The furor over teenage smoking at the Democratic convention was designed to transform Joe Camel into the Dragon and Bill Clinton into St. George. At last, the people of this country were meant to sigh in relief, a social problem this man takes seriously! But in fact it was a hoax, yet another nightclub imitation of a moral crusade, and it bore the signature of all the other squiggly lines in the sand the President has drawn, in that it was utterly cynical and wholly without ethical affect. The vacuousness of the administration’s position, as well as its vulgarity, was driven home by Al Gore, who in his brief Presidential campaign of 1988 had boasted to North Carolina farmers about growing tobacco with his own hands and who continued to accept income from the family tobacco business for years after his sister’s 1984 death from lung cancer, but who failed to mention these facts while orchestrating a weepfest in Chicago over this tragic assault on his family’s values by Demon Nicotine.

Teenage smoking is certainly worth an ongoing homily from the bully pulpit. (The President might well ask, for instance, why “carding” teenagers trying to buy cigarettes, an effective, low intensity enforcement practice of the not-so-distant past, no longer works.) But the fact is that in calling the nation to duty on the issue of young people’s addiction to nicotine at this time and in this way, Bill Clinton was not addressing a moral dilemma, but rather creating a smoke screen. He was trying to hide his unilateral surrender in the war against drugs, a surrender that is having catastrophic consequences for young people in every community in America.

During the four years Clinton has dodged the draft on drugs, the body count has been piling up. Teenage drug abuse is out of control—up 78% from 1992-95 (and up 33% in 1994-95 alone.) On his administration’s watch, marijuana use has risen 141% and cocaine 166%. Meth has become the bathtub gin of the nineties, and heroin is so chic that Calvin Klein dresses up his models in its ravaged face and uses its look as a sales pitch for his new fall line. As one worried teacher recently said, “Schools everywhere—in rich communities and poor ones—have become drug ghettoes, and huge numbers of students are high all the time. Continued on page 14
The Good News

Never thought I'd write a fan letter again (my last one was to Frank Sinatra in 1946), but the current issue of Heterodoxy inspires me. You have produced the best issue since I started reading your publication about three years ago—especially the Horowitz and Billingsley articles. Cheers! I've decided to renew my subscription.

R.P. Porter
Amherst MA

The Bad News

Cristopher Rapp’s piece in the May/June edition of Heterodoxy (“‘True Lies’)” seems more an attempt at exonerating the FBI’s COINTELPRO efforts against the Black Panthers than a discussion of the Geronimo Pratt case.

I remember reading Jean Seberg’s obituary during the late 1970s. Ms. Seberg, an actress who sympathized with leftist causes, was maliciously by COINTELPRO’s dissemination of the story that she had had a child by a Black Panther. That story cost Ms. Seberg her career and her life, which she took in 1979. Needless to say, COINTELPRO’s operations amounted to more than a few “poison pen letters,” as Mr. Rapp would have us believe.

I am well aware of the Black Panther Party’s activities during the late 1960s and early 1970s, especially those of its splinter faction, the Black Liberation Army, which either killed or attempted to kill police officers in New York City, San Francisco and St. Louis. I hope that Heterodoxy is not so blind-ed by its 1960s-era hatreds that it is willing to overlook the very real harm inflicted by J. Edgar Hoover’s McCarthytite tactics in the form of COINTELPRO.

Tom Olafson
La Jolla, CA

Not On The Same Page

Greatly enjoyed your article “Clarence Page’s Race Problem, And Mine”—most excellent! Continue, please, to lift hideous misconception about three years ago—especially the Horowitz and Billingsley articles. Cheers! I've decided to renew my subscription.

Kay Guinn
Dallas, TX

David Horowitz (Heterodoxy May/June 1996) could have gone further in rebutting the “white-good, black=evil” chestnut peddled by Clarence Page and by Spike Lee in his film biography of Malcolm X.

More than thirty years ago, Ernest Van Den Haag addressed the issue during an analysis of the famous “white doll, black doll” experiments conducted by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark in the desegregation cases of the 1950s. Dr. Clark concluded that the psychological harm done by segregated schools was demonstrated in the preference shown by black school children for white dolls over black ones. After pointing out that, according to Clark’s own evidence, even black children enrolled in integrated schools preferred white dolls, Van Den Haag made this observation:

“...the psychological harm done by segregated schools is demonstrated in the preference shown by black school children for white dolls over black ones. This is so to assert that it is a fact...”

Innocence. We need not speculate on why color of happiness, joy, hope purity, and innocence are practically unknown and cultural black has traditionally been the color of evil, death, sorrow, and fear. People are considered evil; and children fear darkness called blackguards or blackhearted when evil, death, sorrow, and fear. People are practically unknown and cultural black has traditionally been the color of evil, death, sorrow, and fear. People are called blackguards or blackhearted when considered evil; and children fear darkness. In these same cultures, white is the color of happiness, joy, hope purity, and innocence. We need not speculate on why this is so to assert that it is a fact. ...

(Passion and Social Constraint, p. 285)

To attribute this transcultural phenomenon to white racism—institutional or other—therefore appears mistaken.

Gan Matthews
Norman, Oklahoma

David Horowitz in his article in the May/June issue of Heterodoxy discusses a book entitled Showing My Color by Clarence Page, who is described as “a black intellectual.” In the article, Mr. Horowitz quotes a list of black grievances raised by Mr. Page which includes “…the era of mass lynchings.”

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, based on a study of the Tuskegee Institute, between 1865 and 1950 “the total number of persons lynched in the United States was 4,452...of whom 3,389 (were) Negro.” From these figures we may calculate that an average of 52 blacks per year were lynched. The Britannica article states that “The peak year was 1892 when 231 known Lynchings took place and we note that this latter figure also includes whites. Since the number of Lynchings rapidly decreased after 1950, this period must be ‘the era of mass lynchings’” to which Mr. Page refers.

As a point of comparison, today in the United States many more whites are murdered every year by blacks than the total number of black-lynched throughout the 65-year “era of mass lynchings.”

Kent Gordis
New York, NY

Activist Yippie

Although I enjoyed Heterodoxy when I subscribed and have a kinship with the core group—I was an activist Yippie in the Sixties—there is no way I will continue my subscription when you will not personally respond to my concerns.

For one I sent a letter to the editor that you reject-ed. But that is no big deal because it has happened to me dozens of times, for I write “tough” letters. But you do not respond to my key concern. In fact you keep promoting your publication the same way.

Why do you pride yourself on having fooled Paul Harvey and David Brinkley? [Ed note: both Harvey and Brinkley have been quoted as saying the test of a truly great film is whether there is a black intellectual.] You also had me quoting something that was not true.

There is enough deception in this world. What is your paper, some elaborate Yippie prank against a mature, honest Yippie? [Ed note: both Harvey and Brinkley have been quoted as saying the test of a truly great film is whether there is a black intellectual.] As a point of comparison, today in the United States many more whites are murdered every year by blacks than the total number of black-lynched throughout the 65-year “era of mass lynchings.”

Daniel R Peterson
Livingston, Montana

Heterodoxy (ISSN: 1069-7268) is published by the Center for the Study of Popular Culture. The Center is a California 501(c)3. Editorial: (916)265-9306. Fax: (916)265-3119. Subscription: 12 issues, $25. Send checks to Center for the Study of Popular Culture, P.O. Box 67398, Los Angeles, California 90067. Visa and MasterCard accepted.

Inquiries: 800-752-6562
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RIGHTIOUS OVERMUCH: The National Council of Churches has been in league with Bill Clinton to create a hoax about church burnings in America, except that, unlike the President, the NCC has professed to have overcome the hysterias it has created, raising $9 million, of which more than a third will go to "advocacy" to "cure racism," "gender oppression," homophobia, etc. Despite studies published in the N.Y. Times Magazine, etc., and other publications showing that burnings of black churches comprise a relatively small part of church arson in America (which is actually declining), the NCC has pushed its hysterical vision of a country teetering on the edge of civil war. The NCC actually asked the United Nations to monitor U.S. racism, citing as evidence of its existence the policies of the Republican Congress. The battle against the NCC and its leftist "partners," the Center for Democratic Renewal and the Center for Constitutional Rights, has been led by the Institute on Religion and Democracy, whose President, Diane Knippers, says, "Once again, the NCC has betrayed America's churchgoers."  

PC-R US: A furor erupted in Virginia in June when an investigator hired by Governor George Allen to probe state agencies distributing $17 mil- lion in federal funds for day-care and early childhood pro- grams, discovered financial mismanagement including the "steering" of funds to organi- zations with a leftist ideology. Some of the groups that received money promoted a college curriculum for "politically correct" day-care profes- sionals. One such group, the National Association for the Education of Young Children, published an "anti-bias cur- riculum" that argues that "homophobia "must be addressed in the day-care set- ting." Not only this, but the "anti-bias educator of young children "must be prepared to address both the gender and sexual differentiations of the sexes for two-year olds" and to identify "oppressive situations which might be addressed by boycotts or demonstrations during day care sessions."  

CUBAN COMBO: Two decades after Abbie Hoffman described Fidel Castro as "a mighty penis for two-year olds," and long after Paul J. Breman, Norman Mailer and Amnesty International's coming to life," and long after Jean-Paul Sartre, Hoffman described Fidel Castro as "a mighty penis for two-year olds."  

BEACH BLANKET BABYLON: San Diego homosexuals were not amused about "Last Eden," a cover story on clothing-optional Black's Beach in the weekly San Diego Reader. "That beach has been a well-kept secret for many, many years," wrote Charles E. Childs. "It's also a gay beach, and we don't welcome what you're doing. You're going to open up the beach to straights and gawkers and everything else...this article you wrote STINKS; your paper's a rotten piece of crap. And I never read it...Like, this stinks, and if we have any trouble down there with people in the gay section, we're going to come after you, you ashholes. Okay. How dare you write an article like that. That was a secret sanctuary, do you understand? And you just opened it up to the whole goddamned world, and we've got enough problems with it already you "heroes.""  

STEAL THIS BOOK: "Baywatch"? well, for one thing about his visit was the quip it occasioned by locals, some of whom have taken to describing himself as "two tacos short of a combo plate."  

LUNA BEACH: By Carl Moore  

FIRST COUPLE ACCUSED OF TAX CHEATING - CHANNEL TWO NEWS AT 11:00.  

CUBAN CRONIES FILL ENTIRE KINGS OF FEDERAL JUDGES PANEL. Read USA Today.

THE CENTER FOR LESBIAN AND GAY STUDIES at the City University of New York has added to its board José Muñoz, who teaches "queer theory and esthetics" at NYU and is co-editor of Pop/Oust: Queer Warhol, published by Duke University. CLAGS will publish A Queer World and Queer Representations, which includes the essay "Creating Queer Us," in which the Rockefeller Foundation has awarded CLAGS a $250,000 grant to support scholars in les- bian and gay studies who will explore such issues as "queer families and communities."  

TATTOO YOU: The Ohio Civil Rights Commission recently announced the discovery of a rather interesting penumbra of the 14th Amendment, when it ruled that every American has the right to a tattoo on demand. The case first arose two years ago when Columbus, Ohio, tattoo artist Adam Grant asked a customer to fill out a standard health form, which asked whether he had hepatitis, AIDs, heart problems, or any other condition which could make getting a tattoo risky. The customer ini- tially answered "no" to all of the questions, but eventually revealed that he did in fact have AIDS. Gray then declined to tattoo the man and offered him a blood- less alternative, such as a painting of his desired design. Ohio's Commissioners reacted swiftly to this mean-spirited trampling of the AIDS-infected customer's constitutional rights. They suggested a settlement in which Gray would pay the customer $150 to get his tattoo at another parlor, post a sign in his shop notifying the public that he had been guilty of an act of discrimination, and then sign a gag order promising not to speak of the case. When Gray refused, the OCRC began a two-year- long investigation of the U.S. Constitution. Upon completing the extensive investigation, the Commission ordered Gray to give a tattoo to the man or to someone else with AIDS. Furthermore, the OCRC stipulated that Gray must never refuse service to anyone with AIDS or other "communicable diseases." When Gray refused, the OCRC began a two-year- long investigation of the U.S. Constitution. Upon completing the extensive investigation, the Commission ordered Gray to give a tattoo to the man or to someone else with AIDS. Furthermore, the OCRC stipulated that Gray must never refuse service to anyone with AIDS or other "communicable diseases."  

GENDER EQUITY: Number of push-ups in two minutes required of men at Citadel: 42. Number required of women: 18. Amount of extra time allowed women at Citadel to run two miles: 19 percent.
The Assault on the Smithsonian

By K.L. Billingsley

In 1949, Adams had his bout of social slumming, working in a factory for 18 months. Concluding that the proletarian life was not for him, he went on to become an anthropologist and archeologist, logging two terms as director of the Laboratory of Anthropology, Division of Social Sciences. In 1978, he served as a National Academy of Sciences exchange scholar to the German Democratic Republic, a regime which made border crossing an exciting process.

Adams admitted that as head of the Smithsonian he intended to promote "confrontation, experimentation, and conflict." Adams pursued these goals became clear during the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. This moment provided a glorious opportunity for the Smithsonian but, as journalist Matthew Hoffman put it, "instead of celebrating the oldest still-in-effect constitution, Mr. Adams has focused on one of the few serious lapses in its enforcement." The exhibit was called "Toward a More Perfect Union," and in it the Smithsonian's Museum of American History rubs the visitor's face in the relocation camps for Japanese Americans during WWII, making sure they walk past Japanese-American concentration camps with oversized readings from the Constitution. One section, titled "Concentration Camps USA," says that the relocation centers were not like Dachau and other camps on their continent, but "concentration camps for people." The text adds: "Although we may not be comfortable with the term the fact remains that these were, by definition, American concentration camps."

The year after that exhibit, the Communist Bloc began to break up and by 1991 the Berlin Wall had fallen and the USSR slid into the ashcan of history. Washington Post writer Ken Ringle thought these momentous events placed in a curious light the 1991 "The West as America: Reinterpreting Images of the Frontier," which was another hit at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American Art.

"The current zeal for 'politically correct' thought and expression on the nation's campuses is surfacing just as the crumbling of global communism has made such mandatory group-think elsewhere in the world as passé as Chairman Mao's little red book," wrote Ringle, who would later become the first international media correspondent for the New York Times newsgroup. The Super Bowl touches off an orgy of wife-beating. "There's a similar bizarre symmetry in the recent arrival of the Smithsonian Institution's first politically correct art exhibit," an example of the "tortured revisionism now so droidently de rigueur in academia," which "effectively trashes not only the integrity of the art but presents history in a way that reduces the saga of America's Western pioneers to little more than victimization, disillusion and environmental rape."

The exhibit portrayed interprets portraits of cavalrymen making a last stand as "an allegory of the plight of capitalism" in an era of labor-management conflict and equated Manifest Destiny with the U.S. role in Vietnam. For Ringle, it was "the most cynical exhibit—despite the frequent glory of the art itself—ever presented under the aegis of your tax dollars and mine."

Curator William Truttmann admitted that "the show went against the grain of some Western historians' perception of the American Art.

The momentous events placed in a curious light the 1991 "The West as America: Reinterpreting Images of the Frontier," which was another hit at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American Art.

"The current zeal for 'politically correct' thought and expression on the nation's campuses is surfacing just as the crumbling of global communism has made such mandatory group-think elsewhere in the world as passé as Chairman Mao's little red book," wrote Ringle, who would later become the first international media correspondent for the New York Times newsgroup. The Super Bowl touches off an orgy of wife-beating. "There's a similar bizarre symmetry in the recent arrival of the Smithsonian Institution's first politically correct art exhibit," an example of the "tortured revisionism now so droidently de rigueur in academia," which "effectively trashes not only the integrity of the art but presents history in a way that reduces the saga of America's Western pioneers to little more than victimization, disillusion and environmental rape."

The exhibit portrayed portraits of cavalrymen making a last stand as "an allegory of the plight of capitalism" in an era of labor-management conflict and equated Manifest Destiny with the U.S. role in Vietnam. For Ringle, it was "the most cynical exhibit—despite the frequent glory of the art itself—ever presented under the aegis of your tax dollars and mine."

Curator William Truttmann admitted that "the show went against the grain of some Western historians' perception of the American Art.

The momentous events placed in a curious light the 1991 "The West as America: Reinterpreting Images of the Frontier," which was another hit at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American Art.
Earlier this year, Robert Maranto of Lafayette College observed that “today’s history curators quite naturally favor the masses-as-morons paradigm. It serves as self-justifying protection against anyone who objects to the single-minded direction of the new history curatorialship. The masses-as-morons history values top-down moralizing over the principle that the visitor replaces the exhibiting of objects and events with the exhibiting of ideas.”

In this process, the script describing the exhibit becomes the artifact because, as Maranto observed, objects and events are open to interpretation and require one to think for oneself. Some Air and Space visitors have splattered blood on the missiles exhibited there, while others marveled at their technology or sheer size, thankful that they helped keep the peace. But thinking for oneself, Maranto said, is part of the job description and the ethnic support groups. Further, the Lesbian and Gay Issues Committee noted that commitments to multiculturalism were part of the job description and there was no attempt to replace the usual code words “diversity,” and “multiculturalism.” When one visitor raised the issue of the labels’ commitment to truthfulness, he was greeted with icy stares.

“They were people with an agenda and there was no attempt to real-

ly represent the truth,” says Collier, who noted that Robert McCormick Adams “was going along with whatever the hard-

core liberals wanted to do.” She also noted that commitments to multiculturalism were part of the job description and that the place was littered with fliers for the Lesbian and Gay Issues Committee and the Black support group. Further, during Collier’s stay, a group of history curators who spent time in Cuba were eager to conduct a joint project with the Castro regime, which then led to the”—the systematic spirit,” the view of early Americans who saw the universe as “a well-made mechanism, set in motion by a creator” but which “conflicted with the traditional view that the universe was a place wherein American Indians, Native Americans and even white Americans . . . these people studied nature in order to work in harmony with it—not control it.” Oddly enough, an accomp-

Science in American Life

The American Chemical Society put up $5.3 mil-

lion for the exhibit, which began on Adams’ watch. What they got, said Bill Gifford in a recent piece, was “a show that looked to

the ‘systematic spirit,’ the view of early Americans who saw the universe as ‘a well-made mechanism, set in motion by a creator’ but which ‘conflicted with the traditional view that the universe was a place wherein American Indians, Native Americans and even white Americans . . . these people studied nature in order to work in harmony with it—not control it.’ Oddly enough, an accompa-

nying picture shows Indians stampeding buffalo over a cliff. The systematic spirit ‘became over time the official American creed, taught in schools and reflect-
ed in legislation,’ not recognizing that ‘Native American and African people developed sophisticated methods of systematizing their knowledge.’ While romanticizing voodoo, the Smithsonian becomes judgmental in ‘Science in American Life.’

In the early 90’s, Gregory Laguna was a foreign ser-

vice officer in Ecuador when he saw “Exploring New Worlds,” produced by the Smithsonian’s Air and Space Museum and shown there as recently as last year. Orderliness, he noted, is a theme of a cata-

logue of American crimes, mistreatment of Native Americans, the Cold War, and the homeless.

Space exploration was “inspired as much by Cold War anxiety as by the spirit of exploration” and “the cost of putting twelve astronauts on the moon is about the same as the cost of building one million average single family homes. The cost of a base on the moon is about the cost of housing seven million people. For the cost of a mission to Mars, we could house half the population of the United States.”

For Laguna, Disney World’s “Star Tours” featuring R2D2 and C3PO “has at least as much to do with reality” as the Smithsonian film on space. The institution, he wrote, “can’t seem to consider American achievement on its own terms. It must bal-

ance it against the multiplicity of our various sins and shortcomings . . . Where will this all end? Can we
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expect the B-17s, B-25's and Mustangs on display to carry legends about the destruction they caused?"

"That walk-off, from a 1992 article in this magazine, became the inspiration for the 1993 exhibition."

Just before the Enola Gay matter hit the fan, Washington Times writer Cynthia Grenier attended an art opening at the National Gallery and found herself standing beside Smithsonian secretary Michael Heyman, who was chatting with Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer about the atomic bomb. Breyer suggested that Heyman should have had something to write about the weapon. To which Heyman replied that "the historians would kill me" if he excluded the revi

The last vacant piece of land along the Mall, right beside the Air and Space Museum, has been ear-marked for a $106 million National Museum of the American Indian. That does not sit well with some blacks who presseced the Smithsonian for a site of their own.

Actually, if this additional balkanization has not yet taken place, it is not far off. In April 1995, the Smithsonian approved a plan to convert the Arts and Industry building into a national African-American Museum. Secretary Adams, in a sparkling example of compromise, agreed to the plan. In a recent direction over the Enola Gay, actually did write a book. Exhibits Denied, which inadvertently shows how politically correct and revisionist the project was, with participatio

The director and staff "should listen to a broad spectrum of external voices and develop an effective communication system for collecting and disseminating information and for assuring that the views of the interested and affected publics are taken into account." Even some regents claimed that they had not been well informed about the goals, plans, and programs.

The investigators found that "A number of staff objected to the Enola Gay exhibit, as early as 1987, but their comments were ignored by the director." Further: "Some curators seldom observe public reactions to their work, and are therefore unresponsive to complaints of a staff," the Air and Space Museum by the National Academy of Public Administration, commissioned by the Smithsonian in March of 1995. "This new impediment to more effective management," said the study, was the "adoption of and adherence to an academic model with a collegial management approach. Reliance on the collegial model increases the risk of a local optimum." The institution has caused murmuring in the congresional choir. Sen. Ted Stevens of Alaska, who has been the chief instigator of the issue with the Smithsonian for financing "The Buried Mirror: Reflections on Spain and the New World," a cable-television program produced by Carlos Fuentes, the anti-American Mexican novelist..."
The sensational news from the Venona Project, a massive and amazingly successful effort by American military technicians to intercept and decode Soviet secret police communications over a fifteen-year period during the height of the Cold War, concerned the espionage activities of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and Alger Hiss, and the fellow traveling of figures like J. Robert Oppenheimer. In addition to allowing historians finally to name names, however, Venona also gives the first full picture of the extent and criminality of Soviet espionage in the United States during World War II. The documents show that KGB agents operated as if on their own territory in California and elsewhere on the Pacific Coast, as well as in Mexico, while assigned under diplomatic cover. They hunted down and kidnapped Russian nationals who had managed to escape Stalin's reign of terror, looted American industrial and scientific projects, including the atom project, and bought off military personnel south of the Rio Grande.

Venona began in February 1943 under the auspices of the Army's Signal Intelligence Service. The project was located at Arlington Hall, a facility in Virginia, and was directed by a former schoolteacher, Miss Gene Grabeel. Its mission was to examine intercepts and if possible break down the codes used in thousands of messages, sent between Moscow and various foreign stations and recorded by American authorities, beginning in 1939 during the Hitler-Stalin pact.

The codebreakers determined that Soviet agents used five cipher systems, serving commercial offices, diplomats, the KGB, and the Army and Navy. In October 1943, one of the codebreakers, a former archeologist from the University of Chicago named Richard Hallock, discovered a weakness in the Russian commercial code. A further break-through came in the KGB traffic, which was double-encrypted, although none of its messages could actually be read for another two years.

Ultimately, some 2,200 Venona messages were decoded by the National Security Agency, constituting a small part of the recorded traffic, and an even smaller fraction of the overall communications between Moscow and its foreign stations in that period. Yet Venona provides an encyclopedic record of Soviet spying and terror operations in the United States during World War II.

As World War II ended, the progress of American military communications operations northward of the border made it possible for the Venona intercepts to have been active in the war to liquidate Jews, so the Soviets took precious resources from a critical moment of intelligence network maintained by the Soviet Communist International, or Comintern. The KGB, which engaged in the hallowed conspiracy of passport and other document forgery, the “fellow-coun-trymen line” or work with the American Communist Party; etc.

A leading protagonist in this extraordinary campaign was Mark Zborowski, whose consider the most fearsome Soviet spy of all time. Alger Hiss, whose code name appeared in “clear,” that is, unencoded, and this slip put together with other Venona intercepts, made it clear that “Liberal” was Julius Rosenberg, who also appeared under the code name of “Antenna.” The Rosenberg were shown by the Venona traffic to have been active in the top priority espionage assault on the atomic bomb project (designated “Enormous” or “Enormoz” in the Russian covername vocabulary), and also in many other military and industrial technology thefts, involving radar, jet aircraft, rocket development, and other research areas.
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The revisionist view, the reigning
orthodoxy in academic history for
the last twenty years, holds that the
American Communist movement was
normal, albeit radical, political participant in
American democracy and a movement with
its roots in America’s democratic, populist,
and revolutionary past. While sometimes
admitting that American Communists took
the inspiration for their beliefs from Soviet
communism, this school insists that the link-
gages to Moscow were either superficial or
ritualistic and that at the grass roots,
American Communists paid little attention to
ideological abstractions but concentrated on
fighting racism, organizing unions, and
promoting American democracy.

No such sympathy is extended to American
anti-communism. Since the 1960s, the dominant aca-
demic view has been that anti-communism met part of
the legal and moral case, but was otherwise utterly without redeeming social value. According to
this view, concern about domestic communism in the
late 1940s and 1950s was without justification and constituted an authoritarian, anti-democratic attack
on a movement whose chief sin was to dissent from
ideological abstractions but concentrated
on fighting racism, organizing unions, and
promoting American democracy.

T

Historians Scramble for Line by John E. Hayes

The American Communist Party had a permanent
representative in Moscow, and as its chief
spokesman, with the Comintern; the correspondence between the
Comintern representative and American
Communist leaders is in Comintern files. Often
American Communist leaders reported in person
to a formal Comintern commission and were
cross-examined by its members. In the 1930s, Earl
Brodersen, the general secretary of the American
Communist Party made at least annual trips to Moscow to report.

So what did Harkey Kliff and I find when, in a few cases, we literally blew the dust off
long-stored folders, plucked thick bundles of
shred, and looked inside? We found material
documenting:

That the Soviets sent secret subsidies to the American Communist movement, as well as
documents showing that as a young man, Armand
Hammer, later one of America’s most famous and wealthy businessmen, helped to
Lauder Soviet money.

That the CPSU set up a secret under-
ground apparatus in the 1930s headed by J. Peters, a figure prominently mentioned by the
malignant Whittaker Chambers.

That the top leadership of the CPSU supervised, the secret apparatus, and had active ties to
Soviet intelligence operations.

That the CPSU established secret ca-
cuses in several U.S. government agencies in the
1930s and 1940s, sought to influence the agencies’ policies, and stole confidential documents.
The agencies involved were the Civil Liberties Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Education Committee, the
State Department, the Office of Strategic Services (our World War II intelligence agency), and the
Office of War Information.

Communications between the Comintern and Soviet intelligence agencies offered strong
interest to major parts of the stories told by key ex-Communists, including Ben Gitlow, Walter
Krivitsky, Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, and Louis Budenz.

None of these points are "revelations" in the sense of being facts never before suspected.
They were propositions made by a number of for-
mer Communists and supported by, to me, convinc-
ing, although usually circumstantial, evidence. They are,
however, points vigorously denied by the con-
sensus that has prevailed in the history profession for
several decades now.

Several of the documents we found in Moscow otherwise showed that little was known about a secret U.S. government project
called Venona. The existence of the Venona project sur-
faced in the 1980s in the memoirs of retired FBI,
British security officers, and in skelelsey reports by
a few scholars of espionage. But few specifics ever
came out. Inquiries by journalists and historians
about the existence of Venona were rebuffed, and the
National Security Agency, our code-breaking
agency, refused to confirm that the project had ever
existed. (Indeed, NSA for many years so discouraged
curiosity about the Venona project that it had even
Leges-tered that NSA stood for “No Such Agency.”)

In July 1995, the CIA, NSA, and FBI jointly
announced that they had declassified and released the first batch of documents. Since
that time, three batches totaling about 800 messages have been released. The remaining 1,400
are scheduled to be released later this year. The Venona Papers not only reinforce the documents that Klehr and I found,
but, given the evidence that we had already
concluded that we had mistranslated this document.

That what we had mistranslated a
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It is a measure of the enormous arrogance of those who are part of the current revisionist orthodoxy that they are unrepentant even when shown that they have made a factual error, and a measure of their uncritical readiness to shift their positions when they feel that a professional pressure to correct a factual inaccuracy.

I will close by contrasting two very different reactions to these documents, foreign and domestic, which cast a new light on the relationship between American Communism and the Soviet Union.

The first came from James Ryan, a historian at Texas A&M, who studied the CPUSA in the era of its greatest influence. When I returned, I got a call from Ryan who was eager to hear about what I had seen. I told him that he was drastically shifting his interpretative script. He also said that in light of the documents he publishable form and felt he had to go to Moscow to trips to Moscow as part of research for American Communism. Then in 1992, I made two we disagreed on the basic approach to the history of as a Kansas Populist and thorough-going American].

I first read Ryan's dissertation, I found much useful information in it, but sharply disagreed with its overviews of the CPUSA in the era of its greatest influence. When

When I returned, I wrote that about the Rosenberg File as a leading example of thorough, truth-seeking scholarship, Eric Foner did not agree. In a lengthy commentary on the book in 1983, Foner charged that in assessing the credibility of the evidence. His review was a near-total condemnation of the book and of the proposition that the Rosenbergs might be guilty of espionage. A few years later, writing a foreword for a book by the son of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Foner gave his enthusiastic endorsement to the revisionist view that the CPUSA was an “Americanized” movement.

Then let us come forward to July 1995 when Venona was released. A number of the Venona messages, about seventy, dealt with atomic espionage. Their examination by Foner, who has been so eager to find new evidence, will, it appears, confirm his views. Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, Fomer gave his enthusiastic endorsement to the revisionist view that the CPUSA was an “Americanized” movement.

Here we see two reactions from our discipline. Eric Foner, one of the most praised historians in the nation, has made it clear that new evidence will not change his views. Jim Ryan, a little-known historian, finds that new evidence requires him to change his views. To my mind, Jim Ryan’s actions are the ones that display scholarly integrity.

Heal made me more confident about talking of what happened in the past than predicting what will happen in the future. But let me end with this: unless historians remember their obligation to follow the evidence, the intellectual corruption of history and the drift that is already well underway of this profession toward a third-rate status, will accelerate.

—John E. Haynes

John E. Haynes is also the author of Red Scare or Red Menace: American Communism and Anti-Communism in the Cold War Era. This article is adapted from a talk given to the National Association of Scholars.
welling as the ubiquity of Soviet sympathizers south of the border, are encompassed in the Venona messages from Mexico City. One detail in Venona that still has the power to surprise is that the KGB controlled the Mexican Army general responsible for Baja California border with the United States.

Venona shows numerous Americans recruited as agents through local Communist Party leaders. The most recent release, which includes KGB traffic from San Francisco and Mexico City, and GRU messages from New York and Washington, to Moscow, details the activities in cooperation with California Communists of Grigory Markovich Kheifitz. The KGB resident in San Francisco from 1941 to 1944, Kheifitz was previously the personal secretary of Nadyezhda Krupskaya, widow of Vladimir Lenin, according to a recent article in a Moscow magazine.

Kheifitz, while in San Francisco, was referred to as “Charon,” the name of the boatman who ferries the dead to hell in Greek mythology. The code name was eerily appropriate, for Kheifitz directed many operations in which fugitive Russian sailors were seized and sent back across the Pacific to Soviet territory.

One of the first decoded messages from the KGB in San Francisco to Moscow, dated October 20, 1943, describes a Soviet cargo ship, the Red October, returning a “deserter” named Sinelnikov to the Pacific port of Vladivostok. Sinelnikov was only one such victim. The KGB traffic is replete with reports on the apprehension, kidnaping, and transportation to Siberia of Russian mariners. Some sailors who had left Russian vessels managed to ship out under the American flag, but they were still hunted by Kheifitz’s men, even when serving under the Stars and Stripes.

Historical study of the West Coast maritime labor movement long ago substantiated that Floyd Miller/Michael Cort had infiltrated the Seafarers’ International Union (SIU) to monitor attempts by American sailors to smuggle Trotskyist Union (SIU) to monitor attempts by American sailors to smuggle a Soviet cargo ship, the Red October, returning a “deserter” named Sinelnikov to the Pacific port of Vladivostok. Sinelnikov was only one such victim. The KGB traffic is replete with reports on the apprehension, kidnaping, and transportation to Siberia of Russian mariners. Some sailors who had left Russian vessels managed to ship out under the American flag, but they were still hunted by Kheifitz’s men, even when serving under the Stars and Stripes.
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Last winter, while working on my autobiography, I got a phone call from my old friend Ron Radosh. He was writing about an article Michael Lind had written about the socialist magazine Dissent. The article was called “The Death of Intellectual Conservatism” and was Lind’s explanation of the political transformation that had left him to bite. I had no such ambivalence. The image of the Right that the Left had manufactured—authoritarian, bigoted, mean-spirited, Neanderthal—was an absurd caricature that had no relation to the way I saw myself or my new comrades in arms after a decade-long transition. Conservatism to me was liberal—a commitment to the values and principles of individual liberty embodied in the American founding. I had rejected the leveling illusions and totalitarian longings of the Left in explanation and no apologies for what I had become. My only political regrets had to do with the durability of the political leftism that Radosh and I had once espoused and now rejected as dangerous and destructive. When Radosh alerted me to the appearance of Lind’s article, the subtext of his call was a question: “Well, is Lind right about intellectual conservatism? Should you be having third thoughts?”

And so I regarded Lind as a sort of doppelganger. I wanted to see how the intellectual world was going to treat him for his apostasy. I had not been prepared for what happened to Peter Collier and myself when our own rejection of half a lifetime of the Left was met with such a reception. The penalties we paid were a lesson for me and many others. There was a further irony in all this, adding to my curiosity about the ultimate fate of Michael Lind. Perhaps no greater caution exists for a leftist tempted to leave the faith than the charge of “selling out.” To those who have it, the radical commitment seems to be less a political than a moral choice. Leaving the faith is inconceivable. Only pathological behavior—taking money or some other material payment—can explain to a leftist the decision to adopt a different political stance. No decent person could ever make such a choice in the absence of some kind of bribe. Even in the post-Communist world, the average leftist remains in this way a vulgar Marxist—except for Maoists who were, of course, less than typical. The image of a parallel career, as someone who once espoused the Left and admitted to voting for Ronald Reagan, now rejected as dangerous and destructive. When Radosh alerted me to the appearance of Lind’s article, the subtext of his call was a question: “Well, is Lind right about intellectual conservatism? Should you be having third thoughts?”
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accused Collier and me of getting (without drawing any suspicion as to his motives), I was also curious in looking at his new book to see if he got the goods as well as the goodies.

In From Conservatism comes with a flap copy that misleadingly describes Lind as “a former radical” and a blurb from Gore Vidal comparing him to Toqueville and describing the book as “a fascinating look—from the inside— at that web of foundations and other interested people, corporate money, media, and the shapers of what passes for political commentary.” Vidal, of course, means the Right, proceeding in his usual abusive way, as in claiming that an event that unraveled the skein of our former political selves. It was our perspective that had changed and the change had been worked over many events in the course of making our book. The movement’s efforts. The survivors had been swallowed by a socialist police state even worse than the movement’s efforts. The survivors had been swallowed by a socialist police state even worse than the anti-Communist war.

As though aware of the indefensible nature of his thesis, Lind repeats it endlessly throughout the book: “The ‘right’ now means the overlapping movement of the ‘far right.’” One of the only movement effects in the United States today that has any significant political influence is the far right [same page, same paragraph].” Lind summarizes the philosophy of this right in the following words: “the fact remains that a common worldview animates both the followers of Pat Robertson and Pat Buchanan and the far-right white supremacists, anti-Semites, murderers, federal marshals and country sheriffs, and blow up buildings and trains. That worldview is summed up by three letters: ZOG. ZOG stands for ‘Zionist occupied governments’ and is used by far-right white supremacists, anti-Semites, and militia members for the federal government.”

Nor is it just hateful philosophy they share. “In the manner of the southern right from the Civil War until the civil rights revolution, which operated both through the Democratic Party and the Ku Klux Klan, or the modern Irish Republican movement, with its party (Sinn Fein) and its terrorist branch (the IRA), the contemporary American far right has both public, political wings (the Christian Coalition and Protestant Resistor movement) and a terrorist tendency linked to particular factions.” Naturally, Lind does not name any of these “factions” or attempt to link terrorist and paramilitary groups with people he calls “frontrunners” like Pat Robertson, who has been worked over many events in the course of making our book. The New Republic, of the Christian Coalition, which (under Sinn Fein) has denounced such violence. For Lind, whose book is an account of the shaping rhetoric, would surrender unilaterally to such hateful and menacing forces if they existed. Lind’s answer is that Pat Robertson’s Christian Coalition is electorally so powerful that conservatives like him are proud of it.

The illogic of Lind’s argument is breathtaking. If Robertson’s Christian Coalition has ideological influence, and Lind elsewhere in the book identifies Robertson as the “kingmaker” of the Republican Party. What does that mean if it doesn’t mean the ability to determine the party’s candidate? And who determines that? The fact is that Robertson is the only “significant political influence on the right” why didn’t Robertson engineer his own nomination, or at least give it to a soudalite like Phil Gramm? Or did he fear the blowback for using Robertson’s votes was enough to intimidate Buckley, Podhoretz, and the neo-conservatives from confronting his alleged anti-Semitism, why were they so ready to jump on Pat Buchanan as an anti-Semite and even “fascist” (as The American Spectator and

render to Robertson. This adds a frisson of impor-
forced to admit is a direct-mail coalition and not a party or cult, in the manner of the Posse Comitatus, the John Birch Society, or the Nation of Islam? Lind publicly attacked Dwight Eisenhower, a D-style Republican, as a Communist, and his members followed suit. Lind does not mention a single occasion during the 1980s when he left the nation's ex- istence, that his policies have reflected a conspiratorial mentality or an anti-Zog agenda.

He section of this sordid and sordid book that held a perverse fascination for me, was Lind's effort to explain the world of intellectual conserva tivism, an environment with which I am quite familiar. His chapter on the subject is called the "The Triangular Trade: How the Conservative Movement Works," and is as dishonestly constructed and argued, and leaving out the rest of his book. To begin with, the descriptive phrase he chooses for his subject, as usual, is designed as a smear: "One might speak of the interaction of money, ideas, and activists on the right as a "triangular trade," like the Eighteenth Century cycle of rum-slaves-molasses."

According to Lind, part one of this "trade" is the "grass-roots" right, which he tells us is the Goldwater campaign, Lind's mentor and friend. Like weeps to the John Birch Society, National Review and all the dread demons—the anti-Semites, the bigots, the militia storm troopers and killers of federal agents—he seems to invoke on every other page. The second leg in the trade is the "corporate elite," which in Lind's fantasies draft all the tax foundations, or renewing his stay at AEI. According to Lind, "The modern conservative brain trust originated in a scheme hatched in the 1970s by William E. Simon, Irving Kristol, and others." The plan was to make conservative intellectuals, whether of an adherent-minded, quirk, and diverse community, a controlled multinational that would function as the reliable tool of the Republican Party. "By the early 1990s, thanks to the success of the Simon-Kristol initiative, almost all major conservative magazines, think tanks, and even individual scholars had become dependent on money from a small number of conservative foundations. At this point, the pet-masters Simon and Kristol are being referred to by Lind as the "Wall Street corporate raider" and "the ex-Communist-apparatchik." For the record, it is worth noting that Irving Kristol's connection to "communism" is this: He spent a year in 1938 in a Tsotistsky splinter group argu ing with the appa ratchik and a fellow expatriate Communist for any Leninist Party or Marxist future he was.

Smears like this are not coincidental to Lind's argument, they are his argument. He writes: "The conservative mind is based on the division of labor, with the grass-roots right serving as an electoral coalition, and the libertarian right as a governing elite." This arrangement, however, presents a problem for Republicans, because the libertarians regard the grass-roots Goldwaterites as fascists, while the Goldwaterites regard the libertarians as more in power, as betrayers of their authoritarian traditions. To make this alliance, an "umbrella ideology" is required that is provided by the third part of the "triangular trade," like Kristol crafted was therefore one that adopted the characteristic institutions and strategies of Communism while purveying an anti-Communist "ex-Communist" message. The Communist Party imposed conformity on its intellectuals, and even individual scholars had become dependent on money from a small number of conservative foundations. At this point, the pet-masters Simon and Kristol are being referred to by Lind as the "Wall Street corporate raider" and "the ex-Communist-apparatchik." For the record, it is worth noting that Irving Kristol's connection to "communism" is this: He spent a year in 1938 in a Tsotistsky splinter group arguing with the apparatchik and a fellow expatriate Communist for any Leninist Party or Marxist future he was.
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These facts and figures have become part of the political language of our national life. And Clinton’s capitulation is all the more obscene because it reverses the hard-won gains of a decade of perseverance. The war against drugs waged during the Reagan Administration was a massive and expensive undertaking. It took place in a field that was designed to involve ignorant armies whose nighttime clash yielded only a thin ray of light at the end of the tunnel. But hard work and determination, not just talk, determines whether the country slowly took back territory lost since the sixties. There was progress, but the progress was less meaningful than the campaign promises.

Throughout the eighties, drug use among kids declined from its pre-1980 high in 1979, which, not coincidentally, was the last time that lifestyle liberalized the White House. The public service announcements, the appearances from the Oval Office, the tough new enforcement measures added up. They were a sign that at least the administration believed the war against drugs was worth fighting. That this commitment had an impact can be seen in one statistic: in 1980, when we began to say no to drugs, less than half of high school seniors in this country disproved of marijuana; and by 1992, after a decade of driving the message home, over 80% of them did.

But 1992 turned out to be the end of an era. Of this year’s graduating high school class, according to a recent article by John Walters of the New Citizenship Project, almost half—48.4%, to be exact—will have tried drugs by the time they receive their diploma. Thus have the efforts of two presidencies been swept away by the moral cleverness of one administration.

The outlines of the drug epidemic, an epidemic which is far more catastrophic for black families than the church burnings Clinton has used for photo ops, have been apparent for some time. Only the connection between the war against drugs and the rise in alcohol use has been made. This study, along with the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, which documents the rise in drugs is a correlation with and related to the rise in drug use.

The National Survey doesn’t mince words. With the end of the war against drugs fought between 1992 and 1994, the nation’s second generation of adolescents are young adults who grew up in a world which has normalized criminalization and legal sanctions.

The defeat now staring America in the face is not merely the result of benign neglect. Less than three months after his inauguration, Clinton gutted the anti-drug war with the 1993 Crime Bill. The public service announcements, the appearances from the Oval Office, the tough new enforcement measures added up. They were a sign that at least the administration believed the war against drugs was worth fighting. That this commitment had an impact can be seen in one statistic: in 1980, when we began to say no to drugs, less than half of high school seniors in this country disproved of marijuana; and by 1992, after a decade of driving the message home, over 80% of them did.

But 1992 turned out to be the end of an era. Of this year’s graduating high school class, according to a recent article by John Walters of the New Citizenship Project, almost half—48.4%, to be exact—will have tried drugs by the time they receive their diploma. Thus have the efforts of two presidencies been swept away by the moral cleverness of one administration.

The outlines of the drug epidemic, an epidemic which is far more catastrophic for black families than the church burnings Clinton has used for photo ops, have been apparent for some time. Only the connection between the war against drugs and the rise in alcohol use has been made. This study, along with the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, which documents the rise in drugs is a correlation with and related to the rise in drug use.

The National Survey doesn’t mince words. With the end of the war against drugs fought between 1992 and 1994, the nation’s second generation of adolescents are young adults who grew up in a world which has normalized criminalization and legal sanctions.
be closer to the mark in his warnings about “the wolf within the man.” And the problem with all these plans to legalise drugs is while they each may believe in them, there is nothing that will ever unlease the wolf, which may be the greatest evil of all.

Will drug-related crime really disappear when drugs are legal? The spectre of a drug epidemic that infects the families of drug abusers diminish? Will we at last, as Bill Buckley believes, be able to step back and see the whole criminal panoply of drug offenses. Perhaps, as one of Eugene O’Neill’s character promises in The Iceman Cometh, we will all eat hot dogs and drink champagne under the willow trees.

One assumption we can reliably make is that there will be huge numbers of new users if drugs are ever legalised. (One DEA official has forecast that in the first year, there would be 50 million new cocaine users.) And there will certainly be an increase in addicts who cannot support themselves and their lifestyles through legitimate means. And unless there is the narcotic equivalent of a welfare state (here the libertarians and paleo-cons jump ship!), this means the violence presently associated with drug wars would not vanish as predicted. This makes sense because drugs mean violence, whether or not there are guncells from the Calti cartel drawing down on each other.

Crime, is not merely revery madness in bellottoms. (And crack is coke, baking soda and water and pop on the minute.) But for the drug war drug that the New York City found that 45% of convicted murderers were on drugs at the time of their crime. And the victims are linked to perpetrators in a psychosomatic symbiosis, according to a 1991 study of crime in New York which found that cocaine users were 50 more likely to commit violence even if members of the general population.

Drug enforcement is the new drug that insist fighting the drug war turns society into an enforcement state. But by promoting a solution where drugs are not simply legal but controlled and taxed, with their use and distribution overseen, and the addicts inserted into a new drug welfare system, they are merely changing the metaphor, not the size of the operation. Instead of an enforcement state, we would have a therapeutic state, a gigantic FDA for losers.

The pre-legislation forces—the civilian critics of the Clinton White House no doubt among them—like to mock what they regard as the clichés of those who favor the centralized criminalization of drugs. “Dawson’s Phoenix is a little drug ‘way’ drug leading to hard narcotics. (Ever ready to create an absurdity, Ted Kennedy, who no doubt would have a therapeutic state, a gigantic FDA for losers.)

All about one thing they are sincere: the average citizen, who no not say “tobacco companies” with the same disgust in their voice as when they said “Reagan policies” in the eighties, “Joe Camel” in the seventies, “American imperialism” in the sixties. These are people who have mastered the withering look of moral condemnation when someone inside their visual field victimizes them with second-hand smoke. But while they would deny their class enemies their addiction, they deny themselves nothing. They are like the Wall Street Speculator who is out of the market to guard himself from regret, who have grown up, tuned in and turned on, they had learned well the narcotic catechism of their youth and had not hesitate to reply to those who express alarm about substance abuse: “What about alcohol and nicotine? They are drugs too and you don’t say no to them! You are hypocrites!” In these words, we hear the smug narcissism and adolescent whine of a generation that has never grown up.
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Clinton and his entourage may pretend not to know what hard drugs look like when it comes to drugs, but they do know what they’re against. They are against square, middle-class morality, which is why, the minute they arrived in Washington, they got involved in “other drug” issues of gay liberation. For all the President’s boys, Just Say No campaigns derided by George Stephanopoulos as “the revenge of the prudes” are part of the comic opera of an ancient religious war against an alien form of post-modernity. The first group to come to power with growing strong, in tuned and on, they had learned well the narcotic catechism of their youth and had not hesitate to reply to those who expressed alarm about substance abuse: “What about alcohol and nicotine? They are drugs too and you don’t say no to them! You are hypocrites!” In these words, we hear the smug narcissism and adolescent whine of a generation that has never grown up.
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The Horror! The Horror!, continued from page 1

system of higher education in the world. The cream of this outrage is that “Newt Gingrich, a former academic himself, roundly condemns the very system that educated him.” (MEMO TO PROFESSOR GILMAN: Speaker Gingrich is a neurotic who is still thinking about his fifties, was educated by the old system that Gilman and his MLA cronies have systematically destroyed, not by the new system that they sustain; those educated by that old and sadly defunct system actually became educated.)

Gilman’s solution is that “The cream of this outrage is that “Newt Gingrich, a former academic himself, roundly condemns the very system that educated him.” (MEMO TO PROFESSOR GILMAN: Speaker Gingrich is a neurotic who is still thinking about his fifties, was educated by the old system that Gilman and his MLA cronies have systematically destroyed, not by the new system that they sustain; those educated by that old and sadly defunct system actually became educated.)

Gilman’s solution is that “The cream of this outrage is that “Newt Gingrich, a former academic himself, roundly condemns the very system that educated him.” (MEMO TO PROFESSOR GILMAN: Speaker Gingrich is a neurotic who is still thinking about his fifties, was educated by the old system that Gilman and his MLA cronies have systematically destroyed, not by the new system that they sustain; those educated by that old and sadly defunct system actually became educated.)
HETERODYX PAGE 17

Do you remember Erich Honecker or the Stasi? The GDR was certainly run by repellent people. Germany represents the former GDR as having sucked into an eddy, I attempt to rejoin the mainstream. The capitalists of the former West Germany aimed from West to East. This is probably a conception growing stronger in the western part of the country. Frantzen, is “working on a book entitled PMLA” No doubt. A recurring device in Wolff’s rambling article is the question, “where am I headed?” It’s my recurring question when I am reading. But wait a minute. What about all those racially prejudiced comments? That “the private, unregulated pursuit of wealth is an immoral wasteland, is ruled by the “delusion” of equality and the “prejudice” of nationalism. But there are questions on the left that tend to deny the traumatic effect of violence within African American communities.” In case anyone thinks he understands that sentence, Berger quickly disabuses him of the notion: “The political terms I use in this essay—liberal, conserva-
tive, national—can have mobile and fluid meanings that represent jointures of complementary and contradic-
tory discursive traditions.”

Wolff’s article is a continuation of the same discussion about America that Wolff comes to about the present. The Federal Republic of Germany: America, that is “rich in anal puns.” Says Frantzen: “The poem . . .” The medieval poem suggests. . . ,” and “Foucault’s much quoted remark . . .” The medieval poem Cleanthes, it turns out, is “rich in anal puns.” Says Frantzen: “The poem takes unusual risks in describing sodomy while defying common sense, and as such is seen as a response to the risks of posing sexual temptations.” Unprompted by this enticement, I make a brief portage to a different branch of the river, the one constituted by the National Education Association’s “Higher Education Journal” Thought and Action.

Past issues of T & A have argued that male students’ questioning of female teachers in women’s studies courses is a form of sexual harassment; that traditional methods of math-
struction oppress female students; and that multiculturality is the inevitable, utopian future of higher education in the U.S. The American university (a.k.a. Lagado) is still in its infancy. These are so dreary as to defy satire. Under the label of “Teaching and Students,” meanwhile, there are three articles. One of these, by sociologist Faye W. Arnold of California State University, Dominguez Hills, carries the title “Collaborative Student Input in Multicultural Classes.”

Those who have recently spent time “in the bush” or are keenly aware of the “collaborative, cooperative, and interdisciplinary” are hot vocabulary items in contemporary discussions of pedagogy. If any one of them appears in a title, be on guard! When “collaborative” is coupled with “multicultural,” it’s a sure sign that lan-
guage and reason are about to be violated. (MEMO TO BERTONNEAU: It’s a reason thing—you wouldn’t understand.)

Peter A. Dorsey’s “Becoming Other: The Mimesis of Metaphor in Douglass’s My Bondage and My Freedom” argues that Frederick Douglass was just playing with metaphors when he described his ascent from slavery to freedom and from illiteracy to educa-
tion. This consisted of his “textual fashioning of his self.” (I feel like smacking myself on the forehead and saying, “of course. . .”) Dorsey quotes with approval another critic’s suggestion that the most important chapter in the book, “What I now call was “a floating signifier.” The concluding section of Dorsey’s essay bears the subtitle “Authorizing the Political” and deals with Douglass’s political and philosophical thought that abolition was a non-partisan issue. Dorsey does not mention, does not even hint at, the fact that Douglass’s thought about the American republic and the white race was a hybrid of Marx and Husserl. He must have been teaching others to view the republic as an ethnic house a home. Tom Bertonneau is with the Mackinac Center for Public Policy in Michigan.

The dead giveaway in this jambalaya-gone-bad of left-wing clichés is the idea that “study” must be made into “collective property.” Thought, too, become “co-intentional.” The whole of Arnold’s breathing-space muta-
ious innovation is nothing less than the Cliffs’s Notes style of Marxism on which the contempo-
ary left is today exclusively (under) nourished. The neologism “co-intentionality,” for example, makes a hybrid of Marx and Husserl.

But what can all of this “input,” “feed-
back,” “co-intentionality” and the rest mean to Arnold’s captive audience of students, not one of whom, of course, has ever refused to serve on my committee? I suspect that it means to them a golden opportunity to bullshit a professor who is clearly trying to pander to them in the name of some type of spurious moral liberation, and who is therefore open to cynical manipulation. And I am all too fearful that in “continuously tap[ping] students’ feel-
ings of confusion, outrage, etc., Arnold simply creates more of what American higher educa-
tion needs least: Intellectually unfarmed and emotionally immature young people who have been taught the active turmoils are the touchstone of worldly significance. As Leonard Peikoff has written somewhere, subjectivism is the epistemology of savages. Arnold’s formula for the future looks like “diverse learning styles” is the usual contempo-
rary formula for the production of intellectual Apaches.

In her conclusion, Arnold remarks that, everywhere, students are teaching faculty about “alternative student evaluation instruments” and she hopes that “the multicultural lecture/discussion [committee] is viewed as a pragmatic addition to that pile.” What? Is Arnold portraying herself as a “depositor,” and the fund of postmodern pedagogical techniques the “truthful” “alternative student evaluation instruments”? As the redoubtable Phyllis Diller once said apropos of a puppy: It takes a heap to make a house a home. I am deep, deep in the rainforest, far ap-priver, and I’m pretty certain that Mistuh Kurtz—he dead. I realize that I must turn back and rejoin the real world of the natural order. But what, meanwhile, has my hasty expedition taught me?

FINAL MEMO TO THE READER: The American university (a.k.a. Lagado) is still chock full o’ nuts and the regime of nutty rad-
cials remains inertly as if not eternally in place. The human edge is as sharp as ever, the aesthetic response to the neo-Marxist and deconstructive classics that first reared their ugly little heads on American shores twenty years ago. The English professors of the time were just as bad as the sociology professors. Students, who have never learned to write, are so much depersonalized grist for the ideo-
logical mill, recognized, if at all, mainly by their skin-color or ethnicity.

But Hartman’s piece and Gilman’s, from the current PMLA, do suggest one family posi-
tive development. The inhabitants of the tar-
mished tower can no longer shout their ears to the critical clamor from outside. They are, bad-
ly. Unmoral, blaming problems on everyone except those who created them (namely those who have the dawning sense that they no longer possess behavioral carte blanche. The articles in PMLA are as devoid of reason as usual, but they are not particularly noto-
rial or calculatedly obscure as they have been in recent issues. Here, too, I sense a defensive withdrawal.

With the tribes demoralized and their com-
munications in vituperative disarray, who knows— the way might be open to bringing civilization to the hearth.
Smaller Alligator Organs, Lower Human Sperm Counts, and Other Scares

By John Berlau

In the apocalyptic new book Our Stolen Future, Dumanoski, Dumanoski, and John Peterson Myers claim that synthetic chemicals may play a role in problems ranging from infertility to attention deficit disorder to even child abuse. Stamping the book with an imprimatur of political correctness, Vice President Al Gore’s foreword calls it the sequel to Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring and says that the book “forces us to think again.”

But before we follow the book’s recommendations, however, and ban thousands of chemicals that have greatly improved our health and well-being, we should also ask questions about the evidence for the dire claims being put forward. And it might help to keep in mind the track record of the environmental movement, which, for the last three decades, after all, has constantly warned that one chemical after another—from fluoride in water to Alar on apples—is causing cancer. Yet the National Academy of Sciences recently issued a report that concluded that the levels of pesticides humans consume in food pose little risk for cancer, and that synthetic pesticides are greatly outnumbered by natural pesticides plants make themselves. But just as cancer claims are being refuted, synthetic chemicals have become the culprits in a new scare. Not surprisingly, the publicity for Our Stolen Future is being handled in part by Fenton Communications, the same public relations firm that masteredmind the Alar scare of 1989. Now, women who want to have children are being told that if they bite into an apple sprayed with pesticides, they may be reducing the sperm counts of their future sons or causing their future daughters to be unable to conceive. Eventually, the book’s authors say, sterility could reach epidemic proportions.

The authors seem almost disappointed that so many synthetic chemicals have been found not to increase cancer rates and seem determined to find that chemicals must be causing some other problem. The book describes the reaction of one of the authors, World Wildlife Foundation zoologist Theo Colborn, when she actually found lower cancer rates among populations exposed to chemicals from the Great Lakes than in the rest of the country. “After months of chasing the specter of cancer,” the author writes in the third person, “she [Colborn] found herself at a dead end. Faced with this major setback, she turned her mind again to the wildlife literature and tried to think clearly where she should go next.”

Stating that “we must move beyond the cancer paradigm,” Dr. Colborn, along with co-authors John Peterson Myers, director of the Jones Foundation, and journalist Diane Dumanoski, advances the “environmental estrogen” hypothesis. The authors claim that synthetic chemicals that mimic the sex hormone estrogen may cause reproductive disorders as well as intelligence problems by disrupting the endocrine systems of fetuses in the womb and breast-fed newborns who are exposed to the chemicals stored in their mothers’ body fat.

Skakkebak brought the issue to the forefront in 1992 with his study in the British Medical Journal (BMJ) that concluded that sperm counts across the world declined by almost 50% from 1940 to 1990. Dr. Skakkebak later attracted much media attention by suggesting in The Lancet that sperm counts dropped by 60% worldwide. But alligator penises don’t quite fit the picture of the dire claims being made.

FIG. 56 MALE ORGAN OF ALLIGATOR LUCIUS, XI.

From Bromn, after Rathke.

By John Berlau

a, the right crus penis; b, the mucous membrane of the cloaca that covers the organ; c, shaft of the penis; d, base of the bladder; e, point of the bladder; f, part of the ring muscle of the cloaca.

But like the cancer claims, the assertions about estrogens rest on shaky evidence and great exaggeration of risk. To partly make their case, the authors point to animal studies and isolated wildlife incidents such as the reduced sizes of alligator penises in a Florida lake where a pesticide spill occurred. But alligator penises don’t quite make the case. In a quest for bigger game, the authors go after Homo sapiens itself. What they call the “most dramatic and troubling sign that hormone disrupters may have already taken a major toll” is the “the study purporting to show a 50% global decline in sperm counts in human males.” This study, like many of the environmental movement’s other scare stories has become fertile ground for criticism of its dramatic and troubling flaws.

Skakkebak’s study was published in 1992 in the same issue of The Lancet that his work was featured. The Lancet is hardly a reliable source for analyzing the effects of synthetic chemicals. But alligator penises don’t quite fit the picture of the dire claims being made.

A glimpse at some recent headlines and articles, however, would still give a reader the impression that the sperm count decline was beyond dispute. Stories about Our Stolen Future that appeared in The New Yorker, Esquire, and Time were entitled, respectively, “Silent Sperm,” “Downward Motility,” and “What’s Wrong with Our Sperm?” Articles in Business Week and U.S. News & World Report didn’t even mention that there is criticism of the sperm count study.

(A notable exception to the prevailing media coverage was a pair of articles by Gina Kolata in the March 19 New York Times that showed that there is no scientific consensus on either the sperm count decline or the environmental estrogen hypothesis. To reward her balanced work, Kolata was immediately attacked in Rachel’s Environment & Health Weekly Newsletter, which asked, “Who in the chemical industry ‘got’ to Ms. Kolata and how did they do it?” So shocked were the flacks at the Environmental Information Center, one of the groups promoting the book, that a reporter would question the claims in their press releases that they took out a quarter-page ad in the Times chastising Kolata for citing “academics whose views are being promoted by industry.”)

A study published this summer, however,
struck a major blow to Skakkebaek's finding of a global decrease in sperm counts, and the media has even given this study some attention. In the May issue of Fertility and Sterility, a study of three U.S. cities by Dr. Harry Fisch of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons found that over the past 25 years, sperm counts have not declined in Los Angeles and have significantly increased in New York and Minneapolis. Another study published in the same issue found that sperm counts have also not declined in Seattle. Both of these studies avoided the biases of previous sperm count research by using standardized sperm counting techniques to analyze men of the same age range whose abstinence had been recorded.

But perhaps more important than its finding that there was no drop in sperm counts in the U.S. is that Fisch's study casts more doubt on Skakkebaek's finding of a worldwide decline by highlighting huge differences in sperm counts among geographic regions. Researchers have begun to notice that Skakkebaek based his conclusion on a sample of studies that included two different populations of men in different time periods, ignoring the possibility that the difference in sperm counts could be due simply to geographic variations. For the first three decades the study covered—1940 to 1970—Skakkebaek surveyed only 13 studies and all but two were conducted in the United States. In addition, more than half the men studied in this time period came from the New York City area. He then mixed in 48 studies conducted after 1970 from all over the globe.

“By drawing a line through New York studies and then down through a lot of Western European and Third World countries, you’re getting a downward regression, but you’re also seeing a very different population of patients because of geographic selection,” says Dr. Larry Lipshultz, a urologist at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston who recently chaired an international panel on male fertility.

Fisch found in his study that sperm counts in New York are, for unknown reasons, almost 50% higher than those of men in Los Angeles. Because sperm counts vary so greatly among regions, Skakkebaek’s finding of a 50% drop may not represent a decline at all but simply a difference among the geographic areas that Skakkebaek looked at. “I thought there was a decline. Now I think differently because of the data we’ve collected in the U.S. and because of the geographic variations not accounted for in other studies,” Fisch said in an interview. Baylor’s Lipshultz says that if the early data from New York are removed from Skakkebaek’s study, the remaining data show sperm counts remaining constant for 50 years.

Our Stolen Future fails to make its case about synthetic chemical use causing infertility and other problems the authors associate with hormone disruption. Man-made chemicals are only a fraction of the estrogens humans are exposed to. Just as plants produce far more carcinogenic substances than industry does, they also have a great lead in the manufacture of estrogenic chemicals. According to Texas A&M toxicologist Stephen Safe, humans receive 40 million times as much estrogen exposure in their diets from natural chemicals in plants as they do from man-made chemicals. A new study by Jonathan Tolman of the Competitive Enterprise Institute points out that some estrogens in plants are 1000 times as potent as DDT and other synthetic chemicals. Many of these plant estrogens, such as the soy ingredient genistin, have been found to impair fertility and cause reproductive disorders in mice. Since the human race has survived what Tolman calls “Nature’s Hormone Factory” for thousands of years, he writes, “the concern over human exposure to synthetic estrogen-mimicking compounds may be somewhat overstated.”

It is not an overstatement, however, to point out the real risks of a ban or sharp curtailment of synthetic chemicals to avoid their unproven risks. If Greenpeace gets its wish and municipalities stop disinfecting drinking water with chlorine, thousands may die of waterborne diseases such as the cholera that killed 3,500 in Peru after chlorination was stopped. Phasing out pesticides would double or triple the price of fruits and vegetables, some of the most effective agents against cancer. If we forgo the benefits of modern technology because of doomsaying claims, and predictions based on faulty evidence, then our future really will be stolen.

Mr. Berlau is a policy analyst at Consumer Alert, a Washington-based, free-market consumer group.
Symphony Violinist in Fight to Regain Job

By Judith Schumann Weizner

Scott Profumo, Principal Violinist of the Newark Philharmonia, has filed suit to regain his job after being fired last week. In papers filed today in State Supreme Court, Mr. Profumo claims that he has been illegally discriminated against by management on the basis of his personal habits and that he is the victim of a conspiracy by several members of the viola section to drive him out of the orchestra.

Newark Philharmonia Personnel Manager Gerald Geruch told reporters that he personally regrets the firing which occurred only after strenuous efforts on behalf of management to avoid imposing the ultimate penalty on Mr. Profumo.

Mr. Profumo joined the orchestra in 1981, the year of its founding, when he was hired to play in the violin section. Last year, when the principal violinist retired, he auditioned for the chair and won it. Shortly after his accession to that position, he was approached by Mr. Geruch, who informed him that one of his colleagues had complained that his breath smelled like cigar smoke. Mr. Profumo admitted that he liked to smoke a cigar now and then, especially if it was an unusually good one, and he agreed not to smoke before coming to work. The complaints persisted, however, due to the scent of cigar smoke that clung to his clothes. Not willing to incur the ill will of his colleagues over such a trivial matter, he hired a contractor to install air-tight seals on all his closet doors and had his entire wardrobe cleaned.

The complaints ceased for several months until Jessica Duft, the Assistant Principal Violinist, who occupies the chair next to Profumo and shares air-tight seals on all his closet doors and had his entire wardrobe cleaned. However, when several audience members complained about her appearance, Mr. Geruch told her she’d have to take off the mask and move to the back of the violin section where she could sit by herself. Ms. Duft balked, explaining that giving up her titled position, even temporarily, would not be acceptable, especially as the cause of her having to wear the mask was covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act. She threatened to go to the law if the management forced her to relinquish her chair. Due to the compelling nature of her remarks Mr. Profumo was ordered to the back of the section and Ms. Duft allowed to occupy the Principal Chair pending resolution of the problem.

With the assurance that his bonus as Principal Violinist would not be compromised, he moved, but three days later another violinist was placed on disability, having fallen under a city bus, and Mr. Profumo had to be moved up. Within a week, his new partner was complaining of severe headaches that abated only when she was not at work. Suspecting a workplace-related ailment, she asked the management to determine whether her new music-stand partner wore a deodorant. Mr. Profumo admitted that he did. Delighted to have found the probable cause of the player’s headaches so easily, Mr. Geruch ordered Mr. Profumo to cease wearing a deodorant.

Now quite certain that that last vestige of offensive scent was gone and that he would no longer be the chemical cause of Ms. Duft’s shortness of breath, Mr. Profumo asked to return to first stand and resume his duties as Principal Violinist. His request was granted.

For several weeks it seemed that everyone was satisfied, but then Ms. Duft once again began complaining of nausea and soon her complaints were echoed by several colleagues and some members of the audience who sat in the front rows. Fearful of alienating any potential contributors, the management called the EPA and the auditorium was sealed so that extensive air samples could be taken. To head off the possibility that it would have to cancel the rest of the season and refund patrons’ receipts, the management scrambled to find an alternate venue. Fortunately, a nearby private school agreed to allow the orchestra to use its large auditorium to complete its season.

After three days in the new hall, however, players and audience alike began complaining of a stifling, disgusting odor. The EPA was summoned once again, the school was closed, the auditorium sealed.

While the management frantically tried to locate another site, the preliminary results of the tests on Orchestra Hall came back, indicating a problem in the backstage area by the dressing rooms that seemed to originate in Mr. Profumo’s locker. Mr. Profumo was asked to submit his tuxedo for testing. After receiving a guarantee that the management would pay for rental of a replacement tux while the tests were being conducted, he surrendered his jacket.

The orchestra was once more homeless while the EPA conducted tests in the school auditorium, and the management grappled with the likely consequences of refunding its box office receipts for the balance of the season. During this time, a stage-hand observed that the odor on stage at Orchestra Hall had disappeared and that the smell in the back stage area seemed to be dissipating. Once his observations had been confirmed, the EPA granted a Certificate of Provisional Re-Occupancy, enabling the season to resume in the school hall.

Life in the Newark Philharmonia returned to something remarkably like the old days, but after a few weeks, players began to notice that the heavy odor was returning, albeit not yet with its former ferocity. The EPA was summoned again, but before the hall could be sealed once again, the results on the test on Mr. Profumo’s tuxedo jacket came back. They pointed conclusively to his failure to wear deodorant. Citing Mr. Profumo’s olfactory unacceptability either with or without a deodorant, Mr. Geruch dismissed him as the vampire of left-wing ideology.

Legal experts familiar with Mr. Profumo’s complaint say that he faces an uphill battle to regain his job because of the wording of the dismissal notice, which charges him with “inability to conform to accepted olfactory ensemble standards.” Refusal or inability to meet accepted ensemble standards is grounds for dismissal from a symphony orchestra.

Several legal experts expect the Newark Philharmonia to counter-sue Mr. Profumo, seeking to recover from him the cost of renting the school gymnasium as well as the costs of the sophisticated air quality tests.

The case is expected to attract a widespread audience when it is televised next month on Justice TV.