

Book Reviews

Pandemic Blunder: Fauci and Public Health Blocked Early Home COVID Treatment, by Joel S. Hirschhorn, 126 pp, Kindle edition, \$4.99, paperback, \$15.19, ISBN-13: 978-1977238221, Outskirts Press, 2021.

Joel S. Hirschhorn, a writer focusing on health issues, has directed studies on health matters for decades; testified at more than 50 U.S. Senate and House hearings; and has written hundreds of articles and op-eds on health topics, U.S. politics, government, and culture. He is a former full professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison who directed medical/engineering research; a senior official for the U.S. Congress (Office of Technology Assessment); head of an environmental consulting company; and Director of Environment, Energy and Natural Resources for the National Governors Association. He is a member of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS) and America's Frontline Doctors.

This book aims to tell the truth, alleviate some anxiety/stress, and even reduce illness severity during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hirschhorn is clearly in favor of treating disease as early as possible and saving lives.

Hirschhorn documents the major blunder by public health officials: failure to recognize, discuss, educate, and implement early outpatient treatment, one of the four pillars of the American pandemic response. Other pillars are contagion control, hospital-based treatment; and natural or vaccine-induced immunity.

The foreword is written by Dr. Vladimir Zelenko, a smart and humble physician who says his life was spared so that he could continue to serve God during the pandemic by implementing early observational and controlled data out of China, South Korea, and France, which saved many of his own Jewish brothers and sisters living and worshiping in close proximity in Monroe, New York. His hope and prayer is that those in public health with a God complex, guilty of the suppression of information and therapeutic nihilism that led to unnecessary death, will eventually face justice either here or hereafter.

Hirschhorn points out that the top-down pandemic response from statist public health officials suffered from their many conflicts of interest, hypocrisy, and inefficiency. In their academic arrogance,

they refused to consider observational and controlled data, insisting on randomized controlled trials.

Since the initial publication of his book, more than a year of new research augments the scientific support for Hirschhorn's opinions. More than 600 scientific studies on affordable, generic, repurposed medicines and nutraceuticals readily available in the U.S. (not including the new monoclonal antibody studies, new oral antiviral drug studies, or studies on medicines only available outside the U.S.) are now published that show favorable effects of treatment.

Thousands of patients are being treated by physicians of various specialties who have risen courageously to the challenge to fight this virus, using a multi-drug sequenced regimen very early during a patient's COVID-19 illness. They have been and continue to be successful in reducing severe late stage II and III COVID-19 (pulmonary phase and coagulant phase with multi-organ failure) morbidity and mortality.

Remember that in their search for early treatment many patients received no care or helpful advice at all or, at best, an antipyretic, a cough suppressant, one antibiotic, and maybe an oral steroid, with directions to go the emergency room if the illness worsened and breathing became difficult.

The goal of early outpatient treatment has been to reduce viral load, viral replication, inflammation, coagulation, hypoxia, organ damage, hospitalization, and death. Why should public health officials and their media allies try to squelch such treatment? Why would they promote therapeutic nihilism, choosing to insist on the most expensive, minimally studied, slow-to-emerge patented drug options when time is critical and people are dying daily? The author believes that collusion between public health officials and media constitutes intentional and criminal behavior.

If you are open to the truth—which is much maligned and mischaracterized by the news, social media, politicians, and public health officials—and free to speak out, this book will empower you.

Despite all the needless suffering and death, the author says he is an optimist and focuses on credible examples of success. He emphasizes that he does not intend for the book to replace the advice of a physician

and does not endorse any therapeutics.

Regrettably, Hirschhorn uses the word "cure," which is a trigger for getting censored these days, despite passage of the 21st Century Cures Act (Cures Act), signed into law on Dec 13, 2016, which allows and encourages the use of factual evidence to accelerate medical innovation and product and pharmaceutical development. It also calls for integrating observations and perspectives of patients into the FDA's decision-making for new drug development.

Hirschhorn discusses several helpful medications and nutraceuticals that are bolstered by well-organized and summarized observational reports, which Dr. Anthony Fauci repeatedly and arrogantly dismissed as "anecdotal." Key references are highlighted in section 2 of the book.

The featured stars in this book are the courageous, practical, skilled Hippocratic physicians and surgeons who have significantly reduced the risks of late stage III COVID, hospitalization, and deaths. Patients have called these good doctors life savers, gifts from God, or even saints. The villains, government employees in public health, have testified against these good doctors but have themselves neither acknowledged the early treatment pillar nor even treated a COVID patient personally.

The book's numerous sorrowful vignettes should strengthen your resolve to retain your autonomy and physician independence so that you can practice Hippocratic medicine for the good of your individual patient, even though the bureaucrats who claim to follow or even represent "science" pressure doctors to practice the Platonic style of public health for the good of the collective, in which the physician is a tool of the state.

Officialdom recognizes only the randomized controlled trial (RCT) and ignores or disparages the use of qualitative integration of basic science, clinical acumen, and real world experience while RCTs are not yet available. When one is in a war, one uses the ammunition and tactics obtainable at the time instead of doing nothing while waiting for the ultimate weapon to be designed, tested, and shipped to the battlefield.

This book was important to write for historical accuracy and posterity but also for the immediate practical collection of

facts, arguments, and sources contained within. Part 4 contains expert views on lives that can be saved (or lives that could have been saved), how to get the best information and ignore and discount bad information and propaganda, how to prepare for home/outpatient treatment, how to find a doctor to get necessary medicines, and what to think about if needing hospitalization. This valuable part could stand alone as a helpful guide for reducing the risk of hospitalization and death. The Kindle edition is especially useful in this scenario.

Study of the grievous blunders during the COVID-19 pandemic is essential in the hope of preventing the same lethal mistakes in the next pandemic.

Michael J. A. Robb, M.D.
Phoenix, Ariz.

Race Marxism: the Truth about Critical Race Theory and Praxis, by James Lindsay, 310 pp, softcover, \$19.98, ISBN-13: 979-8795809083, Orlando, Fla., New Discourses, 2022.

Critical Race Theory is not a new ideology but a repackaging of classic Marxism with race substituted for economic class, explains author James Lindsay, Ph.D. He states that we're living in a false reality fabricated by the late neo-Marxist philosopher Herbert Marcuse, who synthesized Karl Marx's ideas using black ghetto populations and other disaffected groups as stand-ins for economic class. These machinations led to Critical Theory, including Critical Race Theory (CRT).

As with all Marxists, Marcuse's goal was to create a revolution followed by a dictatorship leading to an illusory society. Why? Karl Marx aimed for a classless society but cultural Marxists like Herbert Marcuse substituted class with race, gender and other cultural factors to try to bring about communism, a totalitarian state that Marxists cloak as an illusory, idealized and imaginary utopian society. Over time, ideological converts are used and discarded, and the promised utopia never appears. The utopia is only a pretext for power. A communist dictatorship always results, Lindsay says, and it will be no different this time.

Marcuse's invented world is rapidly becoming entrenched. Converts named "Critical Social Justice activists" rant in righteous indignation at nonbelievers who don't accept their faith. Anyone who questions their illogical belief system is labeled a "racist"—synonymous with a heretic, or someone who is not a Critical Social Justice activist. CRT, a denomination within the theology of Critical Social Justice, sees an evil known as "systemic racism"

everywhere, and exhorts its activists to dismantle society. But don't assume racism means discrimination or prejudice. The presence of different average outcomes between racial groups is the "systemic racism" this ideology calls out—all the while ignoring evidence that correcting for factors such as the absence of a father in the household, inadequate education, and low income completely removes most of these differences.

This fake reality sounds crazy, but it's only going to get more bizarre if the Marxists have their way. Yet many people remain unaware of the threat CRT poses to the American way of life.

Some assume CRT is part of the American Civil Rights Movement. It is anything but. The Civil Rights Movement grew out of ideals that include equality, liberty, universal human rights, the right to private property, capitalism, limited government, separation of church and state, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech. These American ideals have resulted in the greatest prosperity, the most freedom, and the least racism of any country on earth. But those who hate America's success devised CRT to cloak their own autocratic power grab using race as a cover.

Additional definitions from CRT, which Lindsay translates into plain English, reveal the Marxist goals in the ideology's worldview:

- **Antiracist.** Someone who has a lifelong commitment to being a Critical Social Justice activist; a true believer in the fundamentalist views of Critical Social Justice; one who commits to practicing discrimination against those who disbelieve, or even question, Critical Social Justice.
- **Critical.** A strategy that ruthlessly criticizes nearly everything about a society in order to destroy it and supplant it with Marxism.
- **Critical Social Justice.** An ideology that does not seek lawfulness or fairness but rather enforcement of the beliefs of Critical Social Justice activists through revolution and authoritarian rule; an anti-liberal fundamentalist theology that blames liberalism for most of society's ills.
- **Critical Race Theory.** A theory that identifies racism as the source of any problem.
- **Diversity.** A state in which most members of a group or institution come from historically marginalized identity groups and must also be qualified as Critical Social Justice activists; a method of maintaining uniformity of ideological belief.
- **Equity.** A state that privileges those who adopt the "critical consciousness," or religious faith, of Critical Social

Justice and discriminates vigorously against those who do not.

- **Inclusion.** Exclusion of those who do not believe in Critical Social Justice and its denomination Critical Race Theory; the process of censorship, exclusion, and purges of those who are not Critical Social Justice activists.
- **Justice.** Abolishing capitalism, private property, universal human rights, freedom, and democracy through revolution; investing all decision-making power in an authoritarian regime.
- **White supremacist.** A person who is not a Critical Social Justice activist, irrespective of the person's race or beliefs.

These distortions of common words are oddly repetitive. Many have deceptive meanings and all use race as a ruse to gain power. Their implications are as horrific as the accounts of Lenin's Red Terror and Mao's Red Guards. The violent revolutions, purges, and forced labor camps implemented in the name of communism have left more than 100 million people dead.

Lindsay candidly documents the facts we need to know about the Marxist ideology sweeping this nation. We have a better chance of curing what we understand, the author emphasizes. *Race Marxism* is a call to vigorous informed resistance to all people who value liberty, individual rights, and freedom from tyranny.

Elizabeth Smoots, M.D.
Western Washington

Take Two Aspirin and Call Me by My Pronouns, by Stanley Goldfarb, M.D., 209 pp, soft cover, \$17.95, ISBN: 978-1-64293-849-4; ISBN eBook: 978-1-64293-850-0, Bombardier Books, distributed by Post Hill Press, 2022.

Dr. Stanley Goldfarb has had an illustrious career as a practicing nephrologist and academician. For five decades, he has been engaged in both clinical practice and curriculum development at the Perlman College of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, most recently serving as the associate dean of curriculum.

His book *Take Two Aspirin and Call Me by My Pronouns* began as an op-ed for *The Wall Street Journal*. Spurred on by the intense criticism he received from the "usual suspects," he expanded the article to a collection of essays decrying the attempt by the elite medicine establishment to surrender the core mission of medical practice to the "woke" mob's "social justice" agenda.

The author focuses on two critical themes: first, the unfounded notion that "racism" is pervasive in both medical

education and community clinical practice, and second, the startling degradation of medical school curriculum in America.

In his concisely written work, Dr. Goldfarb debunks the assertion that “poor outcomes for black patients are the result of racism on the part of the physicians who care for them.” He highlights the gymnastics in which liberals must engage to twist unrelated observations into “evidence.” Their refusal to factor elements such as genetics, education, socio-economic status, homelessness, unemployment, or any other obvious patient circumstance into the “outcomes” equation confirms that the racism theory is without merit.

Angst about the degradation of medical education has risen for a decade or more, culminating with the AMA’s 2018 salvo of its 86-page “master plan,” titled “Organizational Strategic Plan to Embed Racial Justice and Advance Health Equity.” Dr. Goldfarb makes clear that those who want to turn the tide back to a more rigorous curriculum for medical students will find no aid from the AMA.

Physicians who completed their educational endeavors in past decades have raised alarms regarding the weakening of all aspects of medical training, from entrance standards to the elimination of course work once considered essential, to the disappearance of grades, class rank, and hands-on clinical training. The objective of medical school deans has shifted from setting a very high standard and training students accordingly, to making the curriculum more “relevant” to the student.

The dominos for failure line up quickly. Gone is the MCAT, which has been the single most reliable predictor of success in medical school. With a less-than-prepared cohort of medical students, but a mandate that “everyone graduates,” the curriculum must be altered.

Such alterations include less emphasis on “hard science” courses previously at the forefront of medical training, including biochemistry, genetics, molecular biology, and physiology, but more time allocated to “addressing health disparities, solidarity with the underserved, skills transfer for sustainability and medical anthropology.” Patients arriving in the emergency department with three-system failure are not likely to be impressed, let alone appropriately treated, by physicians schooled in these “disciplines.”

In this failed new philosophy, winnowing down the list of courses becomes inevitable, and even lay readers will be startled to learn that “pharmacology” and “epidemiology and statistics” were the first casualties. Ostensibly, drug indications, contraindications, and interactions can be accessed “online,” and epidemiology is handled “by the government.” Today’s

cohort of students may not have been able to master the level of statistics necessary to interpret, let alone critique, peer-reviewed studies, since many must participate in “remedial” courses for basic science and mathematics.

With grades being relegated to “pass/fail” and class rank sidelined, residency programs directors who depended heavily on those metrics for the finite number of matches available are destined to make lackluster choices. One can only imagine that, for instance, “remedial general surgery” might be the next step to guarantee that “everyone” completes the program. The prospect for the quality of patient care in the not-so-distant future is obvious.

The final essay is aptly titled “Back to the Future,” and that is the destination to which medical education must aspire. Dr. Goldfarb acknowledges that this change requires a “shock to the system.” Medical students cannot “define the subject matter they need to learn,” and the responsibility falls squarely on those with far more clinical experience and judgment. Medicine is a meritocracy, and it must remain one if excellent care for patients is the noble profession’s objective.

Dr. Goldfarb’s antidote is a “new, independent Flexner commission, immune to the threats of cancel culture, one that will root woke ideology out of the medical establishment.” Amen. Fortunately, AAPS is well-positioned to offer the extraordinary support such an effort will require.

Debi Carey
Lexington, KY

Coming Apart: The State of White America, 1960-2010, by Charles Murray, 432 pp, paperback, \$11.99, ISBN-13: 978-0307453433, Crown Forum, 2013.

In today’s polarized America, a surefire way of being characterized as a member of the wrong political camp is to favorably quote an author, commentator, or academic who is seen as being in the wrong camp.

A case in point is Charles Murray, the sociologist and author, who claims to be a libertarian but seems more like a conservative. He has been vilified as a racist by the left ever since he published *The Bell Curve*, a book that has been misunderstood to claim that there are genetic differences in intelligence between races.

Murray wasn’t accused of racism for his 2012 book, *Coming Apart*, which I recently reread. Its thesis is that the U.S. is splitting apart along class lines more than racial or ethnic ones. Because it focuses on white America, the book doesn’t trigger racial

emotions and misunderstandings.

Murray’s predictions of what the divide would look like by 2020, summarized below, were prescient.

Books by liberal social scientists are also in my library, including those written a half-century ago by two of my favorites, Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Nathan Glazer. These two extended their analysis to several races and ethnic groups but came to some of the same unpopular conclusions as Murray did, especially about the benefits of traditional families.

Coming Apart describes two fictional white neighborhoods, Belmont and Fishtown, both of which have a strong resemblance to actual places. Belmont is upper-middle class, while Fishtown is working class.

Murray writes that in Belmont, “Everybody has a bachelor’s or graduate degree and works in the high-prestige professions or management, or is married to such a person.” In Fishtown, by contrast, “Nobody has more than a high school diploma. Everybody who has an occupation is in a blue-collar job, mid- or low-level service job, or a low-level white-collar job.”

Murray also speaks of SuperZips, which are postal zip codes in which the residents rank in the 95th through 99th percentiles in education and income. The metro areas of New York, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C., have the highest number of SuperZips.

Murray says this about the residents of SuperZips:

My proposition is that the hollow elite is as dysfunctional in its way as the new lower class is in its way. Personally and as families, its members are successful. But they have abdicated their responsibility to set and promulgate standards. The most powerful and successful members of their class increasingly trade on the perks of their privileged positions without regard to the seamliness of that behavior. The members of the new upper class are active politically, but when it comes to using their positions to help sustain the republic in day-to-day life, they are AWOL.

He seems to be saying that the concept of noblesse oblige is dead.

Murray establishes 1962 as the point at which the classes began to rapidly split apart, not only in education and income but also in values, interests, lifestyles, and neighborhoods.

Except for the uber-rich, it had been common before 1962 for well-off whites and working-class whites to live in the same neighborhoods or at least nearby, to attend the same or similar K-12 schools,

to be members of the same social and fraternal organizations, to eat similar foods at home, to watch similar TV programs, to live in modest homes, and to have similar values about work and “the American way of life.” For example:

- Almost all parents were married, and divorce was rare across all classes (and races). This held whether the parents were college graduates or high school dropouts.
- Whether rich or poor, it was not respectable for adult males to be idle. According to surveys, 98 percent of men in their thirties and forties said that they were in the labor force, either working or looking for work.
- Only 8 percent of adults had a college degree.
- In 2012 dollars, only about 8 percent of American families had incomes of \$100,000 or more in 1963, and only about 1 percent had incomes of \$200,000 or more.
- In current dollars, the average price of all new homes built in 1963 was \$166,466. Even in upper-income Chevy Chase, Maryland, homes sold for \$351,000, on average, in current dollars. Today, the average price of homes in Chevy Chase is nearly \$1.5 million.
- Reflecting the culture of the times, only two members of President Dwight Eisenhower’s initial cabinet had been born into affluent families. The others included two sons of farmers, the son of a bank cashier, the son of a teacher, the daughter of the only lawyer in a tiny Texas town, and the son of parents so poor that he had to drop out of high school to help support them.
- Surprisingly, JFK’s cabinet also was not dominated by elites. Attorney General Robert Kennedy was rich and Harvard-educated, and Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon was a full-fledged member of the Establishment; but three cabinet members were sons of small farmers (a tenant farmer, in one case), one member was the son of a sales manager of a shoe company, another was the son of an owner of a struggling menswear store, still another was the son of an immigrant factory worker, and yet another was the son of an immigrant who made his living peddling produce.

By 2012, the working-class residents of Fishtown and the upper-middle-class residents of Belmont had grown apart, not only in physical distance but also on various social measures.

For example, 22 percent of Fishtown children were living with a lone parent who was divorced or separated. The number for Belmont was 3 percent. There were similar disparities in the number of children living

with a never-married parent.

This is important because, as Murray says, the family structure that produces the best outcomes for children, on average, is two biological parents who remain married. Moynihan and Glazer said the same and criticized welfare programs for being designed in a way that reduced the incidence of two-parent families.

After listing the positive outcomes of two biological parents, Murray goes on to say, “I know of no other set of important findings that are as broadly accepted by social scientists who follow the technical literature, liberal as well as conservative, and yet are so resolutely ignored by network news programs, editorial writers for the major newspapers, and politicians of both political parties.”

In Fishtown, 53 percent of families had a head of household who worked 40 or more hours per week. In Belmont, 87 percent did. A contributing factor for the fewer hours worked in Fishtown could be the fact that there was a seven-fold increase between 1960 and 2012 in the percent of the labor force receiving federal disability benefits.

Fishtown residents also tend to lack social trust and social capital. They are significantly more likely than Belmont residents to feel isolated and disengaged from the community, and to see others as untrustworthy, unfair, and unhelpful.

Homogamy comes into play in these differences between Fishtown and Belmont. This refers to the interbreeding of individuals with like characteristics, such as education and cognitive abilities. Over the years, college graduates grew more likely to marry college graduates, and those who graduated from elite colleges were more likely to marry graduates of elite colleges. At the same time, high school dropouts were more likely to marry other high school dropouts.

This increase in educational and cognitive homogamy has tended to lock in the advantages of elites across generations and to widen the class divide. Income redistribution and confiscatory estate taxes won’t change this dynamic.

Murray enters the minefield of IQ by comparing the IQ of children with the education level of their parents. As used in this context, IQ is not a genetic determinant but a measure of how well children do on intelligence tests, which in turn is a predictor of how well they will do in school. Murray includes this table:

Parents’ Education	Expected IQ of the Child
Two high school dropouts	94
Two high school diplomas	101
Two college degrees (and no more)	109
Two graduate degrees	116
Two degrees from an elite college	121

I would add that increased education has resulted in technological advances and wealth but hasn’t necessarily resulted in better wisdom, foresight, or leadership—as evidenced by the state of the nation. Moreover, many jobs that require a college degree today were held by non-degreed incumbents in the past, who performed just as effectively, if not more effectively. For evidence of that, consider the Second World War, which required massive increases in industrial output and extremely complicated logistical planning and execution. It was fought to a successful end by the U.S. and its allies in just four years after Pearl Harbor, or a fifth of the time that the U.S. fought to an impasse in Afghanistan.

The wealthy and well-educated now live in socioeconomic cocoons, where they are out of touch with working stiff and tend to stereotype them negatively—an attitude that is sensed by the working stiff, who react and vote accordingly, which goes a long way in explaining their loyalty to Donald Trump. Ironically, Trump is from the upper class, attended an elite college, and had lived, and currently lives, in a SuperZip.

Here are Murray’s 2012 predictions about what the divide would look like in 2020:

- The United States is stuck with a large and growing lower class that is able to care for itself only sporadically and inconsistently. Its concentration in Fishtown puts more and more pressure on the remaining Fishtown families who are trying to hold the line.
- The new upper class has continued to prosper as the dollar value of the talents they bring to the economy has continued to grow. With increased wealth, the prices that members of the new upper class are willing to pay for a home in the right kind of place have risen even more, less affluent residents who still provided some [socioeconomic] diversity within the SuperZips in 2010 have moved out, and the uniformity of very affluent, very highly educated populations within the SuperZips has increased. The proportion of the new upper class who are in the third generation of upper-class upbringing has increased, and with that increase has come increasing ignorance of the world outside their bubble.
- Liberals in the new upper class continue to support adoption of the European model, as they have for decades. Conservatives in the new upper class still contribute to conservative candidates, but they are no more willing to preach what they practice than those on the Left.

Craig J. Cantoni
Tucson, Ariz.

Cult City: Jim Jones, Harvey Milk, and 10 Days That Shook San Francisco, by Daniel J. Flynn, 257 pp, hardcover, \$27.41, ISBN-13: 978-1610171519, Wilmington, Del., Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2018.

Why the Left Hates America: Exposing the Lies That Have Obscured Our Nation's Greatness, by Daniel J. Flynn, 288 pp, hardcover, \$8.73, New York, N.Y., Crown Publishing Group, 2004.

Daniel J. Flynn has been recognized for more than a decade for past books, including *Blue Collar Intellectuals*, *A Conservative History of the American Left*, *The War on Football*, and *Intellectual Morons*. He is a senior editor and regular columnist and blogger for the *American Spectator* and has written for the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Boston Globe*, the *New York Post*, *City Journal*, and *National Review*. *Cult City*, his most important and controversial book, exposes the leftist insanity that plunged San Francisco into a political swamp from which it has never recovered.

In his extensive research and investigation, Flynn tells in riveting style a story that is worse than a horror movie, focusing on two unforgettable San Francisco politicians, Jim Jones and Harvey Milk.

The opening chapter features an announcement of a benefit gala, "A Struggle Against Oppression." Speakers included Dick Gregory, homosexual activist Harvey Milk, and rising black political star Willie Brown. Other movers and shakers of an oft moved and shaken city crammed their big names into a small font on the flyer. For the bargain price of \$25—"tax deductible"—influence seekers could seek to sway the mighty of a great American city.

The event's proceeds subsidized the Jim Jones Peoples Temple Medical Program. Two weeks earlier, the small staff of the Peoples Temple Medical Program had mixed cyanide with Flavor Aid and administered the poisonous, sugary elixir to hundreds of people in the Temple's faraway Guyana colony. The smiling seniors and racial rainbow of children touting the wholesomeness of the agricultural commune in the fundraiser's promotional literature rotted in piles in the steamy South American jungle. Five people, including Rep. Leo Ryan, lay dead, gunned down by Peoples Temple assassins.

Preacher Jim Jones, the darling of the San Francisco political establishment, orchestrated the murders and suicides of 918 people on Nov 18, 1978. The man-made cataclysm represented the largest such loss of civilian life in American history until 9/11 and the largest mass suicide of the modern age. Nothing before or after

struck Americans as so bizarre. The event shocked the world. But the small world surrounding Peoples Temple predicted it—loudly and repeatedly. Not every utterance from Jonestown's namesake, after all, proved as cryptic as the one block-quoted on the "Struggle Against Oppression" promotional literature: "We have tasted life based on total equality and now have no desire to live otherwise."

Just nine days after the horror in Guyana, another tragic event shook San Francisco: Supervisor Dan White murdered fellow supervisor Harvey Milk and Mayor George Moscone in City Hall. As with the Jonestown massacre, myths cloud our understanding of these assassinations. The assassin was a protégé of future U.S. senator Dianne Feinstein, a public-employees union activist, and a friend and occasionally an ally of Harvey Milk.

Dan White was a former policeman then a firefighter, who went into politics claiming to represent blue-collar San Francisco Democrats. But after he murdered fellow Democrats Milk and Moscone, media and historians have declared Dan White a right-wing nut case, while Moscone and Milk, both leftist allies of Jim Jones in every way suddenly knew nothing about Jones and his Temple after the suicide slaughter of 900. In fact, Moscone got elected through the efforts of Jones workers, and then he appointed Jones—a serious sociopath as shown by the evidence, to chair the San Francisco Housing Authority Commission.

Harvey Milk, supported by San Francisco's large homosexual community, was a powerful political figure in the city, and he was a great and long-time friend of Jones. Their sociopathy is on display in this book, and you will not forget how disgusting and perverse they were.

Flynn systematically and eloquently, with impeccable research, takes down the phony leftist revisionist history about Moscone, Milk, Feinstein, Jones, and Dan White, and makes liars of so many who were deceitful about the swamp and the swamp creatures of 1970s San Francisco.

Flynn writes in the synopsis of his book:

In life, Jim Jones (cult preacher) enjoyed the support of prominent politicians and Hollywood stars even as he preached atheism and communism from the pulpit; in death, he transforms into a fringe figure, a "fundamentalist Christian," and a "fascist." In life, Harvey Milk outed friends, faked hate crimes, and falsely claimed that the U.S. Navy dishonorably discharged him over his homosexuality; in death, he is honored in an Oscar-winning movie, with a California state holiday, and with a U.S. Navy ship named for him. His assassin,

a blue-collar Democrat who often voted with Milk in support of gay issues, is remembered as a right-winger and a homophobe.

But the story extends far beyond Jones and Milk. It vividly portrays the strange intersection of mainstream politics and murderous extremism in San Francisco—the hangover after the high of the Summer of Love. At times, the portrayed events were so disgusting that I had to stop reading. To think the press could find a way to make these monsters into good people is a lesson to be learned, and Flynn is an excellent teacher.

After reading *Cult City*, I felt compelled to reread Flynn's 2002 book *Why the Left Hates America: Exposing the Lies That Have Obscured Our Nation's Greatness*. After 20 years, it remains a great way to understand modern leftist hate-America thinking.

Flynn's extensive documentation nullifies the slap downs that I saw on commentary web sites by readers who appeared to be the radical lefties he was targeting. Flynn distinguishes the theories and the political ideological foundation of the hate-America crowd from the leftist progressives who are not fixated on hating America.

The rhetorical touchstones of the hate-America left, which Flynn calls the "Five Big Lies," are considered immutable and indelible. They are (with my comments in parentheses):

1. American women live under a patriarchy (and are oppressed).
2. America is the world's leading threat to the environment (committing the sacrilege of living well).
3. America is a racist nation (regardless of the evidence of freedom and opportunity).
4. The U.S. is an imperial power (because it has been the most important nation of the last century).
5. The rich get richer, the poor get poorer (to a utopian socialist, economics is always a zero-sum game).

Flynn's targets are the ultra-left noisy haters who closed their minds to evidence, facts, or arguments that conflict with their positions a long time ago. Now, instead of engaging in a debate on the issues, they sharpen their vitriol, name calling, character assassination, and vilification of anyone who doesn't agree with them. They display the True Believer state of mind explained by Eric Hoffer, which is the intolerant and closed mind of hardened haters.

Flynn is a facile and lucid writer and thinker. This book is old, but its relevance is current.

John Dale Dunn, M.D., J.D.
Brownwood, Texas