

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. ☐

# The Rockford Institute

934 North Main Street  
Rockford, Illinois 61103 U.S.A.

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED.