Apologists Frame the P.C. Debate

by John J. Miller

Students, scholars, and journalists descended upon the University of Michigan last weekend in order to debate "political correctness," or "PC." Those who argue that political correctness exists essentially assert that a left-wing orthodoxy exists at American universities, refuses to tolerate dissent, and obstructs the controversial discussions necessary for higher education to function. They attended a conference entitled "The PC Frame-up: What's Behind the Attack?"

"We feel bad a deal has been given to the contemporary university reform movement," said U-M professor of English Alan Wald, in the conference organizers opening statement on Friday afternoon. "We want to see if our critics have a point."

By the conference's conclusion on Sunday night, Wald had decided the critics of political correctness had no point. "This massive slander campaign is not dying," he said. He specifically cited the four nationally recognized conservatives who had participated in the conference and accused them of creating a "Frankenstein's monster."

The conference organizers themselves are a group of left-leaning professors and graduate students. Many are members of Teachers for a Democratic Culture, an organization founded in September to promote particular reform and, according to one of its statements, to respond to "misleading charges about political correctness."

They now plan to form a local organization called the U-M Network for Cultural Democracy. The group's inaugural meeting will take place at 5 p.m. on Wednesday, Nov. 20, in a room at the Michigan Union as yet undetermined. Houston Baker, director of the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Black Literature and Culture, noted in the conference's first panel discussion that closed his remarks by asking the audience to consider how it should evaluate accusations of political correctness, and then invoking a recent hit by the rap group Public Enemy: "Can't Trust It."

Stephen Balch, president of the National Association of Scholars, spoke immediately after Baker, and offered a very different account of the modern academy. "The role of the university is to discover and transmit knowledge," he said. "A university's contribution to democracy is as an intellectual institution, not as a partisan player."

Balch asked what is meant by the "democratic reform movement on campuses?" He made a number of suggestions, but concluded that it implies nothing less than "the harnessing of the university for radical and egalitarian social change."

"This involves tendentious teaching and a reconstruction of the university"

Please See Page 11

Coming Out of the Second Closet

by Brian Jendryka

When he came out of the closet, Rich Tafel faced many of the same problems that other gays confront as they seek respect and equal treatment in a heterosexual world. Tafel, an adolescent health specialist for the Massachusetts Department of Health, then faced an additional obstacle: discrimination and ridicule from other gays. Why? Tafel is a Republican. Not only does he face the trials of being gay, but he also has to cope with the frequently more precarious situation of being a gay Republican in a leftist-dominated gay movement.

Tafel, president of the Log Cabin Federation, a national Republican group for gays, is one of many gays challenging the dogma of the leftist gay groups. Dave Edmondson, a third-year law school student at the University of Michigan, is another. Though Edmondson is a Libertarian, he encounters many of the same challenges as other gays and yet does not expect any special favors or rights from the government or society at large. Edmondson is a member of both the Washoe Libertarian Party and Libertarians for Gay and Lesbian Concerns (LGLC), a national group based in Ann Arbor and headed up by U-M alumnus James Hudler.

Hudler, Edmondson and Tafel are all working for gay rights, while in the process trying to dispel the attitudes of many of their peers and society in general. Instead of receiving support from the rest of the gay community, however, they have been ostracized, and even blackballed for their political beliefs.

Equal Rights or Special Rights?

While Tafel, Hudler, and Edmondson are working for gay rights, they are working for equal rights, and not special rights. This is an important distinction, says Tafel. "I'm not asking for any special rights. I'm not asking for money. And I'm not asking for affirmative action. I just want the same rights as every other taxpayer citizen."

On this issue, the Republican and Libertarian gay populations often find themselves in agreement. "Most political parties have a completely wrong-headed philosophy because they emphasize the group over the individual," says Edmondson. "Ironically, it is the elevation of the group over the individual that has been behind the oppression of gays."

While Republicans and Libertarians differ on many issues, gay Republicans and Libertarians also share many of the
The residents of Los Gorreadores, Nicaragua, have decided to "re-christen their village with the name of the man they credit with freeing them from tyranny: Ronald Reagan. 'He helped us a lot. Because of him, the nation lives in democracy,' said Raul Espinoza, the village patriarch," according to The Washington Times and Pat Buchanan's *From the Right*. Not to be outdone, we at the Michigan Review would like to suggest that the U-M re-christen Regent's Plaza in the name of the man who we credit with getting Corey Dolgon to quit playing guitar and shouting in public: Mickle & Sons President James Green.

A homosexual male, a bisexual female, a heterosexual male, and a necrophilous female were walking through the Diag (a distinct possibility on this campus). The bisexual female put her hand on the homosexual male's shoulder and said "Hi honey." The homosexual male glossed the heterosexual male. At the same time, the heterosexual male was making kissing noises at the necrophilous female. Who was guilty of sexual harassment? Clarence Thomas, of course.

This being our "Sex and Culture" issue, we dispatched one of our ace reportresses over to SAPAC to get the low-down on Julie Stein's own private Idaho. We had to try and get an interview with Stein on a previous article on SAPAC, but she always seemed to be too busy. This time, she consented to an interview, telling our reporter that we hadn't pursued her vigorously enough in the past. Unfortunately, Fraulein Stein's schedule was so busy that our reporter, failing to show up for her appointment, had to kidnap her pets and demand she fit us into her schedule. Would be that vigorous enough for you, Julie?

This year's version of the radical, wigged-out, hippy-wanna-bees, the Progressive Party, has really gone off the deep end. First of all, campaign co-chairs Todd "The Convinced Chalker" Ochoa and Mr. Boffo by Joe Martin
Roving Photographer

Do you support Ann Arbor's recently passed Domestic Partnership Ordinance?

by Mitch Rohde

Marty Favor, Graduate student in English: Sure, Whole-heartedly. Homosexuals live in a state where they cannot get married legally. This would attempt to rectify the situation.

Anamika Samata, RC Freshman: Yes, just because we refuse to admit homosexuality exists doesn't mean that it doesn't. Consider the large number of homosexuals...it seems ridiculous to attempt to suppress it.

Scott Almoney, Natural Resources Senior: Sure...it seems to me that people have the right to express their own gender.

Cindy Bauer, Nursing Freshman: I didn't hear about this particular ordinance beforehand, but I would say I support it.

Anita Fernandez, LSA Junior: I whole-heartedly support this. I don't believe that law has the right to call some relationships worthy, while others are immoral or illegal.

When asked the question, a number of students gave "no comment" responses, and one suggested that he wouldn't answer for fear of retribution.
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Domestic Partnership Ordinance is Proper

Today is the first day unmarried couples residing together may register their relationships under the domestic partnership ordinance, passed unanimously by Ann Arbor's City Council earlier this month. The ordinance has been the focus of statewide attention in recent weeks because it applies to single sex couples as well as more traditional heterosexual unions.

Nevertheless, the ordinance cannot be viewed correctly as the creation of a "new right" as it merely brings the law in step with the first and greatest principles of American government: liberty and equality before the law, not because of membership in a "historically oppressed" group, but as individuals who possess the same inalienable rights, and hence, claims, as all other individuals.

While the ordinance does not extend any privileges to registrants, it marks the initial step in eliminating legal distinctions, unduly founded on issues of private morality, as to what constitutes "legitimate" relationships. Many believe that the ordinance will become a spring-board for extending rights to homosexual couples, most of which are already available to married heterosexual couples, such as pensions, tax exemptions for those filing jointly, and the ability of one member of a relationship to transfer health insurance.

Others have concerns that the ordinance will lead to granting special privileges solely on the basis of sexual orientation, or a sort of "affirmative action" for homosexuals. This, however, would only undermine the logic behind the ordinance by re-establishing one's sexual orientation as legitimate grounds for determining social policy. Private sexual practices of individuals should not be a matter of public policy.

At the same time, it is silly to think that the ordinance represents a moral affirmation of homosexual lifestyles. Indeed, the language of the ordinance is purposefully gender neutral. Instead, the ordinance merely represents a needed alignment with the first principles of American government, and a refusal to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

Conversely, opponents of the ordinance claim that its passage will promote promiscuity, undermine family values, and foster sexually transmitted diseases. It is difficult to see, however, how recognizing homosexual unions will encourage promiscuity. Actually, it should have precisely the opposite effect, since registrants are required to cohabitate. Moreover, it is difficult to see how recognizing same-sex couples for being anti-family and then deny legal recognition of their families. As far as the spread of sexually transmitted disease, not only will a well-informed self-interest prevail, but also recognizing some relationships and not others. Consideration of the morality of homosexual partnerships does not fall in the government domain, but rather to private individuals. And while one may not condone homosexuality, he or she should demand consistency from the government. Despite the many ways it may be misconstrued, Ann Arbor's domestic partnership ordinance is a shining example of the way things ought to be.

Student Rights Commission Deserves Praise

Last winter, the Conservative Coalition captured the presidency and a majority on the Michigan Student Assembly. With the changes on the assembly came changes in the composition of the leadership of its committees and commissions, and more often than not, these changes reflected the new conservative bent of the assembly. Third year law school student Michael David Warren Jr. was elected chairman of the Students Rights Commission (SRC), and he pledged to run the Commission in a completely different manner than his predecessor, Corey Dolgon.

Recently, Warren's tenure at SRC has come under scrutiny and criticism in the letters to the editor and editorial section of the Michigan Daily. In addition, this year's version of the liberal party, the Progressive party, has suggested in their campaign flyers that the current assembly has done "nothing" to further students' interests regarding the recent tear gasing of students on S. University and the controversial Michigan Union I.D. policy. The Progressives harken back to the good ol' days of Dolgon, and have actually built their campaign around the issue of students' rights. So how has Warren distinguished himself from Dolgon at SRC?

To begin with, it is interesting to note that last year, the Conservative Coalition made Dolgon's SRC an important plank in its election platform. Dolgon's idea of representing "students' rights" consisted of issuing lists of demands, taking over administrative offices, having sit-ins, rallies, protests, donning gorilla suits, and playing poorly written pseudo-Bob Dylan protest songs to the tune of everything. Needless to say, these antics, while they did grab the headlines of the Daily, did little to actually affect policy in a manner that was beneficial to students. In fact, Dolgon and his cohorts were so far out of the mainstream of U-M student opinion, that one might go so far as to say that his actions were actually harmful to student interests.

Warren's SRC presents a sharp contrast to Dolgon's. Warren has not sponsored any protests; he has not called for any sit-ins or student strikes; he has not issued any lists of demands, nor has he ever bad-mouthed the administration. What he has done is remarkable, at least in comparison to Dolgon's accomplishments.

Rather than staging a retro-'60s freak show, as was Dolgon's specialty, Warren has assembled several sub-commissions consisting of interested students, including other law students, that have quietly been assembling information on several key issues. On November 12, the "Teargassing Subcommittee" issued a 50 page report on their investigation of the incident. This report included a transcript of an interview with Ann Arbor's Chief of Police, and also contained analysis of several documents which were obtained by SRC as a result of their filing Freedom of Information Act requests. Another sub-committee is investigating and is in the process of preparing a report on the constitutionality of the U-M's interim speech code. They have done similar research on the legality of the City of Ann Arbor's noise ordinance, which Warren thinks might be enforced selectively against students.

When the SRC issues its reports and makes its findings known, neither the U-M administration nor the Ann Arbor Police Department will be able to brush them off as they did Dolgon's left-leaning, blanket denunciations of everything that represented the establishment. In this way, Warren's SRC is not only furthering students' rights, but it is also demonstrating that the SRC need not consist of a troupe of wanna-bees acting like it is 1968.

Michael David Warren Jr. is to be commended for his administration of the SRC, and is setting a fine example for future SRC chairmen. He has demonstrated that the SRC can be apolitical, that it does not need front page exposure, that Michigan Daily, blanket denunciation of everything that represented the establishment, but rather to private individuals.
But Wait, There’s Muir

P.C. Walls in Intellectual Laziness

by Jeff Muir

An interesting thing happened the other night. I was sitting in the back row of Auditorium B in Angell Hall last Saturday evening with a few hundred other people, listening to a panel discussion on “Free Speech, Hate Speech, and P.C.” which was part of last weekend’s “P.C. Frame-Up: What’s Behind the Attack,” conference. During the question-and-answer session, a gentleman stood up and described an event that he equated with hate speech, and then asked the panel what they thought. The gentleman, Jim Toy of the University of Michigan’s Lesbian and Gay Male Programs Office (LGMO), said that last year, following the “Drake’s 5” incident, he received an “anonymous” MT5 message which warned LGMO against supporting the Drake’s 5. The message, he continued, further threatened that if LGMO did so, the anonymous sender would try to “de-fund” LGMO.

Toy said that he then contacted the people at MT5 who handle “ethical use” questions to learn the identity of the anonymous person who was responsible for this hate speech. He then paused for dramatic flair, “I discovered that Jeff Muir of the Michigan Review sent that message.”

Before I go any further, I ought to clarify what really happened with the Drake’s 5, the MT5 message, and LGMO.

As for the Drake’s 5: Patrice Maurer and several of her friends were at Drake’s some evening when Truman Tibbals, the octogenarian owner, concluded that they hadn’t ordered enough food to justify their being in his establishment for so long. As he has done hundreds of times before with loiterers, Tibbals threw the bunch of them out. Maurer and her cohorts concluded that this was an act of “homophobia.” They reasoned that this man of 80, who probably wouldn’t know a lesbian from a thespian, realized they were homosexuals and in a fit of hysteria ejected them. So Maurer formed the

Drake’s 5. She called for a boycott of Drake’s, demanded that Tibbals refund the money they had spent on candy there, and further, that he donate $100 to the LGMO.

The campus community was almost unanimous in its condemnation of Maurer and the rest of the Drake’s 5. Even some members of the homosexual community said that Maurer had gone too far. I wrote a column (“The City Hall 1 Comes Out.” March 20, 1991) about the event, in which I was harshly critical of Maurer for her grandstanding.

I sent a message to “LGMO staff” in which I identified myself as a contributing editor of the Michigan Review. The reason that my name didn’t appear is

Letters to the Editor

Column Offensive

As Native Americans, we feel compelled to respond to the article written on October 9, 1991 by Jeff Muir entitled “Singles Have Feelings, Too.”

To begin, as with any other ethnic title, Native American is spelled with two capital letters—not one. This “alp” is comparable to saying “Irish American” or “African American.” It shows a lack of respect to Native Americans. Please show the same respect to our people that you would to anyone else.

Second, the advertisement for Muir’s article in the “Inside” section of the first page of the Michigan Review said, “Muir on Indians.” Muir did not write an article on Native Americans, he wrote an article on the situation between a people and an issue.

Third, Muir states that “Anti-Indian symbol advocates claim that the practice objectifies native Americans, and brainwashes people into believing that all native Americans are collegiate or professional athletes.” We have never heard this argument. Our opposition to Indian logos stems from the way in which we are characterized by the logos and/or the practices which come out of those logos. One example is the Florida State Seminoles. While their logo is not particularly offensive, the practices engaged in by Florida State supporters are appalling. They dress in what they characterize as Native American dress, wear “war paint,” carry tomahawks and run around screaming in the Hollywood stereotype of the “Indian savage.”

The only similar practice that comes to mind is the minstrel shows in which non-African Americans painted their faces black and made fun of African Americans. This has ceased to exist due to their offensive nature towards African Americans. In a land of equality and opportunity, should we not also recognize the prejudice against Native Americans and, therefore, eliminate the use of Indian Logos?

Muir states, “It is obvious that not all Native Americans are athletes, because some of them make pottery and blankets. Similarly, women are capable of more than sex, as is evidenced by the many actresses and dancers that are of the female persuasion.” While we are proud of our cultural traditions, Muir states only those careers that are traditionally Native American. Native Americans are also lawyers, doctors, teachers, scientists—the list is indefinite. It should be noted that women hold these careers as well—a fact overlooked by Muir.

Finally, Muir claims that those who oppose Indian logos never ask Native Americans how they feel. According to Muir, Native Americans are honored to have their likeness as a school symbol.” The first problem with this statement is that Indian logos are not a likeness to Native Americans. They portray them in a way thatNative Americans are brutal savages. This stereotype was created by the colonists to justify the taking of our land and the attempted genocide of our entire people. Second, not all Native Americans support Indian logos. As with any issue in any community, there is a division.

We strongly recommend that in the future Muir take his own advice and ask Native Americans how they feel about Indian logos before writing an article.

Melissa Lopez, Amy Delang, Susan Hill, Amy Locklear, Lulu Block, Colleen Rice

Rocky Horror Article Factually Incorrect

I am writing to critique the article on Rocky Horror (10/23/91). My name is Bree Boler and I am the co-founder of the Velvet Darkness Revue. First of all, the 15th anniversary convention wasn’t in New York, it was at the 20th Century Fox studios in Los Angeles. Shock Treatment wasn’t a sequel, it was the further adventures of Brad and Janet. Henry Price had little to do with the group’s success; in fact it was a group effort headed up by myself, Midnight Blessing, and Ken Cassidy. Henry Price didn’t even join the cast for several months after the cast had formed. No one to my knowledge has ever thrown “meatloaf.” Michael Hess, not Michael Hen is not the only Representative for the National Fan Club. I am also a State Representative for the Fan Club.

People should check their facts before they write an article like this. I can’t even begin to tell you how disappointing it is to read this after you gave such high hopes when finding out that Rocky is going to get some much needed deserved attention. Some of the comments in the article sounded like the writer, Mr. Sprout, didn’t even enjoy the show, so why did he write about it? Shouldn’t it have been assigned to someone who would have shown a little more enthusiasm? Or at least, a little more objectivity. It sounds like someone tied him to a chair, toothpicks holding his eyes open, forcing him to watch the movie! And what about the little people in the cast? Don’t they get any praise? Surely you don’t expect your readers to believe that Midnight, Henri, and Ken can put on the show alone? What about the other actors and actresses, not to mention the crew? They work damn hard to put on the show, attending three rehearsals a week to assure that everything is perfect.

I appreciate the fact that the article was written at all, but I feel that it could’ve been better. I sincerely hope that in the future, there will be more articles in your paper about the Rocky Horror Picture Show, but including some of the other facts and people that have kept the show running for the past 16 years. I hope that my criticisms won’t keep you from doing further articles on our group. We are there doing the show every Saturday night without fail and I think that deserves some attention. Perhaps a follow up article could be done to correct the aforementioned mistakes.

Bree Boler
The Velvet Darkness Revue
R.H.P.S. Fan Club
Rep. #324
Essay: Sexual Assault

SAPAC's Credibility Tarnished by Politics

by Andrew Bockelman

The Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC) at the University of Michigan is frequently a subject of debate on campus. The center was created to effectively deal with the problem of sexual assault in the campus community, and, for the most part, it has pursued that task. At the same time, however, it is often criticized as a laudable cause gone awry because of actions that are both controversial and irrelevant to its purpose. SAPAC seeks to further a noble cause, but its credibility has often been tarnished by its dubious positions on the issue of sexual assault and un­ called for attempts at politicization.

The idea for a rape prevention center at the University of Michigan originated in 1985, resulting from a general concern throughout the campus community that the University approached the issue of sexual assault apathetically. Public pressure forced the administration to acknowledge the issue, and in June of 1985 a drive was started to establish the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, to be run through the Office of Student Services. In February of 1986, the current director, Julie Steiner, assumed her role as the coordinator of the center and SAPAC officially opened.

Since that time, SAPAC has provided a vast array of services to the campus community, including educational programming, counseling services, and coordinating campus safety concerns, for the purpose of constructively dealing with the issue of sexual assault.

SAPAC's educational programming services seek to raise awareness about sexual assault by informing the public about the prominence and seriousness of this crime. In order to disseminate such information, SAPAC produces posters and pamphlets regarding various topics related to sexual assault, such as the number of rapes reported on campus last year, frequent "myths" about sexual assault, Michigan's Criminal Sexual Conduct Statutes, the psychology of a rapist, and how to treat a victim of sexual assault.

In addition to sponsoring Sexual Assault Awareness Week every fall and Rape Prevention Month every April, the center also offers programs and seminars conducted by a volunteer staff of 60 trained professionals and students which teach prevention and awareness. Seminars such as the Acquaintance Rape Prevention Workshop, Survivor Speak Out, and Sexual Harassment Workshop are presented to residence halls, classes, fraternities, sororities, faculty members, and other interested groups. In fact, over 4,000 people attend SAPAC seminars every year.

SAPAC has also established support programs to help survivors of sexual assault. Professional, confidential counseling is offered to survivors on both an individual and a group basis. Similar services are also provided to the families of survivors. In addition, SAPAC operates a counseling phone line which is accessible outside of office hours, and is staffed by trained professionals and volunteers. SAPAC also works with legal and medical organizations in its efforts to provide assistance to survivors of sexual assault.

Coordinating campus safety concerns is another of SAPAC's primary projects. Although SAPAC does not play a direct role in providing campus safety, it has worked extensively with other departments, particularly the Department of Public Safety, to implement strategies designed to increase safety on campus. SAPAC has successfully worked for improvements in the Nite Owl service, the establishment of "blue light" security phones on campus, increased lighting on campus, as well as the SafeWalk/Northwalk student escort service, which operates with over 100 student volunteers.

SAPAC emphasizes that rape can be prevented by men and women working together to increase awareness, and tenably seeks to provide a safe campus and supportive environment for survivors. Overall, SAPAC has honored its mission of raising awareness and working to prevent sexual assault. In some respects, however, it has damaged its own credibility by frequently adopting extreme, politicized positions on controversial matters.

Since the time of its inception, SAPAC has generated controversy by taking rather tendentious positions regarding the nature of sexual assault, primarily through making unsubstantiated and often dubious claims, stereotyping males, and unnecessarily politicizing its role.

SAPAC has often been accused of manufacturing or fabricating sexual assault terminology with no scientific, sociological, or legal basis. The most infamous example of this is SAPAC's attempt to define a new degree of criminal sexual conduct called "psychological rape."

Psychological rape is apparently committed when rude remarks, heavy breathing, whistling noises, stares, etc., are specifically targeted at particular females. SAPAC's goal is to equate such impolite behavior with rape. In extreme cases, such behavior might rightly be labeled as sexual harassment, but in no way is it "rape." The Criminal Sexual Conduct Statutes of the State of Michigan, which define the four degrees of criminal sexual conduct in the state, list penetration, attempted penetration, contact, or attempted contact as grounds for charges. Thirteen aggravating circumstances in addition to the four degrees are also listed. Nowhere does it mention "psychological rape" as grounds for charges.

At the same time, it would be impos­ sible to legislate such a vague standard. Since different people will have different reactions to the same comment, it is impossible to predetermine which actions constitute "psychological rape" and which ones do not. For example, in response to an approving, inviting glance, some people will be flattered and others will be offended. In order to maintain justice, those reactions cannot be generalized. By endorsing such exaggerated terminology, SAPAC gives the appearance of trying to dilute the true meaning of rape in favor of making more trivial actions into crimes.

In addition, SAPAC's educational resources are replete with stereotypes. Ironically, SAPAC claims that it wants to dispel the "myths" of sexual assault. The most obvious example of this is that men and boys can and will be sexually assaulted. "This discrepancy repeats itself in other SAPAC literature, even to the point where it is offensive to many males who feel as if their gender is being stereotyped as "rapist." SAPAC's claim that it is apolitically seeking to end sexual assault is weakened by these blatant and obvious contradictions within its own literature. If accuracy were important to SAPAC, the center would promote gender inclusively when talking about the crime. The terms "rapist" and "rape" are infinitely more accurate than "he" or "she."

Many of the positions taken by SAPAC in its educational material suggest that the purpose of the organization is to uncover "sexism" in our society, rather than promote awareness about sex crimes. While some rapes may occur because the rapist has sexist beliefs, SAPAC attempts to exaggerate this connection by loosely defining sexism on its own dubious terms. SAPAC tends to promote the idea that rape exists because males are brought up in a "rape culture," where they are taught to be sexist. This charge goes unsubstantiated. It is naively assumed that males rape because they are taught to think of women as nothing more than objects of lust. The fallacy in this thought can be illustrated by referring to a 1987 incident at Dooley's Bar in Ann Arbor, which SAPAC vocally criticized as being symbolic of our "rape culture."
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Essay: Campus Politics

SAPAC Abuses Questionable Statistics

by Tony Ghicca

Sexually assaulted on campus has often posed an extreme threat to students. SAPAC, the Student Assistance Program for Campus Attraction, has been increasingly challenged on their sometimes questionable data collection methods. The recent controversy surrounding the SAPAC survey has highlighted the need for more accurate and reliable research methods.

The survey, titled "Sexual Assault Prevention Act," is conducted annually at many universities across the country. It aims to gather information about sexual assault on campus and provide resources for survivors. However, recent critiques of the survey have raised concerns about its accuracy and validity.

One of the main criticisms is the lack of transparency in the survey's methodology. The survey questions are not always clear, and the results are often difficult to interpret. This lack of clarity can lead to misinterpretations and misrepresentations of the data.

Another concern is the potential for bias in the survey's sampling methods. The survey is conducted online, and it is possible that not all students are represented equally. The survey may also suffer from a self-selection bias, as students who have experienced sexual assault may be more likely to participate.

Despite these criticisms, the survey remains a valuable resource for universities and organizations working to prevent sexual assault. However, it is crucial that the methodology be improved to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data.

In conclusion, the SAPAC survey is a valuable tool for universities and organizations working to prevent sexual assault. However, it is crucial that the methodology be improved to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data. With these improvements, the survey can continue to serve as a valuable resource for preventing sexual assault on campus.
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U-M Should Not Pander to Homosexuals

By Mark O. Stern

The recent passage of the so-called "Domestic Partnership Act" in Ann Arbor has added fuel to the flames of this year's left-wing demonstration of homosexual "families" into the University of Michigan's family housing.

The activists who have been demonstrating all year for this change in policy are still following this criterion, and it even maintains that the U-M is hypocritical. The U-M claims it does not discriminate based on sex or sexual orientation, yet it "discriminates" against homosexual couples.

It is obviously true that the U-M's policy is hypocritical—the policy itself is an exercise in futility. No one will deny that the U-M makes distinctions (i.e., "discriminates") based on sex, for example. It clearly matches roommates using this criterion, and it even maintains all-female dorms. While few would question the rationale for these actions, they are still "discrimination." The current housing policy ignores common sense if it is read literally, and should be eliminated or modified, if the U-M does not want to make dorms coed by bed, which would be required under a literal interpretation.

This is a smokescreen, however. The real issue at stake is a second, deeper issue: whether the U-M may set any policies at all for the housing it owns, if such policies might violate the tenants' "rights."

The University ought not be in the business of providing family housing, in which it competes with the free market. If the U-M chooses, nonetheless, to provide such housing (as is likely for the foreseeable future), it does not give up the right to set standards of conduct for those living on its property, including the exclusion of non-families, just because it is a public institution.

All students surrender some of their fundamental rights when they enter any University housing situation. The right to bear arms, for example, is specifically guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Yet possession of firearms in a dorm is grounds for immediate lease termination. This policy, along with others such as substance-free halls, and quiet hours, has not been questioned by activists, even though the Bill of Rights is involved. Thus, the U-M has a precedent to set standards for conduct on its property.

"But wait!" you say. Banning guns is "different." What would happen if the U-M did allow homosexuals into family housing? How would it be detrimental? The answer is far more complicated than proponents will acknowledge. The current standard for family housing defines a family as either 1) a married couple, or 2) a single parent with children. In an avoided homosexual with children (from whatever source) would be able to move in as a single parent, the debate revolves around the first criterion.

Ann Arbor's current ordinance notwithstanding, there exists no universal, accepted definition of "marriage" for homosexuals. If the U-M is to address this question, it will have to allow into family housing any couples who claim that they are "family." The city ordinance applies only within Ann Arbor; there is no national or statewide standard.

Such an interpretation, though, would also include unmarried heterosexual couples living together, or, for the University students who wish to enjoy the benefits of a subsidized North Campus apartment; otherwise, the U-M would be discriminating. The U-M would be unable to set any standards, and family housing would be no different from any other apartment. The whole purpose of family housing would be utterly perverted and vitiated.

The root of this debate, which will come out of the argument in the end, is the allegation that in a free society the U-M cannot discriminate against homosexuals, even if the effect of allowing them into family housing would be to make it no longer for families.

Yet once again, things are not so simple. There is a difference between toleration and acceptance. In a free society, the government does not have any business regulating a transaction between two consenting adults, so long as that transaction does not impinge on the rights of others. Because something is permitted, however, does not mean that it is encouraged, or even legally protected. Homosexual activists allege that the ordinance does not encourage homosexuality. But their arguments are a perversion of logic. They claim that the status quo promotes heterosexuality by allowing heterosexual couples into housing.

If this is so, allowing homosexual couples into housing would promote homosexuality—which proponents deny! If the new policy does not promote homosexuality, then the old one does not (by their logic) promote heterosexuality, so no change would be needed.

Homosexuals may have the right to live their preferred lifestyle, but the University does not have to condone it. To say that allowing homosexual couples to live in family housing does not condone homosexuality is nonsense.

Allowing homosexual couples into family housing is not a neutral action. It is an active encouragement of an activity which is contrary to Michigan law (enforced or not). Ann Arbor's recent Domestic Partnership Act is a similar contradiction of the will of the people of the State of Michigan, as expressed in State law. It is not about whether the government is in the business of providing family housing, simply, but about whether the government ought to be in the business of promoting homosexuality.

Is family housing an endorsement of heterosexuality? It may well be, but heterosexuality is the accepted norm of society from time immemorial. The vast majority of the people of Michigan and of the U.S. have endorsed it. While a majority may be wrong, in a free society, the government must either endorse or not endorse an activity, the majority should prevail, as long as it does not violate people's individual rights to life, liberty, or property.

And the U-M's violation none of these. It does not discriminate against homosexual students in the classroom. University-subsidized housing is a privilege, not a right; as noted above, the U-M can and should set standards in all areas of the University. Students who do not like them may choose to live elsewhere, or exercise their preference by going to school elsewhere.

Almost all societies and religions have condemned homosexuality. More over, many, if not most of the tenants in family housing live there because of the family setting. They do not want their children to grow up among rowdy college students off campus, but instead in a more wholesome, family environment. This is why the U-M gives preference to families with children in admission to family housing. A wholesome environment would not be maintained by allowing any two people, of the same or different sex, into family housing, with no restrictions whatsoever.

If the people of the State of Michigan, who in large part fund this University, want to legalize homosexual "marriage," they will make their preference known by passing such a law. But it is neither for the U-M nor the City of Ann Arbor to begin social engineering which is contrary to the will of the people, and which is subsidized by the people's tax dollars.

The State is not a moral teacher. But it must at all costs avoid taking actions which legislate against morality, and actively destroy it. Laws and policies destructive of the morality of the citizens will ultimately destroy the state itself, the Founding Fathers realized this when they drafted the Constitution.

Finally, the precedent which would be set by allowing homosexual couples into U-M housing is dangerous. This is only the first step down a slippery slope.

In the wake of Ann Arbor's domestic partnership ordinance, activists are already demanding that the city confer benefits on the "partners" of its employees. Next, private businesses may be compelled to do so, if the activists again get their way) and there is even a possibility, albeit remote, of "affirmative action" for homosexuals. Far from getting the government out of people's lives, the natural conclusion of a policy change would create still more government interference in the private sector. Homosexuals are encouraged with inalienable rights, but the "right" to University-subsidized housing is not one of them. The University cannot create morality, but it must not take action to further fray our nation's moral fabric.

Mark O. Stern is a junior in history and publisher emeritus of the Review.
Review Forum: Family Housing Debate

‘U’ Shouldn’t Pander ... It Should Be Fair

by Jeff Muir

The University of Michigan's regents recently voted unanimously to reject a proposal, outlined in "From Invisibility to Inclusion — Opening the Doors for Lesbians and Gay Men at the University of Michigan," that would have made it possible for homosexual couples, non-married heterosexual couples, and extended families to live in the U-M's family housing units. Current admission criteria only allows access to legally married couples and single parents.

Proponents of a change in the housing code point to one particularly forceful argument in their favor. The State of Michigan does not recognize homosexual marriages. Therefore, proponents argue, homosexuals are easily discriminated against by merely stating that a prerequisite for access to family housing is state-recognized marriage.

This sort of Catch-22 is often used as a method of discriminating against homosexuals, just as it has been used against minorities. Blacks have often been denied equal access to comparable educational resources, thus producing a large number of under-educated, state-dependent people. These people are then criticized for being stupid and lazy, and the fact that they are under-educated and state-dependent is then cited as "proof." Homosexuals are denied societal acceptance, legal recognition of marriage, and economic benefits thereof (tax credits and standard exemptions). Homosexuals are then portrayed as perverted and promiscuous social deviants, and the fact that they do not have traditional, monogamous unions is cited as "proof."

As long as the state refuses to formally recognize homosexual unions, the U-M cannot in good conscience make this recognition a requirement for its services and benefits. The U-M should take the lead in providing, for alternative methods of partnership recognition by establishing its own requirements, recognizing church sanctions, or allowing municipal domestic partnership recognition (such as the one recently enacted in Ann Arbor). This has been done successfully, for the purpose of reforming housing requirements, at several Big Ten and Ivy League universities.

Opponents of changes in the housing policy have often claimed in allowing homosexuals access to family housing, the U-M would be engaging in "social engineering." This argument is often made against the practice of employing government or institutional force to change society in ways that it would not naturally change. Claims that allowing homosexuals into family housing amounts to social engineering are completely misguided, however. I would argue that by using the institutional force of the U-M to prevent a segment of the population which already exists from enjoying equal access is itself a form of negative social engineering. Changing policies to meet the needs of the people over time is not social engineering. In rejecting the family housing reforms, the U-M is failing to recognize changes in society (such as the high divorce rate and the increasing acceptance of and openness within the gay community). It is blindly basing policy on outdated conceptions of sexuality and family, and requiring that people fit into these conceptions before conferring benefits. This is social engineering in its worst sense.

Opponents also have employed the sensationalistic tactic of claiming that allowing homosexuals into the family housing units will somehow threaten the children there, or corrupt what they claim is a pristine, Ward and Jane familial environment. This argument hardly deserves a refutation, but I will nonetheless provide one. First, no credible sociological or criminological evidence exists which would suggest that homosexuals are any more prone to child abuse than heterosexuals. Indeed, I would argue that far more cases of child abuse are perpetrated by heterosexuals than homosexuals. In any case, a tendency to abuse children is clearly distinct from sexual orientation. As for the claim that merely having homosexuals around will somehow harm children, I merely point to the fact that many things are alleged to harm children — Saturday morning cartoons, pornograpy, 2 Live Crew records, Catholicism, etc. — and these are not barred from existing in the U-M's family housing.

Opponents of revising the housing policy also claim that by allowing homosexuals into family housing, the U-M is in some way "condoning" or "encouraging" a homosexual lifestyle or homosexual experimentation. To begin with, I would simply ask those who make this argument if they run out and try everything that is allowed, then this reflects more on their talents and capabilities as parents than it does on the power of U-M policy to corrupt children.

Opponents of allowing homosexuals into family housing often rely on arguments grounded in various ideas of morality. For instance, they claim that homosexuality is simply immoral, and as such, the U-M has a duty to prevent such immoral practices and lifestyles from entering into the U-M community. Unless such immoral practices are forbidden by law, however, the U-M has no right to seek to enforce some undefined moral code upon its community. Sodomy laws do exist, but the legal definition of sodomy includes every sexual practice except penis to vagina intercourse, and such laws do not specify any gender ratio, that is, a man engaging in oral sex with his wife is just as much "sodomy" as anal sex between gay men. So, to argue that the U-M ought to do its part to enforce sodomy laws by continuing to deny homosexual couples access to family housing would require, for the sake of consistency, that it also forbid heterosexual couples from engaging in what the law defines as "sodomy."

Biblical objections are also raised — opponents of altering family housing regulations have claimed that homosexuality is clearly forbidden in both the Old and New Testaments. Sliding down their slippery slope, they then claim that the U.S. Constitution is "obviously" based on Judeo-Christian principles. Therefore, they claim, it would be perfectly reasonable to maintain the status quo on these grounds. Merely mentioning the constitutional requirement of a separation of church and state is sufficient to persuade most liberty-loving citizens of the danger inherent in buying this argument. Citizens who wish to live in a society modeled after the Good Book ought to move to Vatican City or South Carolina. In addition to the typical religious objections to homosexuality, there does exist one philosophical objection which ought to be addressed. Some people claim that the primary function of any species is reproduction, and that the state ought to encourage behaviors which lead to maintaining the species and which discourage the opposite. I would again argue that mandating reproductive quotas is not the proper role of the state.

In another version of this same argument, some people claim that because the traditional family unit is the most basic building block of society, the state ought to encourage the promulgation of traditional families. This is often the justification for standard tax exemptions for marriage and children. Official sanction of homosexuality, they reason, is clearly detrimental to this cause, and therefore, the state ought to discourage homosexuality. Not only does this logic put the state in the position of deciding what sort of lifestyles individuals ought to lead, but it would logically point toward the government outlawing the right of a man to be a bachelor.

In short, there are no arguments against homosexuality that are relevant to the U-M's housing policies. People certainly ought to respect opinions regarding homosexuality which are based on religious conviction, but it does not follow that laws and policies should be based on such religious or moral convictions.

The University of Michigan has sought, albeit imperfectly, to create an atmosphere of equality, and an environment which is conducive to equality of opportunity, to all people irrespective of their race, religion, ethnicity, political affiliation, or sexual orientation. Many of these efforts have themselves bordered on being discriminatory and unfair. In establishing an environment which treats all equally, the U-M need not conform additional rights, that is, extra rights on certain groups at the expense of other groups. The U-M should, however, make certain that all are treated equally before its laws. Homosexuals do not need affirmative action, and I would wager that most do not want such extra rights. Homosexuals need not be treated equally, however. This means that homosexuals claimed to be able to live and work and exist in society as any other group is allowed to. So long as our society continues to deny homosexuals equal treatment before the law, the ugly stereotypes of homosexuals as perverted, promiscuous, sexual deviants will remain. Allowing homosexuals and homosexual couples access to family housing at the U-M would be an important step toward changing these stereotypes. Aside from that, reason and logic, and compassion demand such a change.

Jeff Muir is a senior in general studies and the special issue editor of the Review.
Interview: 2 Live Crew's Luther Campbell

Rapper, Author Discusses Obscenity

On November 4, Jay Sprout of the Michigan Review interviewed Luther Campbell, the leader of rap group 2 Live Crew. The Crew's LP As Nasty As They Wanna Be was declared obscene in some communities. This resulted in the arrest of a record store owner in Miami for selling the album, as well as Campbell's own arrest following one of the group's concerts. Their current release is entitled Sports Weekend: As Nasty As They Wanna Be Part 2. Campbell is the author of the soon-to-be-released book about the obscenity trials and arrests, As Nasty As He Wanna Be.

REVIEW: Tell us about the book.

CAMPBELL: It's called As Nasty As He Wanna Be, by me, the Nasty Man. It's my life story and how it started. It goes back to when I was a kid and all that. What it's like living in Liberty City, the records, and it goes into the obscenity trials. It tells a lot of things that were happening that maybe people didn't believe was happening. It talks about life on the road and the band and how we started off.

REVIEW: What, besides your agent, inspired you to write a book?

CAMPBELL: There's a demand for it. Everybody's always asking the same question, everybody wants to know where the idea came from and all these different things. What does 2 Live Crew do on the road? People want to know what it's all about and what we're all about.

REVIEW: Is there anything in particular that you want to achieve with it?

CAMPBELL: I wanted to let people know a lot more about the censorship thing that they maybe don't know. And let people know a lot more about the person who I am. And let them know about life in general as a young black kid trying to make it in today's society. It's real hard.

REVIEW: What about censorship — why don't people know as much about it as they should?

CAMPBELL: I want them to know that it's not just white people. A lot of people have this thing when something is done to a black person and it's a lot of white people that's actually doing it — they would think that it's the whole white race that's involved in it. I wanna let a lot of people know that it ain't. It's just the older mentality of white people that's after us basically because they see more of a newer generation, a younger generation being more responsive to black needs, people listening to black music, hanging out with blacks. It's these people who are trying to fight this from happening. That's my main thing, my main fight and struggle to let people, mostly black people, know that it ain't just a black thing. There's white people that are involved in this too.

REVIEW: What made you want to do the upcoming solo album?

CAMPBELL: Burned In the USA was supposed to be a solo album but then there were things that everybody wanted to get off their chest that I let all the guys be on there. But it was still my solo album. Then this one here, the album that's out now, I wanted everybody to do the things that they wanted to do and not just do what I wanted everybody to do like I normally do on all the other albums. So what I did was, I did about four records and everybody else did their own thing. I still had a lot of things that I wanted to do and I just said I'll do it on my own album.

REVIEW: Will the solo album sound any different from previous 2 Live Crew albums?

CAMPBELL: Well, it's gonna be a lot of, you know... well yeah, it's gonna be a bit different. But it's gonna be talking about sex. Basically it's gonna be the stuff that I do, it's gonna be a little different. I got a great record for your college on my solo album. Y'all are gonna find it very interesting, but I ain't gonna tell you what it is. It's a song for all college campuses across America.

REVIEW: What's the subject matter?

CAMPBELL: What do most people do on college campuses?

REVIEW: Do you feel that your arrest and the arrest of the record store owner accomplished anything?

CAMPBELL: Yeah, it did. When people saw that, they said "Hey, this is some serious shit here." If you believe in something, you've got to stand behind it. The First Amendment is a serious thing and a lot of people didn't: take it too seriously until after that happened. They see guys going to jail saying that's my right and I believe in it and I'm willing to go to jail for it. If you're a true blue American, you would say "Hey, this is what we're all about and we're going to do it."

REVIEW: Your lyrics have been described as vulgar, disgusting, obscene, vile...?

CAMPBELL: All of the above.

REVIEW: Do you do this simply to prove that you can?

REVIEW: What are your thoughts on political correctness and speech codes?

CAMPBELL: I believe they have the right to say what they wanna say. A lot of the stuff that they say is really true, but when they start talking about breaking up the races, I got a problem with that. As far as when they're talking about what went on before and what shouldn't be going on now, I'm with that. I'm all about bringing people together, the younger generation. The older generation is a lost cause.

REVIEW: Is there anything you consider obscene?

CAMPBELL: I consider him a fad but I respect anybody who sells records. There's a lot of black rappers who are lads too, he ain't the only one. There's a bunch of them that come and go every year. He ain't the only one that's corny. But, people like him and I respect him. The girls like him and I respect that. If he sells records, that's alright with me.

REVIEW: Do you consider Vanilla Ice a fake?

CAMPBELL: I consider him a fad but I respect anybody who sells records. There's a lot of black rappers who are lads too, he ain't the only one. There's a bunch of them that come and go every year. He ain't the only one that's corny. But, people like him and I respect him. The girls like him and I respect that. If he sells records, that's alright with me.

REVIEW: Could you take him in a fist fight?

CAMPBELL: I could beat most rappers up. Yeah, man, I'll beat his ass.
SAPAC Politics

Continued From Page 5

At the time of the incident, a lingering show was held at Dooley's. According to the Michigan Daily editorial, "the show encouraged men to think of women's bodies as objects to use and sell to other objects, in this case - alcohol." The generalizations run rampant. It is naïve to assume that all men are going to think of women's bodies as objects - after patronizing the show, or to assume that men in general think this way. If the roles were reversed (men entertaining women) would the offense be any different? The key point to remember is that there are always willing volunteers to provide such entertainment, and there are always willing volunteers to patronize it.

The credibility of SAPAC has also suffered from irresponsible attempts to politicize the center on behalf of its director, Julie Steiner.

Prominent former director of SAPAC, Julie Steiner had a long history of political activism. She previously had worked as an abortion rights advocate and a women's rights lobbyist in Washington D.C., and as executive director of the Tennessee branch of the American Civil Liberties Union. In her current position at SAPAC, Steiner apparently believes she can continue her tradition of political activism and use the center to her advantage. SAPAC is a tremendous lack of responsibility on her part as a leader.

Steiner has managed to use the center to market her own sexist philosophies, to use her authority as a mechanism for political advocacy, and to take sides on controversial issues in the name of SAPAC.

The most recent evidence of this is an "insight" article Steiner wrote for the October 14, 1991, issue of the Daily. The piece, entitled "Anita Hill Challenges Norms," discussed the controversy surrounding the confirmation of Judge Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court. The result was a biased political statement full of unsubstantiated generalizations and opinions that amount to outright racism and sexism.

Steiner began the article by assuming that Professor Hill was being honest in her testimony, and Judge Thomas was not, even though the subject of honesty has not been conclusively determined. Steiner blamed this on the "white" merit in charge of the hearings who were "feeling [guilt] for their own actions in the past with female workers and/or colleagues." Steiner provided no evidence to support either of these claims. Her comments appear to be motivated by a dislike for both the nominee and those in charge of the hearings.

Steiner's attempt to rationally discuss sexism in the article offered insight into her own militant sexism nature. Steiner blatantly demonstrates her own racist and sexist sentiments by stating: "Shame! Shame on the white men in Senate Judiciary Committee who ignored Dr. Hill's statements about the behavior of the Supreme Court nominee." Steiner prefers to think of the Senators in terms of race and sex rather than the nature of their position or their personal or professional records. She would rather label their actions as inappropriate and blame it on the fact they are white men. In her position, one would assume that Steiner would concentrate on the merit of the situation: Anita Hill raises public awareness about sexual harassment. She mentions this only once in the article. Instead, she resorts to repeatedly shouting: "Shame!" at "white" men. Under any circumstances, this constitutes racism and sexism.

Steiner's graverest error is not the mere expression of her opinions. She is entitled to believe what she wants. Steiner's gravest error is affiliating herself with SAPAC in the byline and thereby using her authority as director of SAPAC to take a stand on a controversial issue. This is an irresponsible abuse of power.

SAPAC was established by the university community for the university community. It is funded by this community, and is staffed by volunteers from this community. When the leader of any community organization takes sides on controversial issues in the name of that organization, it no longer represents the community. The only people being represented are the large number of radicals. Those who do not are alienated. Such advocacy, furthermore, creates the impression that the U-M itself sanctions her views.

Steiner perhaps deserves credit for making SAPAC the established organization it is today, but at the same time, she deserves criticism, and possibly rep­rimand, for using her position as administrator to advance her own political agenda.

Andrew Bockelman is a freshman in LSA and a production manager for the Review.

P.C. Debate

Continued From Page 1

that transforms an intellectual enterprise into a political enterprise," he said.

Saturday featured a pair of panel discussions concerning curricular reform, and a number of speakers appeared to confirm Balch's allegations.

Earl Lewis, an associate professor of history and director of the U-M's Center for Afro-American and African Studies (CAAS), noted a "mental fatigue" in addressing charges of political correctness, which he considers "the greatest non-issue of our time."

Lewis then detailed the CAAS curricula, remarking on the extensive coursework required for a student to graduate from the CAAS program. His comments, however, revealed a political agenda.

"The design of the curriculum is conservative; the courses, I hope, are not," said Lewis.

Conservatism has never threatened to overrun CAAS, but it appears that Lewis will never allow it the representation it deserves. How unfortunate that a class focusing upon urban America would not include the recent scholarship of such black Americans as Nathan Glazer, Glenn Loyd, Thomas Sowell, Shelby Steele, or Walter Williams. The study of these authors could make an interesting class in itself.

The position accorded to black conservatives by the "campus reform movement" often reflects the nature of political correctness itself. On a Saturday panel devoted to affirmative action, study of these authors could make an interesting class in itself.

John J. Miller is a senior in English and editor-at-large of the Review.
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John J. Miller is a senior in English and editor-at-large of the Review.

expositions of Balch and Sommers. Diversity, alas, seems to have boundaries. Many of the sessions were well attended, perhaps due in large part of Richard Campbell, an assistant professor of communication and conference organizer, who asked the 400 students of his introductory communication lecture class to attend parts of the conference and write a paper on the media's coverage of what happened. The highest attendance was at a Saturday evening panel discussion entitled "Free Speech, Hate Speech, and P.C." Approximately 800 people filled Angell Hall's Auditorium B, and several hundred were reportedly turned away.

The conference should be consid­ered a partial success, given its reason­ably well-attended sessions and occa­sional moments of insight. Ultimately, however, any assessment should focus upon the conference attendees' re­sponses, which were hopefully able to look beyond the vast amounts of rhetoric and obtain a clear view of political cor­rectness: its origins, its excesses, and its undeniable existence.
Essay: The PC Conference

Curriculum Suggestions Are Misguided

by Beth Martin and Dan Spillane

Four University of Michigan faculty members participated in a panel discussion entitled “Perspectives on Future Curriculum Reforms at Michigan” as part of last weekend’s conference on political correctness.

Prevalent throughout much of the discussion was the expressed need to introduce a more multicultural curriculum in order to reduce racial tensions within the campus community. As co-editors of the Latina/o Studies Program, Frances Aparicio stated classes and programs developed through the campus community such as the Latina/o Studies Program “are a means for minorities to survive culturally.”

Courses that have tried to deal head-on with multiculturalism, such as University Course 299: “Rape, Racism, and Ethnicity” have not fulfilled the faculty’s grand intentions of dealings with prejudices. Bruce Frier, professor of Classics and Law and member of the review board of UC 299, expressed serious misgivings about the class in an interview prior to the conference. “UC 299 was a mixed success as is fairly obvious and is not being taught that way,” he said. “I don’t follow from the conveyence of knowledge that values are going to change. It is my assumption that values usually don’t change very deeply as a result of these experiences.”

Despite the failure of classes such as UC 299 to meet their purpose of dealing with racial tensions, proponents of such curriculum reforms continue to believe that discrimination, marked as one of the best ways to improve college education. They persist to do so in the face of astonishing statistics that reveal a gross lack of knowledge on the part of college students in the very basic subjects of their own Western culture. For example, a 1989 survey conducted by the Gallup Organization for the National Endowment for the Humanities found that more than 40 percent of college seniors could not identify when the Civil War occurred, 25 percent could not identify the date of Columbus’ journey within the correct half-century, and 23 percent could not distinguish the words of Marx from the U.S. Constitution. Professor Frier called these statistics “alarming” and voiced support for the PC conference. He stated that these policies were necessary as a “last resort to disembowel the caste system.” He offered no evidence for his claim, and ignored cases in which affirmative action exacerbated the problem, instead of solving it (India, with the world’s most rigid caste system, is an example).

Another speaker in favor of affirmative action was U-M law professor Theodore Shaw, who criticized conservatives for using “buzzwords” to dodge issues. For example, when health care is the issue, abortion is brought up, and when racism is the issue, P.C. is the buzzword. Besides this ludicrous misrepresentation, Shaw ignored liberal buzzwords such as racism, which is used as the main reason why a black person fails out of school, regardless of whether or not he or she is a victim of discrimination.

The Affirmative Action “Debate”

by Kishore Jayaswal

“Political Correctness (P.C.) does not exist on campus.”

That is what organizers of “The P.C. Frame-up: What’s Behind the Attack?” would like students, faculty, and members of the national media to believe about the University of Michigan. But the discussion, reaching that was titled “Affirmative Action: Intent and Effect” showed very clearly that the “thought police” extend a long arm in Ann Arbor.

Held Saturday morning, the panel discussion was supposed to be an inquiry into the purposes and results of over 20 years of affirmative action policies. What followed was a crusade against dim-witted individuals who regard the world in black-and-white terms. Numerous character assassinations, and many misrepresentations of fact. From the start, the panel was biased heavily in favor of Affirmative Action policies. The lone voice in opposition of these policies was David Horowitz, a former left-wing political activist who became a conservative because of the abuses and excesses of preferential policies.

Besides their different focuses, both studies arrived at the same general conclusion: males with stereotypical attitudes have a greater propensity for rape and tend to believe quite strongly in the rape myth. Experiments whose original aim was to add valuable information to public debate on the issue. When they quote such experiments they conspicuously fail to mention that the male subjects received a biased and inaccurate picture of date rape, or that “most males” means most southern Baptist white conservative male college students.

When groups like SAPAC neglect to mention those facts, they not only leave their credibility behind, they also mislead the public. When they insist on using facts which are clearly of questionable validity in an attempt to justify their own existence and enlarge their budget and influence, they are not living up to their stated purpose — they are unfairly blasing public opinion.

Imagine: A World Without Rape.” Unfortunately, we’ll probably have to make due with imagination for quite some time. It can be argued that male attitudes toward concepts such as rape play a definitive role in the incidence of rape. But experiments which misrepresent male views through biased methodology and faulty interpretation only serve to feed the fanatic hyperbole of vocal special-interest groups. Experiments whose original aim was to add valuable information to our knowledge of rape, admittedly an admirable goal, only succeed in adding to the state of confusion which surrounds the issue of rape.

Tony Gheca is a junior in English and a staff writer for the Review.
Bill Seeks to Regulate Nude Dancing

Jay Sprout

Individual communities would have the right to regulate commercial nude dancing, if State Representative Kirk Cutt (D-Ypsilanti) has his way with House Bill 4067. The bill, introduced earlier this year, would strengthen Public Act 279 of 1909, the Home Rule Cities Act, which allows cities to regulate or prohibit nude entertainment within their boundaries. Profits' bill defines nude entertainment as "live entertainment in which an individual knowingly exposes or offers to exposed any one or more individuals for payment, or the promise of payment, by any person."

House Bill 4067 is intended to give local communities the tools they currently lack to "crack down on purveyors of obscenity," according to the House legislative Analysis Section. It would empower Michigan's present criminal obscenity statute, Public Act 343 of 1984.

In response to accusations that the bill is merely a crusade intended to make minorities' lives more uncomfortable, Dissenting, if not fit; Jay Sprout of the Michigan Coalition Against the Profits' bill from traditional legislative attempts at shutting down skin joints is that it targets renegade places such as "juice bars," which do not serve alcohol.

"Topless places are generally regulated by the Liquor Control Act and other health regulations. A gap was created when they don't serve liquor," explained Profits. "Other sorts of establishments that serve food are subject to licenses and inspections. If you go to McDonald's, the employees have to wear a hat when they're around food. Here, there are naked women around, dancing over the food! The inconsistency is ridiculous."

Jay Sprout is a freshman in LSA and a staff writer for the Review.
Coming Out of the Second Closet

Continued From Page 1

same views. In fact, Tafel considers his beliefs largely libertarian, though he believes that many of these ideals—especially the concept of individual rights—were once staunchly supported by the Republican party. While he considers himself quite conservative on fiscal matters, he parts company with right-wing Republicans on the issue of government and individual rights.

"When I disagree with Republicans, it is with the new Religious Right that is for the government inserting itself into the private lives of individuals. I do not see these people as being true to the party as it was founded by Abraham Lincoln." The Party Difference

So why is be a Republican and not a Libertarian? "The reality is that the U.S. is a two-party system," he says. "If you want to be in the fight, you have to work within one of those two parties."

Edmondson, who began as a conservative Republican before becoming a Libertarian, also sees the Republican party abandoning these rights. Therefore, he sees the Libertarian party as the only viable option for gays.

"Gay and lesbian rights are a subset of individual rights of free thought and action. The Republican party has held itself out as the party of individual freedom, as opposed to the Democratic party, which paints itself as more for collectivism. I question whether or not the Republican party has held to these principles," Edmondson said.

Hudler also sees the Republican party—as well as the Democratic party—as less suitable than the Libertarian party for gays. "It's just a huge party machine. It's very anti-Libertarian. We're the party of principle, we don't compromise, and they do." With the Libertarian party, homosexuality is not even an issue. Nobody cares if you are gay."

And while Hudler admits there is some prejudice against gays by libertarians in some areas like the south, he is quick to mention that seven of the Libertarian state presidents are gay.

Satan on Earth?

Within the Republican party, acceptance of gays is not that simple. Reception within the party varies from person to person, according to Tafel. "There are some people who will say 'You're gay? I don't care, it doesn't matter.' There are others who will say 'You're gay? This is Satan on Earth!'"

This of course brings in the question of religion, and how Republicans and Libertarians view its relation to homosexuality. Tafel, who graduated from the Harvard Divinity School and was ordained as a Baptist minister, believes the two do not contradict.

"I am very much a Christian. Gays don't just give up their faith because their church hasn't come around." Many church—the known as "open and accepting churches—accept homosexuals, including many in the Ann Arbor area, such as the non-denominational Huron Valley Community Church, as well as Episcopalians, Unitarians, and Lutheran churches.

There are also special groups within these churches for gays, including Dignity for Roman Catholics, Integrity for Episcopalians, as well as groups for everything from Jewish people to Mormons.

'The question of religion, morality, and homosexuality does present a problem for nongay Christians," Tafel says. "Unfortunately, right-wing churches have given license to a lot of gay bashing and homophobia. Even a lot of non-religious people will look to churches as a moral barometer—if they say gay bashing is ok, it must be ok."

"Bigoted people have been using scripture for years. They said the same things about women and the same things about blacks." Likewise, Tafel sees the future of such church discrimination against gays no differently than that against these previous two groups. "100 years from now, I think people are going to look back and see these religious folks as not that religious."

And while Tafel sees the recently passed gay ordination law in Ann Arbor as progress, what he really desires is the same rights as any other taxpayer, including state recognized marriage.

"I look forward to the day when gay groups can celebrate under the auspices of the church."

While some libertarians are religious like David Edmondson, who belongs to the Huron Valley Church, Hudler admits religion is less of a problem for libertarians than it is for Republicans.

"I would say that a majority of libertarians are non-religious. That's probably what keeps a lot of gay Republicans from coming out."

A Second Closet?

Just how many is a lot? The Log Cabin Federation includes 19 individual clubs in nine states and has over 4500 people on its mailing list. Tafel believes there are many, many gay Republicans in society.

"I contend that the gay community is actually a pretty conservative community. There are a lot of gay Republicans, but they not only have to fear homophobia, but the gay community. You have to come out of a second closet."

How oppressive is this second closet? For all their differences, Libertarian and Republican gays are united in one thing—the battle for equal rights, as well as against the ideologies of leftist gays, an ideology against views of the left, which in some cases hurts the the movement for equal rights for gays more than it helps. The problem is that militant national groups like the Aids Coalition to Unleash Power and Queer Nation demand more than equal rights, and therefore alienate what might be an otherwise sympathetic populace.

"I see it from both sides," Tafel says of the militant groups. "We as a community are tired of being kicked around. If that respect, I can understand militancy. Things like "zaps"—wherein a group targets an individual for harassment through either phone calls, shouting down, or attacks in the gay press—are counter-productive, according to Tafel, who has been a victim of such zaps.

"I don't want that to be the image of my group. These groups simply do not represent anybody in the community."

Tafel says he does not hesitate to give interviews with newspapers like the Reniero, even though he is discouraged to do so by other gays. "I have been treated much more fairly in the conservative press than in the gay press. I am much more maligned in the gay press."

Examples of this can be as simple as being maligned for opposing affirmative action, or as complex as being criticized for supporting the Persian Gulf War because the money could have been spent to fight AIDS.

"My rights, your obligations" Hudler views the leftist gay community similarly, especially on the topic of health care.

"There are some things they've done that I agree with, but the vast majority I disagree with. One argument that needs to be made—and I admit it is an unpopular view—is that I don't see why the majority of the heterosexual population should have to pay for Aids care. I think it's really wrong to do that. It's immoral for them to ask for other people to pay for their health care."

As far as demands for other "rights"—including those on the U-M campus like the "right" to have gay lounges or other exclusionary places, Edmondson disagrees.

The philosophies of most gay rights groups can be summed up in four words: 'my rights, your obligations.' I don't think that it would be appropriate for universities to set aside areas for members of student groups I think it's counter-productive. As a gay person, I know I can't run and hide from mainstream society forever, nor do I have any intentions of doing so."

Another controversial tactic of such groups is the practice known as "outing"—revealing to the public the fact that someone is a gay person.

"I don't like it—that's not the popular opinion, but I don't like it. The enemy is not each other, but society," says Tafel. One of the main reasons he is opposed to the practice of outing is the arbitrariness with which it is done. However, says Tafel, the gay community knew that Rep. Barney Frank was gay long before the rest of the country did. It was only when the leaders of these national groups decided to out him that the rest of the country learned of his homosexuality. Tafel says he does not trust the people who are making these decisions.

Orientation or Preference?

There are, of course, some issues on which nearly the entire gay community agrees. One of these is the issue of whether or not homosexuality is a question of orientation or preference.

"My personal opinion is that it is not a preference. I feel very strongly that it is orientation," says Tafel. "I look at myself as a case study. With all of the hatred out there, I can't see why 10 percent of the population would choose to be gay."

Edmondson agrees, stressing that from a personal freedom standpoint it shouldn't really matter, although he admits it does. "Personally, I believe it is orientation. From a philosophic standpoint, it's irrelevant. But if you are going to argue before the courts, you have to argue orientation," he says.

"When somebody mentions the belief that being gay is a preference, most
Arts: Feminist Theory

Wolf Examines the Beauty Myth

The Beauty Myth
Naomi Wolf
William Morrow and Company
Hardcover, $21.95
348 pgs.

by Adam Garagola

In The Beauty Myth, Naomi Wolf sets out to analyze a diverse set of social and economic forces which she claims pressure women into conforming to a sexualized ideal of beauty. This mythical image of the perfect woman, she argues, is a product of a male-dominated hierarchy of power, which seeks to keep women "in their place" by channeling their energies into the futile pursuit of the beauty ideal.

While Wolf writes with passion and conviction, marshaling scores of examples in support of her arguments, a close reading finds her analysis wanting. Though dressed up and greatly elaborated, this book is just more of the same old leftist/feminist claptrap that women's studies departments have been spewing since their inception.

Before looking at her arguments in detail, a few words about Wolf's prose style are in order. It is best characterized as disconnected, at times bordering on incoherent; the effect is that her arguments frequently seem rantingly disjointed (take, for example, the opening sentences of the chapter entitled "Violence"): "Hunger makes women's bodies hurt them, and makes women hurt their bodies. Studies of abusers show that violence, once begun, escalates. Cosmetic surgery is the fastest-growing 'medical' specialty." Re ipsa loquitur.

This book perhaps suits her purpose; a barrage of bald-faced assertions is quickly followed by anecdotes meant to shock or horrify, so that the casual reader, forgetting that the problem with anecdotes is they are unanecdotal, and do not constitute convincing evidence, is likely to buy wholesale what she says, simply because the example she gave was so disturbing. To take an anecdote regarding botched cosmetic surgery, for example, and assert on the basis of this story that similar tragedies occur all the time, is not only irresponsible, but sloppy scholarship as well.

Now, on to this so-called "beauty myth." Examining the multi-billion dollar cosmetics industry, the ever-increasing number of social commentary magazines, the rapidly expanding field of cosmetic surgery, Wolf concludes that that a combination of socialized attitudes and powerful advertising messages force women into accepting and pursuing a socially dictated ideal of what is beautiful, to their own detriment. Arguing that the profound social changes brought about by the women's rights movement have stripped away much of the power and influence that the "patriarchy" formerly assevered over women, she points to the beauty myth as a new form of social control.

According to Wolf, the beauty myth exists primarily as tool of economic domination. She basically argues that when women buy skin care products by the gallon, shell out thousands of dollars for breast enhancement and liposuction, or dump a week's paycheck on their wardrobes, it is because the social forces behind the beauty myth pressure them to do so. That is to say, society, through the operating of the myth, dictates that women must wear the latest expensive, disposable make-up, and get a face lift regularly.

Yet in the course of making these arguments, Wolf notes that "it's not as if the messages and images put out by the advertisers of women's products have little to do with the reality of physical attractiveness, but rather are simply a false idea of attractiveness that serves the purposes of the market (which she conceives of as some ominous monolithic force compels women to make purchase after purchase).

Paglia Goes Against the Feminist Grain

Sexual Personae
Camille Paglia
Vintage Books
Softcover, $15.00

by Eddie Arner

The purpose of this book is to "demonstrate the unity and continuity of western culture." Paglia accomplishes this and displays an amazing breadth of knowledge in the process. Paglia begins in Ancient Egypt with Nefertiti and concludes in late 19th century America with Emily Dickinson.

This assertion made in this book will infuriate almost all who read it. Camille Paglia has produced a great work, which will force its readers to re-evaluate their views on almost everything. She gives an iconoclastic view of human nature. She calls the Marquis de Sade, the most unread major Western author. She follows his interpretation of human nature instead of the idealistic Rousseau. Rousseau was a naive fool, who has influenced most Western thinkers. Human nature is not a malleable object to be molded to a given social ideal. Social engineering will always fail because it misses this critical point.

Paglia shows that Western culture is a male culture which developed out of a need for men to free themselves from women. In his opinion, nature is the driving force of culture and nature is an amoral daemon. Nature creates and destroys without care or compassion. Paglia states that, "We cannot hope to understand sex and gender until we clarify our attitude toward nature. Sex is a subset to nature." Sex is the dominant theme throughout our culture. Art, literature, film, and other media are all loaded with sex and violence, which according to Paglia, are one and the same.

Paglia's conclusion comes from her observations of nature, which, "creates by violence and destruction. The common violence in the world is childbirth, with its appalling pain and gore. Nature gives males infusions of hormones for dominance... Lust and aggression are fused in the male hormones." This is the facet of nature overlooked or ignored by most people in their analyses.

Paglia feels that people generally do not understand the true nature of sex and interpersonal relationships well at all. She feels that feminists especially have misread the problem of sex and power by treating them as separate. But for Paglia, sex is power. "Feminists grossly oversimplify the problem of sex when they reduce it to a number of social conventions: readjust society, eliminate sexual inequality, purify sex roles, and happiness and harmony will reign." This is where feminists are heirs to Rousseau's theories, which Paglia feels are flawed. Rousseau and the political left, which descended from his theories, completely misread human nature. Following a daemonic view of human nature, Paglia characterizes it as cruel and destructive, not loving and kind.

Paglia also feels that feminists have missed the point on rape and pornography. "Society is woman's protection against rape, not, as some feminists absurdly maintain, the cause of rape. Rape is the sexual expression of the will-to-power, which nature plants in all of us and which society rose to contain. Further, she argues that society is not the cause of rape and pornography does not incite rape. "Pornography cannot be separated from art; the two interpenetrate each other, far more than humanism and eroticism," she notes. Geoffrey Hartman rightly says, "Great art is always flanked by its dark sisters, blasphemy and pornography." Paglia cites an example, Donatello's David is set in the pose of a whore, but it is great art. Sweden has a thriving pornography industry, but it has a much lower violent crime rate than the U.S. Pornography is unnecessary for violent crime. Paglia notes that "from Nero and Caligula to Gilles de Rais and the Nazi commandants, have never needed pornography to stimulate their exquisite, gruesome inventiveness."

The diabolic human mind is quite enough." Paglia attributes this violence to the natural difference between men and women. Women are more in tune with nature because they bear children and have a monthly reminder of nature's dominance over them. She classifies the difference in men and women as the apollonian and the chthonian. The male, apollonian, strategy is to focus on the beautiful parts of nature and ignore the ugliness of nature's innate destructive-ness and power over all. This leads to the male view of objectifying the world. This characteristically male world view fuel ed the great advances of technology.
But Wait, There's Muir
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that due to my computer illiteracy, I hadn't yet realized that I needed to register my name in the "Userdirectory" for it to show up on my messages. For Toy to characterize this message as "anonymously sent" is really stretching things. First, most everyone knows that it is impossible to send an anonymous message over MTS. Second, any two-bit techie can think of dozens of ways to successfully send an anonymous message (over the phone, under a door, etc.). Third, why would I have identified my title and the paper I would be trying to be anonymous?

So what did my message say? After identifying myself, I stated that, in light of the fact that Maurer was "demanding" that Tibballs give LGMPO $100, I found out that LGMPO was in cahoots with or supporting the Drake's 5 in any way whatsoever. I would do whatever I could to see that their office got de-funded. Not only did I see a conflict of interest in LGMPO potentially supporting a boycott that demanded money for LGMPO, but I felt it inappropriate for a U-M office to get involved, with tuition dollars, in off-campus events. I sent a nearly identical MTS message to President Duderstadt.

I find it amazing that this guy from LGMPO would conclude that my demand of accountability from LGMPO is "hate speech," yet Maurer's incessant taunting of Tibballs was mere political activism.

In any event, after Toy finished assassinating my character in front of 800 people, John J. Miller, editor-at-large of the Review and a panel member, said that he doubted the accuracy of Toy's statements because I was not anti-gay. After the panel discussion ended, Miller and several other people asked whether or not Toy's accusations were true. Their questions were particularly meaningful, and led me to write this column. One, noted that I had taken several contradictory stands on issues relating to homosexuality and Nonsexual rights. On the one hand, I had written two articles that were highly critical of gay activist groups on campus (ACT-UP and the Drake's 5). Yet on the other hand, I had been trying for weeks to get the Review's editorial board to come out in support of both the U-M changing its housing policies so as to allow homosexual couples access, and the city's new Domestic Partnership Ordinance, which allows homosexual couples to register their relationships with the city clerk. They asked for clarification.

So here it is.

I am a devout advocate of homosexual rights. I know and respect many gays and lesbians. I believe that groups like ACT-UP and people like Patrice Maurer do the cause of homosexual rights irreparable harm with their ultra-radicalness and their posturing. Many people come to the U-M without ever having had contact with homosexuals. They get here, they watch Patrice Maurer in action, and they arrive at the conclusion that that is what the movement for homosexual rights are all about. They then conclude if this is indeed what homosexual rights are all about, they are steadfastly opposed to it. I have seen this sequence of events take place many times.

That is why I am so hard on ACT-UP and Maurer, and that is why I have tried to discredit them in my articles. I have never, however, written anything which criticized gays merely for being gay. To label me homophobic, and bigoted for criticizing ACT-UP and Maurer is like calling someone a racist simply because they oppose affirmative action (something that happens here all the time).

A few weeks ago, Amy Polk, my ideological arch-enemy on the Michigan Student Assembly (MSA), introduced a resolution calling on the assembly to urge the U-M to reform its family housing policies to allow gay couples access. She was first on the speakers list, and I was second. After she had finished speaking in favor of the resolution, it was my turn.

I could tell that most of the assembly anticipated that I would blast Polk and come out strongly against the resolution. Instead, I praised Polk, and I then implored the assembly to pass the resolution unanimously. I have no way of knowing for certain, but I suspect that my comments swayed enough conservative votes to ensure the resolution's passage.

In addition to urging the Review to take editorial positions supporting family housing reform and the Domestic Partnership Ordinance, I also decided that I would devote a special issue of the Review to issues relating to "Sex and Culture," and that I would include as many pieces as I could which positively portrayed homosexual rights. I am convinced that most true conservatives and libertarians will agree that the government has no right to tell individuals how to live their lives, and further, that it ought not privilege any one lifestyle over another.

I have made the mistake of believing that most reasonable people would not be so shallow as to conclude that I am anti-homosexual based solely on my criticism of the community's most radical homosexual activists. I guess I was wrong.

There is an important point to be made in all of this, especially in light of the recent P.C. conference, and especially in light of the hate speech portion of it. During the hate speech segment, U-M Law Professor Catharine MacKinnon argued in favor of government establishing hate speech laws. She never gave a clear definition of what constitutes hate speech, though. Given the number of times that I, and the Review, have been called fascist, Nazi, racist, homophobic, and so forth, merely because of our political beliefs, and given Toy's opinion that my MTS message constituted hate speech, I think it is safe to say that on this campus, conservative thought in general would be labeled hate speech. Needless to say, such tactics are for the intellectually lazy. Those who cannot debate ideas on their logical merits resort to name calling and wild accusations instead. And they claim that P.C. is merely a mirage.

Jeff Muir is a senior in general studies and the special issue editor of the Review.

Coming Out of the Second Closet

Continued From Page 14

people I know would greet that with derisive laughter. As if we would really choose to be pariahs.

The Future

So what of the future for gay Republicans and Libertarians? In addition to LGCL and the Log Cabin Federation, non-traditional gay groups are growing in strength and numbers. Some groups include the "Liberty Belles," a Libertarian group based in Philadelphia, and "Gays and Lesbians for Individual Liberty," a Washington D.C. groups that includes many prominent members of the Cato Institute. Locally the campus contingent of openly gay students is growing as well.

"I think that there are a fair number of conservative and Libertarian gay people on campus," says Edmondson. "I have noticed a number of people say "Yes, I am gay, but I don't buy into the PC orthodoxy' and instead lean toward libertarian or conservative politics."

"People are coming to the realization that there are gay people everywhere," says Tafel. Part of what prevents the number of non-traditional gays from coming out is the relationship between the gay community and the right, according to Tafel.

Although he encounters a lot of anger from the leftist gay community for his political beliefs, he also has problems with the right. "Because I am a moderate and don't toe the line, the leftist gay community is offended. However, there are also a lot of right-wing bigots in the Republican Party. There is a lot of hatred on the right, which I find equally disgusting. In a lot of ways, the ultra-conservatives and leftist gay groups have created each other."

Brian Jendryka is a senior in English and economics and editor-in-chief of the Review.
The Beauty Myth
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Wolf seems to assume that women as individuals not only lack the will to make purchasing decisions for themselves, but also lack the intelligence to see advertising for what it is: an image, designed to sell products, with only (perhaps) a tangential relationship to reality. In characterizing women as slaves to the ideal put forth by the mythical myth she has constructed, Wolf credits the average woman with no more brains than did the Victorian doctors whom she so harshly criticizes.

Wolf, laboring under a deep misunderstanding of how the free market really operates, does not seem to grasp that in order for these products and services, which she says are so "oppressive" to women, to have developed at all, there had to be some demand for them in the first place. If a women decides that make-up will make her look more beautiful, than it is within her own discretion to spend money on such products. Advertising might convince her that one particular product is better than another, but advertising is not going to be of any influence at all if she hasn't already decided to participate in the cosmetics market as a consumer. Wolf argues, unconvincingly, that society creates this original demand, but can do little to substantiate this claim, other than piously recite the usual "society is inherently oppressive to woman" rhetoric.

Women are portrayed by Wolf as addicted to Cosmopolitan, Galmour, and Vogue, unable to sort out the differences between the professionally-prescribed beauty of the fashion model, who is paid to maintain her appearance in conformity with whatever standards the fashion industry dictates, and the subjective interpretations of beauty that are more germane to interpersonal relationships. Wolf should give women in general more credit; most of them seem to know the distinction between being beautiful and making a profession out of it.

In the end, Wolf demolishes her own case against the "patriarchy" by hypothesizing the development of a male counterpart to the beauty myth. As Wolf puts it, "Advertisers have recently figured out that undermining sexual self-confidence is Paglia's main point of contention. From that, she builds her entire thesis on the continuity of Western culture. Her arguments are well supported, but some of her conclusions are hard to swallow for all but the most cynical of people. Overall, this book is a fine piece of scholarship, who's only fault is occasional verbosity.

Eddie Arner is a junior in English and political science and a staff writer for the Review.

Against the Grain
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and standard of living made by western civilization.

Paglia does not see the male Western culture as evil and oppressive, as the radical feminists do. Rather, she feels that it is a great accomplishment which should be applauded. As she points out, Western culture has greatly improved the quality of life and has given her the time to write this book. Mpg have followed their Nietzschean will to power in a futile attempt to control nature. Man may impose his creations on nature, but it can remove them in the blink of an eye. Hurricanes and earthquakes can tear down anything man has built so far. Nature also has black holes and supernovas, which are more destructive than anything man will ever possess.

The dichotomy between civilization and nature is Paglia's main point of contention. From that, she builds her entire thesis on the continuity of Western culture. Her arguments are well supported, but some of her conclusions are hard to swallow for all but the most cynical of people. Overall, this book is a fine piece of scholarship, who's only fault is occasional verbosity.

Eddie Arner is a junior in English and political science and a staff writer for the Review.

Curriculum
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the need for a more "systematic" education at the U-M.

"I favor a move toward some sort of core curriculum. I think the faculty believes that freshmen and sophomores are pretty much at sea. This is a fairly crucial period in their education. It is possible to come to the U-M and take a series of courses that are inconsequential. I would like to see us discourage that."

Many claim that the U-M lacks the funds necessary to implement such a curriculum. Perhaps the money was spent on the "crucial" curriculum changes of the diversity requirement and other multicultural reforms such as the New Traditions requirement within the English department. People must be acquainted with their own culture before they can appreciate the glories of ancient Zambian bisexual poetry. Shouldn't we understand our own cultural heritage before we spread ourselves thin over a diverse range of topics, selling ourselves short and ending up mediocre in all subject areas?

Current reforms such as the ones presented at the political correctness conference are completely off-base. The U-M is only leading the way toward the downfall of its curriculum and thus its students' education unless it can begin to concentrate on the elements of the Western tradition that have contributed the foundations of our present-day society.

Beth Martin is a junior in English and a staff writer for the Review. Dan Spillane is a sophomore in economics and a staff writer for the Review.
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Sports: Bowl Season

U-M Prepares for Grandpappy of ’em All

by Corey Hill

The speculation has ended, the post-season bowl bids have been formally announced and Michigan State did not receive a bid this year. Here is a preview of this season’s major games on New Year’s Day.

Rose Bowl in Pasadena, California.

Michigan vs. Washington

The Wolverines are coming off a decisive victory over Illinois last Saturday. Desmond Howard scored his usual two touchdowns per game and Ricky Powers secured the victory running behind our mammoth offensive line. The defense has improved since the beginning of the season and it can only get better against run-oriented Ohio State on Saturday.

The Washington Huskies suffer from playing in the obscure region known as the Pacific Northwest. The Huskies have a stingy defense lead by All-American Steve Emtman. Emtman is surrounded by a very capable group of line backers and defensive backs who can spell trouble for any defense. The offense should not be ignored either. Billy Joe Hobert leads this unit that features a solid offensive line and two excellent receivers, Mario Bailey and Orlando McKay.

Washington has defeated the top two contenders in the Pac-10, California, 24–17 and Southern California, 14–3. Their last game was a victory over Oregon State and they finish the season Nov. 23 against intra-state rival Washington State in Seattle. During the 1980s the Pac-10 has sent average teams to the Rose Bowl, but not this year. Washington walloped a good Iowa squad 46-34 in last year’s Rose Bowl. The Huskies are a serious contender for the national championship, and if taken lightly, Michigan will be in for a long and tiring afternoon.

The Miami Hurricanes clinched their spot in the Orange Bowl in Miami, Florida.

The Miami Hurricanes clinched their spot in the Orange Bowl with a 17-16 victory over Florida State Seminoles. The Hurricanes are likely to play for the national championship in the stadium which they have a 40-game winning streak.

Their opponent is not yet determined. The Colorado Buffaloes were last season’s champion largely as a result of the infamous fifth-down play against Missouri. Nebraska currently leads the conference but a loss to Oklahoma on Nov. 23 would send the Buffs to the Orange Bowl. Miami will be expected to win, but do not underestimate Nebraska. The question remains, will Miami be declared the undisputed national champion?

Sugar Bowl in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Notre Dame was awarded this bid despite two consecutive losses to Tennessee and Penn State late in the season. Notre Dame has struggled with a young defense all season and opponents have exploited this weakness. The offense is very capable with tailback Jerome Bettis and quarterback Rick Mirer.

The Florida Gators earned its first undisputed and recognized SEC title by virtue of its victory over Kentucky. Heisman candidate Shane Matthews will have his first chance to shine after his likely disappointment from not winning the Heisman. Florida has moved up in the polls all season, but if they are not careful, Notre Dame can find a way with its luck of the Irish.

Cotton Bowl in Dallas, Texas.

The Southwestern Conference champion Texas A&M returns to the Cotton Bowl without long-time coach Jackie Sherrill. Sherrill was run out town a few years ago, but the Aggies have returned to form posting an 8-1 record with their last victory over Arkansas. Texas A&M finishes the season against Southern Methodist Nov. 23.

Florida State will make their first appearance in the Cotton Bowl. The Seminoles have posted a 10-1 record this season. Florida State has a dangerous offense and an aggressive defense. The Seminoles may be too much for Texas A&M, however, and they will hope for a Miami loss in the Orange Bowl.

Fiesta Bowl in Tempe, Arizona.

Penn State clinched its Fiesta Bowl bid with a 15-13 victory over Notre Dame. The Nittany Lions are a solid “Chicago Bear” type team, with a tough defense and a tough gritty defense. Penn State is not a flashy team but they are very capable of winning the big game. However, Penn State may not accept the Fiesta bid because Coach Joe Paterno has made it clear he does not want to play for a Miami loss in the Orange Bowl.

Cinderella story. The Pirates have posted a 5-0-1 record this season. East Carolina Pirates are this season’s surprise. The Pirates have posted a 5-0-1 record this season. East Carolina Pirates are this season’s surprise. The Pirates have posted a 5-0-1 record this season.

John Hancock Bowl

The rest of post season bowls:

USA TODAY TOP 25 FOOTBALL POLL

1. Miami
2. Washington
3. Michigan
4. Florida State
5. Florida
6. California
7. Penn State
8. Alabama
9. Iowa
10. Tennessee
11. Nebraska
12. Texas A & M
13. Clemson
14. East Carolina
15. Colorado
16. Syracuse
17. Oklahoma
18. Ohio State
19. Notre Dame
20. Virginia
21. Stanford
22. N.C. State
23. Georgia
24. BYU
25. Bowling Green
Music: Concert Review

Canadian Power Trio Rocks the Palace

By Adams DeVore and Garagiola

Rush’s choice of Eric Johnson for their opening act when they played the Palace of Auburn Hills on November 14 stood not only as a much deserved tribute to Johnson’s masterful guitar playing, but also as a tacit recognition of their own musical expertise. Johnson, who has released but two albums thus far, showed himself to be one of the most distinguished guitarists on the music scene today. As the Palacevision screen featured close-ups of his nimble fingers flying deftly over his Stratocaster, no witness, sober or otherwise, could deny that with a bit of maturation and refinement of stage presence, Johnson will soon find a permanent place among the ranks of truly great guitarists such as Satriani, Clapton, and Vaughan, especially after hearing his inspired performance of “Trademark.”

Johnson’s upbeat but mesmerizing rendition of “Cliffs of Dover” brought many concertgoers to their feet, Zippos aflame. While the Palace shook with series after series of overpowering riffs and daunting solos at top volume, we were slightly disappointed by Johnson’s comparatively unimpressive vocals: though refined, Great guitarist, mediocre vocalist.

Rush’s opening tune, “Tough Times,” was accompanied by a highly stylized animation sequence, including a scene of a ticket-taker returning a curiously ambiguous-looking “ticket stub” to an obviously twisted Rush fan. And as Geddy Lee sang “Look in to the eye of the storm/ Look out for the force without form,” the backdrop flashed with awe-inspiring scenes of Mother Nature’s wrathfully fury. But this concert was not merely a display of stunning musical talent; it also must be appreciated as a gripping multimedia spectacle. “Big Money” and “Subdivisions” were both nicely complimented with fitting video sequences consisting of cartoon scenes of highschool halls, architects’ renderings of distinguished, indistinguishable subdivision dwellings, and film clips of conformity in action: both in seedy basement bars and in the back of 60s convertibles. And as Lee sang the chorus of one of his favorite songs, “The Pass,” carefully synchronized panning spotlights added to the disorientation so honestly captured in the lyrics, “Turn around and/Turn around and/ Turn around around and the razor’s edge.”

Commanding a barrage of state-of-the-art equipment, the trio was able to faithfully reproduce the richness of the sound so characteristic of Rush albums. When the band finally played “Tom Sawyer,” one of Rush’s better-known tunes, Lee adroitly alternated between bass and keyboards, maintaining a driving baseline with foot pedals while energetically working the keyboard.

Given the chance to impress, Neil Peart embarked on an shockingly lengthy and technically masterful drum solo, occasionally employing a gizmo of xylophonic appearance and making excellent use of his elaborate rotating set. Pearl’s sound engineers also made effective use of the Palace’s enormity by quickly shifting Pearl’s rolls from one set of speakers to another, thereby emphasizing the various tones within each series, separating in space what ordinarily would have been distinct only in intonation.

If the audience had been flecked with fiery flickers for Johnson, it was positively aglow once the opening chords of “Close to the Heart” spilled from Alex Lifeson and Geddy Lee’s guitars.

As many of these highlights suggest, there was little old music in the concert that could not be found on the album’s first single release, provided an interesting stylistic contrast to their older works. Perhaps the most innova-

Rush’s Geddy Lee has an easy time with some powerful “Tough Times” riffs.
Arts: Music Review

It's Del, the Funkee Homo Sapien!

by P.J. Danhoff

What's in a name? In the rap world, a name projects an image of what the rapper is all about. And if anyone in music is living up to his name, it's Del the Funkee Homo Sapien. Although his new album, I Wish My Brother George Was Here, is his first release, the 18 year old is by no means new to the industry. He has co-written songs with both Yo-Yo and his cousin Ice Cube. But don't expect any gangster rhymes here.

Though he's from Oakland, Del's rhymes are far from the slow, X-rated style of Too Short, yet he doesn't fit the image of a crossover pop artist, such as Hammer, either.

The combined production of Del, Ice Cube, and The Boogie Men creates an infectious blend of funky bass lines and Ice Cube, delivery! Valid

Free delivery in:

Michigan Daily
Ann Arbor News
Eastern Echo
Ann Arbor Metro Times.

Free Delivery!

Free delivery in 40 minutes or less guaranteed, or $3.00 off!

Medium deep dish or round pizza with cheese & one topping only

$5.95 (+tax)

Offer expires December 4, 1991

Not valid with other coupon offers.

Valid only at:

UM Central Campus
546 Packard
665-6005

U of M North Campus
927 Maiden Lane
955-9101

FAX 955-9109

Crusty's Corner

by Crusty Muncher

Miranda Sex Garden are three young women from England who have released an album of 25 a cappella songs on Mute Records. The songs are all 400 year old madrigals (poetic love songs that were very popular in 16th and 17th century England) guaranteed to make the love-sick weep. Madrigals are the group is currently working on a new record that will include lots of instrumental accompaniment.

Paracan Volume 1 is the name of a compilation of techno-dance material from the underground. Featured on the disc are six DJ's from the U.K. and the U.S., including D.J. Massive, DCB-A, and Detroit's own Underground Resistance. The stuff is neat but very repetitive. If you want good, danceable music that incorporates less techno and more live instruments, go out and get the latest releases from The Brand New Heavies and The Family Stand....

Girly-metalers Shotgun Messiah have released a new album titled Second Coming. There are a few good, catchy cheese-rock tunes here, but these guys follow the formula to a 'T.' They've got exceptionally lame lyrics, a bleach-blond lead singer, a speedy guitarist, and a drummer named Stix...

Follow For Now is the most recent Atlanta-based band to break. Fishbone, The Time, and Living Colour all come to mind after listening to their debut, which features a cover of Public Enemy's "She Watch Channel Zero." The band is touring with 24-7 Spyz and Drivin' n' Cryin'...

Liverpool's latest is The Real People. Their self-titled debut is a collection of very familiar sounding British-pop songs. Despite the many recycled riffs, the release includes several potentially strong singles.