

On the New McCarthyism  
Robert S. Griffin  
[www.robertsgriffin.com](http://www.robertsgriffin.com)

I recently read a memoir of the late 1940s and '50s, *Inside Out: A Memoir of the Black List*, by Walter Bernstein. Bernstein was a writer for radio and television who was blacklisted, as it was called, for his political beliefs and associations during what was known as the McCarthy era (named after Senator Joseph McCarthy, a prominent Communist-hunter during that time). People who were suspected of being Communists--or supporting Communists, or being in leftist organizations or supporting them, we aren't talking about fine distinctions here--were put on a list that was sent to employers and if your name was on the list you were fired, or if you were applying there for a job you weren't hired. So you were blacklisted, unemployed and unemployable. I suppose the term blacklisted is derived from blackballed, which is to shut someone out of social or commercial participation, or ostracize them, exclude them, shun them.

Who compiled the list of names? Anybody who had the inclination--there were no particular qualifications for the task. The owner of a chain of supermarkets put out a list of leftists in the entertainment industry called *Red Channels*, and Bernstein's name was on it and he was out of work and he wasn't going to get any work in the future. It wasn't just people in the entertainment business that were under attack--the witch hunters tried to destroy anybody who had a public voice they didn't like, including artists, intellectuals, and academics.

Bernstein was a member of the Communist Party. He was also a morally upright person who cared deeply about the welfare of his fellow man and economic and racial justice. But all that was immaterial to his inquisitors. It didn't matter what he was like. It didn't matter what his commitments were. And it wasn't a personal assault on Bernstein, because he was no longer a person: he was type, a concept, he'd been objectified, de-humanized. Bernstein could be fit into a category that had been set up as evil and threatening, Communist, and that made him the enemy and fair game.

Bernstein was like the Jap in World War II. You don't acknowledge a Jap's humanity. You don't bother distinguishing one

Jap from another. You don't try to figure out what a Jap is thinking, or hear him out, or dialogue with him. You certainly don't care a whit about what happens to a Jap. You kill a Jap, period. You drop firebombs on Jap women and children in Tokyo—after all, they are all Japs, the same ones that attacked our ships in Pearl Harbor, no difference. You drop atomic bombs on civilian populations in Hiroshima and Nagasaki—why not, they are Japs, they deserve to die. Bernstein was a Jap.

What makes this particularly interesting to me is that the red baiters in the '40s and '50s were basically good people. That's what makes this whole business—and its parallels in our time, that's where this is going—intriguing and, to me, scary, chilling. The point here is going to be that it's not just ogres that do awful things; good people do them too if the circumstances are right.

A personal example: I sent a book I wrote called *A Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds* to the University of Oklahoma Press to consider for publication. In the book, I recount that after World War II two million ethnic Germans who had lived outside Germany, often for generations—civilians, women and children and old people--had been murdered during the process of being expelled from Czechoslovakia and other places and sent back to Germany. My point in relaying this in the book wasn't so much how terrible it was, though it was, but rather that very few Americans are aware that it happened, that it has been blocked out of history.

A university professor the University of Oklahoma Press had commissioned to review my book recommended that they not publish it because I had not made it clear that those deaths after the war were justified; those were Germans and they had deserved to die. I don't know this reviewer, but I presume he goes to church on Sunday and is good to his family and gives to charitable causes and wouldn't hurt a fly. But drum in a Germans/Nazi category as a frame of reference and he's fine with two million people being murdered. People are malleable, suggestible, the vast majority of them go along with whatever is put in its head--that's human nature, I believe. Give people an enemy category to work with and all morality goes out the window.

The political philosopher Hanna Arendt wrote about the banality of evil with reference to how educated, morally upright people could have participated in what was done to the Jews in Germany during the 1930s and '40s. (And let me make it clear, I'm

not equating that horror with firing Communists from their jobs in the middle of the last century, somebody blocking the publication of my writing, or, the discussion coming up, the attacks against white advocates and activists—I'm just trying to make a point about human nature.) I'll offer some thoughts on how you can get good people to commit or go along with a bad thing and feel good about it: up to persecuting, and even slaughtering, other people they don't even know. Here's how you do it:

*Control their information, images, and ideas.* Make sure they only hear your side of the story.

*Couch what you want in the highest sounding language.* Tell them its defending freedom, on the side of justice, combating hate, something like that.

*Give people language they can use to tell themselves how virtuous they are when they destroy the people you want destroyed or go along with it.* People like to think of themselves as a being good, morally upright, having good character, and so on.

*De-humanize and objectify the other side.* In Germany, Jews were depicted as vermin and as being all alike. Racially conscious whites are all KKK members. Nazis are evil and all the same. "White males" are all privileged, boorish, and oppressive. Keep people from looking at the particulars about individuals and just focusing on the pejorative category you've set up. Categories are easier to attack and kill than individual human beings.

*Let people know that if they go along with you they will be acknowledged and approved and respected by others and included in the group.* And the stick to complement the carrot, *point out examples of people who didn't go along with you—how they were condemned, ignored, disrespected, marginalized, or shunned.*

*Distribute some tangible perks to people who play ball with you.* Thinking your way and doing your bidding is a way to get and keep a job, get a promotion and a raise, get praise and an award, get an article or a book published, a project funded, etc. And alternatively, get across that *crossing you is the way to get negated, fired, and your house on the auction block.*

And then turn the dogs loose. Even the sweetest of dogs, to continue that metaphor, will go for the throat, and more, they'll honestly believe in what they are doing. Depending on whether they live in Germany or England, they'll put Jews on freight trains or incinerate 130,000 civilians in Dresden in a bombing raid.

And notice where it starts: Making sure that only the information, images, and ideas favorable to your side gets to the masses. Controlling what gets published, what films get made and what gets on television, what is lectured and read and said in the classroom, who gets to participate in the public discourse and who gets silenced. Clamping down hard on anybody who doesn't mirror the current orthodoxy, the current creed. Joseph Goebbels knew all about this, and so do modern thought managers.

Bernstein naively thought that fairness would prevail in his case: "I never really believed that I would be blacklisted," he writes in his memoir. "I still thought in terms of what I deserved. I didn't deserve to be blacklisted." What Bernstein deserved had nothing to do with it. Freedom of conscience and free speech and association, supposedly core tenets in our political system, had nothing to do with it. "Some blacklisted people died of politics," writes Bernstein. "They died of the insult in their own hearts. A few, like Phil Loeb, took their own lives." Whether Bernstein and others like him suffered had nothing to do with it. Bernstein and his wife and children could have starved to death for all his persecutors cared. Bernstein was the enemy. He was a witch in Salem.

Money considerations are a part of everything in American life and the black list was no exception. Those who compiled the lists of people with a Communist taint—or who were on the left somewhere or somehow—sold them to employers. And, as Bernstein points out, you could sometimes buy your way off a list: "An additional fee could be paid by those accused who wanted to clear themselves and so remain employable. In essence, it was a protection racket."

Reading Bernstein's account, it is hard to imagine this retiring, bookish individual posed a threat to anybody. But if you are in the blacklisting business, or find it somehow rewarding to ferret out and destroy Communists, in order to justify what you are doing, both to yourself and others, you have blow Bernstein up into the devil incarnate and a gigantic threat to the republic. We now know that the Soviet Union was never the threat they were made out to be during the cold war; they were trying to recover from the devastation of World War II. But to rationalize military spending and keep the economy going, the military-industrial complex, as Dwight Eisenhower called it, had to hype the USSR into an immanent threat—build a bomb shelter, give us your money. "We had to be

dangerous so that what was being done to us was justified,” writes Bernstein. “The Soviet Union was the Great Satan; we were its American coven.”

Reading Bernstein’s account, I was struck by parallels between what was going on in the 1940s and ‘50s and what’s happening in our time now with the attacks against “hate.” My research and writing on race has brought me into personal contact with this contemporary inquisition. I’ve seen what has happened to people I’ve encountered, and I’ve tasted a bit of it myself. My transgression is that I wrote about white separatists, white advocates, white activists, and yes, white supremacists, without condescendingly smearing them as ignorant, anachronistic, and malevolent racists and bigots. I didn’t do that because it wouldn’t have been truthful to do that. As a university professor and social analyst, and more fundamentally, as a human being I tell the truth as I see it. I’m not in the stereotyping business. I’m not in the business of telling people what they want to hear about the world and themselves so that I get approved and rewarded. It’s not so much a choice I’ve made, and it’s not that I’m courageous. I’m just being what I am, or the way my parents raised me, or whatever accounts for it. I know full well what would get me patted on the head and I’m not doing it, that’s all there is to it.

I care about the wellbeing of all people on this planet, and that includes European heritage people, white people. Most of my writing on race has been reportage and analysis, but increasingly as time has gone on, I have written from a position of white advocacy. I’m an advocate for whites for the same reasons that others support blacks and Hispanics and other groups. I’ve spent my adult life around secondary schools and universities and I’ve seen first hand how young whites are put down in schools. Their ancestors are trashed as oppressors, they are conditioned to feel guilty about their heritage and race, and they are taught to defer to and serve the interests of other races and pay no attention to the welfare of their own people. They are shut up if they express racial pride and commitment, they are beaten back if they even think about forming organizations or engaging in collective action, and they are the victims of racial discrimination in school admittance. If the children of any other racial or ethnic group were treated this way in schools there would be hell to pay.

If I advocated for any other group but whites, using the exact same language and rationale, I'd be applauded and rewarded. I find it fascinating that nobody seems to notice this contradiction. Say you care about white people these days and it's called hate, and people buy into that. Remarkable. The malleability of human beings again: you can trust them to go along with whatever is in the wind. If it's the '30s in Italy, they are Fascists; if it's the '60s in China, they are Red Guards. If it's the first decade the twenty-first century, they worship at the shrine of racial egalitarianism and diversity and persecute white racial consciousness and commitment. I find it particularly intriguing that today's inquisitors most often are white themselves. As I put it in my last book, *Living White*:

Since I have been writing about race and have become somewhat of a public figure in this area, I have found it increasingly remarkable that advocates for white people, and even people who speak of whites without denigrating them, are viewed by other whites as illicit, even more, scary. It would be one thing if non-whites were put in a dither by the expression of white racial concern or advocacy. What fascinates me is how white people have been conditioned to reject out of hand, and even attack, anyone among them who says, let's talk about how white people are doing. How this state of affairs came to be is one of the major stories of our time, I believe.

I oppose the suppression of thought and speech from whatever direction it comes. My doctoral training and my conception of a university professor tells me to encourage not stifle inquiry, to support not attack expression, to engage in dialogue and not shut it down, to value intellectual diversity and not shun people who do not accept today's conventional thinking. I believe in the marketplace of ideas: let it operate and truth will prevail. No one has any business silencing and punishing people who don't agree with him.

It is more accurate to call the people and organizations I have studied and written about this past decade as white advocates or white separatists rather than white supremacists. They are concerned about the status and future of white people and their

heritage and, many of them, want whites to be able, if they choose, to live among their own and to determine their own destiny. That said, some racially conscious whites do believe that, given their values, the white race has been, and continues to be, more accomplished; superior, if you will. They hold that if you objectively assess the races on the bases of their achievements in philosophy, ethics, the arts, architecture, civilization building, mathematics, science and technology, and business acumen, whites are at the top of the list, or at least compared to blacks and Hispanics. They contend that knowing a community is white allows you to predict that with great deal of certainty that it is clean and orderly and safe, and that its children are cared for and educated well, and that life is liveable there; and that the same cannot be said for a black or Hispanic community. They claim that when there is an infusion of blacks and Hispanics into a white area to the level of a critical mass—say, 30%—you can predict that the area will deteriorate physically, become politically corrupt and more dangerous, that educational standards will become lower, and that it will be an area that decent people will want leave, not enter.

I believe in freedom of conscience. In a free society it should not be a crime or punishable to believe one's race or religion is superior. Rather than forbid assertions of white superiority, we should allow it to be part of the public discourse. If it is empirically false, that will be demonstrated by counterargument. The truth will set us free, or at least it will set us on the right direction. We need to ground ourselves in reality, whatever that reality is, and even if that reality is unpalatable. To operate on high-sounding but false premises is a ticket to distress and failure.

You might think a diverse, multiracial, multicultural society is demonstrably best, and preferable as a setting in which to live. Others, however, have the right to ask you to provide concrete examples to support your perspective and preference rather than just rhetoric. Other than the fictions on television and in the movies where are these multi-racial, multi-ethnic paradises? In Lebanon? In the old Yugoslavia? In Rwanda and the Sudan? In Chicago and Detroit and Cincinnati and Los Angeles? In London? Paris? Where exactly? And what gives you the right to tell white people who want to live peacefully among their racial kinsman that they can't do that and they must live your way? Back to human nature, there is a tendency for people to think their way is the best way and the only

way, and to force that on other people. I think that is a predilection we all need to overcome in ourselves.

Contrary to the image that has been painted of them, the vast majority of the racially conscious whites do not want to harm blacks and Hispanics or rule them. Rather, they simply want to get away from them. And they are not racists as we usually define that term: they don't harbor a deep-seated, irrational animosity toward minorities. What is called racism and hate is actually disapproval and disdain. With blacks, white racialists disapprove of, and have contempt for, their illegitimacy rate, their violent crime rate, the way they fail to keep up the areas in which they live, their educational and work performance, their welfare dependency, and their tendency to hold others responsible for their negative conduct and demand double standards and racial preferences. These whites point out that that 90% of interracial crime is black on white, and are enraged that blacks rape 20,000 white women a year (versus a couple hundred the other way around), and are convinced that these realities are suppressed by those who control the information flow in America.

That is what my investigations have told me some racially conscious whites believe, and I've reported it. I personally have not paid a significant price for writing and speaking on race from a white perspective. I'm a tenured professor in a university and as a practical matter it would be difficult to fire me. And for whatever reason I'm pretty tough when it comes to being criticized and rejected and snubbed. But I know of people who have paid a great price for their beliefs and associations. A couple of examples that come to mind: A woman I have met, a dear and good person, with no notice, was called into her bosses' office and fired on the spot, not for something she did—it was acknowledged that she was doing excellent work--but because her husband was a member of a "white supremacy" organization. Two security guards who were standing next to the bosses' desk escorted her out of the building right there and then. She wasn't even allowed to clean out her office. A man I know, as fine a person as you could find—and again, no question about the quality of his work--was summarily fired from his editing job with a major magazine because he is also the editor of a journal that addresses white racial concerns. If these two individuals had been black, you would have read about it in the newspaper and there would have been outrage.

I am regularly contacted by young scholars who tell me that they are afraid to do research in the white racial area or speak or write what they believe about race because they won't be able to get a university position, and, if they already have a position, they won't be able to get tenured and promoted. This rings of what was going on in German universities in the 1930s, only then the creed was National Socialism and now it is political correctness.

In November of 2006, a young faculty member in my department at the university where I teach appeared at my office door with a sober, concerned look on his face.

"Do you have a minute?" he asked.

"Sure," I answered.

Looking a bit surreptitious, he closed the door behind him and sat down on a chair next my desk.

"Something wrong?" I asked.

It turns out that he and the other members of my department had received an e-mail message from someone representing an organization called the Southern Poverty Law Center informing them that she was investigating my white nationalist activities and looking for information. Attached to the e-mail was an article I had recently published.

This was the first I knew about this e-mail, although I knew about the SPLC and of the woman who signed the e-mail, Heidi Beirich, who is the Deputy Director of the SPLC's Intelligence Project, which publishes exposés on, well, today's Bernsteins. I assured my colleague that I expect this kind of thing and that I was fine and asked him to give me a copy of the message, which he did.

The Southern Poverty Law Center is a private organization headed by one Morris Dees. The SPLC takes after haters in basically the same way the Communist witch hunters did back in the 1950s—it badmouths them and lets their employers and colleagues take it from there. It has also brought several successful lawsuits against white activists, knowing that in today's climate a white activist has about as much chance with a jury as a Negro in the old South had with an all-white jury.

As it was back in the days of Red Channels and the like, you don't have to look far to find a moneymaking scheme in the SPLC's operation. Back in 2000, *Harpers* magazine in an article entitled "The Church of Morris Dees" told the readers:

The SPLC spends most of its time--and money--on a relentless fund-raising campaign, peddling memberships in the church of tolerance with all the zeal of a circuit rider passing the collection plate. "He's the Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker of the civil rights movement," renowned anti-death-penalty lawyer Millard Farmer says of Dees, his former associate, "though I don't mean to malign Jim and Tammy Faye." The Center earned \$44 million last year alone--\$27 million from fund-raising and \$17 million from stocks and other investments--but spent only \$13 million on civil rights program, making it one of the most profitable charities in the country.

History moves fast, so for those who don't know about the infamous Jim Bakker—his wife, Tammy Faye, who recently died, got off pretty clean—he was a television evangelist who got jail time for having his hand in the till. Jim and Tammy Faye would emote that their Heritage USA religious theme park was going to have to be abandoned if the viewers didn't send them some cash right away. In would come the money, Jim would throw a few bucks at the park and pocket the rest.

Dees' specialty is direct mailing and the SPLC sends out a flood of solicitation letters saying that haters are a gigantic threat and that the SPLC is holding back their onslaught, and to send money fast or it's Hitler takes over America. It uses examples like taking me on—I'm its Heritage USA—and to get the checks in the mail. Good, decent people by the thousands who don't know me from Adam buy this and Dees rakes in \$27 million in donations. As far as I know, nobody has caught Dees doing anything illegal, but there is evidently enough seediness about him to prompt the Harpers writer to pass on this assertion of a Bakker-Dees likeness.

My posture regarding the SPLC has been that it is a contemptible outfit but that unless it does something that gets in my face I'm going to consider what it does none of my business. So I didn't know anything about what it had had done with reference to me before this e-mail message. After I found out about the e-mail, I did the briefest of checks and only found that earlier that year a SPLC publication had reviewed a couple of my books. The review was simplistic and misrepresented both the book and me. That's the last energy I've given this organization because, as it turned out, nothing that has gotten in my way has resulted from the e-mail to

the department faculty. Perhaps this Beirich has written something about me, or will, but I'll wait until I feel blocked by it in some way and then I'll deal with it. I have better things to do than attend to people of this ilk unless I absolutely have to.

I'll reproduce the e-mail here in its entirety, section by section, and comment on each section. I've never had any contact with Beirich, so anything I say with regard to her personally is speculation. I assume she is a capable and well-intentioned person; throughout history, just about all of the people who do this kind of thing are. Even though I'll wind up talking about Beirich, my goal here is to use this e-mail as vehicle for discussing a general problem, especially in schools, that gives me great pause.

So, the message and my comments:

Dear Faculty in the College of Education,

My name is Heidi Beirich and I am the deputy director of the Southern Poverty Law Center's Intelligence Project. I am currently researching an article for our magazine, Intelligence Report ([intelligencereport.org](http://intelligencereport.org)), which covers extremism. As part of that project, I am investigating the white nationalist activities of your colleague, Professor Robert Griffin (activities begun long after Dr. Griffin was awarded tenure and which are likely protected by academic freedom).

Note the name-calling. Her publication "covers extremism" and she's writing about me, so what does that make me? I think there is a tacit ending to the last sentence: it really reads "activities begun long after Dr. Griffin was awarded tenure and which are likely protected by academic freedom, *and that's unfortunate.*" Tenure and academic freedom get in the way of the thought-controllers and they would love to get rid of it. Get rid of tenure and academic freedom—and there is a campaign going these days on to do just that—and I would be just as vulnerable as the two people I mentioned above who were summarily fired for their political beliefs and commitments (or those of a spouse). If they can shut down the university professoriate's freedom of inquiry and expression, then they have everything pretty much nailed down except the Internet, and they are working on that. This comment is a implied threat to young faculty like the one who came to my door with the e-mail: keep your mouth shut or you'll get an e-mail sent

to the faculty like Griffin did, and when you come up for tenure and promotion you aren't going to get them and you'll be out on the street.

For those who may be unaware of his aspect of Dr. Griffin's work, he has written what is considered to be a fawning biography, *Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds*, of Dr. William Pierce, the longtime head of the neo-Nazi National Alliance and the author of *The Turner Diaries*, the book which inspired Timothy McVeigh's attack in Oklahoma City. In addition, Dr. Griffin has written several books about white supremacists and written in white supremacist publications, such as *American Renaissance* (amren.com). I am attaching a story by Dr. Griffin just published in *American Renaissance*, in which he describes assigning to one of his classes an article about "Rearing Honorable White Children" that he wrote.

Note the passive voice. Considered a "fawning biography" by whom exactly? *The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds* is as objective a portrayal of Pierce as I could produce, and I included many things that could be seen as negative. What bothers people about the *Fame* book is that it isn't the smear job that people like Pierce invariably get.

What Beirich fails to mention is that *The Turner Diaries* is fiction. As many works of art do, from Oliver Stone's movies on down, *The Turner Diaries* depicts violence. Pierce explicitly, and without exception, argued against violence in his nonfiction writings and speeches. More, it is debatable whether McVeigh was indeed inspired by Pierce's novel. Recent writings about McVeigh, including his own account given to journalists Lou Michel and Dan Herbeck, dispute that assumption. McVeigh points to other sources than *The Turner Diaries* that inspired him. His lawyer's account, written after McVeigh's death, questions whether the Murrah Building bombing was McVeigh's idea in the first place. Even more, as McVeigh pointed out at his sentencing, the United States government is the teacher of the people around violence—he didn't need a book of fiction to teach him about violence. He was a veteran of the Gulf War and saw first hand the slaughter precipitated by our government in that war. He went to Waco, Texas and saw for himself the burned-to-the-ground homes of the 66 people, including 25 children, who died in the federal government's siege against the Branch Davidian religious sect. But then again, those who attack free speech are not interested in nuance and qualification—that

doesn't serve their purposes. Who cares what Bernstein really thought?

Note the buzzword "white supremacist" (read "Communist"). As I pointed out above, most of the people I have investigated don't fit that label, and it certainly doesn't fit me. But it works if you want to hurt people.

Note too that Beirich doesn't go beyond saying that I wrote "about white supremacists" [sic]. She leaves the impression that there is something wrong with that, but she doesn't say what it is. And she says I published in "supremacist [sic] publications, such as *American Renaissance*," which is clear guilt by association (the '40s-'50s congressional hearings: "I have before me an article you published in . . .")

The article Beirich included with the e-mail is "A Knock on the Door," which describes the reaction to my use of an article I wrote called "Raising Honorable White Children" in a university course back in 2001. Both of those articles are listed in the writings section of this web site and I invite the reader to read them. I stand behind both writings and their use in class. They were relevant to the course content. The e-mail implies I did something wrong here but doesn't say what it was, so I don't know how to respond.

I'm going to take a guess here as to what might account for the Beirich's failure to go into specifics at any point in the e-mail. My bet is she simply doesn't feel the need to do that. To her, this is a simple open-and-shut case, no need to get into particulars. She knows deep in her heart, with absolute certainty, that I don't know what I'm talking about (and she does) and that I'm bad (and she's good). Speaking of superiority, I think she doesn't have a doubt in her mind that she is my superior. There is nothing whatsoever she could learn from me (the e-mail wasn't sent to me and she's never contacted me). The truth of the matter is I'm nobody's intellectual inferior, nobody has studied white nationalism harder than I have, and my parents didn't raise a immoral child. But the kind of declaration I just made is beside the point, I understand that. To the Beirichs of the world everybody on "our side," even the least of them, is superior to someone like me, that's just a fact.

Here are some white supremacist sites where Griffin has published or his work has been commented on:

<http://www.nationalvanguard.org/story.php?id=1743>  
<http://www.nationalvanguard.org/story.php?id=3340> (in this article Griffin is referred to as a member of the National Alliance)

These two links are from a defunct organization I have never had anything to do with. I don't know what is in these sites. For this writing, I tried to see what they said, but they don't exist. I have no idea whether the one indicated I was a member of the National Alliance (the '40s and '50s: "Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party?") I'm not going to dignify Beirich's shameful aside by saying whether or not I am a member of the National Alliance or any other organization. This is the United States of America, and my affiliations are none of anybody's goddamn business.

<http://www.natvan.com/pub/2004/122504.txt>

This is a transcript of a radio broadcast back in 2004 that thanked me along with no fewer than 26 other people for contributing to a journal called *National Vanguard*, which I have written for. This is guilt by association, un-American to the core. If you have a problem with what I have written, cite what I wrote and say what your problem is with it. This is McCarthy tactics, pure and simple.

[http://www.amren.com/mtnews/archives/2005/02/rearing\\_honorab.php](http://www.amren.com/mtnews/archives/2005/02/rearing_honorab.php)

This is the article "Rearing Honorable White Children" I wrote in 2001. Here's what I wrote about it in the article that Beirich distributed to the faculty with her e-mail (a reporter from the school newspaper at the university where I teach had learned that I had used the article in class and asked me about it, and this was my reply to him; or better, this is what I later wished I'd said to him): "Some people, including you, may think this is controversial, but the key issue as far as I'm concerned is whether or not the article is true, whether or not it reflects accurately how these parents view things and how I view them, and the article *is* true. And anyway, what's so controversial about wanting to raise honorable white

children? Would you be here if the article had been about black parents who want to raise honorable black children?"

<http://theoccidentalquarterly.com/vol2no4/rsg-living.html>

This is an article called "Living White." It was included in my collection of writings published in 2006, *Living White*. It's about white people being proud of their race and heritage and living with integrity. It says nothing negative about any other group. I stand behind it. You can read it for yourself and decide its merits.

I am writing in hopes of being able to secure interviews or comments about how Griffin's activities have impacted the university community, if at all. I am also interested in whether or not the university has taken measures to warn students of Griffin's views. These views are even reflected in his university web page, where he writes that he now focuses on "the status of European Americans." I would greatly appreciate any help that could provide me.

Best,

Heidi Beirich

Evidently to Beirich there is something wrong with my focusing on the status of European Americans (among several other foci; she forgot to mention that) to the point that it raises the question of whether to warn students about me. What exactly is wrong with focusing on the status of European Americans? It is obviously self-evident to Bierich that it is bad, but why? Would Beirich ask whether students had been warned if I, as do a number of my colleagues, were focusing on the status of African Americans? What is Beirich's problem with focusing on European Americans? Who am I? Who is Heidi Beirich?