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

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

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

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

Ah, now we see what is going on here. For generations now, girls, while consenting implicitly to sex, have wanted to assuage their guilt by being able to tell themselves afterward that they had not planned the action, and that they were merely "swept off their feet" by the charm of the guy and/or the magic of the moment. Hence, as all implicitly consenting parties have been long aware, the use of liquor is a marvelous catalyst of this feet-sweeping. Now, along comes our baneful feminist theoreticians who have been able to use their besotted theories to (a) free girls, once and for all, from guilt for their actions, and (b) to load that guilt onto the poor, hapless male population.

The *New York Times* article details one of the cases. During a brainwashing re-education dorm lecture on date rape at Lehigh University recently, a male student was asked by a dorm official if he had ever committed rape. First saying "hell, no," the student was later talked by the lecturer into "realizing" that he had, and that "not saying no" was not sufficient to establish consent. (There was no notarized agreement!) Later, the poor guy, admitting that he was "very confused," wrote a self-criticism article to the student paper confessing his sins: "I was uninformed and incorrect in my actions," he groveled. Yeah, and I bet he now loves Big Brother (oops sorry, Big Sister). Poor Orwell never knew the full depths of Political Correctness when he fashioned his dystopia.

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

## The Buchanan Smear: The *Commentary* Coda

**by M.N.R.**

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

in a lengthy article by Joshua Muravchik, "Patrick J. Buchanan and the Jews," *Commentary* (January 1991.) Muravchik's article is mainly a rehash of the various claims that Pat is pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic, doused with a veneer of phony judiciousness that befits *Commentary*'s lofty pretensions. But there are some extra points of interest. Muravchik is willing to pronounce Buchanan as anti-Semitic even though he admits that "there may be no authoritative definition of the term." (That's OK, flail away, anyway.) One of the counts of his indictment is that Pat's reference to Israel's "amen corner" must be maliciously anti-Semitic because it is patently false. For, notes Muravchik, "far from beating the drums (for war against Iraq), Israel was at most merely humming along." Yes, Josh, *Israel itself* may be quietly humming along, but its "amen corner" in the United States, the ardent Zionists, have been almost hysterically calling for all-out war against Iraq ever since August 2. Evidence? Just read the periodicals, and watch TV, for the frenetic hawks are everywhere. And that, of course, was precisely Pat's point.

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

Moreover, Muravchik implicitly agrees that Israel's interests are at stake in the Arabian war, since one of his charges against Buchanan is that since Pat has been a hawk all his life, how could he possibly be a dove now if not from an animus toward Israel? Muravchik does not seem to realize that the world has changed in the past year, as even his neocon buddies concede. Pat Buchanan and his fellow Old Rightists were not pro-war for the Hell of it, or for its own sake; they were pro-war because they believed that we engaged in a world-wide conflict with a mortal Soviet/Communist enemy. Now that that war has collapsed, Josh, there is no point to being pro-war as a permanent reflex. Muravchik pays lip service to the dramatic world change since 1989, but grossly plays down its importance. Saying that Communism "is not yet finished" is a far cry from saying that the Cold War is still raging. Hey Josh, where have you been for the last year or two? What do you think happened to East Germany? Or Poland? It is absurd to conjure up "anti-Semitism" as an explanation for this new outbreak of anti-war sentiment.

But the deliciously new note sounded by Comrade Muravchik is to lay a cloud of German blood-guilt upon Pat Buchanan. Buchanan, for one thing, is damned for being a pro-German revisionist on World War *One*(!), and we are subjected to the old mendacious Allied propaganda on that war, including a whitewashing of British war guilt, and the absurd claim that Britain's century-old maritime supremacy was an "answer" to Germany's land forces, when it was precisely the opposite. The German invasion of Belgium, which was only an excuse for Britain's intervention, is again trotted out as the sole explanation of that maximization of the European conflict. But the fascinating point of all this raking over World War One is to prepare the ground for Muravchik's blood libel of Buchanan. For it turns out, as Muravchik points out triumphantly, that Pat, because of his name, "is often taken for Irish," but is not really Irish at all! It seems that Pat is really German, or, as Muravchik puts it, he is "more German than anything else." Evidently a dogged genealogical researcher, Muravchik gleans from Pat's autobiography (which so many writers have been poring over looking for evil) that his mother was 100% German(!) whereas his father was only 50% Irish and 50% Scotch-Irish. Well, there we have it. What case could be clearer? Poor Muravchik has obviously missed his true calling; if he were only born a half-century earlier and had been of a different ethnic background, he could have happily taken his place in Hitler's Office of Genealogical Research.

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