

through the 1945-1951 period in his country, immediately recognizes that Nicaragua under the Sandinistas' yoke is a precise replica of the Eastern European model of the so-called "people's democracy," where ruthless atrocities are committed to install the iron-clad communist social infrastructure of power, which would make any political opposition and protest impossible. In Eastern Europe, under the avuncular protection of the Red Army, the process could be as brutal, underhanded, and invisible, as the West could never imagine. In the neighborhood of the American howitzers across the Honduran border, the merry bustling of Russian, Cuban, and native experts on human enslavement have to do some window dressing. Organizations like U.S. Out of Central America, with their loads of Berrigans, Catholic "nuns," Ramsey Clarks, Pete Seegers and all assortments of fellow travelers, will help. Ships of useful fools with Nobel Prize distinctions will bring supplies and encouragement.

In 1945, in Nuremberg, we defined the meaning of war crimes and war criminals. Sooner or later, mankind will have to understand and define the significance of peace criminals. There are plenty of them among us. □

### Non-Sentimental Education

The magnitude of mental confusion in which this society exists—actually, considered normal and permanent by historians endowed with a sense of humor—overwhelms us on occasion. In August, three months before the election, a Gallup poll found that Walter Mondale and his ultra-liberal Democratic Party are believed by the majority of Americans to be better suited "to improve the quality of public education" than President Reagan and his conservative Republicans. Nothing short of despair will invade the mind of an American who can remember the rapid downfall and disintegration of the

American public education that began in the mid-60's with the wild experimentation by liberal doctrinaires and psychological charlatans who took over the NEA—their storm troopers' organization. It was then when education had abandoned its goal of forming character through knowledge and became the distributor of ideological clichés about the transformation of society and the destruction of antiquated pride in what America was, is, and should be. A narrow-minded, if not nasty, vision of an unmoored value-free individualism had been declared the civic ideal. Twenty years later, the big city schools all over the country have been transformed into

enclaves of random but lethal crime, where bathrooms became places of sex and mugging. Playgrounds turned into stock exchanges for drugs. It was all the vision and the creation of liberal Democrats theoretically fortified by the liberal intellectual establishment, fiercely protected by the liberal Supreme Court, and by the liberal bureaucracy in D.C. entrenched there by Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter. And now, in 1984, the American public still thinks that those who have smashed to pieces the old, precious timepiece should be more trusted with fixing it than those who have discovered the damage and the loss. □

## JOURNALISM

### Highbrow Prattle

Let us praise famous men for their unique ability to talk foolishness and be admired for what they say. Here is Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, *lui même*, in the *Wall Street Journal*:

Where Washington seems to regard the East European satellites as faithful creatures of the Kremlin, West Europeans see them as restless, discontented and, from the Soviet viewpoint, quite unreliable. Where the West Europeans favor the use of trade and cultural exchange to promote the independence of the satellites, the Reagan policy, they fear, is driving the satellites into greater dependence on the Soviet Union.

Anyone with a more discriminate sense of the factual, and a better recall of contemporary history than the famed historian would remember, with a sigh, that since at least 1956 we have done nothing but promote trade and cultural exchange with the captive nations the professor calls "satellites." Under Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon we exchanged with Poland, for one, so much

culturally that we provided all Gomulka's and then Gierek's thugs with the fattest and juiciest grants the State Department had to offer. Today, Poles are being trampled on by Jaruzelski's henchmen, still sporting those Brooks Bros. suits and ties they purchased at the time of those delightful exchanges to which we gave our best hopes and which they immediately and cynically converted into petty material advantages through immaterial promises. Prof. Schlesinger may teach his students many things, but he himself will never learn that "independence" or "greater dependence" of the subjugated Eastern Europe is exclusively regulated by a couple of offices in the Kremlin, and by nobody else. Or by uprisings. □

### Minds Warped or Twisted?

The *New York Times Sunday Magazine* has produced in print a sentence that unmistakably attests to one of two possibilities: either its editors do not know the meaning of conjunctions, a serious grammatical disability, or

their liberalism automatically turns their minds into Tibetan prayer wheels. Here is the sample from a piece on General Vessey, our current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Although the general is 11 years younger than the President, he shares

## Neo-Chastity & Neo-Intelligence

In a curiously schizophrenic article in *Ms.* entitled "The Uses of Chastity and Other Paths to Sexual Pleasures," Germaine Greer, longtime radical feminist, agonized over how young women are "jeopardizing their health and fertility with potent medications and mischievous gadgetry" in the sterile sexual frenzy she helped initiate a decade ago. Unable to admit that she might have been wrong about the Western mores she helped dismantle, Ms. Greer continues her

Mr. Reagan's belief in old-fashioned virtues.

The amazingly utilized "although" made us sentimental. We are roughly 2400 years younger than Socrates and we share his notion of old-fashioned virtues. ☐

attack against every Western norm that denies "the right to sexual activity," while she simultaneously lauds Third World forms of chastity as wonderful and worth preserving for "young people born into" such cultures. For those reborn into the anticultural "permissive lifestyle" still advocated for *Ms.* readers, Ms. Greer suggests only curtailing vaginal sex. Other types of sex are positively encouraged, with the "strategies" employed by homosexuals held up for particular emulation. As a justification for experimenting with what has traditionally been called

perversion, Ms. Greer offers this rationale:

Sex is no more unintelligent or unsophisticated a pastime than conversation, or at least it shouldn't be.

Does this mean professional hookers should be compelled to read Voltaire, Shakespeare, and Montaigne? Or would Harold Robbins and Danielle Steele do?

**MOVING?** Don't miss a single issue of *Chronicles of Culture*! Send this form with the label from your latest issue of *Chronicles* to: Subscription Dept., *Chronicles of Culture*, P.O. Box 800, Rockford, IL 61105.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_  
State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

### Blah, Blah, Blah . . .

In an era when frozen embryos, conceived on processed sperm, are considered legal inheritors to financial assets, and former convicted felons seek redemption by supervising police in Chicago Mayor Washington's administration, nothing is particularly surprising anymore. In the *Chicago Tribune*, someone identified as cochairman of the Illinois Gay and Lesbian Task Force bitterly complains that homosexual high school students are forced to exist in a social and cultural environment in which:

There are no guidelines for normal growth. There are no positive role models.

No one, neither the reporter, nor the *Trib* editors, seems to bother any longer with the fundamental rules of reality and sense. The simple truth that something that is *abnormal* by nature and definition cannot manifest itself as *normal* growth becomes the casualty of the merciless liberal din.

The *New York Times Magazine*, one of

### LIBERAL CULTURE

the best camouflaged incubators of obscurantism, promotes the opinions of Barbara Ehrenreich, a feminist-socialist (a combination of demonic force) whose intelligence, concern, and responsibility for her propounded views are breathtaking:

After all, the traditional female contributions to marriage have been menial, like housework, or intangible, like emotional support.

Menial? Is providing man, nation, humankind, and the world with continuation of life a "menial contribution"? Is "emotional support" an "intangible" element of marriage? And what about love? Does the *New York Times* inform us (which amounts to a verdict, of course)

that love is out as a permissible female contribution to marriage? Even a misconceived, or a short-lasting love? Ah, the feminist jabberwocky—as Sir John Gielgud would say in his Paul Masson commercials.

Finally, *Time*, not to be outdone by anybody, praises a new book (are they really new, all those books?) by a female "Manhattan Psychiatrist." Here is her complaint:

The conditioning that helps to produce [masochism] is almost in the air we breathe: first, most parents want boys rather than girls, and second, our culture places emphasis on a woman's beauty rather than her achievement.

Did the "Manhattan Psychiatrist" ever give a thought to what would happen to *our* culture, indeed to *any* culture, if woman's beauty had not become the arch-catalyst of philosophy, aesthetics, poetry, art, etc. Ah, the feminist reduction of values, the militant dwarfism of human desires, the quest after androgyny that, sooner or later, will suffocate the smell of roses under the pretext of eradicating sexism. ☐