I n the climactic scene of the movie 2001: A Space Odyssey, the astronaut-hero dis- assembles the computer that has been trying to kill him. At first the computer makes logical arguments against its disassembly, but then, as more circuit boards are removed, it revert s to the most basic sort of babbling. It finally ends up singing “A Bicycle Built for Two.”

I got that same feeling when I interviewed a representative for the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force on the subject of NAMBLA, the North American Man-Boy Love Association. At first, the woman, who identified herself as Robin Kane, was quite friendly. Representatives of gay groups seem to assume that all journalists are sympathetic. It was only when I went from the general subject of age-of-consent laws to the specific subject of NAMBLA that Ms. Kane began to suspect I might be deviating from that canon of modern journalism that states that gays cannot err when speaking on matters of faith and morals. Her voice took on a chill.

“None,” said the Barnes and Noble employee. “We don’t support the organizational goals of NAMBLA,” she said, “We don’t deal with age-of-consent laws, period.” Then, like the dying computer, Ms. Kane began to revert to her basic programming: “We believe that people should not be denied their civil rights because of the sexual orientation with which they are born.”

NAMBLA makes that exact same argument,” I pointed out helpfully. “They say pedophiles are born with their sexual orientation. Why should they be deprived of their civil rights?”

“I think I’m going to get off the phone now,” said Ms. Kane.

This is what I dislike most about militant gays. They pose as the wildest, most avant-garde intellectuals you’ve ever seen, but the minute you ask them a tough question they show all the flexibility of a Muslim fundamentalist. Give me a nice, honest pederast any day. They’ll speak on any subject, entertain any question, and give you a well-reasoned, but probably totally hokey, answer.

**The Most Controversial Professor in America**

**STEVEN GOLDBERG, ICONOCLAST**

By William Helmreich

Two weeks earlier, Steven Goldberg had stopped by the Barnes and Noble bookstore in New York and had seen a number of copies of the new edition of his book Why Men Rule on the shelves. Now he had dropped in again and found an empty space where the copies had been. Another author would have had the warm feeling brought on by thoughts of a future royalty check. Goldberg, however, has had 25 years of experience that tell him what he would hear when he asked how many copies of his book had been sold.

“None,” said the Barnes and Noble manager, perplexed at the disappearance of Why Men Rule (which was published originally as The Ineffectivity of Patriarchy.) Goldberg, who is chairman of the sociology department at City College, CUNY (formerly, CCNY), was perplexed, surprised, or even particularly annoyed. He knew that copies of his book had been dispersed around the city and elsewhere in sections such as Tasmanian ethnology, reshelved with jackets out of sight, and otherwise hidden. For nearly a decade his work was listed in The Guinness Book of World Records as “the most rejected book ultimately published” (sixty-nine rejections before acceptance), and it is fair to say that today, with the growing power of radical feminism, the book, which talks in antiseptic and scholarly terms about issues of male dominance, is the most hated sociological work in America. Why Men Rule has also been called "the most important work on sex differences in decades" by Murray Rothbard, a "classic" by some of America’s and England’s leading social theorists, and "persuasive and accurate" by Margaret Mead (an especially important endorsement, given Mead’s own autobiography). This response has, of course, only energized the efforts of those who dislike what they think Goldberg says to do his best to make sure nobody reads his work.

A heavyset man with a quick smile who has been called a “typical New Yorker,” perhaps because his words come so rapidly in an attempt to keep up with his thoughts, Goldberg appears to count himself richly blessed to be the number of enemies he has and is willing to take on all corners in debate. Filled with amusing stories of the obloquy directed at him, he tells of a major figure in a leading sociological association who continually harassed an editor who was planning to devote an edition of her journal to Goldberg’s work. (To the editor’s credit, she refused to be intimidated.) He has frequently had to lecture over the shouts of audience members trying to drown him out, and he has had an astonishing number of accepted articles ultimately “unaccepted” by embarrassed editors who claim, obviously... Please turn to page 12
I read with interest your lead article, "The Conscience of a Gay Conservative." Notwithstanding the wild mischaracterizations of "liberals" and "leftists" that are typical of political nattering, the author quite effectively puts the lie to claims that homosexuality is by itself a condition of disrepute that warrants condemnation and punitive statutory sanction.

My broader disagreements with the anonymous writer aside, as a genuine liberal I am delighted with the existence of Log Cabin Republicans, just as I am with the presence of black conservatives. These people represent a manifestation of Martin Luther King's dream: that they be judged by their philosophical character and not by the color of their skins or their sexual identity. I may argue strenuously with them about many things, but I do not hold irrelevant factors against them.

I am obliged, however, to point out that it is political conservatives who remain at odds with your writer's goal of equality under the law. You can bash ACT-UP all you want, but the truth is that Republicans across the spectrum and conservative Dixiecrats like Sam Nunn are the ones who have persevered in maintaining antagonism against homosexuals. If Bob Dole is such a proud supporter of this unidentified individual, why is he a foremost advocate of statutory discrimination against homosexual persons? It isn't liberals who need to be convinced that homosexuality is irrelevant to a person's character.

If Republicans adopted the goal of dealing with homosexual persons on the terms exposed by your writer, ACT-UP would have no further reason to exist. More to the point, ACT-UP has no legislative authority.

Bob Dole does. If Republicans represent the ideological view your author prefers, why don't his so-called friends quit promoting unwarranted prejudicial practice?

Brian Zick Los Angeles, CA
REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM

THE EMPIRE STRIKES BACK: Dissonant feminist Christina Hoff Sommers, whose book "Who Stole Feminism?" has raised the hackles of the radical sisterhood, appeared on Connie Chung's "Eye to Eye" last month and found herself once again the object of disinformation and dirty tricks. Gloria Steinem, Naomi Wolf, and other members of the feminist nomenklatura refused to show up on the show with Sommers. Steinem piously claimed that Sommers was wrong in charging that radical feminists had propagated false and misleading statistics about women's victimhood, although Steinem herself had removed the claim about bulimia from the second printing of her own book, presumably as a result of Sommers' exposure of the statistic as an absurdity.) Not satisfied merely to boycott the show, feminists also lobbed intensified efforts to kill the program before it was aired, engaging in a concerted action of character assassination that astounded CBS correspondent Bernard Goldberg, who interviewed Sommers for the show, and others involved in the production of "Eye to Eye." The attack was so obviously concerted and so vitriolic that one producer involved in the program commented sub voce, "Well, maybe they are feminists!"

GUN PEOPLE: In the debate over gun control, one cannon goes largely unchallenged: that people who buy guns for self-defense are inefficient and quixotic individuals who are often victimized by their own purchases. According to data gathered by Florida State University sociologist Gary Kleck, however, armed citizens defend their lives or property about 1 million times a year. In 98 percent of these cases, the citizen merely brandishes his weapon or, at most, fires a warning shot. But armed citizens do kill 2,000 to 3,000 criminals each year. Cost effectiveness is hardly mentioned in the gun-control debate, but this figure is roughly three times the number of criminals killed by the police a year.

REPARATIONS: According to the Internal Revenue Service, more than 1,000 African Americans nationwide have filed amended federal tax returns claiming some $43,209 per household and encouraged businesses for social programs, and a significant decrease in the black infant mortality rate. Ajabu claims that violence will "escalate and escalate" right after the holidays if the BPM ultimatum is not met. Does this mean that Kwanza is being called off this year?

HOLIDAYS FOR HOLLIGANS: Britain is in an uproar over a government program that critics are calling "Crooks' Tours." Apparently, hard-core juvenile criminals are being sent abroad with social workers, at taxpayers' expense, for rehabilitation in the form of such adventures as a boat ride on the Nile, swimming with the dolphins off Ireland, skiing in the Pyrenees, hiking in Portugal, and bungee-jumping in Australia. Home Secretary Michael Howard has denounced the bureaucrats who conceived the program as "having more money than sense." Perhaps they didn't know about midnight basketball leagues.

FIRST AIDS AND NOW ROCK: Jim Ladd, the Los Angeles disk jockey and host of the nationally syndicated rock show "Handful whose pioneering role in FM rock will be the subject of a movie, slipped to seventh place in his time slot in the latest Arbitron ratings. Ladd blames his decline on "who else"—Ronald Reagan. "Reagan deregulated radio and turned KMET from the voice of the rock culture," Ladd told the Los Angeles Daily News. "Radio became just another bank bond to be bought and sold by people who couldn't care less about what it stood for or what it represented to people."

NAME: When students at Piscataway High School lined up to receive their diplomas at graduation earlier this year, school officials prohibited them from standing in alphabetical order selected by computer because of the large numbers of Asian-Indian students at the school with the last name "Patel." In past years, administrators claimed, the audience after graduate with the same surname was called to the stage. "As he got up, some people would yell "Patel" in past years, administrators claimed, the audience after graduate with the same surname was called to the stage. "As he got up, some people would yell "Patel"..."
Coast Panthers. It makes it clear that it doesn’t matter that I spoke of the major till which developed between the East Coast branches and the Oakland headquarters over the West Coast’s mismanagement of money, or the fascist tactics used by West Coast Panthers led in charge of the Party while Huey Newton was in jail from 1967 to 1970 (or tactics that eventually would pale to those used by Huey himself after he emerged from prison). Neither does it matter to you that I made it quite clear there were well-meaning members of the party who tried to do good for the black community. He is angry because I provide anything negative at all in the party and did not contact him for his take on the era.

This guy’s attitude demonstrates why it is so difficult to write an objective history of any aspect of life in black America. There is an anti-intellectual strain running rampant through the black community. It is composed of those who believe that stepping back and becoming at aspects of black America—the bad as well as the good—is treasonous. Such people truly believe that the worst blight on human history is what white America did to blacks. Most of them haven’t read a single book about the history of the rest of the world that would indicate, for instance, mat Jews and other so-called white ethnic groups have suffered such atrocities at the hands of others deemed white by groups such as the Panthers, atrocities every bit as horrible and in some cases worse than what black Americans have suffered. These narrow-minded addicts of black history promote romantic visions of black Africa, ignoring the history of internecine rivalries that caused most of the slaves taken from the continent to be captured and sold to Europeans by other black Africans. They blame what’s happening today in Rounda on colonial history as though Huns are so mindless that they cannot themselves be held accountable for brutally pulling the trigger on and applying machetes to Tutus, “The legacy left by the French make them do it,” state black romantics who insist on turning all of black history into fairy tales of glorious kings and queens who lived blissful lives until the white man arrived on their territory.

The roundabout manner in which such attitudes insult the intelligence and potential of all black people is lost on those like my “questioner” and so many voices in the media who observe blacks. Before I interrupt him telling him to save his speech for whenever he wants to make it public, I remind him that I had explained to him what my book, The Shadow of the Panther, is not meant to be a comprehensive history of the entire Party. It is designed to tell of how the stage was set to establish the Party’s legitimacy, when and how it was founded, what happened to select rank and file members within the party, how the Panthers turned into gang of thugs, and what happened to the Founder of the Party to his death one early morning in August 1969.

I ask the audience rhetorically, why am I being taken to task for not doing what this academic, one of those nostalgic artists who calls himself a sixty-his-historian, wishes I had done? I’ll leave it to people such as him to write the kind of book he is interested in writing. (In a desperate attempt to discredit my book, young Kazin also took me to task for being off a page number or two in two books I cited in 52 pages of footnotes!) My initial interest in the subject dates back to childhood and the fact that my birth name is Huey. I wasn’t named after Newton, as the editor of Addison-Wesley responsible for giving me to the book initially thought. I was named after my father at my birth ten years before Huey Newton became a god of the left. Actually, I always hated the name Huey and for many years I felt an undercurrent of anger and resent-ment towards my father, who was a physician, both for giving me a name I was constantly picked on about (other children constantly compared me to the cartoon duck, Baby Huey) and for raising me and my two sisters in a black neighborhood where the other kids teased us because their fathers worked in factories. The kids, encouraged by their parents, were convinced we thought we were better than them. It was all part of the built-in nihilism which keeps so many black people from achieving anything constructive. Such thinking holds that anyone black who achieves something out of the ordinary has separated himself from other blacks and allowed himself to become “less black.”

The Black Power/Black Panther era which caught on in the late 1960s reinforced these ideas and taught that true blacks—“the brothers on the block”—are those at the bottom. Anyone not at the bottom or who doesn’t use their talents to take care of those at the bottom is trying to act white or bourgeois. Such 60’s thinking holds that individualism is wrong, capitalist rather than socialist by its very nature. It taught that blacks have been wronged and atonement for the wrongs committed against us can only be collective in nature. (A distinction must be drawn between the cultural nationalists of the era who taught outright hatred of whites, and the Black Panthers who didn’t teach hatred of whites, but taught hatred of capitalism and those whites who upheld it.) Such “pro-masses” thinking seemed very chic back in the 60s and, for some, still does now. But it is rooted not only in trendy Marxism, but also in the way the
slaves were taught to accept their lot. Any slave who didn't accept it was a danger to the system. And even though many slaves were not convinced of their inferiority, most were conditioned to always feel connected to even the worst-off slave. Thus any gains achieved that raised your lot even a little bit, was shared with the rest. Hold on to nothing (was the motto), including any individual ambitions. And one final aspect of this mindset endemic to so much of black America has to do with excusing failure. Any black who advances his or herself goes on to ape to the notion that you can't improve yourself because you are a victim of a racist society. Such achievers must be summarily dealt with, brought back to the bottom with the rest of the blacks, where we all “belong.”

While growing up in Fort Wayne, Indiana, I experienced all these aspects of a mindset which works to keep African Americans in a kind of bondage. I myself bought into it for a while, feeling somewhat guilty and “less black” because my father had raised himself up to the position of a professional. In 1968, Huey Newton was the first Huey I was exposed to who was looked up to by masses of blacks at the bottom. So at the age of 11 I read everything about him and his Black Panther Party for Self-Defense I could get my hands on. My reading of the situation, beginning in 1966 when Black Power was first advanced philosophically by members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), taught me that doing my school work was acting white. So I got bad grades from the 3rd to the 6th grade. The first thing that saved me from permanent scholastic failure was potential embarrassment at entering the junior high school the following year at the bottom of the tracking system.

But even as my grades improved, I kept reading positive things about Huey Newton and the Black Panthers up to 1973 when they began to fade out of the national limelight. I forgot all about the Party until August 1989. In the intervening years I had academic success at my predominantly white high school thanks largely to writer David Halberstam’s book, The Best and the Brightest. The book, which was about how the U.S. became involved in Vietnam, absorbed me primarily because most of the key characters, except for Lyndon Johnson, attended elite universities. Halberstam’s stress on the personalities involved in the making of history convinced me that in order to achieve, a person needed to go to such a school. I set my sights on Brown University which I attended from 1973 to 1979, graduating with a bachelor’s degree in Biomedical Ethics.

I attended medical school at my father’s alma mater—predominantly black Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee. I grew less and less interested in my subject—predominantly black Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee. I grew less and less interested in my subject. It was Robert C. Maynard, publisher of the Oakland Tribune, inviting me to join his staff when he could open the appropriate position. That same month Huey Newton was shot and killed. It shocked me to learn that Newton’s death was drug-related. In November, with nothing more than Maynard’s invitation (which never materialized into a definite job offer, due to the Tribune’s poor financial health), I headed west. I was determined both to secure a full-time writing position in the San Francisco Bay Area and to find out what led to my childhood hero’s ignoble end.

Within months of moving to San Francisco I became an associate editor at San Francisco-based Pacific News Service. The Newton story continued to fascinate me and I began to research a book. Then in March 1992 I signed a contract with Addison-Wesley Publishing Company for a work on the fate of the Black Panthers Party. I heard about an organization party veteran David Hilliard—once Newton’s Field Marshall—and others including Bobby Seale and I talked about starting to be called the People’s Organized Response (POR) which would “help people at the bottom.” For a variety of reasons, not the least of which involved tremendous factionalism between former Black Panthers, POR never got off the ground, but the story I filed about it implied that it would become a reality. This piece referred to the old Black Panther Party in the standard leftist terms and pointed to the federal government’s counterintelligence programs as being solely responsible for destroying the party.

Two years later, however, after abandoning my deep research into the Party, something strange began to happen. Despite the leftist credentials I had established, which former Panthers like Landon Williams cited as the reason he talked to me, at least half the people I contacted, including David Hilliard, refused to say anything about the party. Many of the veterans asked me for money as a condition for an interview. Others cited the belief that no one who hadn’t been in the party had any business writing about it. In other words, an objective disinterested analysis of the party was out of the question.

Over and over again I was told by veterans that they were writing their own books. After I called her to see if she’d agree to an interview, one key female veteran started the process of trying to get a contract to publish her memoirs. Another said she would only talk if I agreed to have my contract rewritten to include her and a black female journalist she had been working with. A close personal friend of Huey’s agreed to cooperate when I met with him at the home of Huey’s brother Melvin. Melvin Newton himself told me he only agreed to meet with me because I was associated with Pacific News Service. Huey’s close personal friend had been under the impression that I had yet to obtain a book contract. When I traveled to Washington D.C. to meet with him and informed him that I actually already had the contract in hand, he refused to cooperate.

Despite all of this, there were key Panthers like Landon Williams who did agree to interviews. In addition, my archival research was going quite well at UC Berkeley’s Bancroft library, the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. and the library at the San Francisco Chronicle. But all, I felt that something was wrong. I was turning up far too much negative information. As I kept finding things that disproved all the good supposedly done by the Party, I looked for something that would restore the organization in my eyes. That something I decided was the Black Panther free school in East Oakland known as the Oakland Community Learning Center. I was convinced, that when all was said about Black Panther fratricide, drug use, infiltration by the government, etc. the one aspect of the party’s operations that could have worked up to this very day as a key element of the “survival program” was the school, although the institution had been closed in 1982 when Huey Newton embezzled money-from it and got caught in the act.

I decided I had to tell what the teachers had done, what the young graduates of the school were doing today to leave my readers with the impression that something good was salvageable from the Black Panther legacy. But the leads I was given to anyone who taught in the school, or administered it, ended up nowhere. Everyone having anything to do with the school refused to talk about it, including Erica Huggins, a past principal. In December 1992, I came close to getting someone who worked there to go into detail about it. But after a deal I was trying to work out with Panther veteran Flores Forbes fell through, this person refused to talk to me.

So with my deadline approaching and my patience with Party veterans worn thin, on New Years day 1993 I sat down and began to write. Other than eating and sleeping, I didn’t do anything but write that manuscript until I was finished. When published, it got good reviews pretty much everywhere and made the front page of the New York Times Book Review. This was a good review too, except a peculiar one that tells something about the hold the mythology of the 60s continues to have on its true believers.

The reviewer selected by the Times was Robert Blauner, a professor of Sociology at UC Berkeley. He praised my book for going to the heart of the matter about the evil in the Panthers, but he could not keep a tone of outraged romanticism out of his review, particularly when it came to black thuggery. At one point he wrote, “[Pearen] too easily divides black men into solid criminals capable of principled politics and less respectable types who remain criminals even after they achieve revolutionary consciousness. He fails to appreciate how easy it was—and...
Here is our problem—and his—in a nutshell. I've been black now for almost 37 years, attended school with a variety of fellow blacks, and know quite a bit about black history. I know for a fact that it is not necessary for blacks to become criminals to prosper. It is precisely Blauner's patronizing romanticism that allowed the Panthers to get away with murder and allows black criminality to flourish today. Although perhaps unconsciously, Blauner expresses perfectly the viewpoint of the fellow traveling radical of the '60s. Acknowledging that he was part of the "Free Huey" movement after Newton killed police officer John Frey, Blauner says that despite the fact that my book shows how several people were murdered by the Panthers while others were sexually abused and beaten within an inch of their lives, he does "not regret his involvement" although he now wishes his support had been "more critical." That says it all.

The reviews in the Bay Area were not as good as they were elsewhere in the country, and I wasn't surprised. While writing in San Francisco I had made plenty of enemies in the media community because I refused to be politically correct. I riled them in particular during the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill fiasco when in my first column for the San Francisco Weekly, I asked why Hill is the author of The Shadow of the Panther, which traces the crackup of one of the most graciose and dangerous of black delusions, the Black Panther Party "the quintessential intersection of all the racial strains we are perhaps the most quintessentially American of all. Yet we stand on the outside—not only because so many people refuse to see us anywhere else, but also because so many of us refuse to move forward. Too many African-Americans are running in place waiting for some external force to provide salvation. Perhaps The Shadow of the Panther, which traces the breakup of the most gradiose and dangerous of black delusions, sheds some light on how and why we reached such a situation.

For our sake, I hope so.

Hugh Pearson is the author of The Shadow of the Panther.
Clinton's Dr. Demento
By Cameron Humphries

I
n mid-summer, the country was stunned by images of Kevin Elders, 28, son of Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders, being escorted from a Little Rock courthouse after having been convicted of selling cocaine to a police informant. The usually outspoken surgeon general defended her son by claiming that his offense was minor (though still a felony) and, in any case, that Kevin had been entrapped by her own political opponents. But as Elders critics were murmuring that this physician ought to heal herself, Little Rock police discovered the body of the informant, Calvin R. Walraven, 24, dead from a shotgun blast to the head. Police ruled it a suicide and immediately closed the case.

Suicide or retribution? Walraven's death is consistent with what has become the public perception of "Little Rock Justice": swift, often violent, sometimes lethal, and almost always murky and ambiguous. Of course, while the conspiracy theorists have already associated the informant's death with either Kevin's thuggish friends or the powerful politicians who brokered the president's rise to power, both the police and the mainstream media have ignored the Walraven case totally. Even when Kevin Elders made news again in late August by being sentenced to 10 years in prison for a drug offense, the press, which reported his mother's "stunned" reaction in the courtroom, did not mention the fate of Calvin Walraven.

That the bizarre death of a man whose testimony almost single-handedly convicted the surgeon general's son received no scrutiny is consistent with the kid-gloves treatment that the media have generally adopted toward Joycelyn Elders. An uncritical, sometimes giddy, "look-what-she-said-now" approach, mixed with a sort of awe for what is sometimes interpreted as plain speaking, characterizes the way Elders' often belligerent statements about gays, sex, unwed mothers, and Catholics have been characterized. And though Elders' brash style has branded her Clinton's loose cannon, it could be argued that she is actually the vanguard of the current administration's assault on middle American values.

The surgeon general's pronouncements on religion are a case in point. It is clear now that a key element of Clinton's reelection strategy is to portray his Republican opponents in the grip of an "infectious fanaticism" of the so-called Religious Right. Point man in the 1994 election cycle, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee chair Vic Fazio described religious groups as "the fire-breathing Christian Radical Right." Trying to explain a recent congressional seat loss, Clinton blamed "fanatics" embodied by a message of "hate and fear.

But Elders has been far out ahead of anyone else in the administration on this issue. Addressing the Lesbian and Gay Health Conference as its keynote speaker in late June, Elders blamed the spread of the AIDS epidemic not on the sexual practices of the conference's attendees, but on the "un-Christian religious Right," which she charges "provide them [drug-abusing prostitutes] Norplant, so they could still use sex if they must to buy their drugs."

This would be the last of the so-called "Joycelyn eruptions" until the bumbling and largely incoherent statement at the National Press Club last December in which she suggested that drug legalization might have a salubrious effect on the nation's crime epidemic. Emboldened by the controversy that comment provoked, the surgeon general granted a series of interviews on a variety of social issues, most of which were only tangential to the nation's health. In January, she told the New York Times Magazine, "We really need to get over this love affair with the fetus and start worrying about children." Two months later in an interview with The Advocate, a magazine for homosexuals, she said that Americans need "sex is a normal and healthy part of our being, whether it is homosexual or heterosexual." She further endorsed homosexual adoptions, called the Boy Scouts' proscription against active and acknowledged homosexuals "unfair," and once again chided the religious. "I think the religious right at times thinks that the only reason for sex is procreation." And finally she shed additional light on her drug-legalization policy in a USA Weekend interview: "When we say legalize, I'm really talking about control. That we'd have doctors or clinics set up where addicts can get their drugs free, or pay $1." But it is Elders remarks about the Roman Catholic church and Christianity in general that have posed questions about the religious bigotry beginning to emerge from the Clinton administration's closet. The surgeon general's advocacy of abortion and birth control naturally pits her against the Church, but it doesn't explain the venomous nature of her attacks. "We attempted to eradicate a whole race of people," the Holocaust," Elders said before a gathering of the Arkansas Coalition for Choice, "and the Church was silent....The first 400 years black people had their freedom and the Church said nothing. Look at who's fighting the pro-choice movement: a celibate, male-dominated Church.

As a teacher, Elders referred to people who oppose abortion as "non-Christians with slave-master mentalities." She also has dismissed pro-lifers as people who "love little babies so long as they are in someone else's uterus." Elders' assault on religion has been compounded by her own zealotry in condemning those who disagree with her. She cannot simply regard her opponents as taking another position. She must attack them as self-serving and hypocritical; they must be seen as immoral. This extremism is not a characteristic most people expect from the surgeon general, a figure theoretically committed to healing the nation's wounds. But Elders has worked tirelessly not to be the kind of doctor most people associate with the position. And in this effort, at least, she has succeeded.

Little Rock Justice: Kevin Elders, pictured here, was arrested and convicted on drug charges. The chief witness against him was killed with a shotgun blast to the head. Local police ruled it a suicide and the national media followed their cue.

F.C. Everett Koop injected the surgeon general's office into politics, Joycelyn Elders has made it into a cockpit of partisanship. Her views are so extreme that unless Clinton and the Democratic Party renounce their chief doctor and her anti-clerical opinions, she will have to be seen as speaking for them as well. Christians—particularly Roman Catholics and fundamentalists—will have no alternative than to expel Clinton's position on church and family with Elders. For the Fundamentalists, many of whom haven't voted for the Democratic party at the national level in a generation, the ramifications may be minor. But Roman Catholics constitute the largest religious denomination in America, with some 40 million of them eligible to vote. Though polls show that American Roman Catholics often disagree with the church's position on abortion and birth control, and though they have split their votes over the past several presidential elections between Democrats and Republican, Elders' views on the Church are so inflammatory that she could single-handedly help alienate Catholics from the Democrats.

Why does the president take this risk? And what happens if "mainstream" Christians begin to consider that Democratic atrocities against religious conservatives include them? There can only be two reasons why Clinton allows Elders to mal-administer and the Roman Catholic church in terms that, charitably, can be described as intolerant. Either he is too weak to oppose such a strong-willed, out-spoken, and potentially explosive figure—or he agrees with her. Monsignor William Lori (speaking for Cardinal James Hickey, the Archbishop of Washington, who has twice written Clinton asking him to remove Elders' statements on the family and homosexuality without receiving a response) says, "One can only reasonably conclude that Dr. Elders is truly speaking for the administration." And Elders said essentially the same thing when she told USA Weekend that Clinton had told her, "I keep up with you everywhere you go and what you've been doing. I love it.

Clinton may say that he loves it, but Elders threatens to unravel the thin trappings of her so-called "moderation" in the eyes of middle America. Her extremism has made her the id of an administration whose psyche has become progressively more disorganized.

Cameron Humphries is part of the Investigative Journalism Project.
Affirmative Action Foreign Policy

By Peter Schweizer

The U.S. forces training for the invasion of Haiti might well be called the Randall Robinson Brigade. For it is Robinson, director of TransAfrica, along with a kindred group of erstwhile black antiwar activists and radicals, who has beat the drums for intervention in Haiti to a point where the noise has frightened and disoriented the Clinton administration. While Robinson was on his hunger strike last spring to protest U.S. "inaction" in Haiti, the president fired his Haiti advisor, Lawrence Pezzullo, and began to engage in the harsh rhetoric that is about to culminate in an invasion. Beneath the moral posturing was a political calculation. Randall Robinson and his allies in the black caucus had convinced Bill Clinton that it was time to practice a little affirmative action in foreign policy.

The pictures coming out of Haiti are sad, but so too are those coming from Rwanda, Bosnia, the republic of Georgia, and elsewhere. Haiti is inconsequential to U.S. interests, and the human rights picture is not glaring. The Inter-American Human Rights Commission reports it has evidence of 133 killings and 55 disappearances in the last year—an unsavory picture, but hardly near the scale of violence, suffering, and oppression that haunts the former Yugoslavia. And few countries have received as generous a political refugee allotment as Haiti. In 1993, for example, more Haitians received that status than all of Eastern Europe combined, an area which includes the carnage of Yugoslavia and the repression in Romania.

But facts do not stand up against hunger strikes, and for the Left and quite possibly Bill Clinton, Haiti offers a unique opportunity to favor the use of force because it meets the politically correct foreign policy criteria. First, it is a multicultural event, involving a poor, French-speaking black nation. Second, the goal is to bring a leftist to power. Third, and perhaps most importantly, no fundamental U.S. interests are at stake, so military success will not mean much of a victory for the American "imperialism" the advocates of intervention in Haiti otherwise are wont to condemn.

These advocates started out, of course, by trying to persuade people that American security interests justified action. Randall Robinson and others argue that toppling the military dictatorship of Cedras would stop the flow of Haitian refugees as well as help America deal with its drug problem. (Haiti is reportedly a transshipment point for the narcotic East German government, which had to keep its "Tragedy of the hard Core II, ..."

Race (and ideology) are the defining determinants in constructing a politically correct foreign policy, and they reveal the hypocrisy of the Haiti hawks. Consider the case of Ron Dellums, a long-time "anti- war" activist now pushing for military action in Haiti. The Berkeley representative not only opposed using U.S. force in the Persian Gulf, he actually opposed the deployment of troops! "I have a profound respect for human life," he explained his position during Desert Storm. "I think that war is anachronistic. I think war is archaic. I think war is not an appropriate vehicle for a civilized world trying to find a high level of maturity in terms of how we live and deal with each other. That's marching backward—that's killing and dying and suffering and broken bodies and broken homes.

Of course, Dellums, who had played footie with Fidel Castro all through the '80s, has changed his tune on the issue of Haiti, believing that we should consider using force to oust the dictatorial regime of Port au Prince.

Many of Dellums' colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, including Maxine Waters, Major Owens, and Kwesi Mfume, have followed his example. The places where they opposed using U.S. force overseas included the Gulf War, Grenada, and Panama. At the same time they advocate tight sanctions and military intervention to deal with the crisis in Haiti, many of them explain the lifting of trade restrictions and "moderation" in dealing with the brutal regime of Fidel Castro.

The hypocrisy apparent in the Black Caucus is also obvious in the positions of some of its allies, white as well as black. Sen. John Kerry, one of the earliest and loudest voices pushing President Clinton to seek U.N. approval for the use of force in Haiti, was not quite so hawkish during the Gulf War. During the debate over a Senate resolution authorizing the use of force, Kerry said, "In my heart and in my gut and in my mind I do not believe in sending people to war unless it is imperative." Randall Robinson likewise apparently believes force only should be used to bring black left-wing leaders to power, not when American interests are at stake. Not only did the TransAfrica director oppose U.S. intervention in the Persian Gulf, Panama, and Grenada, but he denounces the latter another example of America's "long, record of big-stick intervention—putting in governments we like, taking out ones we don't."

Politically correct foreign policy not only spawns hypocrisy in answering the question of whether and when U.S. military power should be used, it also sushctions a view of human rights and democracy. Multiculturalism is granted more leeway than Eurocentric thugs. If it were Belgian colonialists who were today slaughtering Rwanda's Tutsis, would the U.S. populace be willing to allow the White House to get away with its current "terribly tragic but not our problem" approach?

The choice of Jean Bertrand Aristide as George Washington of Haiti (a member of the Congressional Black Caucus actually called him that) indicates how desperate the Left has become for an icon. Although he was fairly easily elected in September 1981, Aristide hardly deserves canonization as a saint of democracy. Aristide has endorsed necklacing, telling crowds at one rally, "You will have to use it when your life must." As president, he called on his supporters to steal from the wealthy and took dictatorial actions without the approval of parliament. Even activists such as Walter Fauntroy, the former chairman of a congressional task force on Haiti, conceded recently that Aristide had "resorted to the pattern of behavior of dictators in the past" during his tenure.

But Aristide's left-wing credentials are firmly established, which gives him cover in the game of politically correct foreign policy. An old-time Aristide was expelled from the Salesian order by Rome in 1988 for preaching class violence. Aristide has praised Marxism, and in his book, in his book, in the Paris of the Poor, he wrote of "the deadly economic infection called capitalism." He calls U.S. Coast Guard ships intercepting refugees part of "a floating Berlin Wall," apparently unable or unwilling to see the difference between the oppressive East German government, which had to keep
people in, and a democracy that must at times restrict immigration. It is true that Aristide won an election. But that has never been the sole criteria for evaluating the human-rights credentials or legitimacy of a leader. Most recently Zviad Gamsakhurdia won internationally observed and certified elections in the Republic of Georgia by a greater margin than Aristide. Yet when Gamsakhurdia displayed despotic tendencies, the United States was quick to support Georgia leader Eduard Shevardnadze against forces loyal to the deposed president.

Haiti has merely dramatized the double standards that have always animated the black and white Left when it comes to foreign policy. The fact is that left-wing African despots have always enjoyed greater freedom from criticism than less politically correct regimes. In Ethiopia, 1.2 million people died in the early 1980s because of the brutal collectivization policies of the Marxist government. It took four years for even a peep of criticism from the likes of Robinson's TransAfrica and the Congressional Black Caucus. In February 1983, Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe massacred 3,000 Ndebeles, but he remained an icon of the Left, and an example of what the Congressional Black Caucus called "effective African leadership." When the Nigerian government in 1983 forcibly and violently expelled two million foreign workers—during which several thousand were killed—there was only silence. (In fact TransAfrica gladly took grants from that government.) When Tanzania's occupation of Uganda in an effort to oust Idi Amin turned into a frenzy of rape, pillage, and slaughter, the voices on the Left were again silent. And the same response followed the slaughtering of hundreds of rioting students in socialist Algeria in October 1988.

Not only does the Left tend to ignore these human-rights atrocities, many advocates of politically correct foreign policy actually work to secure U.S. government aid for these abusive regimes. Black liberal leaders, including former Congressman William Grey and Rep. Mervyn Dymally, attended an April 1991 summit in the Ivory Coast with officials from across Africa. The American delegation promised to work to cancel Black Africa's $1,000 billion debt, as well as to fight for more aid to the region from American taxpayers. There was little mention of a concrete human rights criteria for the repressive regimes of Africa, many of which had delegates in attendance.

It is not fashionable to say so, but in terms of the levels of slaughter and oppression, the situation in South Africa during the '80s does not compare with the records compiled by black African regimes. But the international denunciation of South Africa, to the exclusion of these countries, led French writer Jean-Francis Revel to conclude: "The tendency that prevails in our age is to regard human rights as being serious only when they include some racist component."

Haiti marks a watershed: the first foreign-policy issue where the Left is calling for the Marines. Military power, it seems, suddenly has a purpose—enforcing affirmative action goals in foreign policy. The next thing you know we'll be sending another task force to the Gulf, this time to punish Islamic regimes that are mean to women.

Peter Schweizer is the author of Victory, a book about how the United States defeated the Soviet Union in the Cold War.
It was at this point in the interview that I began to realize I why mainstream gays are so nervous about NAMBLA. When I was a teenager and didn't have sex with boys. OK, but if you start off with the adult homosexual interested in adult homosexuals will not done: chase adolescent boys. Leland doesn't buy the "Gaystream" in current jargon) has no right to condemn homosexuals are no more likely those who wish to have certain rights have to on taking on corresponding responsibilities. The question of just what those responsibilities might be is a tough one for gay.

I pointed this out to Leland. "You can't very well argue that adults have the right to sodomize children, but no responsibility to be punished if they give the child a fatal disease," I said. He conceded that he might have a point. We talked political philosophy for a while. I asked whether NAMBLA, and for that matter Leland, was making a socialist or a libertarian argument. Leland hadn't really thought about these questions, but he seemed genuinely interested. He asked if I knew of any good books on the subject. "Jeez, Leland, I don't know," I said, as I pondered the ethics of homophobia. NAMBLA refine its philosophy by getting in touch with something like John Stuart Mill's thought about these questions, but he seemed genuinely interested. Why do they always focus on that? Leland and the other pedophiles maintain that, when it comes to the real questions, they're the only adult male with some kind of a man-boy love. He's got queer interest is 13, he said. We proceeded to debate the nature of the NAMBLA argument. Stevenson must have had this debate a thousand times, yet I was amazed at how easy it was to think up questions for which he had no answers, not even stupid ones. For example, NAMBLA maintains that society should throw out age as a legal criterion for judging sexual relationships. "Absent some harm that can be shown, there shouldn't be a case of statutory rape," said Leland, who once spent three years in prison for circulating kid porn. "The idea of locking me up merely because I did something that was beneficial to the boy and that the boy initiated and that the boy wanted to happen—that, to me, is the antithesis of good social function."

"OK, then accept that for the sake of argument," I replied. "But suppose a 40-year-old man gets a 12-year-old girl pregnant? Suppose a 50-year-old man gives a 10-year-old boy HIV? Then what? Should he go to jail?"

"I can't answer that in ten seconds," said Leland.

The most amazing thing about this whole debate is that no one in the media seems to be noticing the real sexual abuse of children, those below the age of perhaps 10 or 11. Pedestrians, on the other hand, in the classic Greek sense, refer to sexual relations with adolescent boys. The ideal here, in the minds of both Socrates and most NAMBLA members, is a boy of about 12 or 13. The thinking among those, as I understand it, is that males simply don't improve as sex objects after that age. They just get hairier. Women, on the other hand, tend to peak around what is now called the "Cindy Crawford right now."

The Gaystream organizations are all opposed to true child molestation. I gather even most members of NAMBLA admit that this is a bit weird. But the Gaystream's position on pedophilia differs from a guy like Leland's only in a small degree. The Canadian chapter of NAMBLA, for example, was dissolved after the age of consent there was lowered to 14. President Clinton's former AIDS czar, Kristine Gebbie, stated that she saw it as the role of government to recognize homosexuality among the nation's high schoolers. Gaystream organizations also maintain that teenaged boys should come out sexually. "We think gay teens should be supported in coming out," she said. In one of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force put it to me.

But come out with whom? Clearly not their fellow 15-year-olds, who are presumably just as confused on the issue as they are. No, the guidance, and the sex, tends to come from adult gays who bring the teens out into the world. A study published in the Journal of Pediatrics showed that of a sample of gay teenagers who had steady sexual partners, the mean age of the partners was 25 years. A study in San Francisco, published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, showed that nearly 10 percent of a sample of male homosexuals aged 17 to 22 were infected with HIV. These two sets of data go together. Obviously, the infected 17-22 year olds didn't get it from their fellow teenagers.
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Manhattan. Ashkinazy described how when he was 14 he began going to Times Square to be picked up by adult gays. "In the next two years I probably had sex with a thousand people, most of them much older than myself," Ashkinazy is quoted as saying.

A thousand pederasts can't be wrong. The oft-stated claim by militant gays that they are statistically no more likely to engage in pederasty than heterosexuals has no empirical basis. A 1985 study of arrests in 12 U.S. jurisdictions showed that, on average, about 40 percent of arrests for pederastic homosexuals. Another recent study, touted by gays as evidence to support their claim of being no more likely than heteros to engage in such behavior actually proved the exact opposite. The study was done by a team of researchers from the University of Colorado who, according to the leader, Dr. Carole Jenny, set out to prove that homosexuals were not more likely to molest children. (Results first, study second: This is Alice-in-Wonderland science.)

In any case, the researchers looked at 269 cases at a child-molestation clinic and found that 50 cases, or 18.5 percent, were male-on-male molestation. Since homosexuals make up probably less than 5 percent of the population, this would seem to indicate a disproportionate molestation rate. So the investigators engaged in what is known in the scientific community as "data torture." Without interviewing the molesters, the interviewers decided that most of those offenders who engaged in homosexual sex weren't really homosexuals. Only one of the 50 cases qualified as gay once the data had gotten the full S&M treatment. The study was then touted as evidence that gays don't molest children. It may not be "scientific" in the sense of this study, but Leland Stevenson's comment seems appropriate here: All black cats are black.

But such studies can only approximate the real rates of pederasty. Sex happens in private, and anyone who pretends to measure it precisely is a fool. A fair better indication of the effects of pederasty is in the real harm it accomplishes. Gay activists insist that AIDS is an equal opportunity disease. Heterosexuals can spread it as easily as gays, they maintain. It stands to reason, then, that if heterosexuals are more prone to pederasty than homosexuals, as gay activists often say, there will be more cases of AIDS among young heterosexuals than among homosexuals. But Center for Disease Control figures show that cases of homosexual transmission outnumber cases of heterosexual transmission by a factor of about four to one. Since heterosexual outnumber gays in the population by about twenty to one, it follows that for every heterosexual act of pederasty there must be at least eighty homosexual acts, if you accept the gay activists' logic at face value.

In truth, gay activists and logic are strange. Anal sex among males is by far the most efficient means of spreading AIDS, which makes homosexual pederasty much more dangerous than the heterosexual version, regardless of exactly how many people engage in each. The 7,015 AIDS victims in the most recent CDC report represent just the tip of the iceberg, to use a cliché favored by the AIDS lobby. For each victim in the final stages of AIDS, there are no doubt many more whose AIDS will surface in the coming years. In short, there are probably 25,000 or so AIDS cases that will eventually be attributable to gay pederasty in the United States.

Gay maintain they have a right to engage in the sort of behavior that spreads AIDS while also maintaining that society has a responsibility to find a cure whatever the cost. This is certainly a new variation on the old rights/responsibilities argument, but hardly a logical one. The "consenting adults" argument only works when the adults are consenting to an activity that does not harm society. It does not work when the activity kills people by the hundreds of thousands, and it does not work when a good number of the people involved are not adults.

The Clinton administration and Leland Stevenson both are on record in favor of recognizing homosexuality in high schools; Leland just has a slightly better eye for it. The members of the Gaystream are less enthusiastic about NAMBLA's aims than the administration is. They would like nothing more than for NAMBLA to disappear. Their second choice would be what they're getting: Media coverage that portrays NAMBLA members as people so bizarre and abhorrent that they have nothing in common with the great mass of gays. The Gaystream's nightmare is that people will see the future of gay liberation as Leland Stevenson sees it: First you win the right to have sex with adults, then you win the right to have sex with kids. Even though I found Leland to be a likable guy, I still was disgust at the idea of a grown man having sex with a teenager. As I talked with him in the park that day, I wondered what it must be like to be a teenager without a car in 1994. When I was a kid, it was simple to say no to the guys who picked me up hitchhiking, even when they offered $50 for what was then called a "blowjob" and now is called "finding one's sexual orientation." But now a kid has people from the President of the United States down to the lowest rock star telling him that there's nothing wrong with that nice man behind the steering wheel. He just has a different lifestyle.

When I said goodbye to Leland that day, I mentioned that I had to get home to pick up my little girls at the babysitter's. "How old are they?" Leland asked. "Two and six," I said. "They must be absolute delights!" he said. "They are," I replied. For some reason a tune popped into my head. It was the old Maurice Chevalier classic: "Thank heaven for little girls." At least they're safe from NAMBLA and the Gaystream.

—Paul Mulshine
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Goldberg found variation in degree: Male-female roles differ among the pygmies, the 12th-century French, the Saudis, and the people of the United States. Such variation, he believed, was in all likelihood not explicable in physiological terms. It must be explained in terms of the factors that work made no attempt to explain the variation but only the limits within which all the variation falls. His theory of male-female roles was analogous to a theory of why people eat in every society that does not attempt to explain why Americans eat one type of food and Chinese another.

"I found a lack of specificity about precisely what cultural anthropologists meant by terms like 'patriarchy' and 'male rule.' One anthropologist meant one thing by these terms and another meant something else. Perhaps the obvious presence of a general idea of male rule made specificity seem unnecessary. But this had the effect of introducing a certain incoherence and an impossibility of generalization because the terms used by the anthropologists were incommensurate. Thus, I had to ignore the determined terms and ascertain precisely what realities were universal and which were not. Only then could I name the universal institutions."

Goldberg found three relevant universalities: three institutions found in every society without exception:

1. First, hierarchies are always filled primarily by men (patriarchy). A Godly Man is always surrounded by a government of men, and there is no queen with any real power any rules at an equivalent male is available.
2. Second, the highest-status (non-maternal) roles are male (male attainment). There are societies in which the women do all of the important economic work (e.g., growing all the food) while the men seem mostly to hang loose. But, in such societies, hanging loose is the highest status. Goldberg found that it is not primarily that whatever males do is given high status (ditch-digging is male and low status), but rather that males are more atavistically drawn to whatever is given high status. By and large, society determines what is given high status. This can vary considerably, hereditary position is given high status in one society, hunting ability in another, etc. Whatever it is that is given high status (for whatever culturally-determined reasons which are particular to society) is always male who are more willing to give up other needs and satisfactions—love, family, health, relaxation, etc.—to do what is required to attain the high status.
3. Third, dominance in male-female relationships is always associated with males. "Male dominance" refers to the feeling that men win, that women must "get around" the male to attain power. In most societies male dominance is reflected in the formal authority system. But even when it is not (as in the United States), the expectation is still one of male dominance. (This is attested to in the United States by, for example, the feminists' dislike of male dominance and their attempt to explain it in purely social terms.) Social attitudes might support or deter male dominance. (In our own society there was a time when the man's taking the lead was positively valued. Today this is very different.)

"Cultural anthropological has given the world a priceless treasure," he says, "the ethnographic descriptions of many hundreds—or thousands, if one counts less formal works—of the 12th-century French, the 12th-century French, the 12th-century French, the 12th-century French. And we have demonstrated. In the future, when the homogenization of the world has made all societies more alike than different, only these ethnographies will stand against the human ethnocentric tendency to think things had to be the way they are."
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FRAUD IN SPAIN

The Odyssey of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, by Peter N. Carroll, Stanford University Press, 1994

REVIEWED BY STEPHEN SCHWARTZ

One of the most egregious features of America's Stalinist "liberals" is their attachment to myths about themselves, their alleged virtue and purported nobility. Their seemingly limitless appetite for self-aggrandizement translates into a worship of their own perversive reading of the past, in which they paint themselves as simultaneously naive and knowing, humble and heroic in their dedication to and sacrifice for ideals. In reality, their record, almost without exception, is one of slavish obedience to orders from their Soviet masters, and is a testament totalitarian deception, abusiveness, and cowardice.

There is no more despicable example of this conduct—and no more hypocritical—than the example of the obfuscating self-type that goes along with it—that of the Spanish Civil War and the involvement in it of the American members of the so-called Abraham Lincoln Brigade. This band of 3,000 militarily inept victims—comprised of a smattering of decent individuals overshadowed by a majority of Communist Party waterfront hacks, college boys, denizens of the Young Communist League from the outer boroughs of New York City, adventuring non-do-do-los, and otherwise nondescript members of the lumpening masses—has been transformed by the passage of time and the gullibility of American intellectuals into a legion of far-sighted and self-sacrificing anti-fascist warriors.

It's all based on a lie, which, like so many others perpetrated by the Left, has been so successfully propagated that its perpetrators have become lazy. Benefiting from nostalgia and the unreproachable approval of those who have swallowed in the myth, they end up saying things that are gross and revealing without really realizing it. This is what makes a recent book, Peter Carroll's The Odyssey of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade: Americans in the Spanish Civil War, a sort of diary of deceit. It would be difficult to find a book more thoroughly saturated with lies than Carroll's. Even its title is a doubly dishonest one. To begin with, there was no "brigade." The Spanish army counted four battalions to each brigade, and the strength of the U.S. (and Canadian) volunteers never exceeded that of, at the very most (utilizing a "separate classification," two battalions. But the title includes yet another lie. This is not the story of Americans who went to Spain to support the republic in the 1936-39 Civil War. Carroll never mentions a number of important participants and memoirists.

This is not the work of a naive young academic, burdened with the prejudices of the 1960s and feeling his way through the 1950s, as may be said about many Stalinophile works by "new historians." It is a sentimental exercise in "official" history, a pasteiche of the writing style of the Hollywood Communist Party hack Alva Bessie and the meanderings of Milton Wolff, another specimen of extraordinary dishonesty and self-delusion.

HP this true story of the Abraham Lincoln volunteers has X been thoroughly established in unchallengeable published sources. The Americans who went to Spain under the auspices of the Communist Party were overwhelmingly inexperienced in war, in contrast with the French, Belgians, Germans, Italians, and Eastern Europeans in the International Brigades, who were frequently veterans of trench fighting in World War I. Their departures from the United States were inadequately documented so that in some cases their families never learned of their fates. They were undertrained and killed in enormous numbers—an 80 percent casualty rate at the beginning. Their commanders, such as one Robert Merriman, nicknamed "Mundane" by the troops under his command, were incompetent, and the rank-and-file assassinated at least one commander, a man named Oliver Law, on the field of battle—a "flagging" avant la lettre. Many responded to the demoralizing situation in which they found themselves by ceaseless attempts to desert after having been prevented from returning home in violation of the promises made to them when recruited. They were politically spied upon, and some were executed by their own officers, even Carroll admits that they were all threatened with assassination for breaches of discipline.

Some of them were used for police duty against Spanish leftist dissidents. They had no serious contact with the Spanish people they had allegedly gone to help, except when they were so used for tasks Spanish workers refused, such as executions. The Americans, while militarily useless, treated their Spanish co-combatants, who fought valiantly for three years, with contempt. An English veteran, Ralph Bates, said the Americans fought 'in a vacuum,' separated from Spanish reality. Indeed, it was as if they had left the United States but never arrived in Spain itself, instead landing in a little extension of the Soviet Gulag, under the surveillance of spy-hunting Stalinist police commissars at the same time they were under fire from Franco's forces.

This bizarre situation is unconsciously reflected in the repeated use by Carroll, a writer who clearly never met a Stalinist cliché he didn't like, of the phrase "the home front" when referring to the United States. The United States was NOT the home front in the Spanish Civil War, the United States was not involved in the war. The home front in the Spanish Civil War was in Spain, and it was populated by anarchists and other Spanish revolutionaries who rescued the republic at the beginning of the war and whom the American Stalinists, once they returned to the United States, spent the rest of their lives defining as cowardly and undisciplined.

This book contains a photograph that speaks volumes. It is of the author, with a flash-bulb grin, sitting with his knee being groped by the American-born Russian spy Morris Cohen, a creepy type now living in retirement in Moscow. It also includes a disclosure that speaks volumes, although Carroll doesn't seem to know it. This disclosure involves William Bailey, a garrulous old CP union bureaucrat and apparatchik in the Bay Area. Bailey claims responsibility for the apprehension in Spain of an alleged American deserter, Paul White, who was subsequently liquidated—one of two volunteers identified by name whose executions are admitted by the Stalinist old guard.

As if that weren't enough, Carroll admits that the Lincoln Brigade veteran Milton Wolff, who later served with the Office of Strategic Services in World War II and never lets anybody forget it, deliberately abandoned a "reconnaissance" group of 30 fellow OSS officers who were then captured by the Germans. In wartime such infractions (real desertion in Wolff's case, not a heresy-hunting pretext as with the purged and executed Lincoln volunteers), are typically punished by court-martial or even a capital sentence.

Carroll himself proves no less devious than the subjects of his hero worship. Although he went to Moscow after the recent opening of archives and examined the files on the International Brigades, nowhere in his book has he used or even described the bulk of materials available therein. These include documents due for publication next year in a Yale University Press book edited by the historians Harvey Klehr and John E. Hayne. The book will show the frightful and incessant hunt for alleged spies and deserters in the Lincoln Brigade's ranks, the hunt led by the Russian secret police of American volunteers (in addition to Cohen, whom Carroll treats as a hero) for espionage elsewhere in the world, and the poor conduct of the American volunteers when compared with that of leftist militants from various European countries. Carroll's mere network of propagandists rests on two fundamental lies that have yet to be discussed by most leftist American historians. The first is the supposition that the involvement of U.S. volunteers was anything but subordinate to the war effort mounted by the Spanish Republic. In reality, they played no significant role. This basic truth is reflected in the absence of substantive attention paid by historians, including those of the Left, in Spain. The second, more fundamental lie, is the claim, repeated to the point of nausea, that the Spanish Civil War was "fascist vs. antifascism," that the Civil War was nothing more than an invasion by Germany and/or Italy, and that the Leftist regime was simply an elected democratic government, whose fight was a "premature" version of, say, the action of the Allies against the Nazis.

This is a thesis supported by no reputable source. Stalin never wanted the Left or the Right. The Spanish Civil War was the outcome of a social revolutionary movement that began in 1917, when the workers of the so-called October Revolution took control of the monarchy and that had to do with problems of Iberian society: land tenure, education, the nationalism of the peripheral ethnic communities, the Basque country. While the intervention of the Germans and Italians was brutal, and certainly as evil as that of Stalin and his mercenaries in the International Brigades, both these external phenomena were secondary in the overall conflict, which had gusted in the peninsula since the early 1930s.

Stalin and his minions did not become involved in Spain to confront fascism or to save an embattled democracy but to destroy an indigenous revolutionary movement that threatened the very existence of the monarchy and that had to do with problems of Iberian society: land tenure, education, the nationalism of the peripheral ethnic communities, the Basque country. While the intervention of the Germans and Italians was brutal, and certainly as evil as that of Stalin and his mercenaries in the International Brigades, both these external phenomena were secondary in the overall conflict, which had gusted in the peninsula since the early 1930s.

This is, of course, the analysis presented by George X Orwell in Homage to Catalonia and elsewhere. Further, it is accepted today by every serious Spanish historian of the Left. In the more than 400 pages of his dreadful assemble, however, Carroll never addresses Spanish views of the war. And the blurb on the back of the book refers to an "Orwellian" quality as if, after more than 50 years of proof, Stalin's betrayal of the Spanish Republic—with the assistance, however inept, of the armed radical tourists of the Lincoln Brigade, rather than a theory put forward by a single contentious individual. Stalin, the International Brigades, and the Abraham Lincoln volunteers played exactly at, rather than the internal enemies of the Spanish Republic that they, and Carroll, still insist on assigning to "Trotskyites"—actually the POUM, a single party that was not Trotskyist and that was supported by the workers of Catalonia long after Stalin was over.

Many years ago Ernest Hemingway wrote to Carroll's hero Milton Wolff, declaring that the Communists were "pricks" in the Spanish Civil War. Hemingway was right. If Carroll had started from this simple precept he might have approached the reality of Spain. The fact that he started with nothing approaching an open mind makes his book not reality but rather socialist realism.

Student Expelled Because of Diversity Problems

BY JUDITH SCHUMANN WEIZNER

Eddie "Duke" Whitman, a 21-year-old junior at Northern New Jersey State College, today became the first student to be expelled for violating the college's recently enacted Student Behavior Guidelines.

Whitman was charged with Racial Harassment last spring following a complaint by Ouishal Ov'rcom, an African-American co-ed. Whitman, who is white, asked Ov'rcom for a date. When she refused, citing a preference for dating men of her own race, he knelt before her and recited the 130th sonnet of Shakespeare ("My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun"), which he prefaced with a remark to the effect that this was the most eloquent way he could think of to sway her.

Seeking immediate redress of this "mutilation," Ms. Ov'rcom contacted Northern New Jersey's Office of Racial Harassment. In her complaint, she asked the school to force Whitman to attend racial sensitivity training because he obviously did not understand why reciting an ambiguous poem by a patriarchal white author like Shakespeare would not only not have the desired effect on her, but also would be, as she phrased it, "a gigaflop-off."

Summoned before the Racial Harassment Officer, young Whitman explained that he had actually asked Ms. Ov'rcom for a date to satisfy the school's Student Life Diversity Requirement. (This provision requires each student to have at least three dates with a member of another race and two with a member of the same sex each year. If the requirement is not met, the student will not receive credit for the year's academic work.) He explained that he had recently received a warning from his advisor informing him that his dating of Asian women had only partially qualified him, and that he must have at least one date with a student of African extraction in order to remain in good academic standing. Since it was just three weeks before the end of the year, when he invited Ms. Ov'rcom to the theater, the possibility of a refusal was a matter of some concern to him. Whitman admitted that he had perhaps shown poor judgment in choosing this particular sonnet, which does have elements of "lookism," but explained that since his major was Elizabethan literature, it was the first thing that had come to mind.

The Racial Harassment Officer castigated Whitman, saying that his offense went far beyond poor judgment and ordered him to rewrite Shakespeare's "Othello" so that the play conformed to the school's Racial Harmony Guidelines and to produce it at Northern New Jersey's Huey F. Newton Memorial Theater before the end of the term. Distressed by the proximity of the deadline, Whitman appealed the verdict to the Board of Sensitivity Oversight and managed to convince the board that he had not only not had the desired effect on her, but also would be, as she phrased it, "a gigaflop-off."

After all testimony had been presented, the Sexual Harassment Board issued a ruling finding Whitman in contempt of women. He was ordered to join the Campus Rape Crisis Group and attend fourteen hours of sensitivity training. Additionally, the board recommended a review of his efforts toward the fulfillment of the Like Gender part of his diversity requirement.

Then Whitman was called before the Office of Homosexual Affairs about the Like Gender Dating Requirement. He claimed that he had more than fulfilled this requirement and produced 12 male witnesses who swore that on countless occasions they had accompanied him to various sporting events and social affairs on and off campus. Following a brief consultation with the president of the local chapter of ACT-UP, the office ruled that two guys going to a football game together did not constitute a date with a member of the same sex. Whitman was ordered to attend the Gay Spring Prom where he had to remain for a period of not less than four hours unless he was invited to leave for an assignation by a member of the same sex.

Whitman attended the Gay Spring Prom and remained there for two hours and twenty minutes, at which time he left in the company of a young man who had been similarly sentenced (although the Office of Homosexual Affairs did not discover this fact). Then, after completing his public recitation of the works of Maya Angelou, he joined the Rape Crisis Group and attended fourteen hours of sensitivity training. Finally, he applied to the Campus Diversity Office for his Certificate of Diversity Approval. This was granted.

However, Ms. Ov'rcom, still mulling over the testimony given at Whitman's hearing before the Sexual Harassment Board, realized to her chagrin that she had allowed an important fact to slip by unremarked. Returning to the Office of Racial Harassment, she cited Whitman's choice of a French restaurant as the venue for their abortive date and noted that the French had long been a colonial power in Africa. She received permission to amend her original complaint to include the insensitivity of the dining arrangements. Whitman's Certificate of Diversity Approval was temporarily rescinded pending another hearing before the Racial Harassment Officer.

Granted, since Whitman had already received a warning from his advisor informing him that his dating of Asian women had only partially qualified him, and that he must have at least one date with a student of African extraction in order to remain in good academic standing. Since it was just three weeks before the end of the year, when he invited Ms. Ov'rcom to the theater, the possibility of a refusal was a matter of some concern to him. Whitman admitted that he had perhaps shown poor judgment in choosing this particular sonnet, which does have elements of "lookism," but explained that since his major was Elizabethan literature, it was the first thing that had come to mind.

The Racial Harassment Officer castigated Whitman, saying that his offense went far beyond poor judgment and ordered him to rewrite Shakespeare's "Othello" so that the play conformed to the school's Racial Harmony Guidelines and to produce it at Northern New Jersey's Huey F. Newton Memorial Theater before the end of the term. Distressed by the proximity of the deadline, Whitman appealed the verdict to the Board of Sensitivity Oversight and managed to convince the board that he had not only not had the desired effect on her, but also would be, as she phrased it, "a gigaflop-off."

After all testimony had been presented, the Sexual Harassment Board issued a ruling finding Whitman in contempt of women. He was ordered to join the Campus Rape Crisis Group and attend fourteen hours of sensitivity training. Additionally, the board recommended a review of his efforts toward the fulfillment of the Like Gender part of his diversity requirement.
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