

# The Public Eye

A PUBLICATION OF POLITICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

December 1993 • Vol. VII, No. 4

## Black Conservatives

### *Part Two*

**“We should be clear that stereotyping and victim-blaming is not more respectable because it is done by a member of the group being demeaned.”**

—DEBORAH TOLER

#### THE ORIGINS OF BLACK CONSERVATISM

In order to understand Black conservatism, it is important to understand the character of the Black bourgeoisie. Developing as it did within the context of white cultural oppression, it is not surprising that the values identified by Black conservative intellectuals such as Shelby Steele and Thomas Sowell as “traditional American values” are hallmarks of both American conservative mythology and Black bourgeois mythology. The ethic of “individual initiative” and “strong families” are values intimately related to the stereotypes that locate Black poverty in the misbehavior of those Blacks who do not make progress.

Black bourgeois mythology is a powerful theme in the African American community, one that exists on two layers. First, like the conservative Horatio Alger myth, Black bourgeois mythology asserts that values and behavior determine economic success. Second, the myth maintains that middle class African Americans are different

from other African Americans. The development of the Black bourgeoisie is rooted in its apartness from the Black mass majority.

Prior to desegregation, African Americans of all socioeconomic groups lived in the same segregated communities. The economic and political position of the Black bourgeoisie depended on the business and political support of poorer Blacks living under segregated circumstances. Nonetheless, most of the Black bourgeoisie historically has seen itself (even when white America has not) as different from the Black masses, in attitude and behavior as well as in economic success.

Histories of the socio-cultural development of the Black middle class emphasize the pivotal role played by schooling for newly freed slaves, schooling which often would make them members of an incipient Black bourgeoisie in the immediate post-Civil War era. Initially, most of this schooling was carried out by white missionaries and abolitionists from the north, and later by Black graduates of their schools. These white instructors were intent on imparting the Puritan work ethic and morality prevalent in white schools of the day. Thus, among other things, the schooling emphasized “proper” sexual

behavior. Schools demanded that students be chaste, especially the girls, and all students were expected to marry and live “conventional” family lives.

The emphasis on “moral” sexual behavior had special significance in the case of Black students. White northern teachers emphasized it because, using paternalistic and implicitly racist reasoning, they believed it the best way to disprove Southern white racists’ belief that the Negro’s “savage instincts” prevented him from conforming to puritanical sex behavior.

“Moral” sexual behavior resonated with newly-freed slaves for a number of reasons—among them, the sexual exploitation and denial of the right to family life under slavery, and the teachings of the Black Church.

In addition to insisting on high moral standards, schooling for the incipient Black middle class added the classist and racist concept that only “common Negroes” engaged in “unconventional” sexual behavior and a wide array of other “dysfunctional,” “primitive” behaviors, such as laziness, boisterousness, improvidence, and drunkenness. Thus, it was their values and their behaviors that made Black elites elite and set them apart from the Black masses.

It is no accident that today both liberal and conservative Black elites are preoccupied by what is, in reality, a nonexistent “epidemic” of Black teen pregnancies, or that poor, female-headed households receive special opprobrium. In part, this stems from the overall patriarchal character of U.S. culture—one in which white ethnic groups’ poverty is also largely blamed on female-headed households. But

#### IN THIS ISSUE

- Books Received
- Eyes Right
- Confessions of a Religious Defender
- Eye Lashes
- Resources

sexual behavior has long been a touchstone of Blacks' civilized status.

Indeed, it is important to recognize that a historical strain in Black political agitation was that elite Blacks were being denied the rights they deserved by virtue of having proved themselves "civilized," *i.e.* better than and separate from "common Negroes." In the words of Adolph Reed, Jr: "Race spokespersons commonly have included in their briefs against segregation (or discrimination in other forms) an objection that its purely racial character fails to differentiate among blacks and lumps the respectable, cultivated, and genteel in with the rabble."

I emphasize this because far too little attention has been paid to the extent to which Black conservatives' arguments—whether delineating the causes of Black oppression, locating the causes of Black poverty, or (as will be seen) making the case against affirmative action—all come back to issues of distinguishing middle class from poor Blacks. This holds also for Black conservatives as individuals, and their need to distinguish themselves, their status, and their identity from negative Black stereotypes.

## THE ROLE OF INTERNALIZED OPPRESSION

Part from their classic Black bourgeois perspectives, Black conservative intellectuals also consistently demonstrate they have personally internalized negative stereotypes about poor African Americans and about African American culture. The evidence for this lies in the underlying assumptions of their written work, the descriptions of poor African Americans in that work, and their personal biographies.

In 1986 Glenn Loury wrote: "But it is now beyond dispute that many of the problems of contemporary black American life lie outside the reach of effective government actions and these can only be undertaken by the black community itself. These problems involve at their core the values, attitudes, and behaviors of individual blacks. They are exemplified by the staggering statis-

tics on pregnancies among young, unwed black women and the arrest and incarceration rates among black men."

Yet Loury's personal history includes fathering two out-of-wedlock children, a jailing for non-payment of child support, and 1987 arrests for cocaine and marijuana possession and for assaulting the young mistress he had

“(Black conservative arguments) all come back to issues of distinguishing middle class from poor Blacks.”

established in a separate household. Referring to that past history Loury has said: "I thought if I hung out in the community and engaged in certain kinds of social activities, in a way I was really being black."

English professor Shelby Steele complains that African Americans suffer from a collective self-image that prefers victimization to success and imposes a suffocating racial conformity that ostracizes nonconformists like him. He discusses his own dissociation from images of lower-class Black life when it was represented by an imaginary character named Sam, created by his childhood family. Sam embodied all the negative images of Blacks his father had left behind because "they were 'going nowhere.'"

Steele succinctly states his concern about being confused with poor Blacks when he admits: "The stereotype of the lazy black SOB is common, and the fear is profound that I'll be judged by that

stereotype. They will judge our race by him [an unemployed young Black man]—and they'll overlook me, quietly sitting on that bus grading those papers."

Nowhere in the array of Black conservatives' positions are the themes of traditional Black bourgeois attitudes and personal individual status and identity more prevalent than in Black conservatives' opposition to affirmative action. As we have seen earlier, in their analyses of Black oppression and the Black culture of poverty the foundation of their arguments comes from white conservatives and neoconservatives.

## BLACK CONSERVATIVES AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Nathan Glazer's 1975 book, *Affirmative Action, Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy*, summarized white neoconservatives' objections to affirmative action: that by the end of the 1960s, discrimination was no longer a major obstacle to minorities' access to employment, education and other social mobility mechanisms; affirmative action has not benefited the poor who need it most, but has primarily benefited middle-class Blacks and other minorities; and affirmative action fuels white resentment against minorities.

In his 1984 book, *Civil Rights: Rhetoric or Reality?*, Thomas Sowell repeats each of Glazer's basic objections. Quoting statistics from the Moynihan Report, Sowell insists: "The number of blacks in professional, technical, and other high level occupations more than doubled in the decade preceding the Civil Rights Act of 1964.... The trend was already under way." Also, like Glazer and other white conservatives, Sowell maintains that: "The relative position of disadvantaged individuals within the groups singled out for preferential treatment has generally declined under affirmative action."

Sowell and the other Black conservatives insist affirmative action programs violate whites' "constitutional rights" in general and those of white males in particular. Not only is this seen as unfair, but, like Glazer, Black conser-

vatives worry about the resulting white resentment. In Sowell's words: "There is much reason to fear the harm that it is currently doing to its supposed beneficiaries, and still more reason to fear the long-run consequences of polarizing the nation.... Already there are signs of hate organizations growing in more parts of the country and among more educated classes than ever took them seriously before."

What is most interesting about Sowell's affirmative action critique, however, is not that he repeats the standard white conservative critique, but that he adds a self-esteem component to that critique. It is this self-esteem component that reflects the personal status concerns of Sowell and other Black conservatives.

Sowell argues that while accomplishing few positive results, affirmative action actually undermines the efforts of successful minority individuals by creating a climate in which it will be assumed that their achievements reflect not individual worth, talent, or skill, but special consideration. "Pride of achievement is also undermined by the civil rights vision that assumes credit for minority and female advancement. This makes minority and female achievement suspect in their own eyes and in the eyes of the larger society."

Other Black conservative intellectuals follow Sowell's position, first making the same criticisms as white conservatives but adding self-esteem, personal diminishment, and status issues. Shelby Steele complains that affirmative action has reinforced a self-defeating sense of victimization among Blacks by encouraging us to blame our failures on white racism rather than on our own shortcomings. He too worries that affirmative action "makes automatic a perception of enhanced competence for the unpreferreds and of questionable competence for the preferreds—the former earned his way...while the latter made it by color as much as by competence."

In *Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby*, Stephen Carter denies being a conservative. But his discussion of affirmative action is a mirror image of the standard neoconservative critique. Like Glazer, Carter argues that: "What has

happened in America in the era of affirmative action is this: middle-class black people are better off and lower class black people are worse off." Carter's "best black syndrome" is the most quoted Black conservative status/self-esteem statement about affirmative action: "The best black syndrome creates in those of us who have benefited from racial preferences a peculiar contradiction. We are told over and over that we are the best black people in our profession. And we are flattered.... But to professionals who have worked hard to succeed, flattery of this kind carries an unobvious insult, for we yearn to be called what our achievements often deserve: simply the best—no qualifiers needed!"

Carter and the other Black conservative intellectuals say they object to the fact that affirmative action benefits those minorities who are already middle income. They do not produce convincing statistical evidence to support this contention. Nor do they recognize that affirmative action was designed to address discrimination, not economic disadvantage, or that most government programs benefit middle and, especially, high income groups. Nor do Black conservatives ever recommend that affirmative action become a program for all poor people, including the more than ten million poor whites in this country.

What Black conservatives do argue for is that Blacks compete on merit and merit alone. Their "merit only" policy is clearly an idealized paradigm. It ignores the fundamental reality that any selection process is always a combination of some imperfect assessment of merit (skills and talent) and purely personal filtering processes. To assume that race and/or gender considerations are neutral at the level of personal filtering is naive to say the least.

What is clear in Black conservatives' defense of merit as the sole criterion for selection or advancement is their own sense of personal diminishment by affirmative action labels. Indeed, Black conservatives fret a great deal about proof of their personal talent. And their comments, focussed as they are on white's judgments of them and their capabili-

ties, demonstrate that, ironically, they remain very much the captives of white racism.

A genuinely confident African American does not care if whites see her/him as the beneficiary of affirmative action imperatives, knowing that racism *ipso facto* dictates that success on the part of Blacks be seen as the result of unfavorable advantages. Thomas Sowell adamantly denies ever having been an affirmative action beneficiary and reportedly resents being identified as a "Black" anything.

Glenn Loury blasted white liberal Hendrik Hertzberg for saying he'd never met a well-informed, unbigoted Black who did not agree we have to be twice as talented and twice as hardworking to achieve the same degree of success as our white counterparts: "How quickly he [Hertzberg] forgets! We've met more than once, and in the course of our encounters never did I confirm, and often did I contradict the sentiments he ascribes to all 'well informed, unbigoted' blacks. I can only conclude that my earnest denunciation of affirmative action failed to register as the legitimate sentiments of a black intellectual... Perhaps he simply dismissed my opinions as a shockingly familiar neoconservatism in blackface."

Given that Black conservatives associate negative racial attributes with low income Blacks, it is not surprising that much of Black conservative analysis seeks to distinguish middle class from lower class Blacks. An unstated but clear objective throughout Black conservatives' arguments is the attempt to recast the current American identification of "Black" with (in Steele's words) "the least among us" to one in which "Black" is identified with their positive stereotype of middle class Blacks.

Glenn Loury captures this point: "The fact that the values, social norms, and social behaviors often observed among the poorest members of the black community are quite distinct from those characteristic of the black middle class indicates a growing divergence in the social and economic experiences of black Americans." Loury produces no supporting evidence for this observation.



## THE THEME OF SELF HELP

Black conservative intellectuals' solutions for improving race relations are very much tied to the classic attitudes of the Black bourgeoisie, and to issues of identity and status. Further, their solutions always assign leadership roles to the Black middle class. Consistent with their analysis of the causes of Black oppression and Black poverty, they return to the "slavery damaged" theme, and locate the solutions within individual Blacks and the Black community. The reasoning behind their proposed solutions represents some of the most reactionary of their thinking.

Loury and the other Black conservatives insist "self help" is the only viable solution to Black dilemmas. They argue we have to rely on ourselves because, as Loury states referring to Booker T. Washington, "[Washington] understood that when the effect of past oppression has been to leave people in a diminished state, the attainment of true equality with their former oppressor cannot much depend on his generosity but must ultimately derive from an elevation of their selves above the state of diminishment."

In addition, Loury and others have developed the profoundly subversive notion, as described by Adolph Reed, that "it is somehow illegitimate for black citizens to view government action and public policy as vehicles for egalitarian redress." Unlike all other American citizens, African Americans, according to Black conservatives, must win white approval by proving ourselves worthy of the rights of citizenship.

"The progress that must now be sought is that of achieving respect, the equality of standing in the eyes of one's political peers, of worthiness as subjects of national concern," Loury argues. Loury frequently acknowledges his intellectual debt to Booker T. Washington's controversial philosophy. He concedes Washington's approach may not have been entirely appropriate for the political and social contexts of his time, but Loury firmly believes the Washington approach is relevant in the post-civil rights era. "The point on

which Booker T. Washington was clear, and his critics seem not to be, is that progress of the kind described above must be earned, it cannot be demanded."

Consistent with their belief in the superiority of the Black middle class, Black conservatives argue that instead of relying on government programs and civil rights legislation, middle class Blacks should make economic investments in Black communities, Blacks should support Black businesses, and most important, the Black middle class needs to teach poor African Americans proper behavior and values. This self-help language, cloaked as it is in Black cultural nationalist rhetoric, has been among the most warmly received of the Black conservative messages in the African American community.

This is not surprising. First of all, self help literally defines how African Americans have managed to survive slavery, Reconstruction, and a series of trials and travails right up through the present day. Black conservatives and those praising them on this point sound as though African American history has not always included such famous proponents and practitioners of self help as Martin Delaney, Edward Blyden and Alexander Crummel, Marcus Garvey, the Nation of Islam, the Black Panthers, Jesse Jackson's Operation PUSH, and the thousands of Black women's clubs, Black Greek and professional associations and Black church-based organizations, among others. But African Americans' long heritage of self-help activities has tended to see self help as a supplement to, not a replacement for, deserved government services and full employment at family-sustaining wages.

In addition to its historical resonance for African Americans, the Black conservative promotion of self help flatters the Black middle class, casting it as the salvation for poor African Americans. It is noteworthy that even some liberal and progressive middle class Blacks have endorsed the Black conservatives' "culture of poverty" analysis and their call for self help to address the problem.

What is missed about Black conser-

vatives' self-help advocacy is that, unlike the cultural Black nationalist tradition whose rhetoric they borrow, theirs is neither an organic, collective model of self help, nor one intended to enhance Black unity and Black cultural integrity. It is based on a savage individualism, advocating a laissez-faire formula for Black progress through the commitment of individual Blacks to economic wealth and cultural assimilation.

As stated by Shelby Steele: "The middle class values by which we [the Black middle class] were raised—the work ethic, the importance of education, the value of property ownership, of respectability, of 'getting ahead,' of stable family life, of initiative, of self reliance, *et. cetera*—are, in themselves, raceless and even assimilationist. They urge us toward participation in the American mainstream, toward integration, toward a strong identification with the society, and toward the entire constellation of qualities that are implied in the word individualism."

Steele's comments illustrate another subversive aspect of Black conservatives' proposed solutions—the call to subsume our racial identity and to forgo collective racial action in favor of individualistic pursuits and a nationalistic American identity. Black conservatives issued this call during the 1980's, at a time when overt racist (and frequently violent) attacks on Blacks were at a post-civil rights era high, when the national political leadership of the country implicitly signaled its approval of racist attitudes, and when government and corporate policies were decimating poor and middle class African Americans alike with last hired/first fired policies. Given the political climate of the 1980's, Black conservatives were calling for no less than Black acquiescence and appeasement in their own oppression.

## BLACK CONSERVATIVES' TIES TO WHITE CONSERVATIVES

Black conservatives are few in number, with few exceptions have no name recognition in the African American community, have little to no institutional base in our community, have no signifi-

cant Black following, and no Black constituency. Indeed Black conservatives' highest visibility is in the white, not the Black community. It is due primarily to their ties to white conservative institutions that Black conservatives have come to be viewed as spokespersons for the race, despite lacking a base in the African American community. Conservative think tanks such as the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, the American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Foundation (which has even implemented a minority outreach program), and conservative foundations such as the Olin Foundation, the Scaife Foundation, and the Bradley Foundation sponsor Black conservatives in numerous ways.

White conservative institutions award Black conservatives fellowships, consultant work, directorships, and staff positions. They also provide public relations services which get Black conservatives television and radio appearances, help get editorials, opinion pieces, and articles by Black conservatives into mainstream, even liberal, newspapers and magazines, publish articles and books by Black conservatives, and sponsor workshops and conferences by and for Black conservatives.

Conservative and neoconservative publications such as *The Wall Street Journal*, *Human Events*, *The Washington Times*, *Commentary*, *The Public Interest*, *The National Interest*, *American Scholar*, and *The New Republic* have played a major role in promoting Black conservatives' visibility, publishing articles by and about them. And finally, the Republican Party, especially during the years of the Reagan Administration but also during the Bush Administration, rewarded Black conservatives with high-visibility government appointments and with financing for Black conservative electoral campaigns.

The Institute of Contemporary Studies, a conservative research organization established by former aides to Ronald Reagan after Reagan left the statehouse in Sacramento, sponsored the first conference of Black neoconservatives in San Francisco in December, 1980. Called The Fairmount Conference, it attracted about 125 conser-

vative Black lawyers, physicians, dentists, ivy league professors, and commentators. It remains the best-known gathering of Black conservative thinkers and policy makers.

A review of prominent Black conservatives' careers reveals the extent to which they have benefited from their corporately-funded presence in white conservative foundations, think tanks, and publications.

Thomas Sowell is a senior fellow at the conservative Palo Alto think tank, The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. Sowell is the most prolific of the Black conservative intellectuals; his fourteen books have been widely reviewed in conservative and mainstream publications alike. Conservative publications such as *Commentary*, *The American Spectator*, *Human Events*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Barron's*, and *Businessweek* consistently provide the most glowing reviews. Articles by and/or about Sowell have appeared in numerous mainstream publications such as *Time*, *Newsweek*, the *Washington Post*, and the *The New York Times*, among others.

When Sowell decided in 1981 to start a (short-lived) organization explicitly intended to counter the NAACP, the Black Alternatives Association, Inc., he reportedly received immediate pledges totaling \$1,000,000 from conservative foundations and corporations.

Glenn Loury's reputation and influence rest on only one book and a series of articles that have appeared in most of the major mainstream publications, as well as the conservative *Wall Street Journal*, *Commentary*, and *The Public Interest*. The Heritage Foundation published one of his best known essays, "Who Speaks for American Blacks," as a monograph in *A Conservative Agenda for America's Blacks*. Boston University's rightist President John Silber hired Loury when Loury left Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.

Robert Woodson has served in several capacities at the American Enterprise Institute. Woodson is also an adviser for the Madison Group, a loose affiliation of conservative state-level think tanks, launched in 1986 by the

American Legislative Exchange Council or ALEC. ALEC is an association of approximately 2,400 conservative state legislators and is housed in the Heritage Foundation's headquarters in Washington, D.C. The conservative John M. Olin Foundation gave \$25,000 to Woodson's National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. Woodson's 1987 book, *Breaking the Poverty Cycle: Private Sector Alternatives to the Welfare State*, was published by the conservative National Center for Policy Analysis in Dallas, then reissued in 1989 by the conservative Commonwealth Foundation, on whose board he sits.

Walter Williams is the John M. Olin Distinguished Professor of Economics at George Mason University, has been a fellow at the Hoover Institution and at the Heritage Foundation, and received funding for one of his books from the Scaife Foundation.

The importance of these ties is not white conservative patronage *per se*. Black liberals benefit from similar ties to liberal institutions. A critical intellectual difference, however, is that Black liberals' analyses and policy ideas originated in their experiences in the Civil Rights and Black Power movements, movements that emerged from the African American community. Black liberals' analyses, limited though they are, continue to be shaped by their Black constituents, who help fund civil rights organizations and elect them to office. It is important to question the implications of the fact that Black conservatives' arguments originate in white conservatives' arguments, and that Black conservatives are in no way answerable to a Black constituency.

The historical distinction between white liberals and white conservatives is also a critical one. White liberal patrons and allies have historically allied themselves with, not against, Black interests. During the civil rights struggles, the only place white conservatives could be found was implicitly or explicitly beside Bull Connor, Strom Thurmond, Lester Maddox, and George Wallace. The white conservatives with whom Black conservatives are allied tried to obstruct the very civil rights legislation which even Black conservatives concede was

necessary to create what they insist is now a largely discrimination-free America.

Today Black conservatives belong to a Republican Party thoroughly tainted by racism, whose leadership openly pursues a "southern strategy," employing racially polarizing tactics. Ironically, even today white conservatives remain ambivalent over the desirability of attracting more Blacks to conservative causes and to the Republican Party. Those favoring outreach to Blacks and other minorities have various motives. Pragmatic Republican strategists want to capture at least some of the solid Black support for the Democratic Party. Further, many conservatives recognize that sometime in the 21st century a majority of the U.S. population will be people of color. Given the historical role played by the traditionally politically liberal African American community as a catalyst for change, many mainstream white conservatives believe conservatism must become more inclusive if it is to survive.

Additionally, many Jewish conservatives seek an alliance with Black conservatives, who represent a sector within the African American community that will unite with them in support of Israel. The result is to diminish African American support for Palestinian and Arab causes and the related criticism of military ties between Israel and South Africa.

The more extreme conservatism of Patrick Buchanan and the extreme right wing of the Republican Party is, however, explicitly racist. As Margaret Quigley and Chip Berlet detailed in the December 1992 issue of *The Public Eye*, the right has always seen the African-American civil rights movement as part of a secular humanist plot to impose communism on the United States. This faction identifies sexual licentiousness and "primitive" African American music with subversion.

Patrick Buchanan wrote a well-known column titled "GOP Vote Search Should Bypass Ghetto" in which he argued that Blacks have been grossly ungrateful for efforts already made on their behalf by Republicans, who had already done more than enough to obtain their support.

It says much about his willingness to "sleep with the enemy" that, even after this notorious column and after Buchanan's outspoken racism during his 1992 run for the Republican Party's presidential nomination, Thomas Sowell could still write in a 1992 column: "If and when he [Buchanan] becomes a viable candidate on his own, perhaps in 1996, that will be time

**“Mainstream, liberal, and even progressive institutions also have promoted (Black conservatives) to their present-day status and levels of influence.”**

enough to start scrutinizing his views and policy proposals on a whole range of issues.”

As crucial as white conservative patronage has been to the careers and visibility of Black conservatives, it should not be viewed as their sole support. Mainstream, liberal, and even progressive institutions also have promoted them to their present-day status and levels of influence.

Robert Woodson's most notable award came from the moderately liberal MacArthur Foundation, which awarded him a \$320,000 "genius" grant in 1990. Walter Williams is a featured commentator on National Public Radio's "All Things Considered." Both Williams and Sowell are syndicated columnists. Shelby Steele produced and hosted a public television documentary on Bensonhurst in 1990. Articles by or about Sowell, Loury, Steele, and Carter appear regularly in such established outlets as *The New York Times*, the *Boston Globe*, *Dissent*, *Time*, and *Newsweek*. Shelby Steele, Glenn Loury, and Tony

Brown were among those featured in the January/February and the March/April 1993 issues of *Mother Jones* magazine, in a two-part article on urban poverty.

It is similarly noteworthy that while Black conservatives received an exceptional amount of publicity throughout the 1980's, the most intellectually sophisticated and nuanced group of African American scholars and theorists—progressives such as bell hooks, Angela Davis, June Jordan, Manning Marable, Adolph Reed, and Cornel West—received next to none.

Between January 1980 and August 1991 three prominent newspapers, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, published eleven op-eds, fourteen articles, and thirty reviews by or about Thomas Sowell, Shelby Steele, and Walter Williams. However during this same period, three prominent progressive African American scholars, bell hooks, Manning Marable, and Cornel West, had no op-eds, no articles and no stories by or about them in these same three newspapers.

This is, in part, a reflection of the conservatism that pervaded the political culture of the United States throughout the 1980's. But the question remains: How and why did a group of African Americans so unrepresentative of Black majority political opinion and so uninvolved in the affairs of the African American community come nonetheless to be anointed as race spokespeople, even by white institutions claiming to reflect liberal democratic ideals? From the perspective of the African American community, there is nothing democratic about the ascendancy of Blacks who demand that we acquiesce in fundamentally racist interpretations of who we are.

## CONCLUSION

**T**he principal complaint of most African Americans against Black conservatives, particularly the intellectuals featured here, is that they provide cover for policies that do grievous harm to

*continued on page 9*



## BOOKS RECEIVED

*A Selected, Annotated List**Conti, Joseph G., and Brad Stetson***Challenging the Civil Rights Establishment: Profiles of a New Black Vanguard**

Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1993. 240 pages, footnotes, bibliography, and index.

In the guise of a book *about* Black conservatives, Conti and Stetson have written an undisguised presentation of their ideology. As such, it is a useful statement of Black conservative thought that neatly packages the movement, folding in vicious attacks on the civil rights "establishment." Individual chapters on Thomas Sowell, Shelby Steele, Robert Woodson, and Glenn Loury (all presented as neglected voices) are paeans, lacking even a veneer of thoughtful objectivity.

*Robertson, Pat***The Turning Tide: The Fall of Liberalism and the Rise of Common Sense**

Dallas: Word Publishing, 1993. 336 pages, appendices, footnotes, selected bibliography, and index.

In yet another of his numerous book-length jeremiads, Robertson predicts that conservatives, when united, will use their common sense and "not only tear down liberalism, but the entire socialist, welfare state." Robertson identifies as gravely dangerous his targeted threats: radical feminists, homosexuals, Planned Parenthood, the ACLU, People for the American Way, and their radical allies. Robertson's implied trinity of patriarchy, Western culture, and free market capitalism is also, conveniently, God's true plan for salvation.

*LaHaye, Tim and Beverly LaHaye***Against the Tide: How to Raise Sexually Pure Kids in an "Anything-Goes" World**

Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Books, 1993. 258 pages, appendices, glossary, no index.

The LaHayes mix helpful advice with questionable assertions, Christian platitudes, and even religious intolerance. An example of the latter is advice in answer to the question: Should a pregnant girl marry the father of her unborn child? "In some cases she should. But not in every instance. If the father is unsaved, she definitely should not marry him. That would violate Scripture (2 Cor. 6:14)..." According to the LaHayes, guilt is the universal aftermath of masturbation, unless one has been brainwashed by humanistic philosophy. Sexual fantasy about someone other than your spouse is a sin condemned in Scripture. And practical tips for the single teen: "Never French kiss! This can be very stimulating and, therefore, should be saved for marriage. Rarely will a couple who does not French kiss indulge in sex." If your date gets aroused, suggest going to get something to eat. Fast food fends off fast friends?

*Kilpatrick, William***Why Johnny Can't Tell Right from Wrong: Moral Illiteracy and the Case for Character Education**

New York: Simon &amp; Schuster, 1992. 366 pages, book guide for youth, notes, and index.

Kilpatrick sanitizes, then restates, the anti-modernist conspiracy theories of the secular and religious right in moderate-sounding academic prose. He praises the ideas of Christian right activists James Dobson and Gary Bauer and condemns feminism as "an esoteric mix of Nietzschean philosophy, Marxist social analysis, and even mystery cult religions." Kilpatrick frequently cites approvingly from reactionary right sources such as Samuel Blumenfeld, Beverly LaHaye, Allan Bloom, William E. Dannemeyer,

and William J. Bennett. A frequent source of information cited is the Unification Church's *The World & I* magazine. Kilpatrick argues that liberal secular humanists consciously attempt to destroy moral values by manipulating public education curricula, warning parents that **use of code words** such as "values," and "responsible sex" is a good indication that a school has no real commitment to character formation.

*Simpson, Christopher***The Splendid Blond Beast: Money, Law, and Genocide in the Twentieth Century**

New York: Grove Press, 1993. 399 pages, appendix, notes and sources, and index.

This critical reinterpretation of the crime of genocide demonstrates how international corporate looting and crass political pragmatism can tolerate, promote, and forgive those involved in mass murder. Using newly-released government documents, Simpson reveals that CIA director Allen Dulles arranged the escape of leading SS murderers and placed persons involved in using slave-labor into the post-war German government. These revelations buttress an analysis that indicts financial elites and their allies in foreign policy circles for a systemic and institutional indifference to genocide. Simpson concludes: "The present world order supplies stability and rationality of a sort for human society, while its day-to-day operation chews up the weak, the scapegoats, and almost anyone else in its way. This is not necessarily an evil conspiracy of insiders; it is a structural dilemma that generates itself more or less consistently from place to place and from generation to generation....social systems that permit decisions institutionalizing murder to take on the appearance of wisdom, reason, or even justice among the men and women who lead society."

## DRAWN BY THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA

Most Black conservatives blame the history of slavery for the economic and social shortcomings of poor, inner city African Americans today, arguing that Blacks suffer from a cultural deficit created by their servitude under slavery. Emmanuel McLittle, publisher of *Destiny* magazine, provides a new twist on this argument. As the keynote speaker at Accuracy in Academia's 1992 Conference, McLittle told the audience that 20 percent of those who came on slave ships ("who came to America in a way that was a little different") came voluntarily because "they had inklings and word that flowed through the tribes in Africa of something about the spirit of America, something about what those people did that left England and started in America, and many of those people came to this country voluntarily and were never slaves." He went on to say that "a remnant of those people, a remnant of the mental, psychological attitudes of those people, still live today."



## BIG SLOGAN CARRIES LITTLE MEANING

Tony Marco, co-founder of Colorado for Family Values, admitted during the trial challenging the constitutional validity of Amendment Two that CFV's slogan "No Special Rights" was "a totally meaningless term." Colorado for Family Values used the slogan successfully to promote the passage of Amendment Two, which prohibits the state and local governments from enforcing laws or regulations that protect gay men and lesbians from discrimination. Enforcement of the law was temporarily blocked pending the outcome of a legal challenge by six Colorado residents and three cities—Denver, Boulder, and Aspen. Marco left Colorado for Family Values after Amendment Two was passed, saying

he objected to certain campaign tactics that stereotyped and dehumanized homosexuals. [Source: *Bay Windows*, Oct. 21-27, 1993.]

## A BLACK RUSH LIMBAUGH?

The American Media Network is attempting to raise \$20,000 through a

direct mail appeal to conservatives to help underwrite the projected \$250,000 cost of adding the Alan Keyes Radio Show to its list of syndicated programs. Their fundraising letter brags that Keyes has been called the "Black Rush Limbaugh," and that like Limbaugh, Keyes "can

## FOCUS ON THE FAMILY TRAINING SEMINARS

Focus on the Family continues its nationwide series of one day "Community Impact Seminars" to equip attendees with "the skills needed to be a key player in your area." Based in Colorado Springs, CO, Focus on the Family is a Christian ministry that dispenses right-wing guidance on moral and political matters. Founded in 1977, the group now has an annual budget of over \$80 million, overseen by its president Dr. James Dobson, a psychologist. The group distributed the following schedule

which illustrates its local alliances:

*Alphabetically by State, then by Date:*

| CITY          | ST | DATE       | LOCAL HOST                       |
|---------------|----|------------|----------------------------------|
| Mobile        | AL | 07/10/1993 | Alabama Family Alliance          |
| Little Rock   | AR | 08/28/1993 | Arkansas Family Council          |
| San Diego     | CA | 10/02/1993 | Capitol Resource Institute       |
| Riverside     | CA | 10/23/1993 | Capitol Resource Institute       |
| Fort Collins  | CO | 11/20/1993 | Rocky Mountain Family Council    |
| Pensacola     | FL | 06/19/1993 | Florida Family Council           |
| Orlando       | FL | 10/09/1993 | Florida Family Council           |
| Chicago       | IL | 09/11/1993 | Illinois Family Institute        |
| Kansas City   | KS | 11/06/1993 | Kansas Family Research Institute |
| Lexington     | KY | 10/30/1993 | The Family Foundation            |
| Traverse City | MI | 07/24/1993 | Michigan Family Forum            |
| Detroit       | MI | 08/21/1993 | Michigan Family Forum            |
| Tulsa         | OK | 07/17/1993 | Resource Institute of Oklahoma   |
| Oklahoma City | OK | 10/16/1993 | Resource Institute of Oklahoma   |
| Hershey       | PA | 06/26/1993 | Pennsylvania Family Institute    |
| Johnson City  | TN | 08/07/1993 | The Association for Families     |
| Memphis       | TN | 08/14/1993 | The Association for Families     |
| Lubbock       | TX | 11/13/1993 | Free Market Foundation           |
| Dallas        | TX | 12/04/1993 | Free Market Foundation           |
| Seattle       | WA | 06/05/1993 | Washington Family Council        |
| Spokane       | WA | 09/25/1993 | Washington Family Council        |

Focus on the Family has affiliates in 35 states and conducts extensive outreach through its syndicated radio program and its numerous printed periodicals: *Breakaway* for "teen guys," *Brio* for "teen girls," *The Citizen* covering current events, *Clubhouse* for children 8-12, *Clubhouse, Jr.* for children 4-8, *Focus on the Family* for parenting and family counseling, *Parental Guidance* on media & culture, *Physician* for doctors, *Teachers in Focus* for K-12 "values-based curricula," and *Youthwalk*, a devotional guide for teens. [Sources: FOF mailing, Institute for First Amendment Studies.]



counter the lies and distortions of the far left media and build a bridge to the black community." [Source: *direct mail appeal.*]

## GET THE MESSAGE? GET THE MEANING?

Three Little Rock, Arkansas abortion providers found their names and addresses on a flyer accompanied by a picture of a half-naked, thuggish executioner carrying a double-headed battle-ax. The headline read: "Profitably serving your baby killing needs." The text speaks for itself:

"My son, if a wicked person entices you, ignore him. If he says 'let us lie in wait for blood and kill the innocent. Let us swallow them alive like the grave and consume them like the pit of hell. We will become rich by their death and build our houses with plunder.' My son! Flee from such people! For they rush to evil and hasten to shed innocent blood. They are foolish

because they can't see that they trap themselves. They will actually forfeit their own blood. This is the way of those who gain by murdering the innocent. They will lose their own life." (Proverbs 1:10-19, paraphrased) [Source: *Women's Project, Arkansas.*]

## A WHALE OF A TALE AT YALE

A slanted twist on the famous book title "Up From Slavery" produced "Up from Liberalism: The Struggle Against the Leviathan State," the title for the conservative New England Leadership Conference held on October 30, 1993 at Yale University. Sponsored by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, The Fund for American Studies, and the Young America's Foundation, the featured speakers were Dr. Walter E. Williams and Charles Sykes. According to the flyer announcing the conference, "Society's dominant liberal ethos" has had "a corrosive effect on the

academy," through such evils as multiculturalism, called "an assault on our American heritage." Liberal professors are described as "complicit in the project to undermine the pillars of the American social order—individual liberty, personal responsibility, the rule of law, private property, the free market economy, and Judeo-Christian moral norms."

## WE CAN'T LET THEM VOTE!

J.A. Parker, president of the ultra-conservative Abraham Lincoln Foundation, "America's Black Conservative Voice of Action," is raising funds as "a black American who needs your immediate help to stop Jesse Jackson's unconstitutional and racially charged drive for Washington, D.C. statehood." Parker helped mentor Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in his climb up the political ladder. [Source: *direct mail appeal.*]

## Black Conservatives *continued from page 6*

Black people. But the potential harm inherent in Black conservatism is a danger to all Americans.

June Jordan has observed that problems which first appear in poor African American communities—substandard schools, AIDS, violent crime—always eventually appear in middle income white communities. At that point they leave the realm of the "culture of poverty" and become an "American problem."

The United States has never allowed full citizenship rights for all its citizens. It has never built a social culture devoid of racism, sexism, anti-Jewish bigotry, homophobia, or classism. Our economic system has never provided full employment at a sustainable wage. As a nation, we have never committed ourselves to providing as basic human rights a quality education for each and every child, universal high-quality health care, and a decent place to live for all people.

So long as the devastating inequities that characterize American society persist, and racism continues to exacerbate these inequities, there is absolutely no

way to make meaningful, much less provable, statements correlating peoples' values with their socioeconomic status.

By tying poor African Americans' poverty to race and our supposed slavery-flawed culture, Black conservatives insult African Americans. They also divert attention from June Jordan's observation that Black problems inevitably become problems of the larger society. At some point, white Americans and middle income Americans in general are going to be forced to confront the fundamental problems caused by this country's severe maldistribution of resources and its intolerance of diversity. Black conservatives delay that confrontation and in so doing, they do the entire country a grave disservice.

By uncritically promoting Black conservatives, liberal and progressive institutions not only undermine their own stated principles, they exhibit a not-so-subtle form of racism. As Adolph Reed Jr. points out: Who

would listen if the word "Italian" or "Jew" were substituted in Black conservatives' characterizations of African Americans? We should be clear that stereotyping and victim-blaming is not more respectable because it is done by a member of the group being demeaned.

—by Deborah Toler

*Deborah Toler holds a Ph.D. in political science. She is an international development consultant with a specialization in East and Southern Africa. She can be reached through Political Research Associates. Call or write for footnotes for this article.*

*Haiku for author Tony Morrison  
on winning the Nobel Prize for  
Literature*

Ceiling glass shatters  
Cannons shuffle on the deck  
Splashing Dead White Males

—Rich Dutcher  
San Francisco Greens

# Confessions of a Religious Defender

Stephen L. Carter

## The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion

New York: Basic Books, 1993.  
277 pp., plus footnotes and index.

Reading Stephen Carter is a frustrating exercise. His points are argued in reasoned tones, without the bombast or rhetoric of so many Black conservatives. In fact, he argues that he is not a conservative. He frequently assures the reader that he believed Anita Hill, holds Ronald Reagan in disdain, and is not a part of the "Christian right," adding to the sense that he is a moderate. To make his points, he assembles a battalion of anecdotal stories with the skill of a conjuring magician. You don't know how it happened, but your guard is down, you're lulled into a heavy-lidded ease, and you find yourself applauding many of his main points.

Carter, you may remember, is the author of the best-selling *Confessions of an Affirmative Action Baby*, the most popular attack on affirmative action to come out of the Reagan/Bush era. In *The Culture of Disbelief* he again has popularized a complex legal debate, in this case a debate over what is known as the "hostility thesis," a shorthand name for the argument that the Supreme Court has erred by granting too few religious exemptions from public laws (under the Free Exercise Clause), and has too often excluded religion from publicly-funded programs in the name of preventing the "establishment of religion." Promoters of the hostility thesis argue that this has weakened the role of religion in civil life, a role further trivialized by liberals, the media, the welfare state, and elite opinion makers.

Carter has crafted a statement of the hostility thesis for the average reader—no legal training required. He outlines in lay language the complaint that religion is excluded from public life

and actually mocked when it is mobilized in support of conservative causes. He blames all the usual suspects—secular liberals, the media, political pundits and opinion-makers—for applying a double standard when they demand the removal of religious statements and principles from the public sphere. He argues that religious principles are accepted so long as they are used in support of liberal causes such as civil rights, but they are excluded as inappropriate and intolerant when mobilized for conservative ends.

Carter's tone is bitter on his central theme, the trivialization of religion, or what he calls "religion as a hobby." He relies on legions of anecdotal stories to support his position that public-spirited citizens who are religious are made to feel "ashamed" of their religiosity. "Through all of this trivializing rhetoric runs the subtle but unmistakable message: pray if you like, worship if you must, but whatever you do, do not on any account take your religion seriously." (p.15) Meanwhile, Carter repeatedly distances himself from the Christian right, diminishing its danger to civil society by dismissing it as weak, politically ineffective, and divided.

Carter makes some points about the role of religion in public life that ring true. He argues that religiosity itself should not be condemned, and that progressive movements do so at their own risk. I agree that those who criticize the intolerance of the religious right too often seem to denigrate the spiritual dimension of people's lives. An analysis of the religious right that dismisses the importance of religious beliefs and practices will overlook a fundamental way that many people seek some sort of wholeness and harmony, some sense of purpose and meaning, and some way to locate themselves in the universe.

Further, civil libertarians would agree with Carter that government should, for the most part, stay out of the practice of religion, even suspect religious sects, cults, and pseudo-denomi-

nations such as the Unification Church (Rev. Sun Myung Moon), Scientology, or the Boston Church of Christ. Surely there are limits to how much pressure government should be allowed to bring to bear on them to mend their manipulative, pocket-picking ways. Beyond outright criminal fraud, people should probably be free to be misled.

Finally, even many who are not religious would agree with Carter that religious expression is debased by the use of mandatory religious sound bites in the public sphere. The banal and counterfeit religious intonations of Presidents Reagan and Bush, including bald statements that this or that American triumph was God's will, is not a new practice but represents an undeniable cheapening of religious sentiment.

Carter concedes that "there are reasons that the public square is cautious about religion—reasons linked to history, linked to post-Enlightenment philosophy, linked to the Constitution." (p.53) Yet he is unable to see any such reasons at work in the United States today. Given his dismissal of the Christian right as weak and divided, it is no wonder that he does not see the obvious danger it represents. He wants religion to be uniformly *welcomed* in the public square, in spite of the declared goal of the Christian right to impose its will on the larger society by capturing the political sphere.

Carter seems unaware that in the past fifteen years in the United States there has been a religious revitalization movement of historic proportions.\* Its impetus has been a revolt against modernity and the reassertion of what Martin Marty calls the "new traditionalisms." In *Religion and Republic* Marty describes these traditionalisms as "frankly nostalgic, longing for the simpler, ordered, homogeneous world that once satisfied the 'wholeness-hunger' of individuals, subcultures, and the larger culture." (p. 26) While mainstream religions have declined, there has been a dramatic resurgence of conservative churches. In many cases the

growing churches are advocates of a form of "born-again" Christianity, often characterized by absolutism, fanaticism, rigid doctrinal conformity, and zealous proselytizing.

An important component of this revitalization is a growing consensus that it is no longer appropriate for fundamentalist Christians to wait passively for the second coming of Christ. A strong expression of this position, found in what is loosely called dominion theology, promotes the notion that Christians must "occupy" all secular institutions in preparation for the Second Coming. The influence of dominion theology has helped to bring fundamentalist Christians into the political sphere, mobilizing them to work for conditions more hospitable to Christianity. This commitment promotes (even mandates) involvement in the political sphere here and now.

On the scene to promote and manipulate this revival are the well-known Christian activists of the day: Pat Robertson (former Southern Baptist minister), Rev. Tim LaHaye, Dr. James Dobson, Dr. D. James Kennedy, Rev. Donald Wildmon, and their lay promoters, Pat Buchanan, Rush Limbaugh, Rep. Newt Gingrich, and Rep. William Dannemeyer, among others. This leadership is not promoting a political activism *informed* by religious belief; it is promoting politics *governed* by religious belief, with an added mandate to convert others. It is this aspect of the convergence between religious life and public life that gives pause to the open-handed acceptance of religion in the public square. If you are one of the despised of this movement, you may

well find yourself excluded from the public square if you do not defend a "wall of separation."

The aggressive push of Christian fundamentalists into the political sphere has corresponded with a similar forceful push by secular conservatism. The two sectors, religious and political conservatism, were explicitly united in the New Right, and fed each other's success. How could this recent history possibly be interpreted as the exclusion of religion from the public square?

Stephen Carter would have us take religion seriously, and we should. But civil society must defend against becoming the captive of the evangelistic instincts of any one religious doctrine. In the case of the contemporary Christian right, the anti-modern aspects of the doctrine promote a rigid division between good and evil, and ultimately the silencing of those members of civil society who are deemed evil. Those who are outside the comforting arms of a "true" relationship with God (usually atheists, feminists, liberals, single mothers, gays and lesbians; sometimes Jews, people of color, Muslims, Buddhists) are in serious peril. Vigorous dissent, in the form of public education, political combat, or the aggressive promotion of opposing ideas, cannot fairly be labeled anti-religious trivialization. It is anything but.

—by Jean Hardisty

*\* Revitalization is a term developed by anthropologist Anthony F. C. Wallace to describe a moment when a society responds to individual and cultural stress by reasserting nativist or traditionalist beliefs, values, and behavior patterns.*

## Eye Lashes

### THE RIGHT LOOKS AT THE WORLD:

"We must look at (former President Jimmy) Carter as a feminist, that is, his administration was feminist. Feminism has nothing to do with being a woman; it has to do with being insane, irrational, emotional, or, as Jenson and Shockley would say, "emotional associative reasoning, not cognitive."

Lyndon LaRouche  
in *The New Federalist*  
11/8/93

### PRA LOOKS AT THE RIGHT:

Neo-cons claim they do like diversity, except when it causes adversity. Their campus suggestion? The canon don't question! No thinking while at university.

# The Public Eye

*The Public Eye* is published quarterly by Political Research Associates. Subscriptions are \$29.00 for individuals and non-profit organizations, \$39.00 for other organizations, \$19.00 for students and low-income individuals. Outside U.S., Canada, and Mexico, add \$9.00 for surface delivery or \$14.00 for air mail.

Please make checks payable to Political Research Associates, 678 Massachusetts Ave., Suite 702, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-3355.

PRA is a non-profit, tax-exempt organization. All donations are tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

© Political Research Associates, 1993. All rights reserved.

#### POLITICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES STAFF

Jean V. Hardisty, Ph.D.,  
Director

Chip Berlet,  
Analyst

Judith Glaubman,  
Archivist

#### THE PUBLIC EYE STAFF

Jean Hardisty and Judith Glaubman, *Editors*

*Design* by DG Communications 

*Printing* by Red Sun Press 

*Mailing* by Walnut Street Center

*Many thanks to Chip Berlet for his limericks*

ISSN 0275-9322



## THE PUBLIC EYE Resources

The Center for the Applied Study of Ethnoviolence, (CASE), is the new name of the former National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence. CASE is now affiliated with the University of Maryland at Baltimore, has moved into new offices, and has a new mission statement mandating that the group focus on bringing together serious research into ethnoviolence and communities and workplaces seeking to reduce inter-group tensions and violence. CASE has two new booklets available, one on organizing communities to fight against ethnoviolence, and another on the role of lawyers in fighting ethnoviolence. Several other reports are forthcoming. Write for a current list of available publications. 712 W. Lombard Street, Baltimore, MD 21201, (410) 706-5170 voice, (410) 706-7551 fax.

Along similar lines, the Poverty & Race Research Action Council is a national organization that seeks to link civil rights, civil liberties, and anti-poverty advocacy groups with social science researchers and social science data to help develop successful strategies to eliminate poverty and racially-based disadvantages. Through a national network of contacts, the Council attempts to "put advocacy groups

in contact with appropriate researchers who can assist them, and put researchers in contact with the advocacy groups that can make use of their work." *Poverty & Race* is the group's bi-monthly newsletter. Applications for grants are welcomed from social science research teams and advocacy groups. For more information, call (202) 387-9887.

The *People of Color Environmental Groups Directory* is now one of numerous directories and guides available on-line on the progressive computer networks EcoNet and PeaceNet. Persons with a computer, modem, and telecommunications software can log onto the systems, search for information, and download the data to their own computer. To learn more about joining EcoNet or PeaceNet call (415) 442-0220.

The conservative equivalent of EcoNet/PeaceNet is called "Town Hall." Among the groups placing resources and text files on the computer system are the Free Congress Foundation and its National Empowerment Television project, the Leadership Institute, International Freedom Foundation, Focus on the Family, the State Policy Network of state-based

think-tanks, and Citizens for a Sound Economy. For membership information call (800) 441-4142 or (202) 546-4400. If you have a modem, you can take an on-line tour by logging in at (800) 648-6964 and hitting the <Return/Enter> key when connected.

Channel One is the corporate-sponsored television program fed into cooperating public schools by Whittle Communications. In exchange for free video equipment, schools agree to have students watch ten minutes of superficial news and two minutes of paid commercials on a daily basis. "Unplug" is the name of the project designed to oppose Channel One and other advertising programs posing as information services. Among the group's goals are ensuring that "curriculum content should be in the hands of the local community, not distant corporations, and that education should be in the hands of educators, not profit-motivated enterprises." An Unplug study conducted with the University of Massachusetts at Amherst revealed that when communities could afford to say no to Channel One, they rejected the program. For more information, call (800) UNPLUG-1.

# The Public Eye

NEWSLETTER

Political Research Associates

678 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 702

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-3355