historians like Kevin Brownlow, who said he was “dismayed” by the DGA’s decision, while the National Society of Film Critics, the leading association of U.S. film critics, deplored the move as “a depressing example of ‘political correctness’ as an erasure and rewriting of American film history, causing a grave disservice to the reputation of a pioneering American filmmaker.”

In so publicly rejecting the founding father of cinema as an art form, the DGA has not only rejected an American legend, but cast aspersions on its own traditions as well. Not only has Griffith long been recognized throughout the world for the centrality of his contributions to filmmaking by most film historians and filmmakers irrespective of their politics, but the DGA itself paid homage to his historic role when they bestowed upon him their first lifetime membership in 1938. While Griffith’s great Civil War-Reconstruction film, The Birth of a Nation, has caused controversy since its first showing in 1915, major American filmmakers, like Charlie Chaplin and Orson Welles, apparently never saw any conflict between their support of liberal causes and their unswerving admiration for Griffith.

Continued on page 8

LINO GRATGIALA’S ONGOING ALAMO AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

by Marc Levin

In 1997, University of Texas law professor Lino Graglia touched off a national firestorm by saying, in response to a reporter’s question as to whether the achievement gap between whites and minorities was genetic or cultural, that some minorities come from cultures in which “failure is not looked upon with disgrace.” It was the opposite of Bell Curve thinking, but that didn’t matter. This sound-bite made Graglia the left’s most hated professor virtually overnight. After sit-ins disrupted the law school, Jesse Jackson arrived on campus to rally thousands of students in favor of firing Graglia. Before the uproar was over, the law school building containing Graglia’s office had to be secured by police following numerous death threats. He is still on the enemies list, but emotion has cooled somewhat. In fact, after the recent publication of Domestic Tranquility, his wife Carolyn’s attack on feminism, he may no longer even be the most hated member of his family.

Although Lino Graglia’s critics on the left, from student activists to tenured radicals, continually insist that he is a racist and a bigot, his own life tells a different story. He grew up in Brooklyn, the son of Italian immigrants. After his father died when he was 13, Graglia worked his way through high school and college. “In high school, I was the pin boy at bowling alley leagues,” he recalls. “I set up pins at two alleys at a time, making three times the minimum wage in violation of all those good child labor laws protecting me from these horrors.”

Graglia attended Brooklyn Tech, a magnet school designed to produce engineers. He didn’t go into the profession, but he was able to find work at huge defense plants as a machine operator. Graglia recalls,
THE DUTY TO DIE

Well, now I'm depressed. For several years I have cheered on Heterodoxy as a periodical which occupied a unique and important niche in political reporting. As an example, I got quite a lift from Benjamin Kepple's article ("The Camel's Nose," November/December 1999) on the progress made by conservative campus newcomers. But then I had to read Wesley J. Smith's article, "Death on Demand," (November/December 1999) explaining how he, and like-minded people in Congress are trying to make sure that I will be out of luck if I suffer intractable pain in my last days. (When one gets to be my age, there is a tendency to dwell on such matters.) For the most part, I have found in the past that I can get through an issue of Heterodoxy without the need to wade into or bypass one more article on school prayer, abortion, evolution, or similar controversial matters. Have the editors bypass one more article on school prayer, abortion, evolution, or similar controversial matters? Have the editors really thought about where they are taking Heterodoxy? Are they ready to antagonize an important segment of their readership that is with them on the old issues like freedom of speech and unmasking the corruption and criminal activities of the far left? I don't think that we have yet won all the old battles that you have helped fight and might expect most reasonable people to support. Let's not march off to more dubious ones.

Harold Farr
North Conway, NH

I am simply flabbergasted that you printed a piece of trash like "Death on Demand." (November/December 1999) The goal of Mr. Smith's "International Anti-Euthanasia Task Force" runs utterly counter to the notions of personal freedom, which you espouse, and in favor of the kind of State paternalism that you detest. Mr. Smith talks about a "death agenda" which is a bunch of hooey. Mother Nature is the one true agenda. It's hard to believe, but thirty years after the counterculture protested for open-mindedness, the people that were once protesters are the very people who are trying to play God and keep us from the perils of abortion. It's hard to believe, but God doesn't even do that.

Alan Unholz
Via Internet

"Heavens! Heaven!" to Ken Kersch and his wonderful exulsie of the totalitarian mindset behind the Robert Woods Johnson Foundation and its efforts to sculpt college students to their idea of how "responsible citizens" should act. These same efforts are currently underway here at the University of Delaware thanks to a $100,000 grant from RWJ, although the administration here appears to be less student in their approach. The new rules aren't quite as extreme, but the new set and intentions are exactly the same and appear to be having the same consequences.

We had a student who made a vow to drink 1,000 beers in one semester (he was an honors student, by the way) as a means of protest and actually got people to contribute to his cause by donating beer, etc. I thought that this was incredibly funny and right to the point, but the most frightening part was that all of my coworkers in the library couldn't see the humor. They thought it was "just terrible" that a student would do such a thing in the face of this "serious problem." I have to wonder if any of these folks were ever young or did they just sprout right into daddy-duddiness from birth? We are occasionally given a "progress report" from the administration that is usually heavy on unpe- cific rhetoric and light on any actual results. Never have any facts or figures been presented that could show any sign of "improvement" on campus, just the usual bromides of "how things are getting better," yada yada yada. The school even tried to get the local bars to stop happy hours but that went over like a ton of bricks; the bar owners aren't stupid and it just caused the tensions between the university and the local merchants, strained already, to worsen.

Delaware has always known as a party school, which I'm sure is one reason we got the grant in the first place, so I would doubt that there has been a significant increase in drug and/or alcohol use; there was plenty already. But my guess is that that would change if the university tried to impose the same heavy-handed restrictions that Lehigh has. I have always believed that everyone should have at least 2 years at the university in the private sector so that they can understand how a capitalist system works. After 11 years at this university I have come to the conclusion that everyone should also be forced to work on a college campus for two years so that they can be exposed to the nonsense that passes for "progressive thinking" these days. Unfortunately, most people have no idea how many totalitarian ideas are passed along to our children through these institutions of "higher learning."

Tom Melvin
Via Internet

THE DECLINE IN EDUCATION

As an affirmative action officer, I received a negative recommendation about the review by Joseph Horn of Sandra Stotisky's book ("Losing Our Language." October 1999) from someone who assumed I would disagree with her conclusions or his support of them because they seem to argue for less attention to subtle factors in pedagogical problems that sometimes coincide with attention to extremely sensitive areas. My recommendation was in a way correct: I have always contended that equal opportunity is partially responsible for the decline of the educational system. However, I believe this is so not because equality in itself is evil, but because the educational system used to benefit from discrimination against women, talented women who had no choice but to become teachers. In the early '70s, women started bailing from the teacher credential path that was their only choice in academia. The result, because teaching is a thankless, largely unappreciated, and extremely difficult job, is that only the very few who are brilliant and dedicated to education and the very many who are unable to succeed at other academ- ic programs in college are teaching our children. I cannot tell you how many times my son brought in un- tellable note home from an administrator. Once my son was the only voice in his 7th grade science class (in a public school) arguing for evolution. The teacher is not to dumb down the curriculum, although that obvi- ously will please teachers who don't understand the material. It is to make teaching more attractive, either by a raise in pay or status, and to arrange for the kind of institutional and personal support that would allow an adult with choices to choose teaching and remain in the classroom for longer than the three years that I believe is the national average—in-service education, meaningful administrative and peer assistance with dis- cipline and academic problems, respect, shared teaching loads. Instead, current teachers are faced with stagnant or reduced budgets because of the insane dependence on property taxes to fund our schools. Their resources are declining even as the need for them grows. I applaud your choice of reviewers and hope that you will continue to support those who gather statis- tical evidence for the decline in education so that we can, as a society, take steps to correct it.

Melanie Griffin
Via Internet

A MISOGYNISTIC ADMINISTRATION

Bravo, Ms. Emery ("The Party of Porn," October 1999) for the expose on the despicable trash- ing of the courageous women (and men) that dared stand up to this administration. I never would have believed that the mainstream media would ever be so complicit with such scams, but again and again they turn their heads as these people say and do the nastiest and cruelest things imaginable to their critics. What gall it takes for them to then point the fingers at conservatives and accuse us of mean-spiritedness. They invented the phrase.

Rhonda Roddy
Via Internet

LEHIGH AND DRY

From a student who attended the institution from 1995-1998, I can say that the Ken Kersch ("Leigh and Dry," October 1999) hit the nail on the head. The new rules have indeed caused the students to lock their doors and drink heavily and quietly. Also, the reports have come to the conclusion that everyone should also
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MOTHER AFRICA: Al Sharpton has made himself into America's premier racial demagogue, forcing Hillary and other aspiring members of the Race Industry to kiss his ring. He's also made himself into, literally, a bouncer. The term is always stuck in a familiar groove. So when he holds a rally, it often has the feel of history repeating itself, whether as tragedy or farce or both—a feeling he is only too happy to question. Never more so than last month, when Sharpton presented Winnie Mandela at his latest protest concerning the trial of police officers. In an attempt to make his arguments stick, this time over a judge's decision to move the trial of the four accused police officers to Albany in hopes of finding an unbiased jury, he complained that they had not been able to find a jury that was “decidedly white.” Of course, that is not true, and Sharpton’s remarks are made in a way that is always intended to inflame black sentiment. But it is a sentiment that he knows how to play to his audience. It is a sentiment that he has nurtured, and that he continues to nurture, in order to keep his own political career afloat.

THE GANG THAT COULDN'T DING STRAIGHT: In an attempt to destroy what it considers to be genetically altered plants, the ecoterrorist group known as the Washington Tree Improvement Association invaded a greenhouse at a Washington State University facility near Seattle and killed more than 180 plants. But instead of killing what they thought were genetically altered poplar trees and a few bags of raspberry plants, they ended up destroying un-modified poplar trees and a few bags of raspberry plants. The damage has left scientists perplexed, with one telling the Seattle Times, “Obviously if someone cannot tell the difference between a raspberry plant and a poplar tree, they’re not doing very well environmentally.”

THE FIGHT CLUB: Jesse Jackson recently declared at an Illinois church that the expulsion of six black students in the city of Decatur was the biggest civil rights issue in America today, according to the Associated Press. The six were tossed out after they were involved in a particularly vicious gang melee at a football game that was so raucous that fans had to rush to get out of the way of the brawling hoodlums. But hours after Jackson had made his case yet again that the students were punished too harshly for their sins, one of them got in trouble with the law. After Jackson had made his case yet again that the students were punished too harshly for their sins, one of them got in trouble with the law. Instead of killing what they thought were genetically altered poplar trees and a few bags of raspberry plants, they ended up destroying un-modified poplar trees and a few bags of raspberry plants.

REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM
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THE FIGHT CLUB: Jesse Jackson recently declared at an Illinois church that the expulsion of six black students in the city of Decatur was the biggest civil rights issue in America today, according to the Associated Press. The six were tossed out after they were involved in a particularly vicious gang melee at a football game that was so raucous that fans had to rush to get out of the way of the brawling hoodlums. But hours after Jackson had made his case yet again that the students were punished too harshly for their sins, one of them got in trouble with the law. Instead of killing what they thought were genetically altered poplar trees and a few bags of raspberry plants, they ended up destroying un-modified poplar trees and a few bags of raspberry plants. The damage has left scientists perplexed, with one telling the Seattle Times, “Obviously if someone cannot tell the difference between a raspberry plant and a poplar tree, they’re not doing very well environmentally.”

GOOD NOT TO GO: According to a recent report in the Washington Times, the Chinese government is actively preparing for a future war with the United States. The newspaper reports a newly-released book of translated articles authored by Chinese military strategists shows that they plan “to use a combination of Marxist-Leninist doctrine and ancient Chinese tactics against the United States,” which they view as a state whose dominance is similar to that of Nazi Germany. The Chinese government wishes to render useless American aircraft-carrier battle groups, disrupt American communication and Internet networks, and carry out acts of subterfuge against the United States. Fortunately, the Chinese currently plan to wait until about 2030 to face the American colossus head-on, but the public airing of such anti-American sentiment on the part of the Chinese leads to another: why are we pursuing a “strategic partnership” with a country whose top leaders have expressed their willingness to destroy us?

BORN-AGAIN, AGAIN: Jane Fonda is, as they say, male identifiable. In her past incarnations she was also known as Houston, and Hart, and Vorta, and Jane for radical Tom Hayden, and Mistress of the Chop for Ted Turner. Now she has found a new man: Jesus Christ. If this latest self invention is the last one, it is no laughing matter. God’s grace has a way of obliterating the folly of his First and Fourteenth Amendment rights—a sound argument, given that the Constitution only precludes the establishment of religion, not its study.

PACIFICATION PROGRAM: In the wake of the school shootings at Littleton and elsewhere, the National Education Association reports that “the government refuses to grant him the money as a violation of his First and Fourteenth Amendment rights”—a sound argument, given that the Constitution only precludes the establishment of religion, not its study.

BIDING THEIR TIME: According to the national Education Association report, the government refuses to grant him the money as a violation of his First and Fourteenth Amendment rights—a sound argument, given that the Constitution only precludes the establishment of religion, not its study.

MOORE'S WORLD: According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the population of Moore is currently 30,000 people. In 2000, the population was 25,000 people. The population growth rate in Moore is 20% per year. The median household income in Moore is $40,000. The median home value in Moore is $150,000. The unemployment rate in Moore is 4%. The crime rate in Moore is 50 per 10,000 people. Moore is a predominantly white community, with a minority population of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians.

LUNA BEACH

**That's A Vibration, Mr. President, Use The Pens.**

The Chavez for Change Foundation promotes harmony and unity amongst all races and promotes a video that celebrates the diversity of the country. The video shows images of people of all races coming together, playing sports and enjoying each other's company. The video aims to promote a message of peace and understanding, and to encourage people to respect and value each other's differences. The video is available on the Chavez for Change Foundation's website, and is widely shared on social media. The video has received praise for its message of unity and diversity, and has been praised for its positive impact on society.
After nearly a decade of leading America's most famous (or infamous) ecumenical coalition, Joan Brown Campbell has finally called it quits at the National Council of Churches. But she is not leaving without a splash. Although her controversial term as secretary general ended at the end of last year, Campbell has since immersed herself in a new round of publicity, going out of the organization as she ran it for several years—by coddling a dictatorial partnership.

Campbell's valedictory came with the Elián González case. Evidently aware of Campbell's strong ties with Fidel Castro, her successor appointed her to spearhead the NCC campaign to return the six-year-old boy to communist Cuba. In a flurry of activity, Campbell has traveled to Cuba to meet Elián's father (and with Cuban officials, of course), offered herself to a host of media interviews, convened press conferences, returned to Cuba to personally fetch Elián's grandmothers in a chartered jet, organized another round of publicity events, met with Attorney General Janet Reno, met with sympathetic members of Congress who support Elián's return, and condemned the bad, old right-wing congressmen who wanted to keep little Elián away from his father.

Campbell has also done her part in the propaganda campaign by criticizing Elián's mother for risking his life in a dangerous escape from Cuba by sea and assuring everybody who is willing to listen that all of Elián's relatives in Cuba are desperate to have him back with them. That Elián's mother and many others are dead because Castro will not let his people travel freely seems not to have occurred to Campbell. And that Elián's family in Cuba might be reluctant to speak frankly either to the media or a left-wing church leader from the United States also seems not to be a possibility to her.

It's been the richest gush of publicity for the National Council of Churches since the hoax about the torching of black churches in 1996. And it's an appropriate epilogue for Campbell's reign, during which the NCC pursued high profile, largely left-wing causes, while sliding into irrelevance among its own church constituency accelerated. For the last nine years Campbell has been defending Castro and the world's dwindling number of other communist despots, creating dangerous myths about racial violence, lobbying for socialized medicine, fighting for gun control, touting for parental rights, supporting campaign finance "reform," opposing the Bush administration's own economic sanctions against Iraq's Saddam Hussein, condemning organized school prayer, defending President Clinton in the wake of sexual scandal, and ignoring the plight of persecuted Christians around the world.

Meanwhile, the NCC at the end of Campbell's tenure has been crippled by huge deficits. The NCC--a typical local church, the Council has simply become an embarrassment. Even stalwart liberals within the NCC's own member denominations are now openly calling for the organization's closure. Created in 1950, the National Council of Churches was supposed to represent the future of American Christian unity. When recently attempting to celebrate its fiftieth anniversary, the NCC found itself floundering amid budget shortfalls and interdenominational strife. Campbell had no apologies. Arguing that the NCC's heart is "too empathetic" not to be in debt, she defiantly declared: "You are right that I value courage and imagination more than caution and efficiency. . . . Our deficit is not in dollars but in our failure to see in one another the moral force that ends poverty as we know it and that challenges racism."

Thanks in part to Campbell's lack of leadership, the NCC's celebration was overshadowed by its special plea to its leading member denominations for millions of extra dollars. The NCC also had to further milk its Council's Burned Churches Fund--its last great fundraising bonanza—likewise seems to have been sucked dry. (Although the NCC raised more than $9.1 million in cash for the fund, it was revealed without comment that only $6.4 million was spent on actual church reconstruction, with the rest going to overhead and programs aimed at the "root causes" of racism.)

At a special 50th anniversary celebration for the NCC at the Roman Catholic Cathedral of St. John the Evangelist in Cleveland, Jesse Jackson praised Campbell's tenure at the NCC and remembered that he and Campbell had jointly traveled to Serbia last year to free captured U.S. airmen. "We are winners," he enthused as he hoisted Joan Campbell's hand in the air, convention-style. Most of the NCC celebrants responded with only polite applause, and Campbell acknowledged the somber mood without acknowledging her own part in creating it. "We're like an aging city with a crumbling infrastructure," she admitted in her farewell remarks to the NCC. "The infrastructure is sadly in need of repair, and it is not cheap to repair it." When mainland churches catch a cold, the NCC gets pneumonia, she explained, foisting the blame on others.

Campbell's tenure began with some reason for optimism. She was a liberal 1960s-era activist, but she did not seem to be a doctrinaire left-winger who would continue the NCC's historic dalliances with totalitarianism abroad and Blame America First extremists at home. She even admitted that she was too cozy with the old Soviet bloc. "We did not understand the depth of the suffering of Christians under communism," she confessed in 1993. "And I was certainly more concerned with the communist oppression. I do give credit to people who called for that and did not get a response, at least from us."

At that time Campbell said she wanted to re-orient the NCC towards "family issues," like fighting pornography, which would unify rather than divide the organization's constituents. "The press really has tagged us as left, liberal," she accurately observed. "When I came my determination was to speak to a broader group of people."

It never happened. Promoting Big Government at home and socialism abroad won out over fighting the small battles that would have had a larger effect. "We made a mistake" in life healthier in America. Campbell has justified her crusade to return Elián to Cuba by saying it is about "family values," but under her guidance, the National Council of Churches' record on social issues is closer to the National Organization of Women than to any recognizable pro-family group.

The now 68-year-old Campbell discovered the joys of liberal activism in mid-life. She was a housewife, the full-time mother of three children, and a Junior League member who married to a successful lawyer in a Cleveland suburb when the social revolution of the 1960s broke upon her. She volunteered for social justice causes through her local church. After Martin Luther King, Jr. came to town in 1967 to help organize for Carl Sturkey's campaign to become America's first black mayor of a major city, she joined a voter registration drive organized by the NCC. She also invited King to speak at her all-white Disciples of Christ congregation.

The invitation sparked controversy, and King spoke from the church's outside steps rather than the sanctuary. Campbell found herself energized by the excitement and the sense of being a member of a vanguard for social justice. Her home became the meeting place not only for King but also for radical lawyer William Kunstler and for parenting author turned anti-war activist Benjamin Spock. She went on to volunteer with the anti-war Clergy and Laity Concerned and helped to organize both the Poor People's Partnership and the Welfare Rights Organization. Campbell recalls that her first "holy fire" movement that saw the church as a place to use for secular crusades, she attended seminary classes and took a theological home study course that allowed her to become an ordained minister.

Joan Brown Campbell
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Church Lady Joan Brown Campbell Says Good-Bye

To Cuba With Love

by Marc Tooley
minister in both the Disciples of Christ and the American Baptist denominations. In 1979, she joined the staff of the National Council of Churches as a liason for ecumenicism. She became a member of the U.S. Committee of the World Council of Churches in 1985. And in 1990, she took the helm of the NCC, the first ecumenical organization to be led by a woman.

The Council was in crisis. Still reeling from revelations in the early 1980s about its ties to Marxist revolutionary groups around the world, the NCC was then thoroughly stigmatized as more political and left-wing than Christian or ecumenical. The socially conservative Greek Orthodox Church, which had helped to give the NCC a fig leaf of respectability, was threatening to pullout. Campbell’s predecessor had abruptly resigned.

Campbell, by then an affable grandmother, exuded reassurance and moderation. Although she and her Cleveland and WCC activism, her arrest outside the South African embassy embarrassed the example of her personal liber- ation theology. But the Cold War was ending, and it seemed a time for the NCC to recast its belated 1980s image as a mainstream liberal organiza- tion devoted to social justice rather than political radicalism. But if Campbell had want- ed to change the National Council’s philosophy it would have been hard to overcome the extended Left bureau- cracy at the “God Box” on Riverside Drive in New York City, where the NCC and other liberal mainline Protestant groups are headquar- tered. But it is not clear that she had any problems with this status quo. She took office in the midst of the Persian Gulf War, which the NCC vociferously denounced. “No war is ever just,” Campbell insisted, as she participated in protest demonstra- tions that demonized the United States while downplaying Saddam Hussein’s aggression.

But Campbell and the NCC advocated sanc- tions as a substitute for war. But in later years as American sanctions continued against Iraq, and as Saddam continued his commitment to weapons of mass destruction, demonized the United States for criminal sanctions that were starving the children of Iraq. And despite her indication that the NCC should focus on “family issues,” Campbell identified with the left on abortion and homosexuality, even though the NCC as a body did not adopt posi- tions on these issues, largely because it couldn’t risk alienating the Eastern Orthodox churches.

On the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall “rebellion” by homosexuals in New York City, Campbell joined other religious activists in sur- rounding the “God Box” in New York in a show of protest against church opposition to homo- sexual practice.

But Campbell’s relationship with the Clinton administration was perhaps the most important hallmark of her tenure. National Council staff members became fre- quent visitors to the White House, after years of disinterest by Republican administrations. Campbell became an Air Force One and to state dinners for foreign heads of state. Most dramatic, in the wake of the Republican congressional takeover in 1994, Campbell and the NCC went to the Oval Office to urge Clinton to be “strong for the task” of resisting the new Republican Congress. Later that year, Campbell would ask churches to join in a “Holy Week prairie to Easter to symbolize opposition to the Contract with America.”

Even if Campbell was rarely bothered to disguise her partisan affiliation or her inclination to ren- der more unto Caesar than unto God. She criti- cized President Bush during the 1992 presiden- tial campaign for accepting support from reli- gious conservatives. And more recently, she has expressed alarm over George W. Bush’s for hav- ing named Jesus Christ his most influential philosopher. No doubt frustrated by the NCC’s ostensible non-partisanship, Campbell helped to found the Interfaith Alliance in 1994 to be more aggressively in counteracting religious con- servatives. The alliance accepted start-up funds from the Democrat Party Senatorial Committee.

But religious conservatives continued to gain supporters as the NCC’s influence would facilitate a cut-off of U.S. aid to oppres- sive governments. Campbell has used her fig- urehead status in the church community to minimize concerns about persecuted Christians around the world. The old Soviet Bloc persecuted religious believ- ers, so now does the NCC remain largely silent about the restrictive religious policies of com- munist regimes in China, North Korea, and Cuba. Campbell earned the role Castro allowed her to play in the Elián Gonzalez affair by her long praise of Cuba for having in it “a priority of caring for the poor.” Last year, with Castro listening appreci- atively, Campbell apologized for U.S. policies towards Cuba before an applauding crowd of 100,000 in the infamous Plaza of the Revolution in Havana.

“We ask you to forgive the suffering that has come to you by the actions of the United States,” the Rev. Joan Brown Campbell implored. “It is on behalf of Jesus the liberator that we work against this embargo.”

A banner across the stage read “Love, Peace, Unity.” The event was intended to crown a month of gospel celebrations by Protestants in Cuba, where about 50 denominations are represented. But some crowd members confessed to the Associated Press that they did not specific religious belief but were pressured to attend by their commu- nist neighborhood watch group.

Christians still endure obstacles to free worship. According to Open Doors International, an advocate for perse- cuted Christians, the Cuban govern- ment routinely denies permits for new church construction. Repairs to existing churches are heavily restricted, and property that has been vul- nerable to government seizure. Public evange- lism is illegal. Church leaders are still moni- tered, interrogated, and threatened with arrest. Exposing religious activities is forbidden. Bible distribution is limited. Yet after a 1995 meeting with Castro, Campbell enthused, “The church was represented and it was a great opportunity for the work of the church, that is the training of pas- tors, Sunday school teaching, evangelism, and service to the society.”

When she returned to the United States from a pilgrimage to Havana last year, Joan Campbell claimed that ending U.S. trade sanc- tions was especially urgent now that Cuba has shown “it does allow people to express their faith freely.” With such comments, who can blame Castro for commenting in a meeting with Campbell several years ago? “We see in you and we see in God and we see in Jesus the leader of the people.”

But religious conservatives continued to do more to shape the church to do so. If you look at the National Council, you can see in it the philosophy of Christian superiority,” she once remarked.

Just as the NCC averted its glance when the old Southern Baptist Council voted to make its mem- bers, now does the NCC remain largely silent about the restrictive religious policies of com- munist regimes in China, North Korea, and Cuba. Campbell earned the role Castro allowed her to play in the Elián Gonzalez affair by her long praise of Cuba for having in it “a priority of caring for the poor.” Last year, with Castro listening appreci- 
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wanced. Asked to contrast the NCC with the Christian Coalition, Campbell replied with frus- tration, “We’re a religious organization, and it is not. They are blatantly political [and] partisan.” More damningly, she claimed the religious right was seeking to “manipulate religious leaders and people of faith into a charge that they say that if they evidently feels does not apply to her own branch of religious left activism.

I n determining Campbell’s legacy, it is likely that the role of the religious left, which she engineered, in the alleged burnings of black churches will loom large. It was a pseudo-event. There was no evidence in 1996, nor has there been since, to show that black churches were specially targeted for arson attacks. (White churches were far more at risk.) And of the small number of black church burnings, only a fraction were the work of racists. The most pro- lific arsonist, it turns out, was a practicing Satanist.

But fighting the Devil did not interest the NCC. Claims of an upsurge in racist vio- lence were more likely to grab headlines and raise dollars. The hysteria the Council ginned up netted more than $9 million in contribu- tions on these issues, largely because it couldn’t risk alienating the Eastern Orthodox churches.

On the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall “rebellion” by homosexuals in New York City, Campbell joined other religious activists in sur- rounding the “God Box” in New York in a show of protest against church opposition to homo- sexual practice.

But Campbell’s relationship with the Clinton administration was perhaps the most important hallmark of her tenure. National Council staff members became fre- quent visitors to the White House, after years of disinterest by Republican administrations. Campbell became an Air Force One and to state dinners for foreign heads of state. Most dramatic, in the wake of the Republican congressional takeover in 1994, Campbell and the NCC went to the Oval Office to urge Clinton to be “strong for the task” of resisting the new Republican Congress. Later that year, Campbell would ask churches to join in a “Holy Week prior to Easter to symbolize opposition to the Contract with America.”

Even if Campbell was rarely bothered to disguise her partisan affiliation or her inclination to ren- der more unto Caesar than unto God. She criti- cized President Bush during the 1992 presiden- tial campaign for accepting support from reli- gious conservatives. And more recently, she has expressed alarm over George W. Bush’s for hav- ing named Jesus Christ his most influential philosopher. No doubt frustrated by the NCC’s ostensible non-partisanship, Campbell helped to found the Interfaith Alliance in 1994 to be more aggressively in counteracting religious con- servatives. The alliance accepted start-up funds from the Democrat Party Senatorial Committee.

But religious conservatives continued to gain supporters as the NCC’s influence would facilitate a cut-off of U.S. aid to oppres- sive governments. Campbell has used her fig- 
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Leonard Peltier Is No Political Prisoner

Bury His Heart

by Kenneth Lloyd Billingsley

In a shoot-out with some 30 heavily armed men on the Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota on June 26, 1975. A quarter century later, the evidence is stronger than ever that, as the two FBI agents lay wounded and helpless, Leonard Peltier leveled an AR-15 rifle and blew their heads apart at point blank range. It was a task for which he was well suited.

Peltier was born in 1944 in Grand Forks, North Dakota, a kind of ecumenical Native American of Chippewa and Dakota antecedents, with a Canadian grandfather. One of his first Christmas presents was a cap gun and Leonard inclined to matters military. He enlisted in the Marines and sought service in Vietnam. But instead ofscoringaction he wound up with a medical discharge because of a shallow bite.

"I wasn't in the Marines to bite people," he explained with a laugh to Peter Matthiessen, author of the fan-magazine book *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*, the phrase Peltier uses to sign his letters. "I was there to shoot people!" The foment of his times denied Peltier his chance in Southeast Asia, but gave him a crack elsewhere. While he was spray-painting fenders in a Seattle body shop in 1965, the movement that would make him a revolutionary hero was taking shape. With the New Left on the rise and all sorts of "liberation movements" mimicking black radicalism, it was inevitable that those now called Native Americans with their long record of mass resistance at the hands of the United States government, would grow their own revolutionary vanguard.

In July 1968, Eddie Benton Banai, George Mitchell, Clyde Bellcourt, and Dennis Banks founded the American Indian Movement, or AIM. The group's emblem was an American flag flown upside down, an international symbol for distress. For the international-
reservation. On June 24, FBI agents Ron Williams and Jack Coler came onto Pine Ridge looking for Jimmie Eagle, wanted on assault charges. Williams was en route to the Mayor's Office of Pine Ridge when he met Coler—a two-tone gold-and-white 1972 Chevrolet Biscayne. Around midday, agents Gerald Waring and Vince Brece heard Williams on the radio. He said he had spotted a可疑 vehicle, Coler had accused Peltier among them. The two FBI men stood stranded in an open field facing with only revolvers, noshed at long range, and one rifle.

“They are on the ridge above us and firing on us,” Williams said over the radio, which registered the dust. The agents opened fire with their M1 carbines to be some Indians in the vehicle, and they appear to have rifles.”

Coler attempted to retrieve his unloaded rifle from the trunk; he took a heavy round, one of nine that passed through the trunk lid, that practically severed his arm. Bleeding heavily, he managed to crawl into his car, soon pierced by volleys of fire from above. At least 125 rounds hit the agent’s car. Together, the agents managed to get off a total of five rounds.

Williams was also hit, but under heavy fire ran over to the wounded Coler, stripped off his shirt and fixed a tourniquet. Coler passed out from loss of blood, and Williams was rapidly weakening but still fully conscious. He was trying to surrender, but this posed a dilemma for the approaching Indian gunmen, as author Peter Matthiessen astutely noted: “So much may happen on the level of the body. Anyone could be identified by the victims.”

The unconscious Coler, father of two small children, would die within minutes anyway, but one of the Indians shot him in the head, first with a graving round then full on, shredding his skull. Williams saw what was coming and pleaded for his life. The Indians had no intention of mercy and shot him in the face, where the bullets were coming from, but eventually the firing stopped and the word went round that the two men from the cars were dead. How the two men came to be dead Peltier didn’t know, but he now casts himself as their potential rescuer.

“I can’t say I’m sorry I killed those guys because it’s not true,” he said. “I did not kill them. I did not see the agents die. But I’m sorry they died and would have tried to stop it if I knew what was going to happen. I want to be free, but if to be free means having to admit to a lie, I can’t do that. So maybe I will have to die in prison.”

That was what those sentenced him to two life terms had in mind, though the sentence hard- ly fits the crime. But as the Clinton administration winds down, Peltier’s supporters in the international sweat lodges of the Left will be stepping up the drumbeat for the President to grant his hero clemency. Based on his record of pardoning Puerto Rican terrorists, it is possible that the President will come through for them, despite strong opposition from the FBI. Whatever the President does, the case presents a parable of the Left for all time, especially its attachment to crime.

Murder has always been the vocabulary of the Left in power, from Stalin to Mao, to Pol Pot’s Khmer Rouge. The vocabulary of the intellectuals defending this power, from Walter Duranty to Noam Chomsky, has been to deny or defend those murders. For those who missed that Big Show of the ’60s, the story of our time, the campaign to free Leonard Peltier tells you all you need to know.

Kenneth Lloyd Billingsley is Author of The Hollywood Party: How Communism Seduced the American Film Industry in the 1930s and 1940s.
The artist whom the DGA tried to airbrush out of history on the basis of one-half of one film was a controversial figure. His work over the years as an avant-garde innovator is remarkable for its productivity (some 450 films), its creative innovation, and its social vision. Born on January 7, 1880, and by his early teens exhibited his talents from his experiences in the Civil War, Griffith struggled throughout his early years, earning his way as a traveling actor. His artistic salvation came not from the traditional workshops of filmmakers and theater but to which he aspired but in the new medium of the motion picture when he began his extraordinary directional career with the Biograph Company in 1908. During his five years with Biograph, he transformed the world of literature and theater to which he was called a Communist himself “when Intolerance was branded radical and dangerous.” Yet the American Stalinists of the 1940s rarely if ever took note of the fact that Griffith at the peak of his career had contacts with anti-war leftists like Max Eastman and was favorably reviewed by such socialist publications as The New York Call at a time when many of his films were being shown throughout revolutionary Russia. Later on, although some of Griffith’s strongest admirers were independence-minded leftists, like writer James Agee, social critic Paul Goodman, and even documentary filmmaker monsters' forces within.

Griffith’s film certainly provided a dramatic portrayal of the sense of grievances felt by the South in the devastating aftermath of the downfall of the “peculiar institution” of slavery and the way of life it had sustained. When he began work on the film, he told his cast: “Only the winning side in a war ever gets to write history. I have decided to project the imagery of defeat in his Biography works dealing with the Indians. His innovative use of a panoramic landscape shot in Ramona to show the Indian hero wallowing helplessly from a mountain top as his village is destroyed by white settlers in the valley below anticipates the famous shots in The Birth of a Nation...”

It was his commitment to the survival of cultures and of the individual that made Griffith, with his roots in the Jeffersonian tradition and his admiration for Whitman’s poetry, an eternal foe of regimentation, a paragon of what the intolerant “think-think-think” men who sought to impose their views on society for the ostensibly purpose of creating a better world. Invariably, in his films, Griffith saw such efforts as leading to harm, whether it was the carpetbaggers swarming into the South in Birth; the puritanical capitalist in the modern story of Intolerance; or Robert Wadlow in Orphans of the Storm attempting to channel the French Revolution’s democratic aspirations into his own totalitarian Republic of Virtue.

As Cari Beauchamp, author of a widely acclaimed biography of screenwriter Frances Marion, observed, “Griffith was a master of the cinema, content of his works, whether seen positively or negatively, should not be an issue. In her opinion, the award that has borne his name is about directores’ accomplishment and of the director who made it all possible. As she succinctly puts it, “End of story.”

The DGA is tight-lipped about who first came up with the decision to dump D.W. and to what degree (if any) they were responding to outside pressure. But the decision was made behind closed doors and never included public discussion. Given the fact that Kweisi Mfume, the current head of the NACCP, applauded the DGA’s decision the very day it was announced, declaring they never should have named the award after Griffith in the first place, the organization may have had some input. It would, however, be yet another illustration of the NAACP’s decline, for as far back as 1915, the NAACP magazine The Crisis had noted the distinction between Griffith as an “artistic producer” and the subject matter of The Birth of a Nation, to which the organization objected.

But if the DGA is different from what it once was, it is still the organization of the blossomed after 1920 with the development of the Hollywood-based film historian, whose uncle was the late, prominent actor Sam Wanamaker, believes that in an out-of-control PC environment, the Directors Guild drops the award because it wanted to demonstrate “sensitivity” to its new black members. The DGA may have been swayed by the continual attacks on Griffith and Birth by the new, younger members of the organization, most notably practicing attorney, actor, and director, Denzel Washington. Indeed, Singleton carried the war against the film to its most ludicrous extreme when, in 1994, he likened The Birth of a Nation to the Holocaust. In...
Why “The Hurricane” Is Hot Air
by Paul Mulshine

A
fter I had written a couple of newspaper columns in 1983 about reading an excerpt from a 1964 Saturday Evening Post article on Rubin “Hurricane” Carter. The article appeared at the apex of Carter’s boxing career, just before he was to fight for the middleweight championship. Carter told the writer that in his youth he used to tell people: “Shoot it up."

He elaborated: “Sometimes to shoot at ‘em, sometimes to hit ‘em, sometimes to kill ‘em. My family was saying I’m still a bum. If I got the name, I play the game.”

Langlais interrupted me: “Surely you don’t believe that.”

But he didn’t press the point. For a good reason. Either Carter was telling the truth, and there is a psychopath. Or he was telling a falsehood, and he is a liar.

Actually, he’s both, if his criminal record and his public statements are any indication. And as for the people who made the movie about him, they tell the truth, and they are not much better. The movie is allegedly “based on a true story,” but there is only one scene in it that is an accurate depiction of a true moment in history. It is the scene in which the up-and-coming young boxer knocks out the great Emile Griffith in 2:13 of the first round of a 1963 fight.

That really happened, exactly as shown on-screen, which makes it unique in a movie full of distortions and outright lies.

The stunning upset in the Griffith fight was the highlight of a life that would soon go downhill fast. But for a few months after that fight, Carter truly looked like the angel that Bob Dylan—“could have been the champion of the world.”

Actually, the only way that really could have happened was if a truck ran over all of the middleweights who actually knew him.

Carter was in the ring what he was in real life, brutal and thuggish. With his shaved head, goatee and evil stare, he was an angel.

In an early scene, for example, the young Carter is shown running through Paterson, New Jersey, with some pals and playfully tugging at some shirts on sale outside a store. In real life, Carter was arrested at the age of 12 for stealing shirts from a store. His own father turned him in, exasperated by the thieving and bullying young Carter had engaged in since his first year in grammar school.

The movie ignores this evidence and instead portrays Carter as an angel.

In real life, some final round of a 1963 fight, video that it could be compared against the lies on screen. The pattern of that fight scene is the pattern of the movie. Carter doesn’t lose fights; they are fixed. Carter doesn’t commit crimes; he is framed. Carter doesn’t bully people, drink, beat women or do any of the other things that he did in real life. He is an angel.

Then the movie shows the inno-

ent young lad defending himself and his friends against a child molester. He is an angel.

In an early scene, for example, the young Carter is shown running through Paterson, New Jersey, with some pals and playfully tugging at some shirts on sale outside a store. In real life, Carter was arrested at the age of 12 for stealing shirts from a store. His own father turned him in, exasperated by the thieving and bullying young Carter had engaged in since his first year in grammar school.

The movie ignores this evidence and instead portrays Carter as an angel.

In real life, some final round of a 1963 fight, video that it could be compared against the lies on screen. The pattern of that fight scene is the pattern of the movie. Carter doesn’t lose fights; they are fixed. Carter doesn’t commit crimes; he is framed. Carter doesn’t bully people, drink, beat women or do any of the other things that he did in real life. He is an angel.

Then the movie shows the inno-

ent young lad defending himself and his friends against a child molester. He is an angel.

In an early scene, for example, the young Carter is shown running through Paterson, New Jersey, with some pals and playfully tugging at some shirts on sale outside a store. In real life, Carter was arrested at the age of 12 for stealing shirts from a store. His own father turned him in, exasperated by the thieving and bullying young Carter had engaged in since his first year in grammar school.

The movie ignores this evidence and instead portrays Carter as an angel.

In real life, some final round of a 1963 fight, video that it could be compared against the lies on screen. The pattern of that fight scene is the pattern of the movie. Carter doesn’t lose fights; they are fixed. Carter doesn’t commit crimes; he is framed. Carter doesn’t bully people, drink, beat women or do any of the other things that he did in real life. He is an angel.

Then the movie shows the inno-

ent young lad defending himself and his friends against a child molester. He is an angel.

In an early scene, for example, the young Carter is shown running through Paterson, New Jersey, with some pals and playfully tugging at some shirts on sale outside a store. In real life, Carter was arrested at the age of 12 for stealing shirts from a store. His own father turned him in, exasperated by the thieving and bullying young Carter had engaged in since his first year in grammar school.

The movie ignores this evidence and instead portrays Carter as an angel.

In real life, some final round of a 1963 fight, video that it could be compared against the lies on screen. The pattern of that fight scene is the pattern of the movie. Carter doesn’t lose fights; they are fixed. Carter doesn’t commit crimes; he is framed. Carter doesn’t bully people, drink, beat women or do any of the other things that he did in real life. He is an angel.

Then the movie shows the inno-

ent young lad defending himself and his friends against a child molester. He is an angel.
that finally set Carter free. Earlier that
killings and their impact on the decision
concerns the events on the evening of the
hero is made to look dishonorable.
honorable and the war wound of a true
military career of Carter is made to look
That's Hollywood for you. The disgraceful
Nineteen plastic surgeries couldn't fix it.
then a German bullet went through it.
handsome face before World War II, but
have an unattractive face. DeSimone had a
the actor who plays him is made up to
the only thing the movie got right is that
according to those who knew him. About
Not only that, he wasn't a racist or a thug,
evil acts attributed to him in the movie.
DeSimone—died in 1979. There is no
ter—whose real name was Vince
Volvo—obvious sabotage by Della Pesca.
Canadians to back off. In another, the
unintentionally comic scene, Della Pesca
fictional molestation incident in the late
has been terrorizing Carter ever since that
movie focuses on the efforts of the
members of a Canadian commune
to find new evidence to free Carter after
his second trial. This part of the movie is so
obviously false that even Carter's support-
ners are writing articles pointing out the
lies, so it is not worth mentioning here
except for perhaps the biggest lie of all.
The character of the racist cop Vince Della
Pesca—you remember him, the one who has
been terrorizing the black community since
that fictional molestation incident in the late
1940s—surfaces in the 1980s to threaten
the Canadian supporters' lives. In one
unintentionally comic scene, Della Pesca
emerges from the shadows to tell the
Canadians to back off. In another, the
front-seat bar of Carter's black Volvos—obvious sabotage by Della Pesca.
In real life, the Della Pesca character—whose real name was Vince DeSimone—died in 1979. There is no record that he ever did a single one of the evil acts attributed to him in the movie. Not only that, he wasn't a racist or a thug, according to those who knew him. About the only thing the movie got right is that the actor who plays him is made up to have an unattractive face. DeSimone had a handsome face before World War II, but then a German bullet went through it. Nineteen plastic surgeries couldn't fix it. That's Hollywood—regrettably.
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At the 1976 trial, the prosecution
argued that revenge was the motive. After
the first shooting, Carter had spoken with
the black victim's relatives and had inquired about a shotgun. And Carter himself had testified to a grand jury that
there was talk in the black community
of "shaking," a slang term for revenge.
But onscreen, the prosecution
argues the motive was simply that the bar
did not serve blacks. The movie then
debunks its own lie by having a black
CARTER & WASHINGTON AT THE GOLDEN GLOBES

Seeing the new, lovable Hurricane Carter.
This infuriates Carolyn Kelley. Kelley
is a black woman who was raised in
Newark, N.J., who in 1974 joined the
effort to free Carter at the urging of
Muhammad Ali. She was and is a devout
Muslim and has an abhorrence of
human nature. Too optimistic.
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on March 29, 1974, Ali (who saved my life from
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Heterodoxy.
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dares you talk about love? You can't
love, anyone, yourself.
The conception of Carter's come-
back is simple: "He's Satan, and Satan
can fool a lot of people."
The movie, of course, totally
ignores the beating of Kelley. But in real
life, she remains the most visible and
undeniable evidence of the true nature of
the man.
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members of the Hollywood community today. Since content has been raised as the only issue in the DGA’s dishonoring Griffith, Guild members have simply dug themselves into a hole in which they will struggle to find another great director whose name on the award might make them feel more comfortable. With the Guild’s board having established political purity in matters of race as an apparent absolute, the vast majority of Hollywood’s great filmmakers from its golden age would be unacceptable to them as Griffith, no matter how many humanistic ideals underlie much of their work. John Ford, Cecil B DeMille, King Vidor, Frank Capra, Michael Curtiz, Howard Hawks, Lewin Milestone, William Wyler, George Stevens, John Huston—all of these and many more could also be accused of helping foster “intolerable racial stereotypes” somewhere in their films, whether this involves the use of black comic stereotypes, depicting Indians as merciless savages in innumerable westerns, or making anti-Japanese propaganda movies during World War II. Furthermore, the DGA’s decision, in light of Hollywood’s current output, is highly hypocritical. After all, as film historian Christopher Jacobs points out in an article on the controversy for Film and Its Vision, “the hypocrisy was all too evident when in Los Angeles Times op-ed piece, screenwriter Ted Elliott defended the DGA’s action, citing the “racism” in Birth as the appropriate reason for renouncing Griffith. Yet Elliott himself has been targeted for his lack of political correctness in the cinematic genius whose works stirred audiences around the world. Griffith, of course, became the ultimate martyr to an orthodox, politically correct view of history when his cinematic depiction of Ivan the Terrible’s tyranny caused a rift with Stalin. Griffith had been one of the first to denounce the methods of repression like World War I. The America of Griffith’s day, by contrast, allowed for a diversity of historical interpretation, paradoxically preventing the country from forgetting. Eisenstein, for instance, had depicted the suffering and sacrifice of the old South in The Birth of a Nation which co-authored, widely criticized by many Arab groups for what they regard as its insulting racial stereotypes” somewhere in their films, whether this involves the use of black comic stereotypes, depicting Indians as merciless savages in innumerable westerns, or making anti-Japanese propaganda movies during World War II. Furthermore, the DGA’s decision, in light of Hollywood’s current output, is highly hypocritical. After all, as film historian Christopher Jacobs points out in an article on the controversy for Film and Its Vision, “the hypocrisy was all too evident when in Los Angeles Times op-ed piece, screenwriter Ted Elliott defended the DGA’s action, citing the “racism” in Birth as the appropriate reason for renouncing Griffith. Yet Elliott himself has been targeted for his lack of political correctness in the cinematic genius whose works stirred audiences around the world. Griffith, of course, became the ultimate martyr to an orthodox, politically correct view of history when his cinematic depiction of Ivan the Terrible’s tyranny caused a rift with Stalin. Griffith had been one of the first to denounce the methods of repression like World War I. The America of Griffith’s day, by contrast, allowed for a diversity of historical interpretation, paradoxically preventing the country from forgetting. Eisenstein, for instance, had depicted the suffering and sacrifice of the old South in The Birth of a Nation which co-authored, widely criticized by many Arab groups for what they regard as its insulting racial stereotypes” somewhere in their films, whether...
“The beginning wage was $1.25 an hour at a time when the national average was 50 cents. We were required to work 68 hours a week. We got a 15 percent bonus for taking the night shift so I took the night shift. I made a couple of thousand in the summer, which was rich then. This is what put me through college and law school.”

The rough road Graglia has traveled affected his political views: “Being self-supporting since age 13 perhaps predisposed me to a sympathetic point to plights or less guilt-ridden about the advantages one has had. I am certainly not complaining. I have great respect for liberals and conservatives is that liberals are upsets that the world is not better while conservatives are gratified that it is not worse. I recently debated several critical legal theorists at Harvard about who you were was beginning to replace who you were. I said, as someone who came from no wealth, I am certainly not complaining. I have never mentioned in media reports, he pointed out, that of the son of Italian immigrants to acknowledge the superior academic performance of Asians in comparison with whites has not stopped campus leftists from labeling Graglia a “white supremacist.”

After all, there are no references to cultural differences are responsible for disparities in academic achievement. Studies have long linked Jewish students’ academic success with the strong emphasis placed on education in most Jewish homes. More recently, research by John Ogbu and Signithia Fordham, notes particularly landmark study “Black Students, School Success: Coping with the Burden of ‘Acting White,’” has concluded, “What appears to have emerged in some segments of the black community is a kind of cultural orientation which defines academic learning in school as ‘acting white’ and academic success as the prerequisite of white Americans. This orientation involves both social pressures against striving for academic success and a fear of striving for academically successful individuals.”

In addition to stating out a position on the issue of race, culture, and academic achievement, Graglia has also been involved in the debate over affirmative action. In 1971, he wrote what was possibly the first law review article opposing racial preferences in the Pennsylvania Law Review. “It took more time than I thought to publish my article,” he recalls. “They would only do it if they could simultaneously publish a refu-

“Of course, the willingness to plights or less guilt-ridden about the advantages one has had. I am certainly not complaining. I have never opportunities to excel academically and to be recognized for excelling. We haven’t had the rit-

Lino Graglia and Clinton Bolick

Busing did not increase integration but rather aimed at “acting white” and academic success as the pre-

the Superior Academic Performance of Asians in comparison with whites has not stopped campus leftists from labeling Graglia a “white supremacist.” Graglia explains, “It struck me from the far right of academic for defending the very meritocratic system that allowed him and others from disadvantaged back-

Lino worked at a firm there while Kay chose to work in New York, but Burger recommended to Kay that she go to Covington and Burling, which was the most prestigious law firm in Washington. They were the first African Americans to do so. Kay and her clerks. Kay really liked Washington and got an offer. She says I got this husband and they said send him around. They made me an offer too.”

Several years later, the Graglias’ first child arrived and they returned to New York. Lino worked at a firm there while Kay chose to stay at home. Kay Graglia’s decision to cut short her legal career despite being at the very pinnacle of the field became the subject of her 1998 book Domestic Tragedy: A Brief Against Feminism. The book has been described by the Dallas Morning News as “a 451-page testament to why she is unlikely to replace Patricia Ireland as National Organization for Women president.” The book has also been discussed in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the New Republic, and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

The court “created a new right out of whole cloth.” Graglia laments that, with a sharply divided Supreme Court, one unelected, unaccountable lawyer can effectively run the country. “The legal system now under assault—that got this transition was not quite complete, as Signithia Fordham, most notably their landmark study “Black Students, School Success: Coping with the Burden of ‘Acting White,’” has concluded, “What appears to have emerged in some segments of the black community is a kind of cultural orient-

Graglia’s writings on racial preferences in higher education antagonizes the left because they pay no lip service to the facets of “out-
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Whether one is looking for an eloquent refutation of racial preferences or an incisive condemnation of modern feminism, it can be found under one roof in Austin, Texas. As for those on the left, even they must admit that the Graglias were made for each other.

Marc Levin is a law student at the University of Texas, editor emeritus of the Austin Review, and executive director of the Campaign for a Colorblind America.

The Biggest Buzz on the Conservative Calendar

You don't want to miss The Restoration Weekend, the “conservative alternative” to the Clinton’s Renaissance event. This year’s festivities will be held on the eve of the Republican Convention (July 27-30) at the luxurious Seaview Resort in Absecon, N.J., between the Convention site in Philadelphia and Atlantic City. It will feature some of the most important political and media figures in the country. It will be a lot of fun too with golf (two 18-hole PGA championship courses), swimming, and deep sea fishing. An exciting entertainment line up will showcase the Capitol Steps, Washington’s most celebrated political satire troupe. And for those simply want to relax and be pampered, a brand new Elizabeth Arden Spa will be available at the Resort.

Confirmed speakers include:

Bill O’Reilly Fox’s O’Reilly Factor
Robert Novak CNN’s Capital Gang
Peggy Noonan
House Manager Jim Rogan
Internet maven Esther Dyson
Hannity & Colmes
Governor Tom Ridge
Governor Christie Todd Whitman

Some of our invited speakers include:
Governor George W. Bush
Senator John McCain
Mayor Rudy Giuliani
Microsoft Chairman Bill Gates
New York Times columnist Bill Safire
AOL/Time Warner chairman Steve Case
Loudcloud chairman Marc Andreessen
Majority Whip Tom DeLay
just to name a few.

For more information call 703-683-5561
Contact: Noelle McGlynn

The Weekend is a project of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture.
The First Litters

The Ecological Indian: Myth and History
by Shepard Krech III

Reviewed by Glynn Custed
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Most from the very start, stereotypes of the American Indian have been exploited by Europeans (and later by their American descendants) both to criticize and to glorify their own societies. The earliest version goes back to the sixteenth century, which depicted the idealized Indian in America as living “in the manner of the Golden Age.” Such Enlightenment figures as Montaigne, Chateaubriand, Lahotan, and, most influentially, Rousseau elaborated this stereotype into the image of the Noble Savage who was described as an innocent, honorable, and wise child of Nature living in a kind of Eden still uncorrupted by the evils of civilization. Rousseau and his contemporaries, however, were far less interested in the primitive virtues of the distant “savage” than they were in using his purported nobility to criticize their own societies. In this way, the New World, as one historian puts it, was used as “a stick to beat the old.”

In the United States, contact between Indians and settlers was one of often violent conflict. Indeed, Theodore Roosevelt, in his history The Winning of the West reminds us that westward expansion was primarily a feat of conquest; the conquest of a “howling wilderness,” as the conquerors saw it, and of its inhabitants, the Wild Indian, who had to be tamed or removed if Progress were to prevail. The more distant the frontier, however, the more this stereotype melted. An increasingly urban population in the late nineteenth century began to view the wilder-

ness and the Indian through a haze of romantic nostalgia, and as the Conquest drew to a close the image of the Noble Savage was altered to meet the requirements of a triumphant nation.

According to this version the Indian was indeed cruel and cunning, yet he still possessed nobility as seen in his unquestioned courage and in his martial virtues. In this way the Noble Savage became the Worthy Adversary against which the heroic progress of a great nation could be measured and properly appreciated. The Indian as Worthy Adversary, depicted in countless novels and Hollywood films, became a paragon of the primitive way the nation imagined and glorified itself for more than a half century.

In the 1960s, the stereotype changed again. The Indian was shown to have his own virtues, since martial virtues were out, and in its place its victimization was stressed, since victimization was in. Also the sensitive, gentle side of the Indian as a pristine child of Nature was reasserted. The most elaborate expression of this image is found in a book entitled The Conquest of Paradise, written in 1990 by a veteran of the Sixties Left, Kirkpatrick Sale. Sale extolled the moral and the ecological perfection of pre-contact Native America and rallied against the Euro-American civilization that destroyed that pristine paradise and violated Mother Earth. The villains in this unmitigated disaster, said Sale, were Columbus and all those who followed him, bringing with them an inherently evil civilization. Nature then goes to the archeological and historical records and to current events in order to examine, with their environment? Were they passive children of Nature running around nature cult, which had become an integral part of the moral and the ecological paradigm that destroyed that pristine paradise and violated Mother Earth. The villains in this unmitigated disaster, said Sale, were Columbus and all those who followed him, bringing with them an inherently evil civilization. Nature then goes to the archeological and historical records and to current events in order to examine, with their environment? Were they passive children of Nature running around nature cult, which had become an integral part of the environmental movement, a modern day nature cult, which had become an integral part of the moral and the ecological paradigm that destroyed that pristine paradise and violated Mother Earth. The villains in this unmitigated disaster, said Sale, were Columbus and all those who followed him, bringing with them an inherently evil civilization.

Both the Noble and the Ignoble Savage have been closely tied to Nature whether Nature was perceived as a hostile wilderness or as a pristine paradise. The sharpest visual image of the latter was created for a PR campaign designed to advance the environmental movement, a modern day nature cult, which had become an integral part of the moral and the ecological paradigm that destroyed that pristine paradise and violated Mother Earth. The villains in this unmitigated disaster, said Sale, were Columbus and all those who followed him, bringing with them an inherently evil civilization. Nature then goes to the archeological and historical records and to current events in order to examine, with their environment? Were they passive children of Nature running around nature cult, which had become an integral part of the environmental movement, a modern day nature cult, which had become an integral part of the moral and the ecological paradigm that destroyed that pristine paradise and violated Mother Earth. The villains in this unmitigated disaster, said Sale, were Columbus and all those who followed him, bringing with them an inherently evil civilization.

The description by a nineteenth-century traveler of miles of scorched earth and pitifully injured and dying beasts would doubtless have brought an outburst of sorrow and indignation. What brought the near extinction of not only the buffalo but other species in historical times was the eager and active participation of the Indian in the booming trade in furs and skins.
Critics fault European and, later, American traders for corrupting Indians with commerce. Yet the Indians were engaged in trade long before the arrival of the Europeans. And when Europeans offered such valuable commodities as knives, axes, iron kettles, and guns along with luxury and prestige items like jewelry and dry goods, Indians did not hesitate to enter the trade, exchanging for them mundane items for commodities of high value. In fact, one seventeenth century Montagnais Indian of Canada told a Jesuit missionary that “the English have no sense. They give us twenty knives like this for one beaver skin.” Krech also tells us in passing that it was not the Indian who tried unsuccessfully to implement conservation practices, but rather colonial and, later, state legislatures. He also shows how certain Indian hunting practices in Canada probably originated from conservation policies advocated by the Hudson Bay Company.

Those are some of the negative aspects of the Indians’ active relationship with their environment. Krech also shows us a degree of sophistication of even hunters and gatherers in manipulating the environment for their own purposes. For example, fire was routinely used to clear forests and create meadows rich with berries or as forage for deer or to increase the yield of grass seeds. In fact, Krech believes that the natural environment of North America had long been molded and shaped by practices such as these as well as by agriculture. He argues that the rapid decimation of the native population due to European diseases allowed the natural environment to recover to a point where the environment appeared as a wilderness to those who finally came en masse to develop it. In this respect, says Krech, the pioneers inherited not a “virgin” but rather a “widowed” country.

Krech ends his study with a brief description of the present situation. Tribes today, he shows, make decisions that sometime please and at other times infuriate environmentalists. “In Indian Country as in the larger society,” he says, “conservation is often sacrificed for economic security.” Indeed that might be said of earlier times before the coming of the European and his American descendant when Indian Country stretched all across the continent.

The conclusions Krech draws from his carefully reasoned and well-documented study are that “images of noble or ignoble indigenousness, including the Ecological Indian, are ultimately dehumanizing” for they “deny both variation within human groups and commonalities between them.” To say, as the stereotype suggests, that Native Americans left no trace on the land “demeans the Indians.” In this respect historian Richard White observes that “it makes them look like an animal species, and thus denies them of culture.” But Indians are humans who, like all other humans elsewhere, have shown a great and rich range of cultural variation over a long period; a richness to which no facile stereotype in service to another people can ever do justice.

Many anthropologists have all too often fallen into stereotypical thinking of their own. One example is the excessive and unreflective use of cultural relativism. Another is the acceptance of stereotypes useful in advancing political agendas but interfering with accurate descriptions of people in human terms. Robert Edgerton deals with the excesses of relativism in his book Sick Societies: Challenging the Myth of Primitive Harmony (1992). Now Shepard Krech has addressed a distorting political stereotype in The Ecological Indian. It is hoped that more scholars in that and related professions will follow their lead so that all of us can better understand the true range of human variation and its long and complex history.

Glynn Custred teaches anthropology at the California State University at Hayward.

---

IF YOU ARE NOT BEING TAUGHT KITSCH MARXISM (race, gender, & class hierarchies) YOU ARE PROBABLY NOT GOING TO CLASS.

IF YOU ARE, THE ANTIDOTE IS NOW IN PAPERBACK.

By the author of Radical Son and Hating Whitey & Other Progressive Causes. Available in bookstores or call (800) 752-6562. www.frontpagemag.com
Three-Year-Old Seeks Reinstatement to Preschool
by Judith Schumann Weizer

Yvonne and Jeff Krieger, parents of three-year-old Herbie Krieger, have filed suit against the Marion Wright Edelman Federal Child Care Center and Preschool in the upstate community of Gap, New York, to have their son’s expulsion from the school on weapons charges overturned.

Expulsion is automatic for violators of the school’s strict no-weapons policy, but depending on which definition of “weapon” the court accepts, the tot’s penalty could be reduced to suspension.

The outcome of any weapons inquiry at any level of the federal school system is significant because weapons allegations become a permanent part of each student’s Academic Narrative.

The current complaint is not Herbie’s first problem with school authorities. Last year, shortly after the beginning of the fall term, he was suspended for cultural insensitivity. According to school director Betty Sweete, young Krieger punched a child who had stepped on his foot, and, instead of apologizing, insisted that the other boy had hurt him, thus violating the school’s zero tolerance policy on unresolved conflict.

The Kriegers insist that Herbie only struck the other boy when he refused to get off of his son’s instep after repeatedly being asked to remove himself. The boys’ teacher, Jennifer Nighce, reported that she had heard Herbie ask the other boy only before stepping on him, but several children said they had heard Herbie, whom they call Kevin, say “getoffgetoffgetoff” several times before the fight erupted.

At Herbie’s hearing before the school’s Sensitivity Panel, Ms. Nighce explained that the other child had actually been expressing his liking for “Kevin,” as he comes from a cultural background in which close physical proximity is the norm. Her Cultural Values Inculcation Report on the incident did indicate that she had attempted to enlighten “Kevin” as to the other child’s cultural framework. The report also noted that “Kevin” had not seemed to grasp the concept and repeatedly insisted that his foot hurt, even after being given a time out to think over what Ms. Nighce had said.
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