O pen the pages of Harper's Bazaar for September, 1997, and you will find, on page 348, not the latest word on gracious living, but an impassioned attack on the welfare reform act; on the president who signed it, the Congress that voted for it, and the people who urged that it pass. Stridently assailing the ‘mean season’ in national politics, and the ‘thinly veiled racial and moral overtones’ of the case made in its favor, it ignores the arguments made for it by rational people, and the growing body of evidence that an entitlement culture, as opposed to aid for short-term and specific emergencies, tends to do nobody good. Extreme to a fault, ardently specific emergencies, tends to do nobody good. Extreme to a fault, ardently par-

tisan, it is far to the left of the good. Extreme to a fault, ardently par-
cific emergencies, tends to do nobody opposed to aid for short-term and spe-
dence that an entitlement culture, as people, and the growing body of evi-
dence that an entitlement culture, as opposed to aid for short-term and specific emergencies, tends to do nobody good. Extreme to a fault, ardently par-

tisan, it is far to the left of the New Republic and other respected liberal voices, the sort of a piece likely to run in the Nation; thin, plain-paper sheets for the post-Stalinist faithful; or in the other fat, toney, life-style glossies, the only ones capable of folding impassioned appeals for the poor and down-
trodden into 400 pages of ads and copy urging the most spoiled people on earth to spend $450 on a plain cotton t-shirt, $750 on a fun pair of sandals, $20,000 on a new sable jacket, or ten times that amount on a diamond, ruby, and emerald hummingbird brooch. The left-wing slant of the women’s magazines has been copiously documented, with their constant support of big government programs; and their breathless recitals of terrible dangers—from power lines, toxic fumes, and bad food and bad water—that can only be solved by big government programs. But these are service books, dealing with everyday problems, so the message, while slanted, is not out of sync. It is in high fashion books like Harper’s Bazaar that the schism gets vivid: the sybarite image is far more dramatic, and the ideology far more intense. Thus, one sees grim fem-
inist screeds against rape and harassment next to clothes that appear designed to provoke it; whey-faced reformers bent on changing the system next to fist-faced tycoons who know how to exploit it; trophy wives enjoying their ill-gotten gains next to weedy environmental crusaders; the worst examples of capitalist excess next to ghetto activists, who spell America with a ‘k.’

There is a place for magazines that write about style, and there is surely a place for the partisan journal, which one reads to get a political viewpoint. It is when a fashion magazine becomes a partisan journal—and from a viewpoint that seems to be hostile to fashion—that it starts to give readers Continued on page 8

**INSIDE**

San Francisco Math
China Policy
Lesbian Rape

**NASTINESS OVER I-200 IN THE REPUBLIC OF NICE**

**BATTLE IN SEATTLE**

by Michelle Malkin

It’s starting to get nasty here in the Republic of Nice. Open the ‘Sunday Scene’ section of the Seattle Times, to the friendly page where “Dear Abby” appears, and you’ll find a smiling local columnist likening opponents of racial preferences to murderous nationalists, hooded Klansmen, and, yes, clitorectomists:

“The Afrikaners hide from their terrible deeds; they don’t want to pay for the past. The Muslims who mutilate women’s genitals say it’s always been their way. Protestant Orangemen in Ireland march through Catholic neighborhoods because they have for 300 years. Many Israelis believe that it’s OK to continue to be unfair to the Palestinians because they have gotten away with it for 50 years,” lectures Times columnist Jennifer James (a cultural anthropologist and self-described “futurist” whose latest book is subtitled A Workout for the Mind.) “Those who support Initiative 200 use similar logic,” James writes, as she plunges her rhetorical brush into a bubbling pot of rhetorical tar: “They may have a new line—it’s definitely slicker rhetoric than the KKK—but underneath is the same old narrow, gut-level need to maintain control and hold onto the territory.”

What’s curdling the milk in the lattes of Seattle’s liberal elite is the looming possibility of a yes vote in November on the Washington State Civil Rights Initiative (known as I-200). It’s the second ballot measure in the nation asking citizens to outlaw government support of big government programs; and their breathless recitals of terrible dangers—from power lines, toxic fumes, and bad food and bad water—that can only be solved by big government programs. But these are service books, dealing with everyday problems, so the message, while slanted, is not out of sync. It is in high fashion books like Harper’s Bazaar that the schism gets vivid: the sybarite image is far more dramatic, and the ideology far more intense. Thus, one sees grim feminist screeds against rape and harassment next to clothes that appear designed to provoke it; whey-faced reformers bent on changing the system next to fist-faced tycoons who know how to exploit it; trophy wives enjoying their ill-gotten gains next to weedy environmental crusaders; the worst examples of capitalist excess next to ghetto activists, who spell America with a ‘k.’
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A HOUSE DIVIDED

In “A House Divided” by John H. Hinderaker and Scott W. Johnson (Sept. 1998), the authors describe the decision in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978), as upholding a racial admissions quota. This does a disservice to Justice Powell, who wrote the decision for the Court upholding the portion of the California Supreme Court that threw out the quota for violating the Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. The Court reversed that portion of the decision in violation of a decision that made any and all consideration of race unconstitutional. Blackmun dis- sented from the portion of the decision that denied the use of fixed quotas based on race. Powell concluded that any discrimination based on race must be subject to the strictest scrutiny. “Racial and ethnic distinctions of any sort are inherently suspect and thus call for the most exact- ing judicial examination,” Powell wrote. “We have held that in order to justify the use of a suspect classification, a State must show that its purpose or interest is both constitutionally permissible and substantial, and that its use of the classification is ‘necessary to the accomplishment’ of its purpose of the safeguarding of its interest.”

Powell, in suggesting that race might legitimately be considered in an admissions program by a state institution, potentially opens the way of encouraging diversity by considering a person’s race as a “plus” but not as a deciding factor. He left open any determination of what might be acceptable, as the issue was not before the Court. Powell’s decision in Bakke is a valu- able tool against quotas. It represents the kind of constitutional decision-making by the Supreme Court that we should applaud.

Richard Cummings
Bridgehampton, NY

THE MEANING OF RACISM

An advertisement appearing on page five of the May/June issue for The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America, edited by Jared Taylor, states that the book offers, “Thoughtful, utterly candid commentary by . . . Samuel Francis . . . and others not afraid of being called ‘racist.’” In this context, the connotation of the word “racist” seems to be what many of us consider the absurdity of the elite culture’s pretensions on matters of race, sex, class, and even “disability,” and to be worn as a badge of honor by those brave enough to stand up for what is right instead of the cost. Then on page fourteen of the same issue, Benjamin Kepple’s review of Americans, No More? The Unmaking of Americans, by John Miller, states that Miller “exercises and easily debunks” the “paranoid Samuel Francis, whose racist view of American society is similar to that of the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.” Beside calling into question the wisdom of the book’s publisher in including a cover that Benjamin Kepple referred to Samuel Francis and the Ku Klux Klan. “I have read much of American society is similar to that of the Imperial Witch of the Ku Klux Klan.” I have read much of what Sam Francis has written and have nowhere seen indications of his view of American society as “racist.” I have missed the paranoia as well.

Mike Barkey
Grand Rapids, MI

In his review of The Unmaking of Americans by John J. Miller, I was surprised to dis- cover that Benjamin Kepple referred to Samuel Francis as a paranoid whose racist view of American society is similar to that of the Imperial Witch of the Ku Klux Klan. I have read much of what Dr. Francis has written and have nowhere seen indications of his view of American society as “racist.” I have missed the paranoia as well.

Whether Samuel Francis is your particular cup of tea or not, his accomplishments are many and var- ied. I’d like to know if he can be named Mr. Kepple.

Dan Hanes
San Diego, CA

CRONKITE REVEALED

In Paul Lofgren’s review of Nineteen Eighty-Four, the book was edi- fying, but mostly in an all-too-familiar way. One minor flaw was its partially excoriatory depiction of Walter Cronkite as “perhaps a dupe,” “conned” by leftist pastors. Sorry, but it is much more likely that WC was a sel-starter and not at all dependent on the Religious Left to direct his politics hard-aport. Space here doesn’t suffice for an adequate recital of Cronkitisms, but permit me a modest offering. In 1979 to a Soviet journalist: “I will never believe in a Soviet truth,” adding the prediction that the USSR would never attack a neighboring country, that less than a year before the invasion of Afghanistan. In 1974 to a Gannett reporter: “There are always groups in Washington express- ing views of alarm over the state of our defenses. We don’t carry those stories. The story is that there are those who want to cut defense spending.” Ted Kennedy once asserted that “Cronkite recently told me that for years he had been in favor of anti- guaranteed social discourse. Nearly anyone has to be given a hearing, provided he or she is bright, articulate and clear enough. But even in such a field the standards of hiring and promotion are not objective. There’s more of the same, stuff making seem less than a year before the invasion of Afghanistan. In 1974 to a Soviet journalist: “I will never believe in a Soviet truth,” adding the prediction that the USSR would never attack a neighboring country, that less than a year before the invasion of Afghanistan. In 1974 to a Gannett reporter: “There are always groups in Washington express- ing views of alarm over the state of our defenses. We don’t carry those stories. The story is that there are those who want to cut defense spending.” Ted Kennedy once asserted that “Cronkite recently told me that for years he had been in favor of anti- guaranteed social discourse. Nearly anyone has to be given a hearing, provided he or she is bright, articulate and clear enough. But even in such a field the standards of hiring and promotion are not objective. There’s more of the same, stuff making seem

In philosophy, my field, it is not easy to exclude people, since the profession is so filled with adver- sarial discourse. Nearly anyone has to be given a hearing, provided he or she is bright, articulate and clear enough. But even in such a field the standards of hiring and promotion are not objective. There’s more of the same, stuff making seem

Tabor R. Machan
Auburn University, AL (on leave)

What group comes to mind when the story of “Nitwit Feminism” appears in the same issue with the story of Professor Laura Freburg, Confessions of a Republican Academic? The answer is the American Association of Liberal Women, a.k.a. American Association of University Women. I would love to read some- thing about the inside workings of the AAWU and how, I presume, it will not come to the defense of Prof. Freburg.

E Rohverts Horner
St. Paul, MN
**REJECTIO AD ABSURDUM**

**DR. DEMENTO TAKES SOME HEAD:** Among the heroes of the loony left, Noam Chomsky is preeminent. Chomsky claims to pursue simultaneously both anarchism and socialism, which is the intellectual equivalent of a daffodil simultaneously entirely anorexic and obese. It may also be the reason that he was cited as a hero by the lead character in last year’s dimestore and most schizophrenic movie, Good Will Hunting. Yet Chomsky is getting criticized for, of all things, being rational. Strange but true. Chomsky spends as much time these days defending himself from the deconstructionists and postmodernists as he does attacking the evil capitalists. A typical Chomsky critic is a self-proclaimed “eco-feminist” by the name of Val Plumwood. In an essay titled “Noam Chomsky and Liberation Politics,” Plumwood skewers Chomsky for what she considers his obsession with rational thought. “Chomsky offers a reason-based explanatory framework to account for contemporary oppression.” Plumwood writes, as if this were the worst thing he had ever done. Instead of reason. Plumwood suggests an attack on “the rationalist dualisms which naturalize and support rational meritocracy and the resulting hierarchies of race, class, gender and nature as well as the mind/body dualism which sustains the central liberal duality between political and economic citizenship.” Her punch line: “In short, to understand properly the failure of the democracy Chomsky deplors, we need the critique of rationality Chomsky refutes.” Indeed we do. And the academic left is only too willing to embody it.

**THE CLASSICS CAN GET YOU FIRED:** Jared Sakren, a professor of Drama at Arizona State University, has filed a lawsuit against the university for violating his federal and state civil rights. Sakren claims the university discriminated against him because of his European descent and his use of male-authored European works in his teachings. In other words, Sakren taught Shakespeare, Aeschylus, and Ibsen the way they should be taught. For doing this, the intellectual satraps in ASU’s theatre department promptly sacked Sakren when he came up for his two-year review. The department’s chair claimed that his teaching of the classics “[did] not match the explicit goals of the department,” while “the feminists are offended by the selection of works from a sexist European canon that is approached traditionally.” While the classics were being expunged from ASU’s Theatre Department, plays such as “Betty the Yetti,” a nifty little thing about a logger who becomes an environmentalist after sex with a Sasquatch in the Pacific Northwest, were approved by the department.

**REVENGE OF THE ADA:** Dwayne Richardson, a janitor at a Long Island Metropolitan Transport Authority, wasn’t cut out to drive a subway. This was evident after the 63’rd, 450 pound Richardson failed to pass his TA-required physical. In fact, he was spent out in the minute he was exhausted after a three-minute walk on a treadmill. However, thanks to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, a federal court declared that Richardson was not disabled from a low point, your grand jury testimony was masterful—winning—not perjury—without a moment. The ad read: “Congratulations, Mr. President. Far from a low point, your grand jury testimony was masterful—winning—not perjury—without a moment.” Calling her the “Chief Prostitute,” Jill Stewart, star writer of the LA weekly New Times, lauded Senate Democrat Barbara Boxer early in October. “I am sorry to predict that when the dust settles, feminists will be judged as the worst liars, the leading moral midgets, and the most passive political prostitutes in Washington’s perjury and sex scandal. Indeed, the damage to feminists will far exceed the harm to bumbling, creepy Clinton or his bumblebee, creepier accusers. The title of Chief Prostitute of the Beltway will go, of course, to Barbara Boxer—a woman I hesitate to identify as “senator” because she clearly has not developed, intellectually or emotionally, beyond girlhood. Boxer is the joint author of the past month equivocating and dodging over her views on Clinton’s treatment of his wife, his marriage. She is, most importantly, the truth. Her kid-glove handling of Clinton was a stunning and revealing harbinger of the far future from her fiery, horrified speechmaking in 1991 and 1995, when Boxer spent months trying to bring down the evil Sen. Bob Packwood and the devil himself, Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas. . . . [In late September] Boxer gave a warm hug to her good buddy and enabler, Hillary Clinton, at a posh fundraiser for Boxer at the San Francisco Hilton. Hillary helped the beleaguered Boxer raise tens of thousands of dollars, but probably not enough to beat back Matt Fong . . . Watching Hillary and Boxer in action, I was reminded of the repressed Ice Wives of the ’50s, who, when their husbands found lovers and stopped pestering them for sex, commented: ‘Better her than me.’

**CRITICAL LEGAL STUPIDS:** Two professors from Harvard Law bought an ad in the Harvard Crimson congratulating Clinton for his grand jury testimony. The two profs are Charles Nesson and Charles Ogletree (Ogletree, who defended Anita Hill during the Anita Hill hearings and represented Frank Carter, Lewinsky’s first lawyer). The ad read: “Congratulations, Mr. President. Far from a low point, your grand jury testimony was masterful—winning—not perjury—without a moment.” Calling her the “Chief Prostitute,” Jill Stewart, star writer of the LA weekly New Times, lauded Senate Democrat Barbara Boxer early in October. “I am sorry to predict that when the dust settles, feminists will be judged as the worst liars, the leading moral midgets, and the most passive political prostitutes in Washington’s perjury and sex scandal. Indeed, the damage to feminists will far exceed the harm to bumbling, creepy Clinton or his bumblebee, creepier accusers. The title of Chief Prostitute of the Beltway will go, of course, to Barbara Boxer—a woman I hesitate to identify as “senator” because she clearly has not developed, intellectually or emotionally, beyond girlhood. Boxer is the joint author of the past month equivocating and dodging over her views on Clinton’s treatment of his wife, his marriage. She is, most importantly, the truth. Her kid-glove handling of Clinton was a stunning and revealing harbinger of the far future from her fiery, horrified speechmaking in 1991 and 1995, when Boxer spent months trying to bring down the evil Sen. Bob Packwood and the devil himself, Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas. . . . [In late September] Boxer gave a warm hug to her good buddy and enabler, Hillary Clinton, at a posh fundraiser for Boxer at the San Francisco Hilton. Hillary helped the beleaguered Boxer raise tens of thousands of dollars, but probably not enough to beat back Matt Fong . . . Watching Hillary and Boxer in action, I was reminded of the repressed Ice Wives of the ’50s, who, when their husbands found lovers and stopped pestering them for sex, commented: ‘Better her than me.’
I n the end, after hand wringing by Republicans, outrage by followers of the Dalai Lama, and charges that he was cotoning to the tyrants of Tiananmen, Clinton went to China. Some said he simply ignored all those who predicted compromise and disaster. But this President did not reach the pinnacle of American politics by ignoring his political opponents, but by out-thinking, out-flanking, and out-manoeuvring them. The trip to China went forward. I am convinced, precisely because of (not in spite of) the chorus of criticism that greeted it. The more Clinton was slammed for China-related scandals, the more determined he became to go to China, to the extent of scheduling an entire speech to justify his trip. Only by actually going to China could Clinton personally enlist the help of senior Chinese leaders to deflate the Chinascape scandal that threatened his administration. He needed Chinese President Jiang Zemin to publicly deny that Clinton had offered China a “quid pro quo” for concessions to his 1996 campaign, and thus help forestall the appointment of an independent prosecutor. He also needed him to agree not to target China’s newly improved ICBMs at the continental United States. Moreover, from Chinese soil Clinton would be in a position to project a more moderate, less confrontational image of the PRC back to Washington, and in retrospect, that was as the “China threat” dropped off the radar screen, the China-related political scandals would recede in importance as well.

But Clinton could hardly have failed to realize that, in return for helping to solve his domestic political problems, China’s president would demand some sacrifices on the key issue of Taiwan. And that to be justified, such appeasement would have to appear to serve some larger strategic purpose.

Of course, these political calculations were not for popular consumption. It would not do for the American people to realize that Clinton’s China scandal were driving his China policy. Instead, our compromised president attempted to sell us on a bold geostrategic vision of a “strategic partnership” with China that would, as he vaguely explained, ensure peace in the Asia-Pacific region.

The only hint of a rebuke in Clinton’s brief opening remarks was directed not at Beijing but his domestic critics “who wonder whether any hopes of a relationship ‘between China and America and China are good.” His answer was unequivocal: “Clearly, the answer is yes.” But it is not so obvious that Clinton and his unapologetic appeasers who arrest their critics, or that true friendship is possible with those who do not share our fundamental values. The U.S. and China, and Japan, Korea and Taiwan share demographic values and a common civic culture. The U.S. and China do not.

Proper diplomatic relations and burgeoning commercial ties between our two countries do not mean we are, or should be, allies.

The summit meeting between President Clinton and Chinese President Jiang Zemin took place two days later in Beijing, after the controversial welcoming ceremony on Tiananmen Square. The two presidents met for 90 minutes, approving a series of agreements, most of them minor, that had been negotiated in advance. These included a joint commitment not to provide assistance to ballistic missile programs in South Asia, an agreement “on the importance” of China, Japan, Korea and Taiwan sharing demographic values and a common civic culture. The U.S. and China do not.
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stability that we are enjoying today (Translation: "Had we not used deadly force we might not be in power"). Tibet is a part of China: [it] the door to dialogize and negotiation is open...[only] if [the Dalai Lama] recognizes that Tibet is an inseparable part of China...

Following Clinton's kowtow, a host of Administration officials, led by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, went to China to suggest that the U.S. was "clearly committed to reform." Clinton was only stating what had long been implicit in U.S. policy. But much was lost in this policy lurch, beginning with the artificial ambiguity that existed leading to the U.S. decision. (Isn't putting dissidents behind bars what the "rule of law" is all about? he seemed to say.)

China's dictators and publicly oppose self-determination, or referendums, or Taiwan; or two Chinas; or one Taiwan, one China. Clinton's proposed "strategic partnership" to the extent that it was ever more than a marketing slogan—alleging China had been involved in the so-called political contributions in the United States. Clinton really thought it's very absurd and ridiculous, and I think they are sheer fabrications. Clinton had raised the issue during their private meeting, Jiang went on to reveal, and "I told him that...we continue to insist on our national right to self-determination. And the result of the investigation shows that there is never such a thing."

Jiang invited Clinton to speak at this point, pointing out that they had pressed for press for Chinese cooperation in producing some of the 50 witnesses in the Chicken scandal who have all, curiously enough, fled to China to avoid testifying. China's state security apparatus presumably knows their whereabouts, if for no other reason than Jiang's "very earnest investigation." But Jiang, like Clinton, had already gotten what he wanted, and it was not witnesses whose testimony would breath new life into a smoldering scandal.

By the time the two presidents finished their remarks, it was clear that Jiang had taken little risk in allowing the press conference to air live.

What did Jiang get in return for the missile targeting agreement, his denial that he had contributed to Clinton's party coffers, and the "Clinton Live" broadcast? His broad objective in hosting a summit meeting with the American president was to legitimize his government in the eyes of the world and consolidate his own power at home. Jiang had hoped him to achieve this just by going to Beijing.

But Clinton may have paid an even higher price in Jiang's eyes. Helping to deliver democratic Taiwan to the Chinese president is the motherland." At a meeting with intellectuals in Shanghai, Clinton responded to a planted question about democracy by quoting Mao Zedong: “We don’t support independence for Taiwan; or two Chinas; or one Taiwan, one China. And we don’t believe that Taiwan should be a member in any organization for which statehood is a requirement." With these words Clinton became the first American president to side with China's dictators and publicly oppose self-determination for the 23 million people of Taiwan.

Clinton explained that "our country recognized China and embraced a one-China policy in 1978, and the Clinton administration reaffirmed this one for students of Bill. In return for making concessions on Taiwan, which may one day involve us in a war, Clinton got Jiang's help in debunking two of the many scandals plaguing his administration, and the opportunity to speak directly to the Chinese people. This in turn became his major claim of success in China—that he had, by the sheer force of his rhetoric, advanced democracy and human rights.

Clinton was upbeat at his final press conference. He boasted that this trip hinged on moderating the popular perception of China as a warlike, bloodthirsty dictator. What, the China trip, was anemic on human rights, bolstered undermines, rather than strengthens, our national security. His pre-visit critics were right: he should have remained in Washington.

Clinton's visit to China was in some ways reminiscent of President Richard Nixon's 1972 trip. As the first U.S. president ever to visit the PRC, Nixon understood that the success of his trip hinged on moderating the popular perception of China as a warlike, bloodthirsty dictator. As the first sitting president to journey to a communist state, Nixon set a new public skepticism. In the popular mind, China remained the Communist dictatorship that had shot down unarmed demonstrators in the streets of Beijing. It became a handy touchstone for the United States of a New China ready to cooperate with the U.S. containment of the Soviet Union. Clinton sought to choreograph his trip to underline his call for America to forge a new strategic partnership with a prosperous, modernizing, nonideological China.

But the world has not stood still since the Seventies. Nixon's China gambit against an aggressive and hostile Soviet Union played to bipartisan support and a universally admiring press. During his week-long visit to China, the media, so often at loggerheads with the Nixon presidency, proved a willing partner in a largely successful effort to gild China's image. They did so, not because China bestowed any popular support for a closer relationship with China would not be forthcoming. Nixon used his visit to succeed in getting the United States and the Chinese Communists to agree to be arrested. Despite "Clinton Live," there have been no more real-time broadcasts of politically important negotiations. Reporters are once again reporting that "insider" knowledge is not to be shared.

Clinton's proposed "strategic partnership" with China makes no geopolitical sense or economic sense. It is based on a self-fulfilling prophecy. China is not a warlike, bloodthirsty dictator. What, the China trip, was anemic on human rights, bolstered undermines, rather than strengthens, our national security. His pre-visit critics were right: he should have remained in Washington.

In the end, this trip was all about Bill. But isn't that what we've come to expect?"
I t was such a nightmare!" Sara says about the abuse she had suffered. Even though six years had passed, the pain was still evident in her voice as she described the horrors she experienced in her six-month relationship: the constant screaming, the public humiliation, and finally the sexual assault. It was familiar to people who read the newspaper or ladies' magazines, except for one fact: Sara's tormentor was not an abusive boyfriend that terrorized her in a drunken rage; it was another woman.

The problem of same-sex sexual assault and domestic violence may seem new, but it isn't. In fact, it happens about as much in homosexual relationships as it does in heterosexual relationships. But it is an issue that has been largely ignored by the mainstream media, and only recently has the homosexual community begun to openly discuss the issue—finally overcoming fear that doing so would air the homosexual community's "dirty laundry," giving ammunition to an overwhelmingly "heterosexual" and "homophobic" society. There has been a conspiracy of silence in which homosexual political leadership has insisted that same-sex sexual assault and domestic violence is for all practical purposes nonexistent—a vice of the heterosexual world that doesn't infect the more uphill gay and lesbian world. Hence, gays and lesbians who do come forward not only face many of the problems those heterosexual victims of rape also have, but face ostracism and criticism from within the gay community as well. It's part of the reason why, as experts estimate, domestic violence and same-sex assault is still widely under-reported.

"It's terribly personal and we all feel their feelings," according to Dawn Rudd, community organizer at Community United Against Violence (CUAV), a non-profit support agency for victims of same-sex domestic violence and anti-homosexual hate crimes based in San Francisco.

Rudd is one of the creators of an advertising campaign designed to promote public knowledge about domestic violence and sexual assault in lesbian relationships. Located in a non-descript security building on San Francisco's Market Street, CUAV spreads its message from a descript security building on San Francisco's Mission Street, using the ads to provide support to victims of same-sex sexual assault and domestic violence. The copy for the advertisements, which were shown on television in some urban areas, was graphically violent, and provocative—the copy for a sexual assault advertisement, for example, read: "I never thought a woman could rape another woman."

Dawn Rudd understands the reaction: "There are too many of us who have never been victims of same-sex sexual assault or domestic violence. And the political elites in this country have not nearly at the level that it does in heterosexual relationships."

A number of studies have shown (see sidebar) that heterosexual female victims of rape and domestic violence go to the police, women's shelters, and doctors far more often than their gay and lesbian counterparts, who generally seek out friends, counselors, or relatives for help. This is believed to be a major factor influencing the under-reporting of sexual assault and domestic violence. As researcher Bruce Jayro Katz noted in her unpublished "Domestic Violence in Lesbian Relationships," "lesbian battering has remained almost completely invisible."

Sara left and went back to her abusive partner half-a-dozen times in the six months they were together, and in those times of crisis, she turned to her friends and later, a counselor for help. Once, her partner trapped her in their apartment. Sara called her counselor, who asked if she wanted to have the police called so that she could leave. Sara said she thought about it for a moment and realized that she didn't want to compound her nightmare by getting involved in a criminal justice system that might treat her and her partner as freaks.

Dawn Rudd understands the reaction: "It takes a lot to step up and reach out to someone like the police department to talk about you. You know, 'I had a date with this woman and she sexually assaulted me.' That is a huge chance that you take."

But Jeff Shevel, same-sex advocate for victims of same-gender violence at the San Francisco District Attorney's office, feels that "there's a high level of comfort and a legal justice system" in San Francisco as opposed to other cities. Yet he admits that same-sex domestic violence ads

people who consider themselves to be progressive and activist and have said that, 'Well, don't make a big deal of it.'" Even the victims feel some of this hesitancy. Sara, for instance, (she is reluctant to give her last name) kept telling herself that she was imagining what was happening even in the middle of her abusive relationship: "I was in the mindset that men were violent and I couldn't imagine this was happening from a feminine partner."

It was the possibility of escape from denial that caused victims like Sara, as well as people who have known victims of same-sex sexual assault and domestic violence, to respond overwhelmingly to the advertisements highlighting the problem. As Dawn Rudd says, "The positive response far outweighs the negative response that we've gotten, and that's because a lot of women who have known friends or family members or people in the community that this has happened to feel like, 'it's about time.'"

Sima Shakhsari, Director of the Adult Education and Prevention Program at San Francisco Women Against Rape, a co-sponsor of the advertising campaign, said she's received a similar response: "We have had actual responses from
tic violence and rape also poses problems for the police.

One problem is that it is difficult to determine the perpetrator, as it is more likely for the victim to fight back. "It can be really difficult to identify the aggressor," Sheehy says. This can be especially true if two men have been involved in a physical confrontation. Police officers will go to the scene, and it's noted that there is mutual fighting. It makes it hard to pursue a case . . . [and] there are cases when everyone gets it wrong," he said. And many hesitate to file charges because "people really don't want to see wrong," he said. And many hesitate to file 

many states have same-sex assault or domestic violence to continue with their partner because either the victim or the aggressor has AIDS or is infected with the HIV virus.

It "adds a layer of complexity," Sheehy argues, noting that for some victims, the relative problems that stem from domestic violence or sexual assault is a smaller threat to them than the loss of their caregiver.

The distrust many gays and lesbians have of mainstream American society—and especially of the political Right—is a prime reason why many gays and lesbians won't report what happened to them, as they will be accused of "betraying the community." The community, advocates say, range from fear to anger.

Dawn Rudd says, "I think when you live in a marginalized community . . . when you're part of a community that is frequently under attack from all sides, the tendency is to pull in. Let's not put it out there. Let's not feed the ignorance. We need to believe so thoroughly in our goodness and in our ability to be a good, safe, strong community because we have nothing supporting that except ourselves. So to step out of that and to draw attention to the flaws and weaknesses in the community is a huge risk, and it's a risk I think some people think we shouldn't take. And I understand why—why give more ammunition to the religious fundamentalist Right?"

"I don't think it would make one bit of difference," according to Wayne Besen, spokesman for the Human Rights Campaign, a national gay and lesbian lobbying group. "Would the right-wing distort that? Sure. Most reason-

able people, many victims of same-sex sexual assault or domestic violence is certainly interrupting our ability to make large monetary payments to a battered women's shelter, and to the victim for counsel-

ing or other problems.

Many states treat instances of same-sex sexual assault as sodomy or oral copulation, or sometimes penetration with a foreign object. While sentencing guidelines are different for each state, California's laws send rapists to prison for three, six, or eight years. These are really equivalent to sentences for sentencing guide-

lines for sodomy and oral copulation.

While California's Department of Corrections does not note the sexual orientation of parolees, men are far more likely than women to be prosecuted for crimes that would occur in a same-sex sexual assault. In 1997, 849 men that had committed rape were paroled from California prisons, along with 78 that had committed sodomy and 292 that had committed oral copulation. On the other hand, two—two—women were paroled in 1997 for committing rape. Three were paroled for committing oral copulation. This, then, is a rather striking exam-

ination of parolees, men are far more likely than women to be prosecuted for crimes that would happen in a same-sex sexual assault. In 1997, 849 men that had committed rape were paroled from California prisons, along with 78 that had committed sodomy and 292 that had committed oral copulation. On the other hand, two—two—women were paroled in 1997 for committing rape. Three were paroled for committing oral copulation. This, then, is a rather striking exam-

ple that women, on the whole, are only very rarely being prosecuted for these acts—despite research that has shown that a nearly equal number of gay men and lesbians reported being in an abusive same-sex relationship, and seven percent of lesbian domestic violence victims have been victims of sexual assault.

There is also a general distrust of bat-

ted women's shelters among lesbians, although Jeff Sheehy of the San Francisco DA's office claims that these "women's shelters are lesbian-friendly," and that they are attempting to reach out to homosexual women. Sheehy's view is exactly the opposite of agencies like San Francisco Women Against Rape, which argues in a brochure that "when we talk about our experiences of same-sex rape . . . service providers may be ignorant and insensitive to our experiences of violence.

Sima Shakhari agrees: "When you're talking about sexual assault between two women . . . [victims] don't get the support they need . . . from some service providers . . . How could this happen? What do you mean a woman raped you?"

Sheehy, a woman for Advocates for Abused and Battered Lesbians, a Washington state-based lesbian support group, said that vic-

tims will often drive three to four hours in order to reach their support meetings. AABL, such as this is in the process of compiling a national data-

base of shelters for lesbians, has found 23 states with no support groups whatsoever, whereas others have only a few. California, a state with approximately 32 million people, has only nine shelters or agencies specifically devoted to the needs of abused lesbians. The states lacking facilities are not in remote or unpopulated sec-

tions of the country—even populous states, such as Michigan, Illinois, Connecticut, North Carolina, and Maryland, according to the data-

base for seemingly everything else but domestic vio-

lence. Looking at Yahoo!—which only provides a look at services that have gone on line—there are 230 sites for news and media organizations, 181 sites for religious issues, and 239 for various other organizations. There are even online shopping malls specifically devoted to gays and lesbians. How many sites are there for same-sex domestic violence? Seven.

But despite the progress that is placed on them, advocates like Dawn Rudd and victims like Sara continue to speak out. "I think a lot of women . . . that I've talked to, that I've gotten from the feedback from about the campaign have been glad that it's here, and felt that it was long overdue," Rudd says. It was a sentiment that was repeated by every advocate that I spoke with.

And Sara agreed. "The relationship cost me my job—[and] I've watched it cost the com-

munity other vital leaders. People need to listen very carefully to what survivors need . . . We need to talk about this issue."

But to begin solving the problem, one thing is clear: more people from the homo-

sexual community will need to join in the conversation.

---

**Percentages of women involved in abusive relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>HETEROSEXUAL</th>
<th>HOMOSEXUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women who have experienced</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical abuse in relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>25-33%</td>
<td>25-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of people involved in abusive</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Social</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Lawyers</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Shelters</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Advisors</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotlines</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Shelters</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**Where Battered Women Turn for Help**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>HETEROSEXUAL</th>
<th>HOMOSEXUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Social</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Lawyers</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Shelters</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Advisors</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotlines</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Shelters</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fashionably Left. Continued from page 7.

What sealed this odd marriage of high left and high fashion, the tone of the goutelle and the tumbrel with the life style of Marie Antoinette? A peculiar new kind of consumer compassion, in which women’s fashions are no longer an accessory, and inconsistencies are ironed out without sacrifice. “Awareness” rules; “concern” becomes painless. And the consumer is always included. By rational standards, of course, and feminism would appear to be oceans apart. Feminism says that women’s looks should mean nothing. Fashion insists they are everything. Feminism stresses androgyny. Fashion emphasizes the sexually female. Feminism stresses the uselessness and passing; feminism wants its mind on higher things.

“The nature of feminine dressing is superficial in essence,” says radical Susan Brownmiller. “Frowzy issues … trivial concerns,” scolds Naomi Wolf, who herself makes an effort to look terrific, and who acquires the beauty-industrial complex of working, hand-in-hand with the worst male oppressors to depress and de-nature newly roused women by obliging them with unrealizable ideals of perfection, forcing them to spend more and more on clothes and on facials, weakening them with cruel and unnatural diets, and of trying to starve them to death. “The more legal and material hindrances women have broken through, the more strictly and heavily images of female beauty have to weigh on us,” she says darkly, warning of “a violent backlash against feminism,” that urges images of female beauty as a political weapon against women’s advancement ... the last, best belief system that keeps male dominance intact.”

Brownmiller notes the tendency of feminine clothing to impede and restrict female movement: the cinched waist, the tight girdle, the hobble skirt, the tight skirt (which forces women to move with extreme caution), and above all, the shoe. “To qualify as passably feminine, a shoe does not absolutely require a high heel,” she writes correctly. “All it demands is some ingenious handicap to walk on—be it a cap, or a country road . . . or street.” Brownmiller says she has foresworn heels forever; for others—Jane Fonda, or Gloria Steinem, or Luci Baines Johnson—weary of feministic politics means a (perhaps temporary) switch from a previous glibness to a new realism: “To be feminine means a (perhaps temporary) switch from a previous glamorous image into plain, or androgynous, clothes.

But all this appears minor, next to more sobering trends. At the precise time the editorial content of these magazines began to celebrate empowerment—the fashion-and-feminist axis, for it is here that their interests entwine: in a culture assaulit, the more they are able to spend all their money on one dress for one evening than some families have to live on for one year. It also depends upon greed, self-absorption, and material hindrances women to discover pornography, and gives advice on what to do when one discovers one’s husband likes men.

Now and then, a conservative voice—perhaps Republican person—appears in these pages, but always in a more personal, and not to explain how or why she turns every page of the magazine without an object should ever be raised. In these pages, she wished she could volunteer to go to work for them. “The more legal and material hindrances women have broken through, the more strictly and heavily images of female beauty have to weigh on us,” she says darkly, warning of “a violent backlash against feminism,” that urges images of female beauty as a political weapon against women’s advancement ... the last, best belief system that keeps male dominance intact.”

Brownmiller notes the tendency of feminine clothing to impede and restrict female movement: the cinched waist, the tight girdle, the hobble skirt, the tight skirt (which forces women to move with extreme caution), and above all, the shoe. “To qualify as passably feminine, a shoe does not absolutely require a high heel,” she writes correctly. “All it demands is some ingenious handicap to walk on—be it a cap, or a country road . . . or street.” Brownmiller says she has foresworn heels forever; for others—Jane Fonda, or Gloria Steinem, or Luci Baines Johnson—weary of feministic politics means a (perhaps temporary) switch from a previous glibness to a new realism: “To be feminine means a (perhaps temporary) switch from a previous glamorous image into plain, or androgynous, clothes.
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Eugene McCarthy, through 1972, when it found George McGovern, through 1998, when the trendy hang tough for Bill Clinton—no liberal campaign hangs tough with winners, only with losers. Film stars, concerts by rock stars, and fund-raisers at the homes of a zillionaire media figures. Film stars sleep on grates to show support for the homeless, and then fly home to one of their many palaces. They berate the greedy, as they buy their third house and their fourth Mazeratis; speak movingly of the dignity of all human beings, as they treat those in their employ like serfs and those they say they desire. The suburbanites behind them, at once the most over-indulged and most self-righteous generation in memory, engage in these acts of moral confusion, the art of never letting a fleeting want go unsatisfied, while maintaining one’s high opinion of oneself. The things that they read are the give-away: the papers and magazines that carry the ads for mothers of every variety, jewelry and spas, for perfume at $250 the bottle and skin cream at $90 per jar; that promise the moderate restaurant, where one can dine for $100; the gourmet food, the fun fur, the fun house at $450; editorialize the most against greed and selfishness.

The more ads for Rolex and for pure diamonds, the more predictably left the editorial content. The more pictures are shown of women as objects—posed, framed, literally coated with makeup—the more grimly feminist the line will be. AIDS is a crisis. So is homelessness. So is the plight of the migrant, the minorities, the inner city young people. So too is that worried, just above the left cheekbone, that one is called on to battle, to spend $40 to prevent, $90 to minimize, and $5,000 to correct with surgery, when worst comes to worst.

This sanctimonious self-absorption was captured perfectly by Tom Wolfe back in the late sixties, at a fund-raiser on Long Island for the grape pickers’ union, at which the concerned and social were asked to see themselves as migrant workers, rising before dawn for long days in the fields: “…They all stood there, in their Pace dresses, Gucci shoes. Capucci scarves, either imagining they were grape pickers’ wives, or wondering if the wind would ever stop. They had come off the ocean, and were wrecking everyone’s hair … Andrew Stein’s hair was long, full, and at the outset had been especially well-coiffed in the Roger’s of 58th Street manner, and now it was thick and soft.”

Roger of 58th Street equates to Christophe of Hollywood, recommended to the man from Hope by his liberal bankers, who thought $200 for twenty minutes pretty much the going price. (They had gone to his inauguration a few months earlier, jetting cross-country with their personal trainers, to celebrate the election of a man of the people, and the lib-eration of the country from twelve years of greed.) Fittingly, Clinton went off to fundraise this summer at the Hamptons, where houses cost $200,000 to rent for a week. They were the most fervent defenders as sinners surround him. They will stay faithful, no matter what happens, because they know larger things matter. He is their defense against a Republican Congress. He is their defense against . . . the attempt is to make this a warmer, more sentimental film. (The producer, abashed, gave the car’s cost to charity.)

And the more you have, the further left you have to be, to reassure yourself that you deserve it. So the great beating heart of cause liberalism is no longer in the middle class, but in the entertainment and the fashion industries, where people make more money for less work doing something than anywhere else in the universe. So Harper’s Bazaar highlights welfare mothers, the Hollywood left tends to back Jesse Jackson, and the millionaire divas of the now-defunct Hollywood Women’s Political Caucus used to hold soirees where they would berate the likes of Ted Kennedy for moving too far to the right. Another such conscience of the modern-day Democrats is Warren Beatty, the prototype Sybarite Liberal, profiled here in Money and Class in America.

Noemie Emery wrote “Nitwit Feminism” in Harper’s Bazaar for October, 1997, and you will find, on page 221, a full page picture of a striking woman, all sleek dark hair, elegantly dressed, wearing a dark black number, whose plaguing V neckline and very thin straps show off acres of well-tended skin. Is it an ad for the dress, or the makeup, or for hair or skin products? Not exactly. It is not a model. It is . . . Anita Hill, Anitah Hill, the law professor and one-time govern-ment policy wonk, whose testimony at the congressional hearings was the main reason then Judge Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court of the United States set the coun-try on its starring role in 1991. The shot accompanies a devotional piece about Hill since the hearings written by Patricia Williams, who is logical-ly a columnist for the Nation, and a law professor (at Columbia) of little class-race-and-gender school. As is usual with pieces like these in these magazines, this takes it as a given that Hill’s case is proven, and never indicates that there could be another side. Hers is taken as a clear case of race-gender bias. Her critics are dismissed as big-ots and lunatics. The many women—the many black women—who testified on behalf of Clarence Thomas are dis-missed. Hill is praised here for her bravery and honesty; for her “courage . . . and her sense of jus-tice,” her “patient intelligence,” her “sense of luminous resolve.” . . . Warren Beatty does not figure in this piece. . . .

What are we to do, after reading this feature? What are we to do, after reading this piece? What are we to do, after reading this story? And Style is it. Open . . .

First Girl: ‘Well, it’s the same thing, isn’t it?’
Second Girl: ‘No, McCarthy.’
First Girl: ‘Well, it’s the same thing, isn’t it?’
And so it is. . . .
Opponents and supporters agree that the issue of I-200 would galvanize stalled grass-roots anti-preference campaigns across the country and perhaps rouse timid Republican leaders in Congress who have stymied efforts to eliminate federal government preferences. A resounding victory here would demonstrate that the victory in California was not an isolated phenomenon. Big business, big government, and the racial spoils-sports will never fight as hard as they did in the Golden State’s revolutionary war of 1996. But they won’t go down quietly in the Pacific Northwest.

The good news is that academia, editorial writers, big business, big government, and the family-values movement are united against I-200 in Washington state.

The city of Seattle prides itself on being a warm, outer layer of civility. The inventor of the “Have a nice day” smiley face is a native son. Ubiquitous pastel-colored bumper stickers on Soccer Mom-mobiles urge fellow citizens to “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.” Bare-knuckle political brawls are gauche. City council meetings begin with poetry readings. If the collective decibel level of public debate in Los Angeles or New York is a raucous 10, this town where Muzak was born maintains a soft and steady 3.

As the Nov. 3 election grows closer, however, Seattle’s preference machine has abandoned its superficial politeness for unabashed smear tactics reminiscent of the anti-209 campaign in California. The mud-slinging is a bit kinder and gentler—“preferential treatment” is a purposeful mis-spelling to suggest fascism on the part of popular politicians. The term’s positive connotation of unseamed opportunity for unabashed smears has dissolved into unfettered snarls. But the cogs in the preference machine have battered the California narrow ballot language of anti-preference action programs that do not amount to preferential treatment; it would defeat them!

The only consistent result in polls asking Americans their views on “affirmative action” is that about 80 percent consistently oppose racial preferences. The term’s positive connotation stems in large part from its original intent—that is, to take affirmative action and gender-neutral steps that help level the playing field for disadvantaged Americans. This common-sense understanding explains why half of Washington voters say they favor affirmative action programs that do not amount to preferential treatment, and more than half also say they’ll vote for I-200. “It’s possible there are affirmative-action programs that do not amount to preferential treatment,” he said after the ruling, but then added that the state decided to trust voters to make an informed choice. But the cogs in the preference machine would rather commit political suicide—falling on their swords in a losing battle over words—than trust voters. Every one of the state’s opponents have battled the careful, narrow ballot language of anti-preference action programs. Even some opponents have battled the careful, narrow ballot language of anti-preference action programs.
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Sex and Affirmative Action

The term “affirmative action” usually makes you think of different programs for minorities and whites and court cases to integrate white schools. And that’s been the subject of a lot of media attention recently.

But did you know that women are the most recent, the most costly example of affirmative action in America today? Affirmative action programs for other groups—blacks, Hispanics, native Americans, and Pacific Islanders, for example—have already made a mark.

In the case of women, affirmative action programs are targeting a majority—51 percent—of Americans, with significant consequences for American society.

Last year the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or EEOC, required employers to pay a total of $72 million to plaintiffs in sex discrimination cases, an amount far greater than those awarded in other classes of suits. Adding together awards for sex and pregnancy discrimination and sexual harassment nets $127 million. These costs are a fraction of the total costs of sex-based affirmative action, but they do give some indication of the relative magnitude of affirmative action costs for different groups.

Women also earn less than men. Many eminent public policy figures argue about the pros and cons of affirmative action for underprivileged minorities. But it’s vital to make the point that, just as women aren’t a minority of the population, they’re also not an underprivileged group. Since the early 1980s women have earned more B.A. and M.A. degrees than men. In 1970 women earned few business, law, or medical degrees, but now they earn about 40 percent of degrees in these fields. Until the 1960s there were very real barriers to entry in colleges and graduate institutions, and cultural barriers to entry in many workplaces. But, when these barriers to women’s advancement did exist and competed successfully against men.

And as women move into previ-
ously male-dominated fields, their wages have been steadily rising relative to men’s. According to studies by Congressional Budget Office director Jane O’Neill and others, women earn 60 percent as much as men for occupations that are not covered under affirmative action enforcement. In 1972 there were only 400,000 women-owned small businesses—today there are over 8 million.

Feminists are right. Women are smart and successful. They belong in the House and in the Senate. So why the affirmative action programs?

Explaining Wage Gaps and Glass Ceilings

Affirmative action supporters ask why, with women’s increased education and work experience, women allegedly face a “glass ceiling” and a “wage gap,” earning only 74 cents of a man’s dollar. At one end of the income spectrum, why are there not more women in construction and in oil drilling? At the other end, why are there not more women executives? Some people are convinced that the answer lies in pervasive sex discrimination and sexual harassment nets.

Still, affirmative action supporters such as Eleanor Smeal of the National Organization for Women and Mary Becker of the University of Chicago note that some occupations still have fewer than 10 percent of female workers, and they cite this as evidence that discrimination persists and that affirmative action is still needed. But many of these jobs call for substantial amounts of physical strength and are risky and dirty, such as mining, timber logging, construction, firefighting, and welding and cutting. Some jobs also call for odd hours of work, such as truck driving.

Railroad transportation, as well as having unusual hours, is also a declining industry. Women have broken barriers to entry so that many more competitive and high-paying fields. A good case can be made that women have not gone into these fields because they prove inequality between young and old. Neither additional earnings, a continuing trend, doesn’t make larger profits than others. In the same way, if women were paid only 74 cents on a man’s dollar, then a firm could fire all its men, replace them with women, and have a cost advantage over rivals.

But why stop at 74 cents on a man’s dol-
lar? If an employer were to have that much power, why not pay women only 50 or even 25 cents on a man’s dollar? We just don’t see this happening, because employment is a willing agreement between two parties, and because employers need workers as much as workers need jobs.

A preference for more time at home with less pay and less job advancement over more time at work with more pay and advancement is a legiti-
mate individual choice for women. Similarly, the choice of some men to retire early and forego additional earnings, a continuing trend, doesn’t prove inequality between young and old. Neither of these phenomena is a policy crisis calling for government interference. One of the greatest harms that feminism has inflicted on women is to make them think that women are the send message that women are only fulfilled if their salaries are equal to men’s, and that a preference for more time at home is somehow flawed.

With a well-educated majority such as women getting affirmative action, there’s only one step further to go. That’s for men—a lessor educated minority, with higher proportion in jail and on hard drugs, and a lower life expectancy—to get affirmative action too.

—Diana Furchtgott-Roth

Diana Furchtgott-Roth is a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and a National Advisory Board member of the Independent Women’s Forum.

### Percent of Women in Selected Occupations, 1970-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists (except biochemists)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer systems analysts &amp; scientists</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitians</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economists</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors &amp; reporters</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; systems researchers &amp; analysts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations specialists</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Elementary</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- &amp; kindergarten</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, college &amp; university</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Battle in Seattle. Continued from page 10

against it; 13 percent were undecided; and 50% favored “affirmative action” programs. The No.200 campaign claims that “confusion” explained the numbers.

Given the clear and common distinction that most Americans have made over time between affirmative action and preferences, confusion rests only with semantically-challenged liberals and befuddled pollsters. “If the opposition can make the argument that this will wipe out affirmative action completely, they win,” notes a liberal supporter. “By evolving their argument, they must base their panic on the assumption that all state-sponsored affirmative action programs involve race and gender preferences. Dimmer bulbs in the anti-200 ranks parrot the line that “quotas are illegal” while at the same time urging their brethren to “Keep affirmative action quotas in place,” as the Northwest Asian Weekly, a Seattle-based newspaper, urged. Anti-200 forces have already tried playing both sides and losing. But the anti-200 team has no other playbook. One I-200 supporter reports that in an apparent push poll, a telephone survey asked voters, “Do you support affirmative action?” After answering yes, the supporter was asked if he supported I-200. Yes again. Then the pollster asked if the supporter knew I-200 would end affirmative action, would it change his support? When the I-200 supporter responded angrily that I-200 had nothing to do with affirmative action, the sly caller pulled out his trump card: If the I-200 supporter knew that the ACLU said I-200 would repeal affirmative action, would he still support it?

No confusion, misunderstanding, or obfuscation about the question to this fact:Favoring the initiative implies that the measure “will turn the clock back to the old reactionary ways of the past.”

Moreover, I-200 is “brutal to communities of color” and “you may lose your rights,” warn Asian-American activists. Over the summer, Smith’s was even speculatively recklessly that racial violence might erupt in anticipation of I-200’s passage. It didn’t happen—and one gets the eerie sense that the Seattle City Council, which unanimously condemned the initiative—were a little disappointed. The NoI-200 campaign points hysterically to California for evidence of the apocalyptic damage of eliminating race and gender preferences. Yet California’s experience provides nothing but comfort and experience provides nothing but comfort and confidence that “the ACLU said I-200 would repeal affirmative action, would he still support it?”

No confusion, misunderstanding, or obfuscation about the question to this fact:Favoring the initiative implies that the measure “will turn the clock back to the old reactionary ways of the past.”

Similarly, the ACLU said I-200 would “repeal affirmative action” programs and “completely end affirmative action” programs and “completely end affirmative action” programs and “completely end affirmative action” programs. Some I-200 opponents take it a step further, implying that I-200 would eliminate anti-discrimination laws. For better or worse, I-200 supporters as bigots, liars, and radicals. “We need to maintain control and hold onto the territory,” to quote a local cultural anthropologist, always.

Michelle Malkin is an editorial writer and columnist for the Seattle Times.

Katuria’s Bravura

Nineteen months ago, a brief fax found its way on the highest pile atop my cluttered desk. It introduced a woman named Katuria Smith who, “assisted by the Washington, D.C. based Civil Rights Institute began airing educational radio ads that give informing voters that “The Dean disputes [Hentoff’s] account.”

Hentoff’s reporting. But never, as Hentoff notes, did the dean say references displace qualified students a “myth.”
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NEW FROM THE AUTHOR OF RADICAL SON

THE POLITICS OF BAD FAITH
THE RADICAL ASSAULT ON AMERICA'S FUTURE

BY DAVID HOROWITZ

This elegant, insightful work ought to be widely read as a necessary corrective to the most dangerous moral disease of our times.

—Robert Bork

A series of essays that lay bare with surgical precision the ways in which American radical intellectuals have managed to disguise themselves as liberals and to marginalize the ideas of genuine liberals. Written with passion, it makes for fascinating reading.

—Richard Pipes

“A passionate and insightful book.”

—Francis Fukuyama

Available in Bookstores
To order call (800) 752-6562 ext. 209
Contact David Horowitz through www.frontpagemag.com

Call (800) 752-6562 ext. 209 to order
Pessimism Examined

Enemies of Hope. A Critique of Contemporary Pessimism. Irrationalism, Anti-Humanism and the Counter-Enlightenment

by Raymond Tallis

St. Martin's Press, 499 pp. $39.95

REVIEW BY BRUCE S. THORNTON

The validity of postmodernism's ideas rests on nothing more than their mantric assertion by semi-crete college professors uncritically repeating the zany exaggerations of Continental philosophers and their epigones. Radical linguistic indeterminacy; epistemological nihilism; the self as mere construct of language or culture; the totalizing reach of "power" in determining human relations, social institutions, and cultural activities; history as a self-serving fable, and science as a localized social construct no more true than MTV videos—all of these incoherent "theories" comprise the chants and dances of an academic cargo cult, the magical rituals of an intellectually backwards professorate trying to conjure up the Big Explanation of the Counter-Enlightenment

Contemporary Pessimism.

Pessimism Examined

Tallis begins with a definition of the Enlightenment ideal—"critical individualism hostile to an authority," toleration of differences, and faith in reason and observation. He then surveys the eighteenth-century attacks on the Enlightenment's epistemology, universalism, presumed faith in the goodness of mankind, and disdain for local cultures, discussing as well the demotion of reason that characterizes all anti-Enlightenment thought. He links these old critiques—many of whose ideas resurfaced in reactionary Christianity, fascism or hysterical nationalism, as Alain Finkielkraut has shown—to contemporary postmodern philosophers.

In addition to exposing the weakness of the postmodernist assertion that reason is no better than magic and that the conscious agent is an illusion, Tallis's valuable contribution, to my mind, is the laying bare of the hypocrisy violating postmodern philosophy. All the professors who espouse the postmodern credo live lives in which those principles play absolutely no part: "Post-modernists still expect a pay cheque every month. . . have a very robust, un-post-modernist sense of their civic rights. . . and expect to be flown between their international symposia in planes designed on sound scientific principles. . . and piloted by individuals with a conventional sense of personal responsibility." No postmodern feminist decreeing the oppression of patriarchal medicine has the lump in her breast examined by a shaman rather than a mammogram.

Throughout Enemies of Hope, Tallis refutes the fashionable pessimism that sees the twentieth-century as the worst of times, a refutation whose greatest force comes from the free-market prosperity, security, and comfort created by science and enjoyed by these same pessimistic "Global Village Explainers," as Tallis calls them, who romanticize primitive hunter-gatherers, American Indians, third-world tribes, and other "organic" pre-modern cultures: "I think that few critics of modernity would prefer untreated cystitis to atomic, chronic malnutrition to alienation; few would find being under the thrall of the priest, the local squire, an unaccountable government or an unchallengeable workplace bully in an organic community better than living in an atomic society." In short, our prejudices are the luxuries of a people liberated from a destructive natural world and the casual violence and cruelty that has stained most human cultures before the present.

Tallis, however, should not be dismissed as a mere cheerleader for science and progress. His aim is to "separate what is good in Enlightenment thought, what is feasible in the Enlightenment dream, from what is bad, dangerous and unacceptable," while acknowledging what is valid in the anti-Enlightenment critique. This Tallis does in his Epilogue, "The Hope of Progress," a hope based on the possibilities of improving human life through the application of reason by conscious agents driven by the recognition that all humans deserve equal treatment. He locates this possibility for improvement in a "benign universalism" that respects the variety of human life, a vision of utopia that does not necessarily suffer from boredom or authoritarian repression, and a view of man as a natural creature, but one "unnatural" in its ability to be explicit about itself and its situation.

Tallis will not satisfy the religious believer, who would argue that human meaning resides somewhere other than in our material bodies. But then, Tallis is not speaking to the believer, and he explicitly states that issues of Ultimate Ends are not the purview of the rationalist. Furthermore, given that in the West our social problems are unlikely to be solved on the basis of religious assumptions, Tallis's prescriptions demand serious consideration. As he reminds us, not only has the legacy of the Enlightenment led to unarguable improvement in the material life of millions of ordinary human beings, but the assumptions of Enlightenment rationalism and political ideals are the only game in town. No matter what they say, in their daily lives, the religious fanatic and postmodern pessimist alike have both voted for the Enlightenment with their feet.

Bruce S. Thornton's Plagues of the Mind: The New Epidemic of False Knowledge is coming out next fall.

Give Heterodoxy this season.

[Form for subscription information]
The End of Affirmative Action

by Lydia Chavez

Back in 1996, when Ward Connolly asked me to co-chair the Proposition 209 campaign in California, I didn’t have any trouble deciding what to do. I regarded Proposition 209 as the best hope for ending state-sponsored racial and gender discrimination—euphemistically called “affirmative action” by its partisans.

While polls indicated that the overwhelming majority of Californians opposed such preferential treatment, politicians had been paralyzed for decades by a fairly small cadre of preference-supporters who lobbied accusations of racism or sexism toward preference opponents. A popular initiative was needed to put an end to that paralysis. I figured that if a tenured law professor couldn’t stand up publicly on such an issue, I couldn’t expect anyone else to. So I said yes.

It was always a bit of an awkward fit. Although I had never opposed voter initiatives on principle, I surely harbored no warm spot in my heart for them. The image of the ill-informed, unruly crowd—short on rationality, long on passion—was always lurking in the back of my mind. Believing that, on the whole, the quality of political discourse one finds in the legislature is superior to that found outside the legislature (however slightly), I had theContemporary Los Angeles Times (Westside) considers_they believe_described that the term “affirmative action” to be substituted for its earlier meaning. A poll conducted by the respected American Heritage Dictionary defines it, it refers to “a policy of action that, with a view to rectifying a social injustice, or promoting a socially useful result, is directed to ensuring that a particular class of persons shall have an equal opportunity to be dealt with in a specified manner as compared with others. It is primarily a matter of equality and opportunity, and not of affirmative action in the sense of positive discrimination.” As Chavez indicates—and tries to validate in the text of Proposition 209—affirmative action has no fixed meaning. As the American Heritage Dictionary defines it, it refers to “action taken to provide equal opportunity, as in admissions or employment, for minority groups or women.” Hence it describes not only preferential treatment for women and minorities, but a variety of benign, non-discriminatory programs. Such a term is wholly inappropriate for use in an initiative aimed solely at prohibiting preferences. When Proposition 209 passed, the initiative’s text became part of the California Constitution—not a place to make word-choice errors.

The term has an interesting history beginning in the early 1960s when President Kennedy used it in Executive Order 10925. That order required federal contractors to take “affirmative action” to ensure that their employees are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin.Kennedy’s order was not intended to require contractors to grant special preferences. To grant a preference on the basis of race or sex in order to ensure that “employees are treated . . . with regard to their race . . . [or] sex” is self-contradictory.

During the early 1960s, preferential treatment for women and minorities was a spectrum raised by opponents of civil rights legislation, not propos- terial teachers—ordinarily considered a sophisticated group—showed them evenly split (43% to 37%) over whether the term primarily refers to programs designed to ensure equal opportunity for all or to preferential treatment for women and minorities. Consequently, when Wood and Custred drafted the initiative, they chose to use the term “affirmative action” altogether—not to evade, but to be clear. Their intention was to outlaw preferences, including programs like the one at Cal State-Hayward’s nursing school, which, they viewed, was needed to put an end to a gender-balanced school. After consulting constitutional scholars across the country (not focus groups as their opponents claimed), they settled upon the final language of the initiative’s operative clause: “The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.” This language, based on the language of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, accomplished their aims in a way that language using the term “affirmative action” could not.

As Chavez indicated, she set out to validate the notion that Proposition 209 immediately seized upon it as a deliberate effort to mislead. Affirmative action, she claimed, was actually very popular; only when its opponents mischaracterized it as involving racial preferences does its support evaporate. They sued (unsuccessfully) to require the term “affirmative action” to be substituted for its earlier meaning. A poll conducted by the respected American Heritage Dictionary defines it, it refers to “a policy of action that, with a view to rectifying a social injustice, or promoting a socially useful result, is directed to ensuring that a particular class of persons shall have an equal opportunity to be dealt with in a specified manner as compared with others. It is primarily a matter of equality and opportunity, and not of affirmative action in the sense of positive discrimination.” As Chavez indicates—and tries to validate in the text of Proposition 209—affirmative action has no fixed meaning. As the American Heritage Dictionary defines it, it refers to “action taken to provide equal opportunity, as in admissions or employment, for minority groups or women.” Hence it describes not only preferential treatment for women and minorities, but a variety of benign, non-discriminatory programs. Such a term is wholly inappropriate for use in an initiative aimed solely at prohibiting preferences. When Proposition 209 passed, the initiative’s text became part of the California Constitution—not a place to make word-choice errors.

The term has an interesting history beginning in the early 1960s when President Kennedy used it in Executive Order 10925. That order required federal contractors to take “affirmative action” to ensure that their employees are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Kennedy’s order was not intended to require contractors to grant special preferences. To grant a preference on the basis of race or sex in order to ensure that “employees are treated . . . with regard to their race . . . [or] sex” is self-contradictory.

During the early 1960s, preferential treatment for women and minorities was a spectrum raised by opponents of civil rights legislation, not propos-
1) Michael has two abusive stepfathers and an alcoholic mother. If his self-esteem is reduced by 20% per dysfunctional parent, but Michael feels 3% better for every person he denigrates, how long will it take before he’s ready to go home if 1 person walks by Starbucks every 2 minutes?

2) Sanjeev has 7 piercings. If the likelihood of getting cellulitis on a given day is 10% per piercing, what is the likelihood Sanjeev will need to renew his erythromycin prescription during the next week?

3) Chad wants to take half a pound of heroin to Orinda and sell it at a 20% profit. If it originally cost him $1,500 in food stamps, how much should Debbie write the check for?

4) The City and County of San Francisco decide to destroy 50 rats infesting downtown. If 9,800 animal rights activists hold a candlelight vigil, how many people did each dead rat empower?

5) A red sock, a yellow sock, a blue sock, and a white sock are tossed randomly in a drawer. What is the likelihood that the first two socks drawn will be socks of color?

6) George weighs 245 pounds and drinks two triple lattes every morning. If each shot of espresso contains 490mg of caffeine, what is George’s average caffeine density in mg/pound?

7) There are 4500 homes in Mill Valley and all of them recycle plastic. If each household recycles 10 soda bottles a day and buys one polar fleece pullover per month, does Mill Valley have a monthly plastic surplus or deficit? Bonus question: Assuming all the plastic bottles are 1 liter size, how much Evian are they drinking?

8) If the average person can eat one pork pot sticker in 30 seconds, and the waitress brings a platter of 12 pot stickers, how long will it take five vegans to not eat them?

9) Todd begins walking down Market Street with 12 $1 bills in his wallet. If he always gives panhandlers a single buck, how many legs did he have to step over if he has $3 left when he reaches the other end and met only one double-amputee?

10) Zelda and Jane were given a rottweiler at their commitment ceremony. If their dog needs to be walked two miles a day and they walk at a rate of 3/4 mile per hour, how much time will they spend discussing their relationship in public?

For Advanced Placement Students Only:

Katie, Trip, Ling, John-John and Effie share a three-bedroom apartment on Guerrero for $2400 a month. Effie and Trip can share one bedroom, but the other three need their own rooms with separate ISDN lines to run their Web servers. None of them wants to use the futon in the living room as a bed, and they each want to save $650 in three months to attend Burning Man. What is their best option:

a) All five roommates accept a $12/hour job-share as handgun monitors at Mission High.

b) Ask Miles, the bisexual auto mechanic, to share Effie and Trip’s bedroom for $500/month.

c) Petition the Board of Supervisors to advance Ling her annual digital-artists-of-color stipend.

d) Rent strike.

Judith Schumann Weizner is on vacation. She will return next month.