Free Mumia - NOT!

Several years after Mumia Abu-Jamal shot her husband, Maureen Faulkner moved to Southern California. It was as complete a change as she could imagine, from the confined rowhouse neighborhoods of Philadelphia to the wide-open beaches of the Pacific. She wanted to get away from it all, but the horror of that death has come after her.

"I had a very interesting experience the other day," she told me. "I was pumping gas and I saw this guy get out of his car and he had on a 'Free Mumia' T-shirt. I went over to him and he said, 'Excuse me. Where did you get that shirt?'"

"At a rally at UCLA," he said.

"Tell me about the case, I said."

"It's about a Black Panther and the police framed him," he said.

"I said, 'Who do you really think shot the cop?'"

"Some other guy did it and ran away," he said.

"I said, 'You better get your facts straight, because the next time you walk around wearing a shirt like that the widow of the officer may come up to you.'"

"He said, 'You mean you're the widow?'

"I said, 'If you give me your name and address, I'll send you the facts of the case.'"

"He said, 'No, thanks.'"

Maureen Faulkner wasn't surprised at this response. Those who worship in the cult of Mumia Abu-Jamal are allergic to the facts. In fact, ignorance is a precondition for the religious experience. Far better to restrict oneself to the experience of Mumia's cuddly image as an existential dreadlocked intellectual, and his voice, a wonderful, mellifluous instrument familiar to listeners of PBS' "All Things Considered."

In a gesture reminiscent of the Ayatollah's communiques from Paris all those years, Jamal regularly sends out from Death Row cassettes that reach the hands of the faithful in faraway places. In Pennsylvania, where people know about him, Jamal is a nonentity, but in California he's a star. TV actors like Ed Asner and Mike Farrell prance his gospel. And college students in Los Angeles wear t-shirts emblazoned with his image and reject any invitation to learn about his case.

The University of California has done some amazing things over the years, but perhaps its most remarkable accomplishment has been to make available to the masses the sort of high-minded ignorance that used to be the sole province of Ivy League alumni. It produces an amazing type of person, superficially educated yet totally devoid of the type of intellectual curiosity that the university education is supposed to engender.

When I used to cover the war in Central America in the 1980s, I was amazed at the number of U.C. students I'd run into in places like Nicaragua and

UC REGENTS PERFORM EUTHANASIA ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

PRESENT AT THE UNGREATION

By John Ellis

I had originally intended not to make the 80-mile drive to San Francisco for the July 20 meeting at which the Regents of the University of California were to decide whether to end the use of race, gender, or ethnicity in student admissions and faculty hiring. It was not that the event lacked historical gravity, nor that I lacked interest. But the Regents were planning to let only 30 people, chosen by lot from what was sure to be a very large crowd, address them for three minutes each. There would also be 30 invited speakers, "elected and other public figures" like Jesse Jackson, Tom Hayden and Willie Brown, the former speaker of the California Assembly. It seemed unlikely that I would have a chance to speak or even to get into the meeting if I went, since in the original plan even the speakers would be allowed in to the meeting room only to have their say, and then would have to leave.

But then, two days before the meeting, my phone rang. It was the Governor's office. One of his representatives told me that as an officer President of the Board of Regents, Pete Wilson had been asked to speak at the event. Since I was on the list of invited speakers and he was offering me one of those slots, I quickly agreed and set to work on a statement. Guessing that the issue of fairness would be talked to death by opponents and proponents of affirmative action alike, I decided to devote my three minutes to the enormous damage that had been done by affirmative action to college campuses around the country, especially the denial of curricula that had resulted from the obsession with race, gender, and class.

I got up at 3:30 a.m. to drive to the meeting in San Francisco and arrived in time for coffee in the lounge next to the meeting room. Many of the invited speakers were already there, as well as the Chancellor and the dean, and the board of the campus administration. Having been a dean for nine years on the Santa Cruz campus, I still knew many of them. I could see that my presence did not thrill them. Maybe they guessed the Governor's intent - to have an insider speak who knew how bad things really were on campus, to counter the
At War With the Army

Thanks for the complimentary issue of #200 for June, 1995, backing up your publication with the “The Americans are about what they think this country’s military.” My subscription check is enclosed.

The hard hitting article by K.L. Billingsly spotlights the misguided “seizure on the military,” which turns appropriate and honorable service by American women in the U.S. armed services into a projection of the political/ ideological revolutionaries who have always suspected American military tradition, and provision of necessary resources, now appears as a dedication to corruption of U.S. soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen (of both sexes) into “peacekeepers,” disarmed and displaced by the inaction of social engineers and far-cut agendas completely unrelated to the readiness of military forces to fight and win our nation’s wars.

Of equal urgency, in my opinion, is the need to call out, in the name of Congress, to amend the 1993 Homosexual Exclusion Law to prevent further Department of Armed Services authorities from sanctioning homosexuals never intended by Congress, and a failure to uphold American military traditions and the desires of the American people in this vital matter.

I hope in future issues Intermedia will pay attention to this attack on a solid military personnel policy and the benefits it is of us all. Both the Center for Military Readiness and the Family Research Council have traveled extensively to look to our military bases and battle damage inflicted by misguided administration policy and congressional action. They will be able to provide you with background information, I am sure.

Bill Miller
President, CA

Social Madness

In dealing with social pathology you people talk about crime, about affirmative action, about the causes in the ivory tower, about Louis Farrakhan and the fraud—Nazis. So far so good. But you ignore the most important thing of all: Drugs.

Amnesty takes better care of their children than do prisons. Once a month or so the newsies carry some pontic account of sixty, eighty children discovered disfigured by the cuttings of a crack pipe. That's drug talk, for the mentally defecated, from Judge Packer to Bill Buckley want to legislate. There was a celebrated case in southwest Chicago last autumn, little half-dead little kid who without a parent in sight. It turns out they belonged to three ‘mamas’ by seven different ‘taters,’ and the three crack mamas were receiving over $20000/nmonth in APDC welfare. Where domestic assistance checks and SSI payments (two of the women were ‘disabled’ and the other had low by a ‘visible 127a ance-disability’. 3 At the same time the welfare rates were expanding the (1900) drug culture hit America. So what’s the answer? It’s a liberal program, which people that said war was fun, sex was recreation, to be not sexually active was to be a prude, a snob. So it was with drugs. Anyone who did not take drugs during 1967-74, I’ve heard it said, was not worth of any sort of love or love at all. Drugs were cool. Terrorism is cool. Do your own thing. It feels good, do it. All fees are off. Anything goes. Make love, not war. Burn, baby, burn.

In 1983 an earthquake hit Mexico City and San Diego. 780 people died in Mexico City, two in San Diego. Why? Because the infrastructure was meant to be in San Diego, weak in Mexico City. When the cult of anti-Americanism is so widespread that people who have fought, after the standard of our people in the United States, it is not uncommon that the cultist will. This ugly phenomenon is simply the tail end of our being cognitively non-judgmental term “the breakdown.” Any social worker will tell you that the horrifying things people can do. The perfect example I have had four things (a) drug use, and (b) illegitimacy (to put it thus, these children are being beaten by their dope-addicted mothers and rapist current boyfriends). Creation and nurturing of the young-the “maternal instinct” is amazingly powerful in woman. Only something as powerful as drugs can overcome it.

Women will trade their own children for drugs, once the need starts to come.

The chrysalid, the biological dictum tells us children will genetically inherit the dispositions of their parents. We know more than that, the memory of a criminal is known to more discussion. I think of female friends showing me the photographs of their nephews and nephews being born, the boys, and being born often times with a bit of disjoint as they smoke and filter over such ad every athlete, though, and just a modest, dough-like infant. I am not amused, or not more, nor charmed by its purging and disfashion (AI those interested should read Roger Wright, The Mind’s Ownreffing). Against this obvious discrepancy, I see no reason why this is Wright calls this theory “environmental psychology” to escape the tight of Social Darwinism sociobiology under收官ed during the dark days of the 1970s, when many authors such as Arthur Jensen were misused on college campuses. This book is worth reading solely to watch Wright’s liberal New Republic editor go through tortured arguments explaining why the proves differences between men and women [or whites and blacks] are absolutely meaningless and furthermore require more affirmative action programs to overcome these intellectual differences—although they are real.

The modern urban underclass is a Frankenstein’s monster of liberalism, pure and simple. We created it. Centuries of experience teach us that women are made, not born, and that they have foster a reliable, trustworthy, incorruptible, young man who will father their children and provide for them forever afterwards (it used to be until age 18, but now it seems to be until they are 25). This has always been the case in America. Men must work for their reliability and future earning potential (e.g., “Chris is a good provider”). In the modern urban underclass, the provider role has been taken over by the federal government. Until now, you give a government a job over your head, food on the table, and plenty of pocket money—you all need to do in order to support the people in the welfare system. This, then, is the American underclass.

Social Madness

In dealing with social pathology you people talk about crime, about affirmative action, about the causes in the ivory tower, about Louis Farrakhan and the fraud—Nazis. So far so good. But you ignore the most important thing of all: Drugs.

Amnesty takes better care of their children than do prisons. Once a month or so the newsies carry some pontic account of sixty, eighty children discovered disfigured by the cuttings of a crack pipe. That's drug talk, for the mentally defecated, from Judge Packer to Bill Buckley want to legislate. There was a celebrated case in southwest Chicago last autumn, little half-dead little kid who without a parent in sight. It turns out they belonged to three ‘mamas’ by seven different ‘taters,’ and the three crack mamas were receiving over $20000/nmonth in APDC welfare. Where domestic assistance checks and SSI payments (two of the women were ‘disabled’ and the other had low by a ‘visible 127a ance-disability’. 3 At the same time the welfare rates were expanding the (1900) drug culture hit America. So what’s the answer? It’s a liberal program, which people that said war was fun, sex was recreation, to be not sexually active was to be a prude, a snob. So it was with drugs. Anyone who did not take drugs during 1967-74, I’ve heard it said, was not worth of any sort of love or love at all. Drugs were cool. Terrorism is cool. Do your own thing. It feels good, do it. All fees are off. Anything goes. Make love, not war. Burn, baby, burn.

In 1983 an earthquake hit Mexico City and San Diego. 780 people died in Mexico City, two in San Diego. Why? Because the infrastructure was meant to be in San Diego, weak in Mexico City. When the cult of anti-Americanism is so widespread that people who have fought, after the standard of our people in the United States, it is not uncommon that the cultist will. This ugly phenomenon is simply the tail end of our being cognitively non-judgmental term “the breakdown.” Any social worker will tell you that the horrifying things people can do. The perfect example I have had four things (a) drug use, and (b) illegitimacy (to put it thus, these children are being beaten by their dope-addicted mothers and rapist current boyfriends). Creation and nurturing of the young-the “maternal instinct” is amazingly powerful in woman. Only something as powerful as drugs can overcome it.

Women will trade their own children for drugs, once the need starts to come.

The chrysalid, the biological dictum tells us children will genetically inherit the dispositions of their parents. We know more than that, the memory of a criminal is known to more discussion. I think of female friends showing me the photographs of their nephews and nephews being born, the boys, and being born often times with a bit of disjoint as they smoke and filter over such ad every athlete, though, and just a modest, dough-like infant. I am not amused, or not more, nor charmed by its purging and disfashion (AI those interested should read Roger Wright, The Mind’s Ownreffing). Against this obvious discrepancy, I see no reason why this is Wright calls this theory “environmental psychology” to escape the tight of Social Darwinism sociobiology under收官ed during the dark days of the 1970s, when many authors such as Arthur Jensen were misused on college campuses. This book is worth reading solely to watch Wright’s liberal New Republic editor go through tortured arguments explaining why the proves differences between men and women [or whites and blacks] are absolutely meaningless and furthermore require more affirmative action programs to overcome these intellectual differences—although they are real.

The modern urban underclass is a Frankenstein’s monster of liberalism, pure and simple. We created it. Centuries of experience teach us that women are made, not born, and that they have foster a reliable, trustworthy, incorruptible, young man who will father their children and provide for them forever afterwards (it used to be until age 18, but now it seems to be until they are 25). This has always been the case in America. Men must work for their reliability and future earning potential (e.g., “Chris is a good provider”). In the modern urban underclass, the provider role has been taken over by the federal government. Until now, you give a government a job over your head, food on the table, and plenty of pocket money—you all need to do in order to support the people in the welfare system. This, then, is the American underclass.
REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM

APPLE PIE: The former H. Rap Brown, one of those momentary icons of the Sixties who was a leader of the Student Non Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) during the phase when it became ambivalent about non violence, is in trouble in Atlanta. Brown, now known as Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin, famous for his faux profound political sayings such as “As American as apple pie,” served five years in a New York prison during the 1970s for attempted robbery. During this time he was converted to Muslimsim and is now known as Al-Amin, and is back in Atlanta upon his release. He style himself as a “healer” in the black community, but nearly a year ago two members of Al-Amin’s mosque were convicted of fedERAL gun running charges in connection with a ring that was helping arm New York City Muslim groups. Early in August Brown/Al-Amin was arrested by Atlanta police for shooting a man named William Miles in a city park. After the shooting, Brown/Al-Amin went to the victim to rob him, did not do it and that if he had done it Miles would have been dead instead of merely wounded. When arrested Al-Amin was carrying a .45 caliber automatic, for which he had no license. Naturally his attorney said that Brown/Al-Amin’s symptoms had been “brought up” by the police.

THE DIVERSITY CONSPIRACY: Cornell student Kenneth Lee, a frequent contributor to Heterodoxy, got tired of the self-congratulatory talk on his campus, so he put it among the faculty elites about the need for diversity. Smelling a rat in all this talk, he decided to find out how diverse the various departments were— not in the surface categories of gender and pigment, but in the deeper categories of intellectual commitment. He went to public voter rolls and discovered that Cornell’s History department had registered Democrats and no Republicans, and that the Women’s Studies and African Studies departments had 38 Democrats and no Republicans. In sum, of the nine social science departments Lee studied, there were 171 Democrats and 7 Republicans. To make sure it was not something in the water at Ithaca, he traced the Religion Project to help him cope with the personnel of comparable departments at Stanford, 3000 miles away. The tally was similar: 163 Democrats and 17 Republicans. Diversity, as we have all suspected, has a clear meaning for the advocates. It does not mean a fair and honest attempt to represent the broad spectrum of ideas. (There are as many Republicans as Democrats in the American electorate, after all.) People who are diversity’s intellectual equivalent of ethnic cleansing would have you believe that the sad think only of people in skirts or with black or brown skin who think exactly as they do, and that’s that. Kenneth Lee’s findings appear in the current issue of The American Enterprise.

HIV NEGATIVE AND ASHAMED OF IT: You would think that gay men who have escaped the AIDS epidemic would feel lucky. But No-o-o-o. In San Francisco, a group of HIV negative gay men also feel “guilty and ambivalent” about their own good fortune have formed a support group called the Inversion Project to help them cope with the social and psychological issues. There is also a feeling of being left out. “We are expected to be

us less than most. Kunstler made a reputation for doing his Borscht Belt imitation of Clarence Darrow. But he was an attorney for only a certain spectrum of the damned. Shortly before his death, when Kunstler was asked if he might consider defending Timothy McVeigh, he snapped: “I don’t defend right wing fanatics.” No, but he defended left wing fanatics with gusto. And he actually seemed to believe in the leftist ideology on which he based his legal strategy. For instance, representing New York drug kingpin Larry Davis (a suspect in several drug killings), Kunstler said that the case showed “how the police treat young Third World people in the depressed communities of the cities.” Ugh!

HANOI JANE/BEIJING JANE: Last month, the Wall Street Journal published excerpts from an interview by Minneapolis attorney Stephen Young with Bui Tin, a former colonel who served on the general staff of the North Vietnamese Army and later edited the People’s Daily. In the interview, Bui cast new light on old questions. He admitted that the U.S. could have won the war by cutting the Ho Chi Minh Trail as early as 1965 rather than being an indigenous force, the NLF was a wholly owned subsidiary of Hanoi; and that General Giap regarded the Tet Offensive as “a staggering defeat.” Bui also makes it clear that Hanoi won the war on the streets of America rather than in the jungles of Vietnam: “Every day our leadership would listen to world news over the radio at 9 a.m. to follow the growth of the American antiwar movement. Visits to Hanoi by people like Jane Fonda and former Attorney General Ramsey Clark gave us confidence that we should hold on in the face of battlefield reverses. We were elated when Jane Fonda, wearing a red Vietnamese dress, said at a press conference that she was “生まれた時、アメリカが我々を攻めるために戦争を宣言した” to “When Is It OK To Throw A Man Out Of Bed?”

AVE ATQUE VALE: We note the passing of William Kunstler. Every man’s death diminishes us, and all that, but this death probably diminished us.

LUNA BEACH By Carl Moore

BETTY FRIEDEAN, BELLA ABZUG AND HILLARY...

THREE FEMINIST HEAVYWEIGHTS AT THE GREAT WALL—A SUPER PHOTO OP

TRAINED TO ABUSE WOMEN—A BABE

A COMPARED TO ABUBER, SHE’S A BONKER!

GOD, SHE’S NOT THE TURSKERS, I’M MILDUN MONROE!

NIGHT OUT

SADO-NYMPHOMANICAL ZOOPHILIES: The Great Rivers Girl Scout Council dismissed troop leader Pat Seabering earlier this summer without explanation, but she believes it was retribution for stirring up trouble over the council’s use of a local sex education curriculum called “Sexuality and You.” One program exercise given the Girl Scouts involved seventh and eighth grade girls writing plans for what they would do if they identified themselves as devotees of various sexual deviations, including sado-masochism, nymphomania, and zoophilia. “They got rid of me because I was asking questions and I was not doing what they wanted to do. One of their mottoes is ‘Creating Caring, Competent, and Confident Women.’ Yet when they meet someone like that, they don’t want her.” Seabering said that it is “a little bad” that students are not told to tell other parents what their daughters were being exposed to. “I was trying to tell them, ‘This is what your cookie money is paying for.’” Twenty-six fellow volunteers, who still get August in solidarity with Seabering, Great Rivers Girl Scout Council Executive Director Barbara Bonifas says the “Sexuality and You” program, started in 1982, and was reappeared in 1985. The program was cancelled last March after the national leaders of Girl Scouts USA, stepped in to quell the uproar. But that may not be the end of the story. Bonifas says that eventually the Great Rivers Girls Council will replace the sex ed program: “That’s just part of what we do for the kids.”

MUM’S THE WORD: Students at Indiana’s Wabash College are buoyed this week by, as one local resident Andrew Ford’s demand that they avoid publicly discussing the content of classroom lectures. Ford is a former military analyst who has characterized his country’s current situation as a “culture of insiders,” Ford said in a statement, “Each and every one of us must choose to maintain this culture, or else this is not the place for us.” Conservative students felt particularly ticked off by Ford’s remarks. In recent months, they have been emboldened with administrators over events such as a screening of “The Godfather” and the reading of one chapter of Salo: 120 Days of Sodom, an x-rated sadomasochistic video, and the rise of radical left ideas deeply off-putting to them. Hour after Hour after Ford’s speech, one psychology professor informed his students ominously that he expected what would eventually happen was on the issue of sexuality to be kept strictly confidential.
Great Books Triumph in Beer City

by David Mulroy

A highlight of my career occurred this spring, when a colleague, the chairman of the Department of Africology, in a letter to the editor of an alternative newspaper linked my advocacy of a Great Books Program to the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City. "In the guise of a return to the sources ... of Western civilization, some colleagues have proposed great books..." These academics have given cover to hate groups. They may want to reassess their position view of the Oklahoma bombing, but it is already too late. Other angry white males have gone too far, who found ammunition in the academic work of angry white males. "The chickens have come home to roost."

I quoted the interrogation now: "Which great book pushed you over the edge, Mr. McVeigh? The Republic? Aristotle's Letter From the Prince?

What was my offense, that I should elicit such an outburst? As vice president of the Wisconsin chapter of the National Association of Scholars, I had taken it upon myself to propose an optional program on my campus, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM), that would encourage students to take courses amounting to the nucleus of a traditional liberal arts education: advanced mathematics and foreign language, the history of Western Civilization, and 15 credits in Great Books. Actually, I knew that my PC colleagues would sense implicit criticism of their excesses in such an initiative, but nonetheless I was surprised by the virulence of their attack. I guess I bit a nerve.

As with other schools, the curriculum of the College of Letters and Science at UWM was ripe for reform. Meaningful degree requirements were not, in the 1970s. For a time, our students were not even required to have a major. The current direction is now towards required courses, but they are heavily fla-
xed with "standards," for example, there is now a cultural diversity requirement: three credits in the life experiences of the racial and ethnic groups protected by affirmative action. Recent legislation has required students to demonstrate proficiency in English composition and the course in which most of us do, one of the largest on campus, is controlled by ideologues. Students предмет the course by reading such masterpieces as David and Myra Sadker, Falling at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat our Girls and Joseph Steffens, 's Honor Board: A Gay High School Mutiny. To fight for Our Country.

Our students also face "distribution credits." They are required to take four courses each in the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. It is quite possible, however, from the same department, they could fulfill both humanities and social science requirements with courses taught exclusively from a feminist perspective or those focusing on African-American experiences.

Two programmatic innovations preceded my Great Books initiative. In both cases, I was rash enough to criticize the changes, thus precluding some colleagues to oppose my program when the opportunity arose.

First, the Department of Afro-American Studies changed its name to the Department of Africology. "Africology" is the brainchild of UWM Professor Winton Van Horn. In an essay that accompanied the formal request for the departmental name change, he explained that Africology studies "the life histories and life prospects of peoples of primary African origin and their descent transgenerationally, universally and transnationally. To the question of whether other racial and ethnic groups do not deserve their own disciplines, Van Horn answers No: "Africology represents the recognition of Africa historically as the wellspring of human life and human civilization...In a very real sense, then, by subject matter Africology predicates philosophy as it is constructed by the Greeks and becomes the foundation discipline from which all other disciplines have emerged in the West. And so...there is no one-to-one correspondence between the subject matter of Africology and the subjects of comparative Axiology or Eurology in relation to the foundation of life and civilization."

What actually goes on in Africology classes? A Classics major fulfilled his natural diversity requirement with a course in Africology showed me copies of the tests from the course. He received an "A," he says, without studying. Most of the questions were true or false. They included, the following (let me give you a tip: in each case, the "correct" answer is true): "Black women literally nurse babies at their breast who they knew would grow up to rape their daughters and kill their sons." "America has throughout its history been a country living in permanent contradiction between its ideals and its practices." "In slavery and freedom, white men regarded black women as sexual objects and treated black men as unwanted competitors for the sexual favors of white women."

"Without Africa and slavery, American culture, language, speech, music, literate, artistic, cooking, and religion would be unimpressive, in the case of European ones, barren and somewhat sterile."

The other programmatic innovation that preceded my Great Books initiative was the establishment of a Certificate Program in Gay and Lesbian Studies by a group of faculty members centered in the English Department. UWM has a dozen or so of these certificate programs. In choosing majors in a subject, students may earn certificates in various subjects by selecting designated elective courses. The original certificate programs were in Women's Studies and Ethnic Studies. Over the years, there have been joined by certificate programs in Peace Studies and Aging, as well as various area studies such as Scandinavian Studies.

The Gay and Lesbian Studies Certificate Program has been referred to as "an educational and scholarly program" for students whose "interest lies in the theorization of sexuality." A more specific space of its character was provided by a flyer for a new course that advertised widely around campus while the certificate program was being way its way towards faculty approval. "English 330: Media and Society: Seeing Queer. Exciting New Course: Innovative, Informative...even sexy. You don't have to look queer to study queer...look...How have gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and/or transgendered people --- and straight white men --- been portrayed in film history and how might these same audiences...create new imagery with which to reframe our culture's constructions of subjectivity and sexuality?"

Transgendered people? In an article about the Gay and Lesbian
Liberating Accreditation

In the world of higher education, the power to accredit is the power to shape the personality of a university or college. For several years, some regional accrediting organizations have used the power of the purse (accreditors act as "gatekeepers" to federal programs and funds, including Stafford Student Loans) to force multiculturalism and race-based admissions and hiring practices upon "traditional" schools. But now, critics of the continuance of accreditations are calling for the end of a new organization, the American Academy for Liberal Education (AALE), which has been recognized as a national accrediting agency for liberal arts colleges and for outstanding liberal arts programs with in universities by Education Secretary Richard Riley.

One of AALE's students states that "They are not a religious or political organization, but do encourage diversity and freedom of thought." The organization is also known for its support of "liberal" teachers and professors. The AALE Board Chairman, Herman S. Adler, is a constitutional scholar of the University of Minnesota. The group's aim is to "promote educational freedom and diversity in higher education." The AALE was formed in part out of concerns that accreditation had become "highly technical and very politically correct." The AALE is the first organization to meet this need.

In 1990, when one of the regional accrediting agencies, Middle States, denied accreditation for Barnard College in New York because it had a history of minority student enrollment, the Barnard students formed a "bypass" committee to challenge the accrediting decision. The Barnard students argued that the accreditation decision was based on "political correctness." The Barnard students were successful in overturning the accreditation decision. The AALE continues to challenge the "political correctness" of the Middle States decision.

In 1992, the AALE sponsored a conference in New York City to discuss the "role of race" in education. The conference was attended by scholars and educators from around the country. The conference was funded by the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation.

In 1993, the AALE published a report entitled "The Future of Higher Education: A Liberal Perspective." The report was widely cited and used as a basis for discussions in universities across the country.

The AALE has been criticized by some as being too "liberal" and too "political." However, the AALE has also been praised for its role in promoting diversity and freedom of thought. The AALE continues to be a controversial organization, but its influence on higher education is growing.

Wendy L. Lebow

Studies program in the local press, I was quoted as being skeptical of its value. I was careful to say that as a Classical students, the Classical program was not viewed as a psychological abnormality by the ancient Greeks and Romans and that many of the most revered personalities of antiquity were gay or bisexual. Still, I did not think it was a good idea to desegregate curricular programs around the experiences of groups defined by innate characteristics such as sexual orientation. I also made the point that the Lewes Study program was a political objective and would work to enlarge its scope. After a certificate was issued, a major, and then a department. On the analogy with the sexual orientation of the student, the question of the "other" came up. The gay lobby on campus seems to have found this last remark especially odious.

In the Fall of 1994, my program was ready to run the gauntlet of faculty approvals. The thought behind it was simple. Despite all the overcrowding, madness, it seemed to me, students could still find an "escape route" through the classes of professors who don't elect the right courses. My object was to embody sound advice in course selection in a convenient fashion. Accordingly, I contacted a mathematics professor, suggested calling the program "Certificate In What Dave Would Tell His Kids To Take." This captured the program's spirit, but we needed a name for a title. Hence the "Certificate Program in the Study of the Liberal Arts through Great Books" was born.

The program needed to be approved by a college curriculum committee, the faculty of the college, and by a university-wide curriculum committee. I knew that I had not ingratiated myself with some "Highlights." On the other hand, the program that I was preparing had gathered widespread support from a diverse group of faculty members, some prominent feminists, and the director of the Peace Studies program. I had frequently consulted with these individuals and with their help each new course was added to the program.

Then, too, the history of Gay Studies and Africanaology demonstrated the laissez-faire philosophy that governed our faculty deliberations. How else to explain the combination of political correctness and Gay Studies and then shut down Great Books.

Nobody in his right mind, I thought, would seriously try to prevent the approval of my program. I forget about Greg Jay, a professor of English at UWM and one of the founders of the Gay Studies Program. As a former student, he tells me that the program at UWM was "unacceptable" to the university's administration.

Most of the debate centered on the Great Books because the great of the program. To fulfill this requirement, students were required to take 15 credits in courses in which their primary responsibility was to master texts commonly acknowledged to be of the most significant and enduring, in a sense of the epoch. These would be mostly pre-existing courses that were volunteered by their instructors as fulfilling the requirements of a Great Books course.

Rather as an afterthought—just to make sure—enough of this description were still being read—I sent a memo to department chairmen asking them for the names of regularly offered Great Books courses. On the basis of this list, I was able to assemble a list of 20 regularly offered courses "voluntarily" by their instructors as fulfilling the requirements of a Great Books course.

This was the point at which Jay and his allies attacked, pointing out that all 20 of the courses listed dealt with works by "western" authors. It was the evident intent of the program's sponsors to encourage the study of women...
How the West Was Lost at Stanford
By David Sacks and Peter Thiel

Less than a decade ago, Stanford University prided itself, at least in the company of alumni and other financial backers, on its commitment to Western Culture—not just its commitment to Western values and civilization, but to a freshman requirement that was, at the time, perhaps the nation's flagship course in the study of Great Books.

Restored to the university in 1980, the class was a prime point of pride among graduates who had been appalled to witness a coed faculty eliminate the original course in response to student protests in the 1960s.

As it had been celebrated for Western Culture at the beginning of the decade, so would Stanford, by the end of the eighties, be doing away with the commitment and the freshman course in a decision that would change the character of the institution. What appeared instead of Western Culture was Multicultural—a euphemism for speech censorship, witch hunts against normposters, devoted curricula, and anti-Western zealotry. Looking back, one can see what happened in Palo Alto as a standing story of the subversion of an institution which touched off a freedom of intellectual minority that eventually swept the nation.

A large part of the problem was (and is) generational.

Many of those student radicals who had turned their backs on Western values in the 1960s became tenured radicals in the 1980s and 1990s. Their preferred mode of dialogue—screaming from the rooftops—had become an irreverent form of speech within the groves of academe.

The most notorious of these episodes took place on January 13, 1987, when a group of 500 indigent students and faculty gathered near Stanford's centrally located White Plaza to hear the Rev. Jesse Jackson. The purpose of the rally was to show support for the "rainbow agenda," a program of minority-set-asides in admissions and teaching, and for other causes including the rejection of the nuclear freeze. But what began as the sort of protest commonplace on today's college campuses set in motion events that would push the university toward becoming the nation's first anti-Western academy.

At the crowd stepped across the manicured lawns to present a list of demands to a meeting of the Faculty Senate. It translated its grievances into a chant that it had soon become infamous: "Hey hey, ho ho, Western culture's got to go! Hey hey, ho, Western culture's got to go!" Even at the time, campus observers were aware that much of the anger was a result of some of America's elite students and faculty engaged in an unqualified denunciation of the very civilization, after all, that had established universities like Stanford and Stanford University.

The chant could not be stopped—and would go on to become the unofficial motto of a revolution with implications for the very soul of Stanford—because it succinctly articulated exactly what important people in higher education had been thinking for some time.

Similar demonstrations followed in the tempestuous months ahead, and the slogan became synonymous with the university's growing identity crisis, as many of Stanford's leaders came to insist that the academy's mission needed a thorough overhaul.

The nominal target of these demonstrations and protests was Stanford's core curriculum, a required course called Western Culture in which freshmen surveyed the history and classics of the West. This course gave many students—especially in engineering and science majors—their primary exposure to the humanities. But the real target was much broader. The "Hey hey, ho ho" chant resonated powerfully because the Western Culture that had to go was not just a single class at Stanford, but the foundation of the West itself—its open inquiry, free-market capitalism, and constitutional democracy; to Christianity and Judaism; to the complex of values and judgments that help shape who we are.

The complaints about the West—present and past—that became a topic the following year had originated in 1987 when the faculty adopted an expanded definition of multiculturalism. The faculty believed that by accommodating the needs of different groups, the university would be able to attract and retain the best students. This change was opposed by some faculty members, who argued that it would undermine the university's traditional standards of excellence.

The debate raged for several years, with faculty members on both sides voicing their concerns. In the end, the faculty approved the revised definition, which led to a number of changes in the curriculum. Some courses were revised to incorporate new perspectives, while others were eliminated or modified. The result was a curriculum that was more diverse and inclusive, but also more controversial.

The issue of multiculturalism continues to be a source of debate on college campuses across the country. Stanford is no exception, and the university's leadership has faced criticism for its handling of the issue. Some critics argue that the university has caved in to pressure from student activists, while others contend that it has stood firm in its commitment to academic freedom.

Despite the challenges it faces, Stanford remains a unique institution, committed to the pursuit of knowledge and the advancement of human understanding. As it continues to evolve, it will no doubt face new challenges and opportunities. It is a place where ideas are tested and where the boundaries of knowledge are pushed ever outward. And in the end, that is what makes it special.
Vice Provost William Chace was one of the few to express alarm at the politicization of the university, and the growing popularity of political correctness. This phenomenon, he believed, was undermining the very principles of academic freedom and excellence. Chace was particularly concerned about the growing influence of political correctness on the campus.

The CIV movement, he argued, was not just about political correctness, but about the need to consider the perspectives and experiences of marginalized groups. However, Chace believed that the CIV movement was often used as a tool to marginalize and silence voices that disagreed with the dominant political narratives.

Chace also highlighted the need for a more inclusive and diverse curriculum. He argued that the curriculum should reflect the diversity of the student body and the broader society. He believed that this would help to create a more inclusive and equitable campus community.

Chace also emphasized the importance of academic freedom. He believed that academic freedom was essential for the pursuit of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills.

In conclusion, Chace believed that the university had a responsibility to uphold the principles of academic freedom and excellence. He called for a more inclusive and diverse curriculum that reflected the diversity of the student body and the broader society. He also emphasized the importance of academic freedom for the pursuit of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills.
Egypt Über Alles in the Classroom

Afro-centric Curriculum
by K.L. Billingsley

Rah-neeze positioned himself in the cockpit as a dozen of his brown-skinned workers lined up behind the seat. They released the lever and the wood and papyrus glider was flung forward into the sky. The sleek, curvilinear design of the craft, with its reverse dihedral wing configuration, quickly took the hot air up from the Egyptian desert and lifted the sharp nose of the boat, warning high tides and strong winds. The glider soared high over the pyramids, creating a sensation among the people of Nubia when a contingent of Greeks was due to arrive from Syria for their regular lessons in philosophy, literature, and mathematics. The Greeks were a proud race and spoke for the first time in history, their knowledge renowned in the intellectual circles of Alexandria. But they came in peace, and Rah-neeze saw in them a desire to learn and expand their wisdom. Today, he would personally teach them how much they had created. He would lead them into the mysteries of science, philosophy, and human nature, showing them the wisdom found in the pages of ancient Nubian texts. He would guide them through the corridors of knowledge, leading them to the secrets of life and the cosmos. Beneath him, the signal for the landing strip, and Rah-neeze began a slow descent down to the landing strip.

Although the sound was of an eager and creative student, this scenario could easily be extracted from any page of educational curricula, the African-American Baseline Essays, and be integrated into almost any classroom in America. Produced by the Portland Public Schools, the science section of these essays says that from 250 BC to 1500 BC the Egyptians used their advanced theories of travelers, expeditions, and inventions and included them in the religious and cultural life of African people as being "the wellspring of creativity and knowledge on which the foundation of all science, technology, and engineering rests."

The Portland Baseline Essays are the most widely used of all Afrocentric teacher resources. Craig Kershner, a Portland School District writer who says that the essays cost $10 to produce and carry a price of $25 have been "very hot" and that thousands of the copies have been sold to districts and individual educators in Denver, Chicago, Kansas City, Atlanta, Denver, Cleveland, Seattle, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, and other cities. Craig notes that the coordinator of multi-cultural education, reporting that there has been no interest in the essays at teacher conferences. There are hundreds of back issues, and some bookstores carry the essays, which have also been sold to Australia, Japan, and Eritrea. Karlah reports that a dozen districts in the Virgin Islands receive the essays each year.

The Portland Baseline Essays have been in circulation since 1977, but although they have grown scarcely more influential within the educational community, they are widely used in schools with African American students. It is easy to see why many have been the word, the development and dissemination of these essays is an important study in minority power politics, intellectual quickness, bureaucratic acquiescence, and journalistic deference to political correctness.

Far from the Jim Crow South in both distance and customs, the Portland School District, the largest in the Pacific Northwest, for more than 100 years has been the recipient of a court-ordered desegregation plan. One of the key pressure groups facing the schools was the Black United Front. "When they decide they want change, they get it," said its multifaceted educational director Carolyn Lenard of the group. "They don't negotiate." The Baseline Essays confirm that the Front would bring Afrocentrism to the schools and put it. (These essays, it is stated in the Preface, are a direct result of the interaction of the Black United Front and the Delegation Monitoring Advisory Committee with the Portland School District.)

The Delegation Monitoring Advisory Committee carefully reviewed the materials, along with the Cultural and Multicultural/Monarchical Education Forum, and the African-American Curriculum Consultants.

But even though they emerged from Portland's tightly sensitized racial politics, the essays were not a local project. The concept was first tested in Portland Public Schools in 1978 by Dr. Asa A. Hilliard, a member of the Association of Black Psychologists and the "primary consultant" to the project. The choice of Hilliard for this role was a significant one.

In a recent essay on Afrocentric writers for the Smithsonian magazine Civilization, Gerald Early, an African-American who teaches at Washington University in St. Louis, notes that "Afrocentrism is related to the rise of the 'black psychology' as a discipline." The Association of Black Psychologists, which was founded during the radical heyday of 1968, argued that to "repair a collectively neglected black psyche..." would be necessary to destroy "Eurocentrism" and its "white values" of "rationality and individualism." The ABE says that "the values" were "totally inimical to the political and psychological interests of black people." W. B. Tatum, an education writer who has attended conferences on Afrocentric education, reports that Professor Hilliard (who teaches at Georgia State University) is not exactly affable to those texts with their epistemological biases. He notes that the major movement of Afrocentric was the National Black United Front, the National Urban Coalition, the National Alliance of Black Educators, and the Association for the Study of Classical African Civilization. Key figures, besides Hilliard, include such notable Afrocentrists as the noted Leonidas Jeffries of the City College of New York and Conrad Worth of Northeastern Illinois University in Chicago. The "target cities" for the dissemination of their materials are St. Louis, Kansas City, New York, Chicago, Seattle, Atlanta, and Washington, D.C. The Portland Baseline Essays were a gateway to this group.

The African American Baseline Essays comprised of five sections (art, science and technology, language arts, social studies, and history) each of which, says the preface, was "the product of an individual who is both knowledgeable about the specific discipline and recognized by the profession in the field of African-American History." Dr. John Seavey, Portland's current Supervisor of Education, declines to say whether he believes the essays present students with the best information from the best available scholars. But Louis Friederich, an expert in information for the district, says that "four people selected for the essay through the essay to insure accuracy. Judging from what has been left off, the reader can only wonder what materials were considered questionable enough to be omitted." "Egypt was a Black African nation," says Michael Harris of Morehouse College in Atlanta, and "since the Black Africans were not responsible for Egypt's greatness, Black Africans were, since the two were one and the same during Egypt's most productive periods." Harris' list of African authors includes Phinikia, Xenophon Dams, and Asap, whom the writer, was derived from the Greek word Ethniki, which meant "about the face." In addition to subtracting these famous writers from the white world and adding them to the company of scoundrels such as tycoon blacks, Harris writes about the contemporary literary scene: "Black literature is manipulated and controlled by white editors and publishers..." Writers who are published give receive little or no promotion for their work. Harris also notes that when client agreements, the failure to accept manuscript from black authors and publishing the works are not published out of print. She does not indicate how this aligns with the celebrity above-talented white writers like Toni Morrison and marginal ones like Alice Walker. But she does recommend selections from the Diaspora, by Rae Karenso, which "can do a superb job of teaching Egyptian literacy into everyday language." During the 1500s, Karenso was part of U.S., "United States," a violent cultural battle ground, but whether in the Black Panther culminated in a shoot-out in the UCLA cafeteria.

In the mathematical essay, Beatrice Lempicki, an administrative assistant to the Mathematics Department at the University of Chicago, writes that "the heroines [could not] admit that black people have built this great country and that we have done as well as the rest. This country is for all people, and as long as Africa is considered to be the birthplace of the human race, it follows that Africa is the birthplace of mathematics and science." Thus does Lempicki reveal the non-segmental reasoning on which Afrocentricism is based.

John Henrik Clarke, Professor Emeritus of African World History at Hunter College and author of the social-studies essay, says that "The
Europeans not only colonized most of the world, but also shaped the modern world and its people. In order to do this, they had to forget, or pretend to forget, all they had previously known about the Africans. Professor Clinton's historical-religious observations include the following: "There are misconceptions about the role the Hebrews played in Africa... They came originally from Western Asia, seeking food and water during their wanderings, during this period they were treated much better in Africa than history tends to indicate. Non-biblical history of the period indicates the Hebrews were not slaves in Egypt. Some of the Hebrews mistakenly took sides with the enemies of Africa and were punished... The Hebrews, like the Greeks, Romans, and others, were alcoholics who were morally, religiously and intellectually from their sojourner in Africa. What they learned there would influence all of their future history."

"Professor Clinton also asserts that Chippewa was part Greek and part African, and that if she were alive today, "she would probably be living in one of the Black communities of the United States."

Cherrell Lawrence-McIntyre, of SUNY, Old Westbury, states that all of the authors listed as knowledgeable about African-American culture are "simply not essay on music, which reads like a combination of a high-school music text and rejected reviews from both Billie Holiday and Chet Baker, a well-known and respected jazz trumpeter, a ghastly, which is roughly equivalent to describing Jerry Garcia as a Likewise. And the author, also a close friend of the author, says she had serious doubts about some of the authors and their material, but no dissent was expressed when they were asked if you are challenging, she says, recalling one meeting where a single adverse comment made the meeting fail apart."

Although we are Afrocritics, Adams' lack of qualifications is actually an advantage. Gerald Early writes "Criticisms that Stolen Legacy and other key Afrocritics were not written by professional historians or by college professors. The fact that several classic Afrocentric texts have been written by amateurs, he says, gives Afrocritics its powerful populist appeal, its legitimacy as an expression of truth that white institutional forces hide or suppress. At the same time, this leaves it vulnerable to charges of being homogenous, unprofessional, superficial, and subjective.

The basic of music in the Western world both European and African-American can be traced to Africa (particularly Egypt), Lawrence-McIntyre writes. She goes on to give a new twist to the old racist notion that blacks "have rhythm" by saying that drumming in Africa was a symbol for the human spirit. By 1970, the author is saying that rhythm is becoming a factor in its own right. Something any African drummer does automatically, based on the phenomenon of the African sense of rhythm."

But at all the pieces in the Baseline Essays, by far the most interesting is the one on science and technology. In his essay, Hunter Haile Adams III, believes that "science is the search for truth and wholeness within the totality of the universe," according to Ruth Blitzer's Feminist Approach to Science. "The distributions of cultural experience, gender, religion and class will be reflected in the social sciences. We must develop theories, concepts, values, ideologies and practices." In this view, science becomes another tool for the maintenance of white males to keep whites and women down. Yet he also believes that many people, "not only are scientists, but, if a more fundamental level, science itself. But within this domain of talent, the Egyptians were more equal than others. Training to be a priestly class in Egypt was a long, arduous process," Adams writes. And: "The earth today and for hundreds of thousands of years has been a melting pot in which many cultures had micro-cultures, which not only were over the source of the earth's water, but of water's climate as well.

The ancient Egyptians, who of course were black Africans, were "masters of magic pre-conscious, pre-cognitive, remote viewing and other phenomena," Adams claims. Then, thousands of years before the Wright brothers, they were the gliders. By the time of the pyramids, "the Egyptians are contemporary and bear a strong resemblance to the American Heroes tour bus, which has a distinctive ethnic otter-shaped wing."

But this was centuries before the Egyptians used the port technology. The Egyptians used for "travel, expeditions, and recreation." Adams details the Baseline Essays identify Hunter Haile Adams III as a "Research Scientist, Historian and Consultant" at the Department of Energy's Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago. But the line-by-line fact checkers, who read the book with great care, were unable to verify this publication with a Life-Size Corset apparently failed to verify these qualifications. Adams' former boss at the Argonne Lab confirms that Adams was on the Argonne staff at least from 1970 to 1974, but not as a research scientist. He was an "industrial" and "industrial hygiene consultant," a position requiring no college degree. "So what is the point," asks the author. Stuffed in the Portland School District say they don't know where Adams is or what he is doing. Carl Spight, who reviewed the science essay in "Science," a magazine he edits, says Adams was one of his correspondents. Portland, Calif., says he has not received any replies. Both Spight and Adams are listed as founders of something called the Life-Ways Sciences Institute. Another founder, the author says, was K. Anderson, R.O. and A.K. Sanwee. Spight did not return calls either.

The book by so many legitimate African-American scholars to choose from one must wonder how Adams the hypochondriac was selected to author a science essay which is now used across the United States and abroad. The book, it seems, was not one of qualifications but politics. "As Hilliard recommended the people," says Portland's Carolyn Le Cornd, adding that the Black Scholar "is a book by and for black people." Le Cornd says she has serious doubts about some of the authors and their material, but no dissent was expressed when the author was challenged. "If you are asking whether I am challenging the book," she recalls, recalling one meeting where a single adverse comment made the meeting fail apart.

And for some Afrocritics, the real test of the material is what whites think of it. Carolyn Le Cornd says that the response of some black scholars in Portland was that "whether people like it or not, the book has been written by a number of scholars and intellectuals, black and white, and so a pretty weak argument is Afrocriticism is a tool that is independent and the Portland essays in particular. It's a book that is independent of the popular page science," author Sheela Stein, "a book that I am glad for the book on that level, but at Afrocriticism, but also as a book that scholars have to take on their own academically and not just in the academic journals and in their publications, but in the society itself, the level of concern at which Afrocritics have the strength and are necessary to look at. We need to recognize that the marketplace of ideas is not only debate, but debunking. We need to get busy."

But at this time it seems that the ones getting busy are the Afrocritics and their allies in education. Carolyn Le Cornd says that the multi-cultural officials in Portland are aware of the criticism of the Baseline Essays. They say the materials are being looked into. The Baseline Essays are currently on display at the Portland Public Library. The author says that "the book has been published by the Portland Public Library. The book includes a foreword by Dr. Science from the approved list. According to Leonard, the new, revised African-American Baseline Essay, due in September, still carries the material by Adams but excises his bogus credentials.

"Districts call and say they want the Essays distributed because of the curriculum and would package them as a book. We're not sure what the hell they're going to do," says Portland school administrator Craig Kurth. Meanwhile, the Hispanic Baseline Essays is in the process of being published by an independent publisher and will be available in September. Just what it will say about Indian civilization has not been revealed. One wonders if it will support that the Moguems were driving prototypes of the Model T through the Adirondacks before the arrival of the Puritans."

The Portland Essays, not only pushed a radically different view of Afrocentism but also take
Particularly embarrassing were the excuses. Race, they protested, was but a single criterion among many used—yet one had only to look at Berkeley's admissions to see that racial quotas. They insisted that if the university had been more tribally oriented, knowing very well that what was both untrue (they had increased the category of "special admits")—students lacking formal qualifications for admission—from 2% to 30%. The reason, they continued, was that the system and irrelevant to the explosive situation at Berkeley (particularly where students of one race with 500 SAT scores sat next to students of another race who needed 1,200 SAT scores). And they meant no diminution of quality when it was obvious from what was happening at this very meeting how badly the intellectual climate of the university had deteriorated. The student's unflattering selection of courses, the galling retention rates for affirmative action admissions were improving, shutting their eyes to the rampant grade inflation that had been caused in large part by embarrassing "dual enrollment." They indicated that the industrialization of affirmative action kept away from faculty hiring.

In my own statement I referred to some of these factors and curricula by the race gender class machine that now operates the campus. To press the point, I mentioned the appointment of Angela Davis to the faculty and the treatment of her. I pointed to the concentration because of the magnitude of the intellectual decline and on the clear link between affirmative action and that decline. The crowd boomed and hissed me, as I knew it would, and then waved the Regents and all but that in this display, was farther evidence of what I was talking about. (The boos were not the damage they had done to this institution and lapsed into a silence solid for the rest of my talk.)

Nobody in the administration dared to talk about the pros and cons of affirmative action in an open forum. The administration's political correctness is a problem on campuses, but the administration pretends not to. University policy is that they and the faculty leadership were all united on this question, but it would be more accurate to say that they were united in their paralyzing. Widespread ignorance can not find expression at campus housing. Having worked in the administration, I know that some very senior people had doubts but do not dare speak frankly. The subject is simply taboo.

I ran out of time. It was not obvious how the vote would be, but by the early evening a vote was taken on what seemed a minor procedural matter. The vote was 15-0, with the Governor among the 15. Shortly, another procedural vote was brought, a much more drastic result, with the same opposed bloc. Suddenly it became clear that affirmative action was going down. By now I was home, watching the meeting on Bay Area television. At about 9:30 p.m., the first of the two substantive votes came, with the same margin. For the first time, I knew on me that this had been a watershed event—the beginning of the end of a diabolical policy had to do with the racist American higher education inside out—and I felt lucky to have been there.

I wondered how those senior administrators were feeling. I wondered if they were in the defense of something they kept proclaiming their allegiance to, I suspected that they were secretly relieved that the public through its representatives, the state. To me, they seemed to be saying: "look yourselves into it. Now they could say, "we were the good guys—see how hard we tried for you" and still get out of the bubbling cauldron where they were living the nightmare. They seemed to me to have seen a confrontation between the unreal world that campuses have become and the real world outside them concerning the most important issues they now face. The outside world had saved the university from itself.

I later mock-grilled to my friend that everyone was supposed to have their 15 minutes, but I got a few sound bites. Your fifteen minutes was a five-second sound bite and 14 minutes 25 seconds of Jesse Jackson calling you a racist.
T
tough, I grew up here. I attended
the University of California in the 1960s, so I'm not
aware of the roots of this phenomenon.
It's what could be called the California's
First-Name Americana: the moral authority derived from living in a beautiful
place. When you're up in the
calamity groves above Berkeley, gazing at a
panorama of the San Francisco Bay and the
Pacific Ocean beyond, it's easy to believe
that your thoughts are as wonderful
as the view isn't true, but it
has one major advantage from
my point of view. Practically
of the California Malfeasance really
show up where I live, just out-
side Berkeley.

It was a bit of a shock when,
on emerging from the
'60s, grey Philadelphia
courtroom in which the case of
Martin Luther King was being
argued, I found myself sur-
rounded by a handful of U.C.
types who had convened east to
chart in behalf of their
favourite political prisoners.
It was only a little more shocking
when, 15 minutes later, I
was being assailed by two of
them on the street in broad
lightday.

But I'm getting ahead of
myself. I was at the hearing because I was trying to discover
just what it is about Jamal that
has made him into an interna-
tional celebrity. His fame is cer-
tainly a mystery to the working
journalists of Philadelphia who
have covered his case since the
beginning.

The picture of Jamal at his trial was so con-
clusive that no one, not even those who
are Philadelphia's politically
liberal equivalent of the Main
Line, doubts that Jamal shot
police officer Daniel Faulkner.

One of the journalists who
knows the case best is
David Hofbauer, who covered it
for the Philadelphia Daily
News. At the time of the trial
in 1982, he was a committed liberal
who was very skeptical of the
Philadelphia police. He was pre-
pared to give Jamal the benefit of the doubt. "It
was just one of those things where the whole tone
was, 'This is a black guy. This is the
Philadelphia police.'" he says. "But whatever the case, at
that time, your first inclination was to identify with Jamal,"
says Hofbauer. "But the evidence was just
overwhelming. It was just the most convincing thing that
happened in Philadelphia in a long time."
want to attract a crowd of them. They were the usual collection of clowns, Quakers, burnout 60s radical women, and rasta-dressed middle-class types. They were having their little party out there for days, and it was a pathetic sight. A woman who identified herself as the Socialist candidate for New York City Council said her group was "the only revolutionary free nation on the earth." At another point, a young black college student-type actually smashed a black-and-white TV with a crowbar in the center of the crowd. I hadn't the heart to tell him that that particular piece of guerrilla theater had become a cliché before he was born.

So I didn't want to get man-handled by that crew. So I tucked my notebook in my back pocket and got into the mid-day crowd. It was when I was a block away from City Hall that I happened to discover. I asked and saw Ms. Alvarado trying to escape with my notebook. I grabbed it back. Ms. Alvarado, to give credit where it's due, had a hell of a sense of humor. Before I could work my notebook free, I felt someone grabbing me behind. It was a tall Jamal supporter with whom I'd seen back at City Hall. "Call the police!" I began to yell at bystanders.

There followed an errant arrest by the Philadelphia police instantly inspired a burst of rationality in the mainstream. The tall guy left and Ms. Alvarado without my notebook. I stuck my finger in the tall guy's chest. "Listen, bozo, I could have you arrested for assault!"

"I am not a bozo!" he replied.

"Can't we compromise?" said Ms. Alvarado. "Those are my quotes. I don't want them used."

"Well, if you don't want your quotes used, don't talk to journalists." I told her. "This is the East. We play for keeps."

"Well, I was calling for a pay phone to call 911 and have you arrested. But by the time I found one, I began to feel the humor in the incident. "I am not a bozo" — they should print that up on the back of all those T-shirts that say "Free Mumia" in front.

The death of American Journalism

The next night I attended a panel discussion on the Jamal case. By coincidence, the annual convention of the National Association of Black Journalists was in town. Security was heavy. The Maimités were out in force, picketing at the entrance to the hotel where the convention was being held. The panel featured the three Dallas papers and the Dallas Times. For Jamal, there was Leonard Weinglass, the leftwing lawyer who has represented everyone from the Chicago Seven to the goal bomber who bombed the World Trade Center. The anti-Jamal side was represented by Joseph McGill, who had prosecuted Jamal in the original trial in 1982. McGill had since left the district attorney's office and gone into private practice. The panel discussion was promising:...
such a statement. At his trial, he divided his time between political trials and the MOVE organization and quotidien trials, and one of them was a legal skirmish in the middle of the minority community. This is when he decided to launch his political career.

In his own defense, Jamal challenged the testimony of a bacteriologist who claimed to have identified a bacterial strain which was present at the crime scene. The defense argued that it was impossible for the bacteria to be present at the scene for more than a few hours, and that the presence of the bacteria was simply a coincidence. The prosecution, on the other hand, argued that the bacteria were present for a much longer period of time, and that this was evidence of the defendant's guilt.

The trial lasted for several weeks, and the courtroom was packed with spectators. The defense team presented a number of expert witnesses who testified that the bacteria were not present at the scene for the length of time claimed by the prosecution. The prosecution team countered with their own experts, who argued that the bacteria were present for a much longer period of time.

In the end, the jury deliberated for several days before announcing their verdict. The jury found Jamal guilty of murder and sentenced him to life in prison without the possibility of parole. Jamal appealed the conviction, but his appeal was denied. He is currently serving his sentence in a maximum-security prison.

The case of Jamal Abou-Jamal has raised significant questions about the fairness of the judicial system, particularly in the context of capital punishment. Many people argued that the evidence against Jamal was not strong enough to warrant his conviction, and that the trial was marred by a number of procedural errors. However, the case remains a controversial topic, and it continues to generate much discussion and debate.
Scientists Discover The Real Cause of AIDS!
But the media and the government don't want you to know about it!

(Berkeley, CA) — At a shocking press conference recently, it was revealed that over 200,000 scientists and doctors have been studying AIDS for the past several years, yet the virus is still not understood. This group, known as the "AIDS Establishment," has been investigating the disease, yet the real cause of AIDS is still unknown. The AIDS Establishment includes Harvard researchers, Nobel prize winners, and top medical centers, yet they have failed to uncover the true cause of AIDS.

"Another deadly factor" is always present

According to Mr. James Telebly, a spokesperson for the 200 scientists involved in the study of AIDS, the media and government are intentionally covering up the true cause of AIDS.

"The AIDS Establishment has failed to disclose any information about what is really causing the disease," Telebly said. "The media and government are only interested in the financial benefits of the AIDS industry."

Some $6 billion at stake

Furthermore, the AIDS Establishment has been working to protect its financial interests. By controlling the media and government, they have been able to lobby for billions of dollars in research funds, much of which has been wasted on unproductive research.

Truth is not "politically correct"

All this would explain why the top scientists have come under increasing pressure from the AIDS Establishment, the media, and government officials. As they claim, they are being told to drop their findings that contradict the views of the "establishment." It is only when the scientific findings are not "politically correct" that they are forced to be published.

News media blackout by the Government

If you're wondering why you haven't heard this vital information before, it's because the Government is doing everything in its power to keep you from learning about AIDS.

Time after time, when Dr. Deuberg and Palenos are about to get their messages out through the press, the story gets mysteriously "killed." This has happened to Dr. Deuberg's research on the "AIDS Industry," as well as to the work of Dr. Palenos on the true cause of AIDS.

In every AIDS case, there is always another deadly factor present which has been deliberately covered up and ignored.

What's more, one of Dr. Deuberg's top researchers, Dr. Babayan, has published a book on this subject. The book, titled "AIDS: The Truth," has been banned by the government and is only available to those who are willing to pay the subscription fee.

Can't silence truth!

Silence and deception, however, are ineffective. After being ignored by the news media, Dr. Deuberg and Dr. Palenos have turned to the public and are now producing a book to reveal the truth about AIDS.

"We believe it is our duty to inform the public about the true cause of AIDS," said Dr. Deuberg. "We will not be silenced."

Order now!

Order your copy today. After a recent court decision, we are only able to print a limited number of copies. Order now and get a signed copy of Dr. Deuberg's and Dr. Palenos' book. The book is now available for $19.95 plus $3.00 shipping and handling. Order now before supplies last.

Theodore W. Deuberg, M.D., Ph.D.

200 West Fifth Street

Los Angeles, CA 90015

(213) 555-1234

Internet: theodoredeuberg.com

---

These Christian pro-life leaders urge you to read this book...

George Grant says:

"I have long been an advocate of Dr. Peter Deuberg's work. This book may be the most important issue on the public-health scene in this decade."

Congressman Bill Dannenberg says:

"The information in this book should be read by anyone interested in AIDS. The government has pursued an unscientific quackery which may be harmful to the people of the U.S."

J.T. Binn (Director, Pro-Life America) says:

"This book may be the most important issue on the public-health scene in this decade."

---

The United States Government hopes you won't!

The following is a direct quote from a "medical" publication:"AIDS is a major health concern, and more funding is needed. The government has not only failed to properly fund AIDS research, but it has also tried to cover up the truth."

---

Read the facts and decide for yourself!

Your money back if not convinced. Clip and mail this form today.

---

Clip and mail this form today to:

YES! I want to learn the truth about the cause of AIDS. Please rush me your shocking new book, Why We Will Never Win The War On AIDS. I understand that it comes with no risks, 100% money-back guarantee. If I'm not completely convinced by Dr. Deuberg and Dr. Palenos' evidence against AIDS, I will return the book for a full refund of every penny paid. I remit, in order, my:

[ ] One copy: $15.95 plus $3.00 shipping and handling (total $18.95) [ ] Two or more copies: $14.95 plus $2.00 shipping and handling (total $16.95 per copy, ordered) [ ] Check enclosed in the amount of $________. Make your check payable to "Inside Story Communications"

Name:
Address:
City:
State:
ZIP:

Please return this form for your free book today.

---

Inside Story Communications
1325 E. Noble, #129
Vista, CA 92087

---

---

---

---
How the West Was Lost, cont. from page 7
that the reason for the philosophy of the discovery of trans-cultural truth, and that you face the doctrine is predicated on a Western pursuit. The anti-Western social science that is being written over and over again-emphasizing details The aboriginal readings were actually written by Western anthropologists because the term was written in the name of Western culture and language, not to reflect anthropological itself.

For instructors in other tracks, the CVF program provided the desired vehicle for a comprehensive curriculum, perhaps most extreme was "Europe and the America," a CVF track developed Anthropology Prof. Reman Rosado, one of the foremost advocates of curricular change. The course was to be a mix of race, class, and gender - to the exclusion of almost everything else. Marx's historical analysis of class warfare, The Communist Manifesto, is still read, however, due to old-fashioned educational experience determines rather rapidly. They study Guatemalan civil war, Venezuela's Ruperto Mencu, whose book, Revolution in the Revolution, explains the effects on the social fabric and social life. The story tracks a journey from poverty and despair to the center of the Central American revolutionary movement. Next, a black woman writer, Zora Neale Hurston's Their Eyes Were Watching God, which presents a semi-autobiographical critique of male domination in American society. The hero of Was Hussein in his How to Be an American is a Mexican who seeks a local sheriff in Texas and runs away from the law, as he realizes that there is one law for Anglo-Texans and another law for Texas-Mexicans. Juan Rulfo's The Burning Plain is dominated by "infanticide and despair," as Mexican Indians struggle to eke out a living in the parched desert. Sandra Cisneros' House on Mango Street emphasizes the days and days of the life of a little girl in a downtown town.

The last week of fall quarter lectures are devoted to the topic of "Forging Revolutionary Solidarity." In the Spring quarter, students are required to complete a project or lengthy paper as a significant portion of (one-third) of the final grade. The Spring 1991 course syllabus explained that projects in the past have included:
- a skit on the debates around culture center
- a photo essay on San Francisco, organized around a theme
- a report on a field work project on a migrant worker camp
- a day-long event to create an inter-cultural event
- an Aries newspaper for the year 1929, entitled "Fist Contact"
- an essay on women's athletics in the U.S.

According to one student in the class, that year's projects even included a documentary on a Guatemalan refugee. Of course, what migrant workers, ethnic performances, women's athletics, or Jerry Garcia have to do with great literature, Europe, the Americas, or any academic study of new-Western culture is acceptable mystery.

CVI's approach to organizing the "West" was to "promote" the experience of students. Should not, however, be confused with "anything goes." Rather, the new course is vague precisely so that teachers can complete their personal belief. Paul Rudolph with Lee Bokov's Cut Bank, Bill of Rights, the appearance of campus radicals by the Stanford administration, in substituting CVIF for Western Culture in 1988 threatened to create a new social relations crisis. As the host from the media spotlight grew more intense, the administration tried to cover its tracks. The administration was not eager for alumni and parents, whose obligations financed the university, and to identify the political motivations behind the change from Western Culture to CVIF. As the national media spotlighted the curricular battle, Official Stanford launched an explosive public relations campaign aimed at convincing parents and alumni that the changes were benign, modest, and academically legitimate. A pre-page letter to "Stanford Parents" in the Fall of 1988 from Dean Lankenau and Thomas Wason, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, explained this effort: "We hope that a certain balance of what happened will serve to allay any misgivings you may feel from accounts you may have read of what is, in fact, a fairly modest (although imaginative) curricular reform. The discussion was carried on at an impressively high intellectual level, clearly putting questions of pedagogical principle above any political considerations."

Meanwhile, activism on campus received precisely the opposite message. In a Symposium circulated only among coordinates, Radicals' parents, one, Wason wrote, "As late was widely reported in the press, Stanford's Faculty Senate voted on March 5, 1984, to make substantial changes in its Western Culture courses. The changes will take effect in the autumn of 1989.

Now, "modest" and "substantial" are relative terms, and it is certainly possible that the same curricular changes could have been "high" by one observer and "obscure" by another. But in this case, the same observer described the same change in dramatically opposed ways. Dean Wason could have been criticized for both the elements he wrote. The statement circulated on campus was more likely to be accurate one, because campus activists (like parents suggested across the country) were in a better position to monitor its veracity.

Dean Wason's double talk echoed the equivocation of Stanford's President Donald Kennedy. Throughout the year of protest and intensification, Kennedy maintained a strong silence. He did not distinguish between a political and an institutional critique, for him, as for many others, that difference seemed to have collapsed. But by early 1988, he declared that it was not his place to dictate the content of the curriculum, and that such decisions should be left to the faculty. He had "deferred to a priori conclusions that the outcome should be" and would await the voices of others. While washing his hands of the immediate decision, President Kennedy said little about the misuse of political form at these academic discussions. Having failed to make the distinction between public and academic critiques, he failed to do so then. Once the change was enacted, however, the president again vigorously defended the new program before the public: "The decision-making really operated on the academic and very rational and very constructivist environment."

On campus, the administration endorsed the efforts of the professors, if not explicitly then by tacit approval of inappropriate conduct and pressure tactics. Off campus, in order to facilitate fundraising among parents and alumni who supported the popular Western Culture survey, it carefully maintained the image of diligent educational paternalism. In the wake of the Western Culture debate, Office of Public Affairs, Robert (later to become one of the anti-western CVI teachers) is still meeting across the country, where he directed the same eloquence which had galvanized the faculty, into a smoothly ingratiating decay. Even Vice Provost Chase, former critic of academic populism, decades talks with the new regime, defending it in a statement to The Stanford Daily, that "the university's broad academic spread conviction here that a very good course, now modified in reasonable ways, will continue to be taught here."

The fall of Stanford had begun.

This article is adapted from The Diversity Myth: "Multiculturalism" and the Politics of Inclusion at Stanford by David Sacks and Peter Thibol, published by the Independent Institute in Oakland, California.
HETERODYNE

**Great Books, continued from page 9**

...subjective evaluation.” (Take Aitkens, for example.) Jay elaborated this point of view in discussion, claiming that the whole notion of literary “greatness” had been “provincialized” by modern intellectual critics. Anyone who has devoted even a semester of study to “authoritative” Great Books has been familiar with the techniques of “naturalism,” which is to say that our own age is the only age that has ever existed. All issues involve concepts with definitions. For every definition, there are phenomena that are defined by this or that line of reasoning. At some point in every debate, the PC academics will announce triumphantly that they have “naturalized” an entire concept, which is true yet they have not just an arbitrary des-sification...
Sour Patch Kids
By Nicholas Nastro

W

Oners don’t just watch Larry Clark’s Kids. They rubberneck at it. How else to describe the peculiar spell the film casts, with its patient, pitiless gaze on 24 hours of boozing, 20 boxes of Sour Patch Kids and half a bag of New York City skate kids? Like a car wreck, the film presents a strikingly appalling spectacle—and then it vanishes in the rear-view. The clean-up, apparently, is left to somebody else.

So why was Kids the most talked-about American film at this year’s Cannes Film Festival? Why did it tour, as The New York Times’ Janet Maslin has written, as “far too serious to be laired as exploitation and (in its extension) too moral and devastating effective?"

First, let’s back up. The script by Harmony Korine principal concerns Telly (Lowe, Patrick), a scrubby young man-cut who happens to specialize in virginia. This is doubly alarming because he’s HIV-positive. One of his recent conquests, Jenny (Chloe Sevigny), has just learned she’s HIV too. Korine and Clark make Jenny’s search for Telly the sole ligature in an otherwise whimsical succession of half-baked and begging and acting-out. Telly and his equally squirming pal Casper (Justin Pierce) chomp at a Korean grocery, drift to a friend’s place to do phish, then slide over to Washington Square Park to score some herb and beat some black ass. Jenny, of course, is always one frustrating step behind.

There’s nothing particularly new in this smirking, underpowered style of moviemaking. Richard (Schnick, Dazed and Confused) Linklater pays his debt to the fashion. The difference, however, is that in Kids the stakes feel much higher. In Linklater’s universe, and enliven Hik’s Mallin have been at pains to make us feel that this film is pertinent. And unlike Linklater’s kids, the kids in Kids rarely take us anywhere amusing; they are never kids, even for a minute. In its unresolved, astonishing film is sociologically one-note.

The standing defense for the Kids brand of “real” exaggeration is the wake-up call argument. That is, this kind of thing is “out there,” so the art is not only justified but performing a valuable social function in highlighting our own ills. Trouble is, we already know all the kids are just fantasizing in the world of some of them. Pretty young Now what? When the show has no concern for the causes of the problems it illustrates, much less solutions, Kids comes perilously near being not only cheap thrills, but dangerously sug-negative ones. (Incidentally, there’s nothing especially “real” about the suggestion that there’s an epidemic of AIDS among near-white female teenagers— at least, not before Clark’s film was released.)

Kids is reminiscent of a better film, Hector Babenco’s Pixote (1981). Babenco used even younger children, most of them orphans, to tell his story of murder, sodomy, petty crime, and prostitution in Rio. The difference is, whether they were drugging on a cigarette, kiting, or playing hooky, they were all actual, sad, lonely, and somehow pitiful in your face. And it amours.

Nicholas Nastro is a film critic who lives in New York.
Doing What Comes Unnaturally

Intimate Terrorism: The Deterioration of Erotic Life,
by Michael Vincent Miller, W. W. Norton & Co., 1995, 250 pp., $23.00

Reviewed by Michael Long

The danger (so I hear) in being a really smart guy is that you can get so caught up in the details of your discipline that obvious conclusions get lost while you’re looking for fresh angles. Consider, then, Michael Vincent Miller, a practicing psychologist, contributor to The New York Times Book Review, and author of Intimate Terrorism, purported to be a myth-busting dissection of why men and women seem to do so much bickering anymore. After a couple of hundred pages, Dr. Miller concludes—via over-long deconstructions of 20th-century novels and numerous and showy literary allusions—that people ought just grow up. In other, less exalted venues this is, I believe, called common sense.

The huffing and puffing notwithstanding, one hopes that Miller’s theoretical wonder at the freshest coats of paint on the walls between the sexes will reward consideration. Perhaps, as the dust jacket hints, this book will indeed enunciate those cultural forces that make modern romance/s ‘unsuccessful.’ No such luck. Miller precisely understates the problem, a loss in the high weeds of his witty style and thus forgotten in a poorly reasoned and mangy conclusion:

His thesis, however, is quite correct. The collapse of modern relationships is often caused by the failure to move from adolescent and emotional notions of romance to love as a valued commodity.

After a flushing out of this thought, one expects a litany of specific cultural causes for this arrested development. Instead, the author squirrel away scraps of poetry, movie quotes, and an observation with Great Gatsby analogies until the reader feels like he is being lectured to by a frustrated high-school English teacher.

The description of the psycho-pathology of dissed marriages is entirely accurate, though distinctly wordy. The book is especially strong when Miller goes to his own reactions and reactions to the world, his own experiences. He’s a witty stallion, rambunctious (see his conversation—right—between husband and wife patience. He quite effectively phallics a very big test on seemingly disconnected quandaries. He zeroes in on the battles between the paradigms: what can be deconstructed into instant, verbal interplay engaged in to keep the other person perceived in any way, Love, he posits, involves a tenacious balance of power and vulnerability. The initial trust between lovers evaporates as the mystery that is the other person is emotionally reeled in, methodically peeled away. Intimacy increases, attack becomes easier and increasingly occurs—out of frustration, boredom, a lusty moment. But instead of forgiveness, the current politics (and the time and cause of this model shift) is never quite clear. Miller has narrowly directed us to polar extremes of reaction: either we withdraw completely, or we lash back even harder.

Overriding all this is the insecurity of an impersonal world, and that’s where Miller patently fails. Furthermore, he is absolutely right in noting that popular culture does nearly nothing to encourage persistence within even mildly troubled relationships, with the result that bumpy people and society in general have gone to peculiar extremes to preserve attachments. Lately, this has taken the form of giving away the emotional score so that there is nothing left to protect and, hence, nothing to attack. Larger manifestations of what Miller calls "craziness" are best (or worst) observed in the ubiquitous talk shows and celebrity confessions that now clutter TV.

The cure is in the description of the illness. Miller’s phrase "intimate terrorism" demystifies mutually parasitic relationships where the erosion of trust and the dispatch of dependency leaves partners dissolving. The salvation, obviously, is in not one partner’s move to seek a bit of mystery about yourself. But that advice is good advice. The lesson for both of them: to restore these things to a relationship that has lost them.

The meat of the book should have been the naming of those cultural forces that brought all this about. When the author finally fingered a culprit, however, it seemed in grand form by calling out the "culture of abuse," a popular concern which he invokes through head-stroking speculation and superfluous cliche research. (Any illuminating book about the serial failure of relationships that contains hundreds of words about O.J. Simpson and zeroes on words about Elizabeth Taylor is immediately questionable.) For instance, Miller submits that after-relationship abuse is on a steep increase. He does not consider that its prevalence may simply be more accurate, or that its definition may have been recently and overly expanded. His slander evidence of a rising tide is no more than a citation of a Warren Buffet quote from the Surgeon General. It is from this sort of research that Miller begins a run through current events to cite diseases as the Woody Allen-Mia Farrow feud and the sexual world of the O.J. trial as airports on the bourgeoisie's route to romantic hell. No seriously, the author has no idea how many people have been made lusty, and neither the number of nor causes for a "culture of abuse" are easily established.

The truth in Intimate Terrorism is laughably diluted with a toxic sociology and politically correct posturing. His first solution to all this romantic confusion is for all of us to get busy restoring the unknown to relationships. Miller means to have significant portions of the text dedicated to destigmatizing the "normal" side of romance—that part of a relationship where no such is unknown about the other person that we color them in with ideologically desirable daydreams and slow songs on the radio.

Instead of calling for men and women to recognize and navigate phases of lusty that are perhaps the same as the unknown to relationships. Miller means to have significant portions of the text dedicated to destigmatizing the "normal" side of romance—that part of a relationship where no such is unknown about the other person that we color them in with ideologically desirable daydreams and slow songs on the radio.

What Heterodoxy does for political correctness.
The Report Card does for education.
Parents Lose in Child Divorce Case

By Judith Schumann Weizner

Warren and Matilda Talberg today lost a year-long battle to retain custody of their thirteen-year-old daughter, Rhonnie. The former Mrs. Talberg, who will now be known as Rhonnie Greblat, sued to divorce her parents on grounds of mental cruelty when they refused to pay for a tattoo which they had forbidden her to acquire.

In granting the divorce, the court has awarded Mr. Greblat $25,000 a year until she is twenty-one. In addition to this support for their ex-daughter, the Talbergs have been directed to pay her college tuition and all her legal expenses as well as to make good on her debt to Body Art, a tattoo studio.

The divorce ends what Mr. Greblat calls "six years of oppression" that she says began the day after her seventh birthday when, despite a custom in the Talberg house that no parental impositions would be made during a birthday week, the senior Talbergs forced Rhonnie to clean up a plateful of steamed broccoli that she had flung at the living room wall. They also ordered her to wash and eat one stalk of the broccoli.

The next day, when Rhonnie's teacher noticed that the child was unusually quiet, she contacted the school psychologist, who persuaded Rhonnie to reveal the cause of her unhappiness. Following a call from the school psychologist, the Child Welfare Examiner invited Mrs. Talberg, who happens to be a kindergarten teacher in her daughter's school, for an interview.

The social worker assigned to the case informed her that Rhonnie had been hamstrung by having to eat a piece of food that had been lying on the floor and that a more appropriate punishment might have been requiring her to read a book about food shortages in underdeveloped countries to make her more appreciative of the advantages she had. When Mrs. Talberg explained that her daughter had barely begun to learn to read, the social worker suggested a video on the same subject might have been used to make the same point. The social worker reminded Mrs. Talberg that, as a teacher, she should be able to devise creative solutions to problems posed by young children, and, as a result of what she called "the arbitrariness of the situation," the social worker issued Mrs. Talberg a Temporary Partial Negligent Parental Conduct in her employment dossier.

Rhonnie takes of the period following her mother's interview, "It was sort of hell. I felt very insecure. But outwardly, life in the Talberg house was normal. They that everybody was shocked by what happened in the parking lot," Rhonnie says. "She had taken me shopping for shoes and I didn't like any of them, but I let her buy me a pair just to make her happy."

When I scuffed them in the parking lot, she really lost it. She said she was going to spank me when we got home. Thank God somebody heard her." Unbeknownst to Mrs. Talberg, the realis security guard had heard the comment and took her license number. Thus the social worker was waiting for her and Rhonnie when they pulled into the driveway. Over the Talbergs' objection that Rhonnie's father would lose his night job if he took off more than one night a week, the Child Welfare

Rhonnie Greblat nee Talberg

Examiner gave them a choice between placing Rhonnie in a foster home and attending thirteen-weekly parenting classes.

"The parenting classes were supposed to help them find ways to get me to want to do what they wanted without appearing to order me around," Mr. Greblat says. "Like they were supposed to give me a choice between two or three things so I would feel that it was really my decision. But how is it my decision when they pick the two or three things? By the time I was ten I felt like they were really into controlling me. So I told my Child Advocate about the games they were playing."

Alarmed by the Child Advocate, the possibility that the Talbergs might be exerting undue influence on their daughter, the social worker gave Rhonnie the Elementary Standard Attitude and Emotional Development Test. According to the social worker, the test showed that Rhonnie was not being allowed to function as an individual. "She was clearly deficient in self-image utilization. She was in jeopardy of losing her Self. We couldn't allow this state of affairs to continue."

Charges of emotional repression were filed against the Talbergs in Family Court, whereupon the state suspended Mrs. Talberg's teaching license. Following a hearing, Rhonnie's parents were given the choice of having Rhonnie's social worker live with them at their expense for a period to be determined by the Family Court judge or participating in a study conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services. They opted to join the study, in which the parents attend daylong workshops in childhood self-determination while the children live with a mentor who assists them in developing decision-making skills.

Rhonnie's Child Advocate was assigned to be her mentor. "At first Rhonnie was uneasy at having so much latitude in her decision-making," she says. "For example, she resisted with suspicion when I allowed her to decide whether or not to attend school each day. She did raise a few months of six grace, but after a while she decided — on her own — to go back, although she tried to cover it by saying she missed her friends. As she develops a little more self-confidence, she will realize that it's okay to say you like school."

When the Talbergs had completed their readjustment, their daughter was returned to them. "By then I was twelve," Rhonnie said, "but they acted like I was still ten. Here I had learned how to make my own decisions and they kept asking me thing like, 'Have I done my homework? Have I done my homework? Hadn't I learned a thing. It was really tame.'"

Rhonnie's assessment notwithstanding, life in the Talberg house appeared to have settled down. Her father had found another night job and, although her mother was now barred from teaching, she was working part-time in a diner. But then things were thrown into turmoil once more when Rhonnie announced that she had decided to acquire a tattoo.

Hoping to prove their daughter from making what they called "a possibly fatal mistake," the Talbergs got an injunction forbidding her to get the tattoo, only to have the injunction overturned on appeal filed by Rhonnie and her Child Advocate because it violated her right to free expression. The case propelled Rhonnie into the public spotlight, her tattoo becoming a cause célèbre for the nation's teenagers. When her parents refused to pay for the tattoo, Rhonnie summoned enough confidence to file for divorce.

Appearing today on the Nicki Drake Show, Mr. Greblat said, "Things really came to a head over the tattoo. The Talbergs said they didn't want me to get it because of AIDS, but I think they just couldn't handle the idea of little girls getting Snoop Doggy Dogg's face on their chest." Although the record of the divorce proceeding has been sealed, Rhonnie says she is anxious to expose family life for what it really is and is currently negotiating with CBS for the rights to her story.

Asked whether she had any advice to share with other young people, Mr. Greblat did not hesitate. "Yes," she said. "Don't wait until those little problems turn into big ones. I hate to think what my life would be like today if I hadn't told my school psychologist about that beret. You've got to learn how to just say no."
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