culture is the very crucible of America’s future and its multi-ethnic success.

Multiculturalism is the place the Left went to lick its wounds when the ‘60s was over, and to carry on its malevolent agendas. The question radicals faced at the time was how to continue the war against the evil empire—America—now that socialism was indisputably bankrupt. You do it the Gramscian way—Antonio Gramsci being one of the many many respectable Communists (and not a few disreputable Nazis) who have been enshrined as intellectual icons by the academic Left. Gramsci’s addition to Marxist theory was to suggest that by seizing control of the culture you could extend that control to the rest of the social order as well. Never mind that the notion that the ruling ideas may not be the ideas of the ruling class destroys the entire edifice of Marxist theory. Logic was never a strong point of the Left. The real beauty of Gramsci’s strategy is that it lets you get away with economics (which you never understood anyway) and about the colossal failure, the pure evil of actual socialist achievements, while continuing your adolescent hatred for America and its immense good works.

If you need an academic rubric under which to carry out this nihilistic attack, try “cultural—one of its kind since Whittaker Chambers’—as in critical legal studies, critical race theory, or critical theory as such. Marx and his friends in the Hegelian Left were, of course, the original “crit-
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The Apology that Never Came

Revisionists and the Cold War

By Jamie Glasov

The final verdict on the Cold War is in. With the revelations that have gradually surfaced from the former Soviet bloc, we can now finally confirm one reality: that it was the Soviet regime that initiated as well as aggressively prolonged the East-West conflict that dominated the international arena for four decades. The so-called “revisionist” historians, who lectured us for years about how the United States was responsible for the Cold War, have now been proven irrevocably wrong. Once exceedingly vocal, they are now conspicuously silent. Sometimes silence is golden. Sometimes it is something else.

Revisionists greatly enjoyed articulating one basic theme: that American economic “aggression,” manifested by Washington’s supposed effort to penetrate Eastern Europe with its vast economic “aggression,” triggered the Cold War. This thesis always suffered from two basic flaws. The first was that it ignored, or exonerated, Soviet behavior. The second was that it suffered from a dubious gulf between its theory and reality. A serious problem existed in the fact that the evidence was simply not there to support the revisionist theory. There was a fundamental flaw in its main underlying assumption: that American imperialism was exclusively a product of capitalism’s need to expand. But the revisionists were asked, was it that so many non-capitalist powers developed imperial policies? The revisionists never answered that question. It is safe to presume they never will.

The evidence that has surfaced from behind the former Iron Curtain has now completely legitimized what most observers always deemed to be common sense: America was justified in defending the Western world from the Soviet regime. If Moscow’s behavior throughout the Cold War was not enough to convince the skeptics of Soviet intentions, the documents from the Soviet archives, as well as the revelations of former Soviet officials, now confirm that the Soviet regime did not, to put it charitably, bestow utopian egalitarianism, or entertain Marxism. Sometimes it is something else.

The documents now reveal. When the authors mention a few of the myriad details that have surfaced from the Soviet archives, they crystallize the major flaw of Cold War revisionism.

One recently declassified document by the Directorate of History in Ottawa is a stolen memorandum, dated 1956, from the chief of the Directorate of History in Ottawa is a stolen memorandum, dated 1956, from the chief of the

The British Commonwealth and the United States, the memo notes, “are the only countries with Armed Forces of striking, demonstrations, sabotage, etc., instigated “civil war in some of the less stable countries and are capable of seriously disrupting and disrupting any war effort made by U.S. or Commonwealth countries.”

The memo considers that “it is possible that the willingness of U.S. and the British Commonwealth to fight Russian expansion has deteriorated to the extent that we could overrun portions of Western Europe or the Middle East without bringing on global conflict.” The U.S., it is suggested, might “accept a decisive defeat of Great Britain by aerial atomic warfare if present- ed with the accomplished fact . . . .” This would be more likely, the study suggests “if subversive activities in the U.S. were intensified.” The study boasts of the capability of having 300 atomic bombs “readily available,” stresses the importance of denying the U.S. “the use of operations and bases in Europe, Middle East, and North Africa,” and concludes that “any move toward expansion by us could cause a world war, we are prepared for this and will accept the risk.” The study stresses, however, that it is “essential that this campaign be conducted with the utmost speed.”

One declassified Soviet document after the other articulates these same basic themes. Numerous documents, for example, now reveal that the Warsaw Pact accentuated an offensive strategy and had planned to launch a surprise nuclear offensive against Western Europe, despite the Pact’s official declaration that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. East Germany had thousands of medals ready to be awarded to soldiers who crossed the Rhine and a collection of new traffic signs to put up in several West European countries. One Warsaw Pact exercise entailed a plan to move troops through Schleswig-Holstein, the German province bordering Denmark, after it had been destroyed by 76 nuclear bombs.

It is interesting to note that, during the Cold War, any individual who suggested these were real Soviet intentions was shunted aside on the left of the political spectrum. Western conservatives who argued that the Soviets were intent on world domination were caricatured as paranoid and reactionary. Why? It is simple. People can be ridiculed—fact can’t. Several historians are conspicuously silent today in regard to the facts regarding the Cold War. Two of the most prominent revisionists, Walter LaFeber and Gabriel Kolko, devoted their entire professional lives to blaming the United States in the Cold War. It is now clear they based their intellectual careers on a lie. Silence has been their escapism. But because we do not know what these historians have to say now, does not mean we do not know what they said then. It would be worthwhile remembering.

Kolko and LaFeber employed double standards that were impeccable in their consistency and honesty. Every American action was demonized, while Soviet behavior, however brutal and inhumane, was mentioned in passing and put into “context.” Thus, while America’s supposed efforts to penetrate Eastern Europe with capitalism was portrayed as scandalous, Stalin’s ruthless occupation of that area was mentioned briefly and explained as the result of Soviet desires for “economic partnership” and “security.” Kolko and LaFeber spared their readers the story of entire peoples caught in a totalitarian nightmare. The realities of the suppression of political dissent were left out of their narratives. Perhaps the authors felt these painful stories about tortured human lives would confuse the issues. Perhaps they felt they were serving a higher human purpose with their heartlessness. Perhaps not.

For revisionists, communists were allowed to pursue their lives as they desired. The double standard was clear here, but more intriguing was the discrepancy between these revisionist arguments and the ingredients of the private lives of the revisionists themselves. While Kolko and LaFeber found it unconscionable that the United States pursued its interests, it was worthwhile for the individuals ever pursue their own interests? What human being does not pursue his or her inter-
Kolko says that Stalin did not engage in genocide during the 1940-1945 period. History does not support this, and even today he provides no evidence that the Soviets did not engage in mass murder during this period and that they were killed in mass numbers along with six national minorities in the Ukraine. The fact that they were deported wholesale to Soviet labor camps in 1943-44. Approximately three million Russians were also exterminated in the penal camps of Kolyma from the early 1930s to the late 1950s. The nucleus of this economic policy, according to the revisionists, is its economic success.

Kolko's position on the Korean war was as telling as his position on Poland. Kolko blamed the Korean war on South Korea, even though North Korea invaded it. Kolko writes that "North Korean army moved across the 38th parallel about 4:00 a.m. on June 25," but explains that the invasion should not be seen as "a causal fact" of the Korean war. It remains questionable how much wisdom exists in an interpretation that maintains it is relatively insignificant when one considers the far-reaching consequences.

If North Korea's invasion of the South was not enough evidence to persuade revisionists that North Korea started the Korean war, the Soviet government's refusal to supply North Korea with the necessary means to wage the war will make them reconsider their position. Released Soviet documents now directly contradict the official communist position on the Korean War's outbreak, revealing that North Korea had planned and initiated the invasion with the objective of unifying the country through military force, not by political means. This was a critical factor for revisionists to consider, as it indicates that the Soviet government was directly involved in the planning stages of the invasion.

Recent disclosed Soviet sources now confirm that Stalin's paranoia did not have the same effect on the Soviet leadership as it did on the American leadership in the Cold War, for American leaders did not dare to broach the subject of an attack that could lead to the Communists' ultimate triumph, and the American leadership was never able to come up with a policy that could prevent it. The American leadership was also unable to come up with a policy that could prevent a war that could lead to the American government's ultimate collapse. The American leadership was also unable to come up with a policy that could prevent a war that could lead to the American government's ultimate collapse. The American leadership was also unable to come up with a policy that could prevent a war that could lead to the American government's ultimate collapse.
What attitude was the United States supposed to have about these realities? What reaction should it have had when it found out its ally was spying on it throughout World War II? What was it to do when the Soviets brutally took control of Eastern Europe and imprisoned, tortured, and liquidated all of their opponents? How was it supposed to behave while the Stalinist regime demonstrated intransigence everywhere from Berlin to Iran and Korea, supported guerrillas in Greece, and demanded possession of the two eastern provinces of Turkey? What was it to do when the Soviets continued to operate in complete secrecy and blocked Western inspection of their territory (designed to calculate the damage inflicted by the Germans)?

After the War, the West confronted a regime that kept a tyrannical grip on its own people, as Stalin proceeded to stifle all religious and political freedom. Poets and intellectuals received special attention from the NKVD, suffering incarceration or worse, and no Soviet citizen was exempt from possible execution, not even Communist Party members. Perhaps no other reality epitomized the nature of the Soviet regime better than the fate of Soviet civilians and POWs, two million of whom were involuntarily sent back to the Soviet Union; they were either immediately executed or deported to the Gulag Archipelago, to serve sentences from six years to life.

It is worth recounting the circumstances surrounding this tragedy, since the fate of the POWs crystallizes the nature of the Soviet regime. It also illuminated the mentality of the people who chose to ignore it. Washington and London both complied in returning Soviet POWs intact. Yet the very existence of this component is apart from its other flaws, which must remain the focus of another study, this new revisionist argument is based on hindsight, an ingredient which is, arguably, not the strongest of intellectual foundations for historical scholarship.

It is possible to ignore the past. It is also possible to avoid the process of soul-searching. But insulating oneself from reality does not change reality, nor does it nurture the integrity of those who practice such isolation. Today, the revisionists confront a truth that is, in their circumstances, horrifying in its ramifications: it necessitates the abandonment of an obsessive anti-Americanism, a disposition upon which the revisionists have built their entire professional careers. Without anti-Americanism, revisionists would not only lose their status and cultural affiliations, but also their entire sense of purpose. It is easier, therefore, for them to hold on to their political beliefs, which never did, and never will, fit in with those undesirable things called facts.

The perpetrators who initiated and prolonged the Cold War, who engineered a brutal totalitarian regime that left millions of victims in its path, have finally admitted their guilt. It is the defenders of the perpetrators who are still to speak. They have been left out in the cold, lost in the shadows, scurrying from the light. They are silent, but silence can speak a thousand words. In this particular and pathetic case, the silence distinguishes the revisionists in one illuminating and tragic light: today, the only people in Russia who agree with the revisionist interpretation of the Cold War are the neo-Stalinists. This is Western revisionism's greatest legacy, its touching post-mortem. Perhaps a plaque should be made for the occasion—and placed at Katyn.

Jamie Glazov is author of 15 Tips on How to Be a Good Leftist published by Second Thoughts Books.
Bill Clinton no doubt knew that Bill Lann Lee would run into some difficulty in his confirmation hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The role of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, the nation’s chief lawyer for the poor, he would have to shepherd through the Senate the Individual Rights Foundation in Los Angeles City Council with a consent decree for the Los Angeles Police Department. The terms of that consent decree were to lock the LAPD into race- and gender-conscious preferences in public employment, an expansive settlement with attorneys from the city of Los Angeles, and a statewide ballot initiative that prohibited race- and gender-based preferences to those contexts where such drastic remedies can be utilized, despite Proposition 209 ruling given his past record on these issues. Far from showing a moderate stance on matters of race, Lee’s record actually shows him to be a determined activist who will employ any device, legitimate or not, in support of such preferences. My own experience with Lee in a little noted but significant case involving quotas, leads me to believe that he is willing to sacrifice democratic principles, ethics, honesty, constitutional rights, and respect for this nation’s legal institutions in pursuit of his extreme ideological goals.

In 1994 when the NAACP and the ACLU filed Tipton-Whittingham v. City of Los Angeles, a class-action gender discrimination and sexual harassment lawsuit against the Los Angeles Police Department, the city of Los Angeles, Bill Lee was one of the lawyers who represented the plaintiffs. The purpose of the lawsuit was to get injunctive relief with respect to female officers and others who alleged gender discrimination, sexual harassment, and retaliation in the LAPD. A few years earlier, the NAACP and the ACLU were successful in obtaining a consent decree requiring the city to hire and promote more women within the department. The plaintiffs’ attorneys intended to seek similar relief for female police officers and applicants to the LAPD, in effect extending the requirements of the previous consent decree.

Everything might have gone well for them if the California Civil Rights Initiative had not qualified for the ballot. But it did qualify and posed an immediate threat to the case Lee was pursuing. In December 1995, two co-counsel—a race-conscious settlement with attorneys from the city of Los Angeles, attempted to settle the portion of the lawsuit seeking injunctive relief. I represented a LAPD lieutenant who intervened in the case to challenge a settlement to the lawsuit.

The obvious reason for Lee’s sudden move was the unexpected passage of Proposition 209, a statewide ballot initiative that prohibited race- and gender-conscious preferences in public employment, education, and contracting. Proposition 209, by its own terms however, exempts federal consent decrees entered into before the effective date of the initiative. On election day, Tuesday, November 5, 1997, Lee and his co-counsel presented the Los Angeles City Council with a consent decree for approval. The terms of the consent decree were to lock the LAPD into race- and gender-based hiring and promotional requirements for the next 18 years. One of the consent decree’s more ominous requirements was that the LAPD would be required to make efforts to hire and promote women in the same percentages in which they are represented in the civilian work force. This is despite the fact that women apply to the LAPD in numbers far less than their representation in the civilian work force.

Any ambiguity as to the exact intentions of Lee and his confederates was dispelled by comments made to the Los Angeles Times by city councilman Bradford Reynolds and a letter that were allegedly done what needed to be done in terms of making sure those provisions that were affected by Proposition 209 got passed. Furthermore, Lee’s co-counsel represented the ACLU in a December 1997 letter to Carol Sobel, the general counsel of the ACLU, in which he said: “There were important issues about recruitment and hiring that were dealt with today: ‘It’s easier to do the commitment before election day and not put it at risk.’”

The city council approved the consent decree and Lee and his co-counsel presented on the same day to magistrate Judge Rosalyn Chapman for signature and approval. Before the magistrate judge Chapman, the Los Angeles City Council later confirmed that Judge William Keller, to whom the case was originally assigned, reassigned jurisdiction over the case after the abandonment of the parties’ back door maneuvers through press reports.

At a status conference held on November 19, 1997, Judge Keller indicated his anger and surprise at the parties’ effort not only to do an end run around Proposition 209 on election day, but around him as well. On nine different occasions, Lee and his co-counsel requested that the court stay the proceeding “to facilitate the parties’ ongoing settlement discussions.” At no time did he and his co-counsel ever inform Judge Keller that they would attempt to have a magistrate judge sign the consent decree. In fact, the evidence indicates that Lee and his co-counsel actively misled the court about their intentions. The parties never placed a signature line on their stipulation to proceed before a magistrate judge, and therefore it was never seen by Judge Keller.

Lee attempted to settle the injunctive portion of the lawsuit without any notice or fairness hearing that is required in class-action settlements. The purpose of such a hearing is to ensure that the millions of dollars at issue and the millions of people who are affected by the lawsuit, have some voice in the settlement agreement. Lee and his co-counsel were so desperate to keep this opportunity to create another pocket of affirmative action from slipping out of their grasp that they took affirmative steps to hide their intention to do an end run around the voters of California. The likely reason for this is that they assumed Judge Keller would be reluctant to sign a wide-ranging consent decree in the face of those class members and to notify them that their rights will be affected. Such notice is also useful to non-class members who interests may also be prejudiced by the decree.

At best, Bill Lann Lee’s conduct in this matter was unscrupulous. At worst, it was unethical and a fraud on the court. (California ethics law requires all lawyers to be candid and honest with the court.) Lee and his co-counsel were so desperate to keep this opportunity to create another pocket of affirmative action from slipping out of their grasp that they took affirmative steps to hide their intention to do an end run around the voters of California. The likely reason for this is that they assumed Judge Keller would be reluctant to sign a wide-ranging consent decree in the face of those class members and to notify them that their rights will be affected. Such notice is also useful to non-class members who interests may also be prejudiced by the decree.

To some extent, of course, Bill Lann Lee’s actions in Los Angeles have become a moot point now that the Clinton administration has gone around the Senate’s back (as Lee attempted to go around Judge Keller’s) and given him an executive appointment as “Acting” Assistant Attorney General. But what the events in Los Angeles show is that Republicans were perfectly reasonable to question Lee’s position on preferences and that their worries that he would be committed to a radical moderate’s clothing were perhaps just Lee’s past conduct indicates that he is the type of attorney who harbors no reservations about stepping on the electoral process, circumventing court rules, compromising the interests of his putative clients and the constitutional rights of others, and attempting to deceive a district court judge and the general public in the pursuit of an extreme ideological goal.
One obstacle is the fact that white-skinned people do not typically think of themselves as members of a "race" with distinct and insular interests. Indeed, those who do most conspicuously are neo-Nazis and other pariahs. Reeder explains that "white people don't want to identify as being white because for too long discussions of whiteness have always been in racist terms, or about white power or white supremacy. Identifying as white comes along with the stigma of racism."

In whiteness studies circles, the hesitancy on the part of mainstream whites to embrace their skin color is seen as evidence of feelings of racial guilt but also of their silent complicity in institutionalized oppression. "Whites are said to consider themselves a neutral universal category, hence nonracial and superior to 'racialized' others," writes Annalee Newitz, a Ph.D. candidate at Berkeley who spoke at the spring conference. "Their self-image as whites is thus both underdeveloped and yet extremely presumptuous."

One of the luxuries that white folks have in thinking about race is that we don't think of ourselves as belonging to a racial group," says Matt Wray, a Ph.D. candidate in Berkeley's ethnic studies department and an organizer of the conference. "We tend to think of ourselves as individuals." This "tendency," of course, has its roots in the classical liberal and Judeo-Christian traditions which made the abolition of slavery and segregation possible, but for these new racials, like the old individualism is a non-no. "One move in critical studies in whiteness is precisely to encourage white folks to see themselves as belonging to a racial group which has social advantages, and to stop thinking in individualistic terms," Wray explains, "because that skews one's perspective on the reality of race and class.

It is her intertwining of race and class that makes White Trash Girl particularly important. According to Newitz, poor whites are unique in white society in that their race is noticed—thus the term "white trash," as opposed to simply "trash"—and therefore they can play a key role in convincing white people that "white" describes more than just melanin content. "Because white trash is, for whites, the most visible and clearly marked form of whiteness," write Newitz and Wray in the introduction to the recent anthology White Trash, "it can perhaps help to make all whites self-conscious of themselves as a racial and classed group among other such groups, bringing us one step closer to a world without racial divisions or, at the very least, a world where racial difference does not mean racial, symbolic, and economic domination."

Reeder explains that white skin (and the benefits which it presumably affords) is thus both underdeveloped and yet extremely presumptuous. "One of the luxuries that white folks have in thinking about race is that we don't think of ourselves as belonging to a racial group," says Matt Wray, a Ph.D. candidate in Berkeley's ethnic studies department and an organizer of the conference. "We tend to think of ourselves as individuals." This "tendency," of course, has its roots in the classical liberal and Judeo-Christian traditions which made the abolition of slavery and segregation possible, but for these new racials, like the old individualism is a non-no. "One move in critical studies in whiteness is precisely to encourage white folks to see themselves as belonging to a racial group which has social advantages, and to stop thinking in individualistic terms," Wray explains, "because that skews one's perspective on the reality of race and class.

It is her intertwining of race and class that makes White Trash Girl particularly important. According to Newitz, poor whites are unique in white society in that their race is noticed—thus the term "white trash," as opposed to simply "trash"—and therefore they can play a key role in convincing white people that "white" describes more than just melanin content. "Because white trash is, for whites, the most visible and clearly marked form of whiteness," write Newitz and Wray in the introduction to the recent anthology White Trash, "it can perhaps help to make all whites self-conscious of themselves as a racial and classed group among other such groups, bringing us one step closer to a world without racial divisions or, at the very least, a world where racial difference does not mean racial, symbolic, and economic domination."

Reeder explains that white skin (and the benefits which it presumably affords) is thus both underdeveloped and yet extremely presumptuous. "One of the luxuries that white folks have in thinking about race is that we don't think of ourselves as belonging to a racial group," says Matt Wray, a Ph.D. candidate in Berkeley's ethnic studies department and an organizer of the conference. "We tend to think of ourselves as individuals." This "tendency," of course, has its roots in the classical liberal and Judeo-Christian traditions which made the abolition of slavery and segregation possible, but for these new racials, like the old individualism is a non-no. "One move in critical studies in whiteness is precisely to encourage white folks to see themselves as belonging to a racial group which has social advantages, and to stop thinking in individualistic terms," Wray explains, "because that skews one's perspective on the reality of race and class.
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terly journal he edits, Ignatiev writes approvingly of the L.A. riots, longing for the day when the "Los Angeles Rebellion of 1992 will become general and sustained." This will bring about the collapse of U.S. society, which like "any capitalist society" consists of "two classes, the masters and the slaves." Ignatiev says that the separatist militias that have attracted so much attention in recent years "aren't any worse that any other cross-section of white Americans." In fact, aside from their white supremacist tendencies, such groups have "potential" because of their anger and willingness to use arms.

Even the less militant proponents of the discipline, indeed American society as fundamentally racist. Asked for an example of white privilege, Kelly Stoddart, an organizer of the Berkeley conference, tells of her experience she had as a literacy teacher in Richmond, a small city near Oakland. One of her students lived in a neighborhood where she could not get the newspaper delivered. Stoddart believes this was because the neighborhood was largely Latino. "I attributed it to discrimination," she explains, adding that it "just blows my mind."

Calls to the newspapers serving the Richmond area suggest a different reality. Zonna Thomas, a circulation manager for the local daily, the West County Times, says that the paper delivers to the entire city with the exception of one three-block area where door-front service had to be ended because carriers were repeatedly mugged. Jim Dodge, vice president of circulation for the company that delivers the Oakland Tribune, adds that this is one of the most racially diverse in the country, making discrimination economically suicidal. "If we weren't going to deliver to minorities, we wouldn't have anyone to deliver to."

Not surprisingly, even some leftist academics are less than enthusiastic about this new field. Scan Wileenitz, a professor of history at Princeton and an avowed "progressive," told the New York Times Magazine, "in their view whiteness is implicitly the racial category that is evil, and blackness is just a response to it. It's black nationalism by another means." The Times also noted that some black studies professors are unhappy with the new field and worry that interest in whiteness will draw attention away from minorities.

Regardless, whiteness studies looks like an idea whose time has come, at least in the American academic discipline. The discipline has found its way into courses in places like UC-Berkeley, Northwestern, and the Universities of Connecticut, Florida, and Minnesota. Last year the Harvard Educational Review included the topic in its symposium on ethnicity and education. The Center for the Study of White American Culture has provided teaching materials to professors looking to add whiteness to their ethnic palette, most notably at Emory and UC-Santa Barbara. Three hundred scholars attended the conference in Berkeley last April; in November, Hitchcock's Center hosted an equal number at its Second Annual National Conference on Whiteness. This February, the Claremont Colleges will be hosting a similar conference dubbed "Outing Whiteness."

"We're hoping that we can provide a dynamic force for change," explains Mary Washington, a professor of sociology at Lehigh University and a member of the Center's board of directors. "Certainly within the academy, and if it has implications for the broader society that's even better."

In the meantime, White Trash Girl continues to maximize the contradictions of white society on-screen. To date her films have been featured at festivals and in 10 foreign countries, and throughout the United States, and she has her own line of trading cards. A series of "graphic novels" based on the character is in the works, and a new film is scheduled to debut early this year. And it seems likely that this toxic avenger will continue to embody the perverse prescriptions of whiteness studies. As alter-ego Reeder explains, "I'm not advocating all-out public chaos, but I am advocating ripping the scab off the wound again and again until it can really fester. That's when it begins to heal."
Established by the educator and folklorist Norman Studer in the mid-1940s, the camp was a meeting place for children of the Old Left until its demise in the early 1960s. At that time, strangely, a fight broke out among its staff over whether or not to sell the valuable land the non-profit camp was located on, for big bucks. The temptation must have been too great to resist. The old main social hall was named informally the “Kinderland,” after what was apparently an act of arson, and eventually, the camp was sold to developers who immediately converted it into prime suburban condos.

Camp Woodland was unique because although it was clearly a very left-wing institution, it was successful in a way that the score of other Communist camps, both within and outside of its orbit, was not. At one extreme were the overt Communist Party institutions, which included Camp Unity (later Wingdale on the Lake) for adults, and two children’s camps, Camp Kinderland (affiliated with the Yiddish Communist fraternal group, the International Worker’s Order), and the very hard-line Camp Wo-Chi-Ca. Perhaps the name was meant to confuse innocents, who might think that it was some kind of Indian name. But Wo-Chi-Ca stood for Worker’s Children’s Camp, to indicate its proletarian orientation, or to make it clear to Daily Worker subscribers that this is where their children should go. The camp developed its social hall “The Paul Robeson Playhouse” and regularly engaged in open Party activities. During the great 1950s comic book scare—the “Catskill Mountain Folk Songs” song book—a book edited by the left-wing psychiatrist Dr. Frederick Wertham—the camp’s yearbook reported proudly that its campers were asked to turn in all their comic books, which were then burned in a huge evening public bonfire. In that manner, the Wo-Chi-Ca campers were purged of whatever racism and pro-Americanism might have been instilled in them by the dangerous cartoon strips. No “Captain America” or “Wo-Chi-Ca campers”

Eventually, the camp was forced to close when local super patriots raided the camp with rifles, putting fear into parents, who quickly pulled their children out. In the heated atmosphere of ’50s America, the negative publicity the camp received in the press was too much for them to take, and the institution closed its door.

My camp, Camp Woodland, received its share of bad publicity, but it did not meet the same end as Wo-Chi-Ca. Indeed, during the House Committee on Un-American Activities’ foray into the New York area, the directors and some staff members of Woodland were subpoenaed. But the local upstate New York Republican newspapers, which ran editorials praising its programs and its presence in the region, defended the camp. At one point, the camp was even featured in a book edited by the left-wing composer Alan Lomax, was carrying out at the Library of Congress, who interviewed children from South with his ancient recording machine, finding among others, Leadbelly and, later, Marvin Yale, who Cazden described as a “hermit-like rural handyman with a droll manner.” He went on to recount how the whole Edwards clan could sing and tell stories throughout the night. And the songs were sung at barn dances, husking bees, and apple peels. It was, indeed, far different than our modern era. And then Studer got to the point. The singing of community activities, the square dances and quadrilles, were “testimony to the creativeness and endurance of men and women!” But then, alas, the modern era dawned. “The age of curses—the radio, the phonograph and the movies—canned entertainment.” Their music might have died, but for one thing. “The WPA throughout the country began to collect folklore.” And so it was that the New Deal, with the influence on it of the political and cultural Left, was tied to the tradition of people like Edwards, even if he and his friends did not know it. And Studer, relating how Woodland then brought him to its quarters, cited what he thought was the camp’s importance. “It seeks to bring city and country people together in a neighborhood way; getting people together of all races, creeds, backgrounds in fellowship with one another.” But Studer ended his article by gener-
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Edwards was the camp’s greatest find. In an article about him written years after his death in 1949, Studer explained why he was important, and in what way his life was connected with the heyday of Popular Front culture. Edwards, Studer wrote in a 1955 issue of the magazine "belonged to the days of the lumber camps, tanneries and quarries, when raftsmen rode the Delaware and canals plied the old D and H canal. His father, a scooper who lived a carefree life [was] always on hand with a ditty or a good story. He went on to recount how the whole Edwards clan could sing and tell stories throughout the night. And the songs were sung at barn dances, husking bees, and apple peels. It was, indeed, far different than our modern era. And then Studer got to the point. The singing of community activities, the square dances and quadrilles, were “testimony to the creative and endurance of men and women!” But then, alas, the modern era dawned. “The age of curses—the radio, the phonograph and the movies—canned entertainment.” Their music might have died, but for one thing. “The WPA throughout the country began to collect folklore.” And so it was that the New Deal, with the influence on it of the political and cultural Left, was tied to the tradition of people like Edwards, even if he and his friends did not know it. And Studer, relating how Woodland then brought him to its quarters, cited what he thought was the camp’s importance. “It seeks to bring city and country people together in a neighborhood way; getting people together of all races, creeds, backgrounds in fellowship with one another.” But Studer ended his article by gen-
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To bring the folklore to the public, at the end of each camp year Woodland present- ed the Folk Festival of the Catskills, at which campers and counselors, along with numerous authentic Catskills folk musicians and songsters performed songs and stories which were performed publicly at the Phoenicia ski slope, in long afternoon sessions, one of which I well remember. The camp also produced a different cantata each summer, and in this effort, the face of Popular Front culture was most visible. Most people know this summer's efforts by heart, such efforts, Earl Robinson's and John LaToouche's "Ballad for Americans," made most famous by Red Army Choir, longing at the 1940 Republican Party convention. And Robinson and Millard Lampell's "Lonesome Train," about the death of Sojourner Truth. By pre- viously named and fashioned after the Soviet bloc World Youth Festivals, which were the Cominform's post-war attempt to attract American-backed fascists, and nobly preaching the message of one summer youth festival was, in fact, the time at camp where Woodland boy campers at times, of course, performed these, but they had their own composers and their own cantatas. The most popular was Herbert Hauptrech's "We've Come from the City," which in a simple manner preached the message of farmer-labor unity, a mythical favorite of Party propaganda. It was. I recall, a rather trite and pedestrian piece of work. Its main chorus extolled:

*We've Come from the City, We've Come from the Town, We've Come from the City, To Shake Your Apples Down; You Have Called Us City Slickers, We Have Called You Hicks.*

You get the idea—our goals were the same, and with a proper attitude unity can and will be achieved. The camp also nobly worked to acquaintance us with those who were up till then neglected fighters for civil rights and freedom. Thus Bob Dorr, the brilliant and charac- teristic composer and singer (later leader of the Belafonte Singers during Harry Belafonte's heyday, and head of the New York Choral Society), composed a cantata about the life of Sojourner Truth. By present- ing these works at each year's Catskill Folk Festival, the Camp did its part to bring the broader Popular Front message to the local inhabi- tants.

Then at the day's end, the events were capped off with a long evening of square and folk dancing, with the calls provided by numerous Catskill musicians—often accompanied by the various counselors and campers, a group which at different times included John Cohen, later and still one of the New Lost City Ramblers; Julius Lester, remembered fondly by his friends as having started out his career as a folksinger; Eric Weissberg, later of The Tarriers and banjo player extraordinary who had the hit record "Dueling Banjos," which he first played for me, one afternoon, at the "Del of Delierance." And, of course, no summer could be complete without the arrival of Pete Seeger, who at times stayed for days on end, performing, film- ing the camp and participating in various events. I can still vividly recall the sleepout on top of a local mountain, at which Seeger woke us very late at night, singing madly the old holler "Wake up Jacob," as he grilled eggs and bacon on a frying pan.

It was events like these that have caused long after to linger in my mind and as a source of personal pride and pleasure to look back on a time when all would live in peace and harmony under socialism.

**Everywhere the youth are singing**

**Freedom's Song,**

**Freedom's Song,**

**We are the Youth,**

**And the World claims our Song of Truth.**

How poor Shostakovich must have blanched to be forced to write these words, knowing fully that the "truth" the ballad espoused masked the worst horrors imaginable. At Woodland, the teams were divided into teams with different col- ors, and playoffs were between the two win- ning teams. Woodland had something else instead—the "summer youth festival," obvi- ously named and fashioned after the Soviet bloc World Youth Festivals, which were the Cominform's post-war attempt to attract young people to the Communist cause by orga- nizing yearly trips to whatever Soviet bloc nation hosted the festival. There, young people would begin and end the festivities by joining together with all the world's youth in atten- dance, where they would link hands and sing "The World Youth Song," penned for the event by the Soviet composer Dimitri Shostakovich. And of course, we sang it at times at Woodland. I can recall the lyrical, bright tune, promising a better tomorrow when all would live in peace and harmony under socialism.

Pete Seeger Singing Camp Songs

I do recall the two visi- tors informing us of how Stalin closed off the borders to prevent Yugoslav arms going to their comrades, in order to keep the New York branch of the GPU from going to the GDR. The New York branch was always to be a center of the Cominform's post-war attempt to prevent the spread of the American-backed fascist regimes there. It was events like these that have caused long after to linger in my mind and as a source of personal pride and pleasure to look back on a time when all would live in peace and harmony under socialism.

**Everywhere the youth are singing**

**Freedom's Song,**

**Freedom's Song,**

**We are the Youth,**

**And the World claims our Song of Truth.**
left taking our names and addresses. Sure enough, a few months after camp, the two appeared at my parents’ apartment, asking to see me. They had come ready to have me join their ranks. At the time, a young junior high school student, I was not quite ready. But they had sowed the seeds, and a year or two later I joined the youth arm of the Party entirely on my own.

I also was a camper the year the armistice in Korea took place, ending the fight in which the United States had conducted a highly unpopular dragged-out war. One has to remember that to most Americans—who, it turns out, had it right all along—the first time the United States armed aggression against North Korea. All of us had read I.F. Stone’s conspiracy theory against North Korea. All of us had of U.S.-backed South Korean aggression by Stalin’s puppet in Korea, the great leader, Kim Il Sung. But to the legions of the so-called Stockholm Peace Petition.

It was a litany of the expected refrain: the rejection of America’s official culture into that realm of the masses, who supposedly would translate their demand peace was a victory for the country ostensibly wanted war, to demand peace was a victory for the forces of socialism.

On Sunday morning, when the camp gathered at our amphitheater for our regular Sunday ecumenical gathering—the substitute for religious services at regular camps—we had a special service to honor the new peace. Norman Studer, the camp’s director, spoke of the hope it gave those of us who were on the right side in our own country (i.e., the Left side) and we all sang those favorite peace songs—“Study War No More,” “Strangest Dream,” and of course, “Put My Name Down,” a song that called upon people to sign the Soviet propaganda document, the so-called Stockholm Peace Petition. Some of us wondered what our true Party comrades at Wo-Chi-Ca were doing. After all, we had wanted North Korea to win, but the Left wanted the country for socialism—and I recall debating whether in fact the peace treaty had been an actual defeat for the forces of revolution. At Wo-Chi-Ca and Kinderland, we thought, they would have had a better and more honest perspective, and would not have left the official statements to a bland celebration of the attainment of peace.

About 15 or so years ago, a memorial meeting was held for Norman Studer at the auditorium of the left-wing New York union, Local 1199, the old Hospital Worker’s Union. Founded by the late Leon Davis, who built the auditorium of the left-wing New York union, the camp may not have been overtly political, in the sense that it sought to implement the politics and views of the official Communist movement. But its directors and staff saw the camp as part of what they believed was the “broad progressive community,” of which Communists were a central part. The emphasis on folk music alone as an integral part of the camp’s program dovetailed with the Party’s discovery of folk music as a key part of the Popular Front. As they contrasted the authenticity of the music with the supposed commercialization of folk music, adoption of folk music was seen as a way of reaching the real working class who supposedly would translate their rejection of America’s official culture into that of adopting the political program of the Marxist party. For those who were not so political, it was simply an unspoken understanding that the Soviet bloc countries were on the right side of history, and that somehow or other, Camp Woodland was in its own way part of that same worldwide struggle for the better socialist future.

As I look through the roster of names on the camp’s reunion alumni list, it reads like a Who’s Who of the Old and New Left. The camp may not have been overtly political, in the sense that it sought to implement the politics and views of the official Communist movement. But its directors and staff saw the camp as part of what they believed was the “broad progressive community,” of which Communists were a central part. The emphasis on folk music alone as an integral part of the camp’s program dovetailed with the Party’s discovery of folk music as a key part of the Popular Front. As they contrasted the authenticity of the music with the supposed commercialization of folk music, adoption of folk music was seen as a way of reaching the real working class who supposedly would translate their rejection of America’s official culture into that of adopting the political program of the Marxist party. For those who were not so political, it was simply an unspoken understanding that the Soviet bloc countries were on the right side of history, and that somehow or other, Camp Woodland was in its own way part of that same worldwide struggle for the better socialist future.

As we grew and made our way in the world—the alumni of Camp Woodland by and large, never left the milieu in which we spent our formative late childhood and early teen years. The Popular Front may have disappeared politically with the demise of Earl Browder, but the culture it created lived on. Indeed, it even was co-opted and put to modern patriotic use by Ronald Reagan. During the 1976 Centennial celebrations, viewers of the Presidential gala at the Statue of Liberty were treated to Freeway of Love, a folk-ied PopFront standard he recorded during the FDR years, Earl Robinson’s “The House I Live In.” A song that Robinson wrote to celebrate the United States, he had written for President on his pro-Communist third-party ticket—and Camp Woodland is a serene resting place for the children of those who thought they were engaging in the last ditch struggle to prevent World War III, and who, in so doing, would make the future safe for socialism.

A few years back my old college roommate and friend, the writer, filmmaker and former U.S. Army specialist Bill Brickman, appeared on a network television show and was queried about a line he wrote for Annie Hall, the film he co-authored with Woody Allen. As I recall the movie, one of the female characters had said that like so many others, she attended “socialist summer camp.” Indeed, it even was co-opted and put to modern patriotic use by Ronald Reagan. During the 1976 Centennial celebrations, viewers of the Presidential gala at the Statue of Liberty were treated to Freeway of Love, a folk-ied PopFront standard he recorded during the FDR years, Earl Robinson’s “The House I Live In.” A song that Robinson wrote to celebrate the United States, he had written for President on his pro-Communist third-party ticket—and Camp Woodland is a serene resting place for the children of those who thought they were engaging in the last ditch struggle to prevent World War III, and who, in so doing, would make the future safe for socialism.

That description, in a nutshell, served well as a coda for Woodland. And because of this, I decided not to attend the event at New Paltz. Having moved on in my view of the world and long since left the world of the Old Left, I knew that attending would have made me party to a nostalgia trip of memories by those who were still mourning that world’s demise. Those who were in prison for violation of the Smith Act, despite their suffering, were hardly great American heroes. The memorial meeting at 1199 for Norman Studer had taken place soon after my first article on the Rosenberg case was published in 1979, and even though at that time I still thought of myself as a man of the Left, the irony of attending the commemoration of a program that organized the nursing staff of New York hospitals, the union had a long relationship with Camp Woodland. Throughout the years, Davis sponsored scholars and children of the children of his members away for the summer, thereby creating a base of support for the camp as well as a body of knowledge that would become the core of his work, published in 1986. The Rosenberg case—when the sons went to the gallows REALLY time for the two generations of Morton and Helen Rosenberg, the children of the ostracized and the blacklisted, including the children of Morton and Helen Sobell, and the two sons of the Rosenbergs, Michael and Robert Mecropoulus. (In a strange twist of fate—given my own personal involvement with the Rosenberg case—when the sons first went to the camp, my parents gave their adopted parents, the Mecropoulus, my old footlocker to use for their clothes when they went off for the summer.) And there were the children of some of the Smith Act victims, as well as those whose parents sought to disappear as the Party instructed its key cadre to go underground, in order to avoid being picked up in the period when it taught that fascism was on the horizon. I remember one of my campmates telling me of the various complicated arrangements he had to undertake to even see his father—including waiting at selected subway stops in New York, where his father would come off a subway car and visit him for a few minutes. The Rosenberg File

Ronald Radosh is co-author, with Joyce Milton, of The Rosenberg File, recently reissued in a new edition.
The Postmodern Bible

The Bible and Culture Collective
Yale University Press, 1995

Reviewed by Thomas F. Bertonneau

T he collectively authored Postmodern Bible prompts the partly familiar question, how many cutting-edge theorists does it take to screw in a light-bulb—or rather—to screw up Scripture? The answer, in this case, is ten—less, if I am not mistaken, than that which John adduced to prove himself sufficiently for Jesus’ prescription that “wherever two or more are gathered in my name...”

Immediately, however, this densely written tome from Yale University Press must disappoint because the book under review is not an apologia for the sake of amusement; it is not, I mean, a rewritten, PC version of the Bible, with God desexed or unsexed (or versified), the strident voice of feminism infused throughout, and the agony of sensibility settled imperiously over the whole. (Exodus 20 sanitized, for example, into an anti-hegemonic and pleasantly untethering “Tea Party” version, with Did God say that one’s interest or raised one’s hackles. Alas, what “The Bible and Culture Collective” have produced, linking themselves in a socialist shock brigade of the indelivered authors, is a mere plethora on dozens of grad-school-esoterted anthologies offering summaries of Saussure, Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, Johnson, Kristeva, Irigaray, and all the other dark luminaries of contemporary epistemological nihilism, “a suspicion of the absolute status, the knowledged, the implied destruction of certainty that they entail—this is the perfected ‘language of dominance’ that TPB disingenuously attributes to the traditional readings of the Testaments Old and New. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to learn that “the politics of reading is... an obvious focus of our book,” and that the text becomes “an experience which occurs during the reader’s experience,” whereupon the meaning of the text as a privileged object is displaced in favor of this entire volume seeks to explore and enable: a foundational shift in biblical criticism rather enacts what this entire volume seeks to explore and enable: a foundational shift in biblical criticism

But I believe I hear a cock crowing. does echo its scriptural prompts the partly familiar question, for readers of postmodern criticism, the meaning of the text lies the reader, or in the language of today’s disengaged undergraduates, “Whatever... The Bible and Culture Collective require membership in the club. They say (blowing hard) that “the reader and the text [being] interdependent, the text as a privileged object is displaced in favor of the subject from which it is read and translated into the World.” Whatever... In structuralist criticism, the critic, reveals, à la mode de Derrida, the “binary opposition that structures the traditional reading, which revelation, in turn, lays bare “how culture is constituted by the valuation of one term in the opposition over the other.” Narratologists show how the Gospel, for example, spin tales in such oppositions, in a strategy that the text becomes “an experience which occurs during the reading process.” Weighting the readerly side of the reader-Bible interdependency free the subject from elision to the text and translates into the World.”

The collective authorship of TPB defines poststructuralist criticism (a.k.a. deconstruction) as the identification “of points of failure in a system... at which it is able to seize coherence only by excluding and forgetting the meaning that which it cannot assimilate.” Since the Bible has traditionally offered itself as the transparent Word of God, Derrida’s critique of “logocentrism,” the Western tendency to grasp at objects and possessions simply because they currently belong to someone else. Much of the Bible, of course, for example, instantly becomes obsessively interested in what it says and not in how it is said, ignoring until I pick it up to put it away. Thievery is covetousness. So is putting the money on your neighbor’s wife. The danger implied by covetousness is in retaliation. If my neighbor finds me in bed coveting his wife, he is likely to forget the seventh commandment and shoot us both into sheol. My hot-blooded Creole relatives will have no doubt seek revenge on their own and, before I know it, the community is riven by a full-scale vendetta. God admonishes the Hebrews not to worship idols (a) because the idols are false (i.e., not gods and not deserving of worship) and (b) because the manner of propitiating them entails human sacrifice, a practice forbidden since Abraham went up the mountain with God and in which many traditional postmodernists morally can see no difference. But much matters because it can see no difference. Much matters because it is not what one hopes it will be, if only for the sake of amusement; it is not, I mean, a rewritten, PC version of the Bible, with God desexed or unsexed (or versified), the strident voice of feminism infused throughout, and the agony of sensibility settled imperiously over the whole. (Exodus 20 sanitized, for example, into an anti-hegemonic and pleasantly untethering “Tea Party” version, with Did God say that one’s interest or raised one’s hackles. Alas, what “The Bible and Culture Collective” have produced, linking themselves in a socialist shock brigade of the indelivered authors, is a mere plethora on dozens of grad-school-esoterted anthologies offering summaries of Saussure, Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, Johnson, Kristeva, Irigaray, and all the other dark luminaries of contemporary epistemological nihilism, “a suspicion of the absolute status, the knowledged, the implied destruction of certainty that they entail—this is the perfected ‘language of dominance’ that TPB disingenuously attributes to the traditional readings of the Testaments Old and New. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to learn that “the politics of reading is... an obvious focus of our book,” and that the text becomes “an experience which occurs during the reader’s experience,” whereupon the meaning of the text as a privileged object is displaced in favor of the subject from which it is read and translated into the World.”

Immediately, however, this densely written tome from Yale University Press must disappoint because the book under review is not an apologia for the sake of amusement; it is not, I mean, a rewritten, PC version of the Bible, with God desexed or unsexed (or versified), the strident voice of feminism infused throughout, and the agony of sensibility settled imperiously over the whole. (Exodus 20 sanitized, for example, into an anti-hegemonic and pleasantly untethering “Tea Party” version, with Did God say that one’s interest or raised one’s hackles. Alas, what “The Bible and Culture Collective” have produced, linking themselves in a socialist shock brigade of the indelivered authors, is a mere plethora on dozens of grad-school-esoterted anthologies offering summaries of Saussure, Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, Johnson, Kristeva, Irigaray, and all the other dark luminaries of contemporary epistemological nihilism, “a suspicion of the absolute status, the knowledged, the implied destruction of certainty that they entail—this is the perfected ‘language of dominance’ that TPB disingenuously attributes to the traditional readings of the Testaments Old and New. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to learn that “the politics of reading is... an obvious focus of our book,” and that the text becomes “an experience which occurs during the reader’s experience,” whereupon the meaning of the text as a privileged object is displaced in favor of the subject from which it is read and translated into the World.”

The authorship of TPB defines poststructuralist criticism (a.k.a. deconstruction) as the identification “of points of failure in a system... at which it is able to seize coherence only by excluding and forgetting the meaning that which it cannot assimilate.” Since the Bible has traditionally offered itself as the transparent Word of God, Derrida’s critique of “logocentrism,” the Western tenden...
Supreme Court to Decide Whether Vote Goes to the Dogs
By Judith Schumann Weizner

The Supreme Court has announced that it will hear arguments to determine whether the State of New York must continue to allow George Chienne, an Akita, to register to vote.

The case has been working its way through the courts since 1997, when George was refused entry into the voting booth for a school board election in his Chemung County hometown of Hundesberg, despite the fact that his owner, Debbie Chienne, produced a valid voter registration card obtained for him by mail during a state wide voter registration drive.

Ms. Chienne insists that she never had any desire to make George a cause célèbre and underscores this claim by explaining that after the polling supervisor forbade George to enter the voting booth, she handled the situation quietly, obtaining absentee ballots for him in the next three elections, instead of filing suit.

Subsequently, however, George was forced to relinquish the franchise when his Christmas Eve rescue of three kittens from certain death under the wheels of a speeding train—while their distraught mother looked on, frozen with fear—made the front page of the Hundesberg Citizen. An alert Board of Elections clerk, reading the story to his children, made the connection between the George Chienne in the story and the George Chienne whose signature on an absentee ballot had struck him as unusual.

Upon revocation of George’s voter registration, Ms. Chienne reluctantly decided to press George’s case in court, and hired Steve Badger, legal counsel for Humans for the Sensitive Protection of Animals (HuSPA), to restore George’s civil rights. The suit, Chienne v. Chemung County Board of Elections, charged that George, who is the recorded voice on the “Fearsome Fido” Electronic Household Cat Lifetime Membership Account, is entitled to the franchise because he is a minor celebrity in Hundesberg and a minor celebrity in Hundesberg with a good name of civil rights.

The Court of Appeals ordered a new trial. This trial, lasting seventeen weeks, ended when the jury found that although George did earn money on which taxes were paid, the money was actually Ms. Chienne’s, as George had no independent bank account and did not write checks. Based on this finding, Judge Kenneth Jerbelle ruled that since Ms. Chienne was the tax-payer and was registered to vote, the Chienne household already had all the representation it was entitled to. He ordered George’s name stricken from the rolls.

Badger returned to the Court of Appeals, arguing that the criteria set forth in the lower court’s ruling amounted to discrimination on the basis of his client’s ability to balance a checkbook and write with a pen. He argued that George’s ability to express his voting preferences independently of Ms. Chienne, was entitled to a pseudo-scientific construct [IQ] that was solely to limit the self-determination of the candidates was challenged as being cover for a minimum-IQ requirement. The stipulation was dropped when the court ruled that it was “grounded in a pseudo-scientific construct [IQ] that exists solely to limit the self-determination of groups regarded by some as marginal.”

The Court of Appeals reversed Judge Jerbelle’s decision and directed the Board of Elections to permit George to register on condition that he demonstrate the ability to express his voting preferences independently of Ms. Chienne. Ms. Chienne readily agreed, noting that, given his strong opinions about people, George would have no trouble expressing his preferences once he had met the candidates, although she feels that his right to vote in presidential elections might be restricted if she were not able to drive him to meet the candidates.

Mr. Badger says he is looking forward to arguing George’s case before the Supreme Court. A graduate of National Law School, he has been chairman of the school’s Animal Rights Department since 1994 and has been in the forefront of the animal rights movement for the past 12 years.

Speaking on Sable News Network’s “Tomorrow’s News Today,” Mr. Badger told reporter Jeffrey Lyncks, “It is unfortunate that the Court’s decision concerning such an important matter will be based on the narrow question of taxation without representation, because, at best, a positive ruling will benefit only a small number of animals—those that have jobs. I would be happier if this case were going to settle the matter of the vote for all animals.”

He pointed out that although this appears to be uncharted territory in law, in fact it is not. “As late as the 15th century, there were trials in France in which animals were charged with crimes. They had state-paid attorneys and were convicted or acquitted like humans. It was a very advanced concept that somehow never caught on in Anglo-Saxon law. Anyway, the Constitution makes no distinctions according to species. This ought to be a no-brainer.”
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“George Chienne

The Court of Appeals ordered a new trial. This trial, lasting seventeen weeks, ended when the jury found that although George did earn money on which taxes were paid, the money was actually Ms. Chienne’s, as George had no independent bank account and did not write checks. Based on this finding, Judge Kenneth Jerbelle ruled that since Ms. Chienne was the tax-payer and was registered to vote, the Chienne household already had all the representation it was entitled to. He ordered George’s name stricken from the rolls.

Badger returned to the Court of Appeals, arguing that the criteria set forth in the lower court’s ruling amounted to discrimination on the basis of his client’s ability to balance a checkbook and write with a pen. He argued that George’s ability to express his voting preferences independently of Ms. Chienne, was entitled to a pseudo-scientific construct [IQ] that exists solely to limit the self-determination of groups regarded by some as marginal.”

The Court of Appeals reversed Judge Jerbelle’s decision and directed the Board of Elections to permit George to register on condition that he demonstrate the ability to express his voting preferences independently of Ms. Chienne. Ms. Chienne readily agreed, noting that, given his strong opinions about people, George would have no trouble expressing his preferences once he had met the candidates, although she feels that his right to vote in presidential elections might be restricted if she were not able to drive him to meet the candidates.

Mr. Badger says he is looking forward to arguing George’s case before the Supreme Court. A graduate of National Law School, he has been chairman of the school’s Animal Rights Department since 1994 and has been in the forefront of the animal rights movement for the past 12 years.

Speaking on Sable News Network’s “Tomorrow’s News Today,” Mr. Badger told reporter Jeffrey Lyncks, “It is unfortunate that the Court’s decision concerning such an important matter will be based on the narrow question of taxation without representation, because, at best, a positive ruling will benefit only a small number of animals—those that have jobs. I would be happier if this case were going to settle the matter of the vote for all animals.”

He pointed out that although this appears to be uncharted territory in law, in fact it is not. “As late as the 15th century, there were trials in France in which animals were charged with crimes. They had state-paid attorneys and were convicted or acquitted like humans. It was a very advanced concept that somehow never caught on in Anglo-Saxon law. Anyway, the Constitution makes no distinctions according to species. This ought to be a no-brainer.”

“This book shows how the race card is always dealt—off the bottom of the deck.”
—RUSH LIMBAUGH

“A harrowing account of a journey across America’s troubled racial landscape, now densely populated with double-dealing opportunists and incendiary crackpots. By exposing these charlatans, Horowitz and Collier point the way to a rehabilitation of the good name of civil rights.”
—DINESH D’SOUZA
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