

"relationships," the feminists are setting out to destroy romance (if that word is not yet obsolete), which thrives on spontaneity, and on implicit, non-verbal mutual understanding. Which is also the problem with the current mania for condoms and other elaborate birth-control machinations.

As to the peculiar fuzziness of the current analysis of rape can be found in the assumptions of the famed Koss study, headed by the shrink Mary Koss, now of the University of Arizona. In trying to find out the extent of rape on the college campuses, Koss defined sexual assault as the use of force or "intercourse as a result of intentionally getting the woman intoxicated." And we find various references to women being reluctant to report the "rape" because one or usually both parties were "drunk" at the time.

Well, now, drinking indeed! Are we now to include in rape any sex taking place after liquor is imbibed? Isn't everyone familiar with the old poem and the social reality it reported: "Candy is dandy, but liquor is quicker?" Everyone is responsible for whatever he or she imbibes, unless the guys spiked the girl's drink without her knowledge (not mentioned in any of these cases) and everyone is responsible for their own actions, liquor or not. Come off it, ladies; "date rape" my foot!

Ah, now we see what is going on here. For generations now, girls,

while consenting implicitly to sex, have wanted to assuage their guilt by being able to tell themselves afterward that they had not planned the action, and that they were merely "swept off their feet" by the charm of the guy and/or the magic of the moment. Hence, as all implicitly consenting parties have been long aware, the use of liquor is a marvelous catalyst of this feet-sweeping. Now, along comes our

baneful feminist theoreticians who have been able to use their besotted theories to (a) free girls, once and for all, from guilt for their actions, and (b) to load that guilt onto the poor, hapless male population.

The *New York Times* article details one of the cases. During a brainwashing re-education dorm lecture on date rape at Lehigh

University recently, a male student was asked by a dorm official if he had ever committed rape. First saying "hell, no," the student was later talked by the lecturer into "realizing" that he had, and that "not saying no" was not sufficient to establish consent. (There was no notarized agreement!) Later, the poor guy, admitting that he was "very confused," wrote a self-criticism article to the student paper confessing his sins: "I was uninformed and incorrect in my actions," he groveled. Yeah, and I bet he now loves Big Brother (oops sorry, Big Sister). Poor Orwell never knew the

full depths of Political Correctness when he fashioned his dystopia.

There are several ways by which this terrible crisis on the campus can be solved. One, we can go back to the prohibition of alcohol, which our culture is almost ready for in any case. Two, we can go back to the good old days of campuses before the 1950s, especially in the South: not only the banning of coed dorms, and abolishing coeducation altogether, but insisting on official chaperons for girls on every date, on dance-cards filled out in advance and cleared with the chaperon, on boys being barred from the entire girls' campus except one official room, etc. And finally, why not go the whole hog toward Left Puritanism and define all sex as *per se* coercive? That would clear up all the fuzziness and sex, or at least hetero-sex, could be outlawed completely. Or is that the point, after all? •

The Buchanan Smear: The Commentary Coda

by M.N.R.

The record of the organized smear against Pat Buchanan (see my "Pat Buchanan and the Menace of Anti-Anti-Semitism," *RRR*, December 1990), could not hope to be complete without a substantial contribution from NeoCon Central—the monthly *Commentary*, the Thinking Man's *New Republic*. For a long while it seemed that we would have to make do with a puny editorial from "editor-in-chief" Norman Podhoretz. But at long last, our expectations have been fulfilled,

Are we now to include in rape any sex taking place after liquor?

in a lengthy article by Joshua Muravchik, "Patrick J. Buchanan and the Jews," *Commentary* (January 1991.) Muravchik's article is mainly a rehash of the various claims that Pat is pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic, doused with a veneer of phony judiciousness that befits *Commentary's* lofty pretensions.

But there are some extra points of interest. Muravchik is willing to pronounce Buchanan as anti-Semitic even though he admits that "there may be no authoritative definition of the term." (That's OK, flail away, anyway.) One of the counts of his indictment is that Pat's reference to Israel's "amen corner" must be maliciously anti-Semitic because it is patently false. For, notes Muravchik, "far from beating the drums (for war against Iraq), Israel was at most merely humming along." Yes, Josh, *Israel itself* may be quietly humming along, but its "amen corner" in the United States, the ardent Zionists, have been almost hysterically calling for all-out war against Iraq ever since August 2. Evidence? Just read the periodicals, and watch TV, for the frenetic hawks are everywhere. And that, of course, was precisely Pat's point.

Moreover, Muravchik implicitly agrees that Israel's interests are at stake in the Arabian war, since one of his charges against Buchanan is that since Pat has been a hawk all his life, how could he possibly be a dove now if not from an animus toward Israel? Muravchik does not seem to realize

that the world has changed in the past year, as even his neocon buddies concede. Pat Buchanan and his fellow Old Rightists were not pro-war for the Hell of it, or for its own sake; they were pro-war because they believed that we engaged in a world-wide conflict with a mortal Soviet/Communist

enemy. Now that that war has collapsed, Josh, there is no point to being pro-war as a permanent reflex. Muravchik pays lip service to the dramatic world change since 1989, but grossly plays down its importance. Saying that Communism "is not yet finished" is a far cry from say-

ing that the Cold War is still raging. Hey Josh, where have you been for the last year or two? What do you think happened to East Germany? Or Poland? It is absurd to conjure up "anti-Semitism" as an explanation for this new outbreak of anti-war sentiment.

But the deliciously new note sounded by Comrade Muravchik is to lay a cloud of German blood-guilt upon Pat Buchanan. Buchanan, for one thing, is damned for being a pro-German revisionist on World War One(!), and we are subjected to the old mendacious Allied propaganda on that war, including a whitewashing of British war guilt, and the absurd claim that Britain's century-old maritime supremacy was an "answer" to Germany's land forces, when it was precisely the opposite. The German invasion of

Belgium, which was only an excuse for Britain's intervention, is again trotted out as the sole explanation of that maximization of the European conflict. But the fascinating point of all this raking over World War One is to prepare the ground for Muravchik's blood libel of Buchanan. For it turns out, as Muravchik points out triumphantly, that Pat, because of his name, "is often taken for Irish," but is not really Irish at all! It seems that Pat is really German, or, as Muravchik puts it, he is "more German than anything else." Evidently a dogged genealogical researcher, Muravchik gleans from Pat's autobiography (which so many writers have been poring over looking for evil) that his mother was 100% German(!) whereas his father was only 50% Irish and 50% Scotch-Irish. Well, there we have it. What case could be clearer? Poor Muravchik has obviously missed his true calling; if he were only born a half-century earlier and had been of a different ethnic background, he could have happily taken his place in Hitler's Office of Genealogical Research.

Muravchik concludes his vile article with a final thrust: "why is Buchanan spoiling for a fight with the neoconservatives?" To Muravchik it is self-evident that the only reason one could possibly dislike neo-cons is because they are almost all Jewish. Hence, Pat must be anti-Semitic. Why be anti-neocon? If I had time, I would lovingly count the ways. Suffice it to say because they have in their ranks writers like Joshua Muravchik, who is billed as a "resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute," and who will bless us with a forthcoming book, entitled *Exporting Democracy: Fulfilling America's Destiny*. Need I say more? ●

Why be anti-neocon? If I had time, I would lovingly count the ways.

The War on the Right

by Paul Gottfried

Conservative wars are flaring up in the United States, especially since the Rockford Institute, a traditionalist thinktank based in Rockford, Illinois, dismissed the Rev. Richard John Neuhaus, the director of its New York center. Neuhaus and his staff were also evicted from the premises, an act in a struggle begun long before and continuing down to the present.

Months and even years before the eviction, heated disagreement was occurring between Neuhaus, a longtime civil rights activist who had built a hesitant alliance with the Right, and Thomas Fleming, editor of the Rockford Institute publication *Chronicles*. Fleming, a social theorist and classicist, had become a leading representative of the Old Right. Contemptuous of egalitarian politics, Fleming stressed in his publications the indispensability of rooted communities and social hierarchies for maintaining public order. He and Neuhaus clashed repeatedly on the issues of immigration and on the nature of democracy. Unlike Fleming, who still calls himself a political liberal, Neuhaus is closely identified with the neoconservatives, anti-Communist social democrats who had abandoned the Democratic Party (claiming the Democrats had forsaken them) after the presidential nomination of George McGovern in 1972.

Neoconservatives remain essentially Centrist Democrats, but

Paul Gottfried is professor of political science at Elizabethtown College.

have developed connections on the political Right and were prominent in the Reagan administration. Neuhaus's access to their foundations and journals led the two presidents of the Rockford Institute, John Howard and Allan Carlson, into enlisting him for their enterprise. Both had given him considerable discretionary power in running the Rockford Center in New York dealing with religious questions. From the start, it was a marriage of convenience on both sides.

Neuhaus, a Lutheran clergyman associated with predominantly New York Jewish neoconservatives, was looking for a Midwestern heartland affiliation. This affiliation could also benefit his neoconservative sponsors by extending their influence, at least indirectly, to other cultural groups.

The Rockford Institute, which had depended initially on local support, hoped to use Neuhaus and the New York connection to build their own financial and social network. Since the mid-seventies the neocons had come to control a multitude of foundations dispensing many millions of dollars annually. It was Irving Kristol, editor of *Public Interest* and close friend of former Secretary of the Treasury, multimillionaire William Simon, who had begun the neocon march through the foundations.

The John M. Olin, Bradley, Scaife-Mellon, and Smith-Richardson Foundations, together with smaller less opulent ones, fell

to Kristol and to his designated retainers, most prominently Michael Joyce at Bradley and James Pierson at Olin.

Unlike the American traditionalists of the fifties and sixties who had viewed fundraising with revulsion, Kristol, a sometime Trotskyist and still an impenitent defender of the welfare state, spent 25 years convincing wealthy businessmen to support him and his friends as a countervailing force to

the Left. Never did he promise his benefactors a return to an older America with small-town virtues and a pre-welfare state economy. He extolled big business, including multinational corporations, and praised present-day America as a more just society than the one it had replaced. He urged cooperation between business and big government; and prosperous busi-

nessmen, eager to uphold American values, flocked to his banners.

The Kristol empire also came to include intellectuals, some of them academics but mostly journalists like Norman Podhoretz, Ben Wattenberg, and Midge Decter. A neoconservative ideal type would not be a scholar but a publicist of Eastern European Jewish background and someone who is only at home in the New York-Washington corridor. Perhaps the predominance of this type has made neoconservatives welcome with open arms such conspicuously Christian allies as George Weigel,

Irving Kristol, an impenitent welfare statist, controls the neocon foundations.