

# Media Coverage and Free Press Issues

Richard Brookhiser, Paula Duffy, David Gelernter, David  
Horowitz, Deborah Lipstadt & Liz Maguire

Sept 24, 1997

Richard Brookhiser moderated this panel of several authors who have been published by the Free Press, part of Simon and Schuster. They talked about some of the opposition they faced, both in publishing their books and reaction to their books after publication. This was part of the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Free Press.

## **PEOPLE IN THIS VIDEO**

### **Richard Brookhiser**

Senior Editor  
National Review

### **Paula Duffy**

Publisher  
Free Press, The

### **Andrea Dworkin**

### **David Gelernter**

Professor  
Yale University->Computer Science

### **David Horowitz**

President  
Center for the Study of Popular Culture

### **Deborah Lipstadt**

Professor  
Emory University->Jewish Studies

### **Liz Maguire**

Editorial Director  
Free Press, The

---

**C-SPAN Voiceover:** Next from New York, a discussion of media coverage and issues involving a free press. In September, several authors took part in this forum. To talk about their personal experiences concerning press coverage of their published works. Ideas and opinions. This hour and twenty minute event was hosted by the Simon and Schuster publishing group the Free Press and is moderated by National Review editor Richard Brookhiser. Speaking first his free press publisher Paula Duffy.

**Paula Duffy:** It gives me great good pleasure to welcome you this evening. To a party that is meant to celebrate. Fifty years of a particular brand of good book. And so of course. We're here to celebrate the authors who have written those books. The editors. Agents and publishing colleagues who support them. And the booksellers who sell and sometimes still love those books. The good books I'm talking about. Are the ones that Jeremiah Kaplan began to publish in one thousand nine hundred forty seven. At the free press of Glencoe. And that an unusual mix of. Learned often opinionated. Always committed publishers. Continued to acquire and sell. Throughout the decades

after Macmillan. Acquired the free press and moved it to New York in one thousand nine hundred sixty. I have tried to summarize far too briefly. The history of this remarkable imprint in the anniversary catalog that is here for you today. Because I think it is important for an entity that bears our name to keep the enterprise in perspective. The Free Press has over the years. Frequently made publishing history. By going against the grain of prevailing academic and liberal orthodoxies. But my predecessors also translated and Republic. The great liberal thinkers who gave rise to those orthodoxies. In hopes of shedding light on. And improving the human condition. And so we have continued to. publish And Republic. The great thinkers. And in this anniversary year. We have christened a new set of backlist titles. As classics. In hopes of introducing new generations. An age old but truly gratifying exercise in self-improvement. As the new century dawns when all the world is free to press on with an edited opinion. On every conceivable topic. I pledge to you that what we will promote. What we will champion. At the free press is less the work of the public personality. Than that of the careful intellect. The historian political observer strategist economist. Business person or humanist. Who's creative research. Or experience. Deep intelligence respect for history. And strongly held views. Are not easily labeled. But whose book. Will make waves. In what we've all come to accept. As the relentless sea of instant authority. I arrived at the free press. Last March. But I grew up on its books. Both personally and professionally. And I welcomed the chance to contribute to the future. Of first rate nonfiction. To do this today. Requires a certain leap of faith. I like to think that mine was reasonably well placed. Not in a powerful deity as several of our own authors might suggest. But in a strong parent. Simon and Schuster. Whose dual commitment to both trade. And academic publishing. Is the scenic Kwan known. Of our particular kind of enduring nonfiction. Now six months into the job. I can report that it is both exciting and frightening. To be at the press. At a time when the industry's most significant channels of distribution. Retail bookstores. Are consolidating and changing in ways that are difficult to intice a paid. Let alone control. And when the timetable for bringing a noteworthy. Serious new book. To the attention of the public is shorter than ever. Yet. Control. A greater part of the marketing and distribution process we must. If our special kind of backlist book is to reach the widest possible readership. So it is reassuring to have the backing of the publicity and marketing force like Simon and Schuster that extols our mission at the free press. And that encourages our efforts to reach. A truly global audience of serious professionals. And general readers. Without that understanding of our particular brand of author. And that long term investment in serving multiple markets. Our mission. Would have small sympathy.

Please join us this evening. In toasting a future for the free press that allows us to publish to make public. Truly significant contributions to the intellectual life of the times. And to add in a meaningful way to the debates that will shape our future. I'm indebted to the free press authors on tonight's panel. For helping us celebrate by sharing their own experiences and views of the media. And Rick Brookhiser for agreeing

to moderate the panel. Thank you very much for coming. And now Liz McGuire our new editorial director will introduce the members of the panel.

**Liz McGuire:** Thank you thank you. Like Paula I grew up on. Free Press books and. It's a great moment to be joining the press when we're both celebrating its past and forging its future. It's impossible to separate our books from the editors who publish them and. While you're here I hope you'll take a chance to speak with each of them. Adam Bellow. Bruce Nichols. Paul Begala, Bob Wallace. Susan era Llano. Philip Rappaport. And Stephen Morrow. Many of them are responsible for bringing the members of our panel to the free press.

Andrea Dworkin is one of the most important and controversial feminist writers of our time. The author of such. Influential works. As intercourse. First published in one thousand nine hundred eighty eight and reissued as a free press classic this year. Pornography and the recently published Life and Death. In addition she's authored critical civil rights legislation recognizing pornography as legally actionable discrimination.

David Gelernter, professor of computer science at Yale is the author most recently of drawing life. About which Terry Teachout of the Wall Street Journal wrote. There is indeed something heroic and. Unfashionable though it may be to say so inspiring. About Mr Goh inners refusal to bow to the spirit of our week will. He's also written such critically acclaimed works as a one nine hundred thirty nine And muse in the machine. In addition he's a frequent contributor on. Art Technology and Culture. To commentary the New York Times. City Journal. And the Weekly Standard.

David Horowitz. Is the author of over a dozen books most recently the highly successful and acclaimed. Autobiographical radical son. A renowned cultural spokesman. Often referred to as a one man culture war. He's currently the director of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture. At Los Angeles. And his essay collection the politics of bad faith. Is scheduled to be published by the Free Press Next fall.

Dr Deborah Lipstadt is dura professor of Jewish and Holocaust Studies at Emory University in Atlanta. And author of the first and definitive study of the history of those who attempt to deny the Holocaust. Published by the Free Press in one thousand nine hundred three. Denying the Holocaust when the one nine hundred ninety four national Jewish book. Honor Award. And has been published in Britain Australia New Zealand and Japan.

And finally. Our moderator. There is a senior editor at National Review and a columnist for The New York Observer. He most recently wrote rules of civility for the free press. A follow up to his highly successful founding father. A moral biography of George Washington. So is there a free press. It was thanks.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Thanks very much I'm just going to say very few words and then we'll go. Have our panelists speak for three to five minutes as. Read by the clock. On the clock by me. And then we'll discuss among ourselves and then we'll open it up to questions. One of rule number seventy three of the rules of civility is think before you speak. And every one of this table has thought. Very hard and they speak with great

passion speak and write with great passion. But the question tonight is. Does anybody listen. How do you get people to listen. Is it possible to get people to listen. And it seems to me there are two problems. To general problems one. Is the quality of debate when it happens which is very often like. Punch and Judy. Or it's like professional wrestling. You're assigned a role. And then you're supposed to each other's windpipes out and there's. There's Hulk Hogan on one corner and then the disco man and the other and. You know and at last for ten minutes and it's kind of up. It's more last unsatisfying artificial encounter more. Serious perhaps. Is the general fog and clutter. Of American life. Couple weeks ago we went through an. About the late Princess of Wales. I think far out of proportion to the people involved or even the archetypes. That were in vogue. I think the whole thing was a kind of media blowback. Machine of witlessness and. Before I before I retire I just want to contribute to. Little items of my own experience. On a George Washington book which is not controversial. But the two most commonly asked questions whenever I did radio shows were the most commonly asked was did he grow hemp but Mount Vernon. Every radio show this question came up. The second most commonly asked question. Was he a Freemason. Now. You may not be worried about that but let me tell you there are lots of people out in the heartland who are very disturbed by this possibility. So when you're up against this you kind of. Some Sometimes in the dark moments of the book tour you sort of shake your head and you wonder One of my doing what can I do and. Everyone on this panel and has. Has commented in his or her most recent book. On this problem on different aspects of it on what they themselves have been up against and so I think we're just begin by by going down the table. And having everybody speak for three to five minutes. Maybe about their worst experience or perhaps their best one. Or how they see this problem. So I'd like to begin with a David Gelernter.

**David Gelernter:** Let's see that question. The questions that. That I got in and focused on 'is there a free press' Good question. That's kind of big in general. 'What does your own experience taught you about the way the media handles real ideas and debate'. This was question number one, question over two is a trade off. Of notoriety for a nuance worth it. From your point of view as an author. Really is question I thought at first the obvious thing for me to do is to run through. In loving detail the reception my own books over the years. Whining about the bad reviews and gloating over the good ones. But despite the fact that such an examination would obviously be spellbinding. For all of us. It struck me on further reflection of. Probably Susan and. Adam had something broader in mind so in general. I don't see how anyone could argue with that they press on the whole or the media handles books or ideas Well now it is an absolute terms. It seems to me the press coverage of culture. In this country is disgrace and in fact it's one of the topics. I most enjoy complaining about. And I recommend it to anyone who's in the mood for a good Snit. I have myself been tremendously lucky in getting here and there are serious and thoughtful reviews. Discussions of my books. But of course most reviews of everybody's books are short. Cursory and lead nowhere. On the other hand. Should an author. Rationally speaking

expect serious public discussion of his books. Or even want it. I myself. I know are not alone don't write books. Expecting that they'll have any measurable effect on public debate. I'm delighted and also shocked. On those rare occasions when they seem to a little. But my goal. My own goal in writing voice isn't for people to talk about them. Or debate them or write about them but rather for people to read them. Of course. Goes without saying an author needs noise and commotion and public discussion. Where nobody will read them. And I'm just as desperate for a commotion as any other author probably more than most but. It's a means to a goal all this public discussion and spirited public debate. The reader who reads quietly. Privately. Thoughtfully and maybe never says a word about the book his whole life. Still has publishes anything about it. Is what it's all about. In the end not public discussions here is or otherwise. Furthermore was really no where the now days it seems to me is not that there is so little serious discussion. Of books in the press but that there is any serious discussion at all considering that the fundamental flavor in modern. US culture is under seriousness. I consider for example the law to be sad and I won't say a lot but. Just looking glancing briefly. The influence of universities on modern culture. They used to be. The guardians of the intellectual seriousness. In the sense that the church is used to be the keepers of moral and ritual seriousness. Today's universities have in many cases renounced. Intellectual seriousness explicitly take out any issue of heterodoxy and. When the soberest. Kid in a class decides to move to the back row and shoot spitballs What do you expect. Obviously you're in trouble. It's true the discussion of books in the mainstream press lacks nuance. But consider an article by. William Dowling. In this fall's public interest called the crisis in scholarly publishing. About the ongoing decline of the scholarly monograph. And its replacement at the University Press is by such books as clear accessories. And I want to biographical essay. In the form of a Mona graph about doing. Change things with dolls. I mean very strange. Don't ask me to elaborate. By a professor of art history at Bates College. Published by. Duke University Press. Naturally. And available in the gender studies section at your local highbrow bookstore. Course we can count on Duke for the very best stuff but this is in no way atypical. This is modern scholarly publishing. How can we choose a New York Times are not being serious when it's a lot more serious than the average modern English department.

Finally, the most important part of the background against which I think we should look at the seriousness or lack of it of public debate about books. Our pathetic schools and their gathering incremental of fact. Everywhere in culture. As we know, today's young people tend to favor not so much a literary cognitive style. As something more attuned to the rapid assimilation of digital multimedia cyber imagery. In other words they're airheads and their attention spans are approaching zero. Our children are exempt of course. Here in Noah's Ark where the elites take shelter against the deluge we've inflicted on the rest of the country. But out there not every parent has the means to fill in the blanks in his child's pathetic education.

There's a sign on the front door of the school our young boys attend. Seems to me to bear on the quality of current public discussion of books. And ticks me off every time I go in there. It says learning is fun and big hostilities in this. Pathetically defensive. Desperately crave in lie. Who ever had fun learning times tables or grammar or spelling or long division. No normal person anyway. Children see right through it to the message of educational. He's a man underneath and a fundamental failure of nerve. In this sawing. You read I think the future what are you complaining too much about the state of the press in a public debate today.

It may be bad but after all there is a public for books including serious books. And there is public discussion of books including serious discussion. And then years the comment will look like a golden age. And my guess is that we ought to appreciate it while it lasts.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Thank you David, I guess we laughed, which is wrong, but... Deborah Lipstadt.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** What I what I'd like to do. Is really share with you some of the experiences I had both in writing this book. And once the book came out in dealing with the media because I think they tell you the thousand number of things.

But first and foremost, when I first started to work on this topic. As I know them the book. Most of my colleagues friends acquaintances. Thought I was absolutely nuts. To be wasting my time on people who were the equivalent of flat earth. Theorists who would take these people seriously. So, I took them seriously I take them seriously. Not just because of their attack on the Holocaust but because to me. To me and. When Adam and I were working on the book or Adam was editing the book we talked about this a lot. The fact that if this truth can be attacked. Any truth can be attacked. And that was exemplified for me. When I received a call shortly before the book came out it was. New York Times had done a story on the fact that I was writing it because they were so intrigued by the fact that I was taking the topic seriously. I received a call from a producer. Of a nationally televised talk show now. Televised talk shows. Are not the bastions of intellectual thought. By a long shot. But she said to me. Facilities that were going to be doing as a show on. Holocaust revisionism. And that was her word not my word one of the small victories I've had is most people now talk about Holocaust deniers these revisionist they don't revise anything they just simply deny. And their choice of the term revisionist is to cloak them. Themselves in respectability. So I insist on calling them deniers they also insist on calling them deniers because they hate being called deniers So what we call a half a consolation.

She said we would like you to come and be on the show and I said well I've learned I had been in one of the shows before and I've learnt you must always ask who or what will be on the show with me and it can be one in the same you know. And she said well we'll have some survivors I said That's very good. In. Some educators good men she paused and said we'll have some deniers I said I can't and I won't go on. I won't go on because I won't dignify these people by entering into a discussion with them and. Being on a panel with them and I said I can't. Because I can debate someone on a

topic about which I feel quite passionately and which they feel quite passionately and. We are different ends of the spectrum. But I can assume that we're both it here to the facts or to rent a semblance of what the facts are we may interpret things differently make case that this. Takes the districts and turn them on their head. But we won't make things up I said with the deniers. They have quote. They take things out of context. And then make up. And it comes out. Totally different they do that. One of the prime ways Diary of Anne Frank but they do with documents all the time. Taking half a quote leaving. Something else out. And I said you know so I just. I won't do it it's like trying to nail a blob of jelly to the wall when you enter into a discussion with them.

So she said you know she listened and she kept trying to get me to change my mind finally she said you know I think these are nefarious people, I don't give them an ounce of credibility. But don't you think our audience has a right to hear the other side. This. In in the end nacelle is what the deniers are all about and this of course is the great challenge that we face. Because here was someone who didn't believe them at all. But in her mind and she controlled who got on that show and who didn't get on that show with that show had. What they call in is the live in L.A. a very good market share this with there were two saw it's. To the story and that's how the deniers and that's how any a group. Wanting to rewrite history. In a nefarious kind of way. Want. They first enter the conversation by saying by becoming And other side may be a questionable of a side maybe a. Much debated other side. But in others far it was simply one C.N.N. called me and said we want you to go in with a denier and. It's interesting and if you go back in the. Press offices at the free press. You see that. Usually I think they just keep a list of what shows you've been on and where you've been if you know with which ones you've accepted we've been on, in my case they kept to list the ones I've been on the ones I refused to go on. Because it meant going on with the denier and again, Erwin, bless his memory supported me strongly on this as. As that Adam. That I wouldn't go on with these people because you know it just. Was it would it would be who worked out better or whatever it would be elevating them. Now often the question comes up with you don't go on doesn't that leave them. The platform to themselves but what I quickly found out that for the popular television. Media. If there's no fireworks there's no show. If they can't get someone to hit loggerheads and they would just. Usually cancel the put me on alone or they cancel the show. And do something else once they want to see and then want to put me on a split screen. With. I think David Duke on the other side or something. And I asked that he would be coming to his bed sheets and his cone head you know his complex clang uniform. And I just said I refuse it what's the point to people going to vote are when I'm pretty or you know. But she said Well. Well we can't do that can you recommend any people who may be saved by Schindler this was which. I mean it was just you know what it was. I said No I don't think so and I have to go teach the.

The final point I want to make it is. Is that there. This also is half a consolation. There are more people in the United States that think Elvis Presley is alive and think



the Holocaust didn't happen. That says a lot about the United States or it's good news or bad news you can deal with it as you wish. So you might ask why this book why this book and all these languages why the attention to it because it's not for now. It's for later I've spent today at the Holocaust Museum and in meetings. Sitting with me were a lot of survivors. And it's for when there aren't people around to say this is my story this is what happened to me that they deny to the deniers don't go away people who hate don't go away, they hang in there and I was reminded of this I was telling the story to two cousins of mine my. My mother's your mother's the. One of the youngest of a large family and her older sister was about fifteen years. One of her older sisters about twelve to fifteen years older than she so my first cousins from that sister are about fifteen and sixteen years older than I am they grew up in the in the south. And their father had an elderly man a man who worked for many became too old to do work in the store and he began to do work around the house and his name was Charlie Washington. My cousins remember him quite explicitly. A) Because he walked quite bent over today would recognize that his osteoporosis and the sort of shuffle but more importantly Charlie Washington would teach them songs. And they remember those songs Charlie Washington had been born a slave on the plantation. So from my cousins. The Civil War The War Between the States I teach in Atlanta you are the War of Northern Aggression and that they don't say that in the lands Atlantis a city surrounded on four sides by Georgia. They But for them the civil war is not something of the one nine hundred century it's Charlie Washington story it's stories that they grew up with. And no one is trying to deny slavery. Maybe people try to reinterpret it but no one's trying to deny it. Of the Holocaust. Which was unprecedented in its horror and didn't have anything to parallel and have very little to parallel with. Here you have people trying to deny it and when there's no one around to say this is my story this is. This is my experience this is what happened to me to my parents my brothers my sisters. Then a book like my will be even more necessary and all I can hope is that the people who've read it. And maybe understood it will understand the lessons of for it and that's why I do what I do and still argue about what I argue and hope. Someone's listening that. I think someone is but I'm not sure exactly who or how many Thank you. Thanks very much. David Horowitz.

**David Horowitz:** When I think about this question 'is there a free press' I'm reminded of the story about the optimist and the pessimist and the optimist says. This is the best of all possible worlds. And the pessimist says 'you're probably right'.

As the optimist, we have a an incredibly free press in this country. The rioting and range of media sources. Is unbelievable. The major city newspapers the wire services the your local throwaways your local papers. Television Network T.V. cable soon will have five hundred channels. Radio. And now we have the Internet. Which is a frightening and. Wonderfully frightening phenomenon I was. I was up there. The other day just. Researching a story at the University of Texas and they announced that there are a hundred thousand Web sites at the University of Texas. Give you an idea of what's up there and nobody is controlling it or can control it.

On the other hand as a pessimist. As a conservative I've you know as you know been on both sides of the political fence. Fence so I highly sensitive to any illogical. Biases. You. You know the media is a very liberal media the culture of the media. is Left and liberal let me since I'm sure this criticism well. Will crop up and point out that not only is there a variety of the press. But it is not controlled by the government obviously in this country. And contrary to what some people on the left think it's not really controlled. In a tight way by the corporations the Wall Street Journal is one of the most conservative. Corporate institutions in America. The news and feature page. These are written by liberals who hardly speak to the editorial pages the Orange County Register is one of them is even more conservative. As an institution. Then the Wall Street Journal. The same situation between the feature pages and the editorial pages. The Chandlers. In the who own the L.A. Times or. Life. Lifelong Republicans the L A Times. Is a kneejerk. Supporter of liberal Democrats. When A.B.C. is now. Run by a Democratic. Corporation but during the Iran Contra hearings it was controlled by Cap Cities which. One of the two principals in Cap Cities was William Casey. And I'm sure he didn't agree. Very much with Peter Jennings reports on Iran Contra.

So we have that, in that sense, we have that we have that freedom. On the other hand, there is a monochromatic perspective, particularly in news writing and reporting in our major media. Radical Son tells the story. Of my experiences with the Black Panthers and. Which was a left-wing militia during the sixty's and in my book I describe how they killed more than a dozen people. And got away with it including. A friend of mine Betty van patter. Identify the killers. Betty van patter I name them they're still. Still around and. Consider if. If this book. Were about a right wing militia. That had been supported by the home. Conservative. Intel against the and funded by conservative funders and. Supported by the Republican Party. A governor of a major state as the Panthers where. If it. If this book were about a right wing militia. That way it would have been all over the media.

There has never been an independent press coverage of the Panthers and of these murders and of these accusations that I have made they have been confirmed by a brave young writer in this room Hugh Pearson who wrote a book, called it In the shadow of the Panther. But there is there is no, there has not been a independent press review of this case and in fact the New York Times has celebrated.

The murder of the woman whom I accuse of organizing these murders murders is a feminist heroine. With a huge treatment in the Sunday Times Magazine recently Johnnie Cochran. In a an incredible travesty of justice. Got the killer of a elementary school teacher in Santa Monica some. Twenty five years ago. The killer's name is drawn among Pratt. Drama Pratt. Was treated by the press. Just the way Johnnie Cochran presented the story. The prosecution was never interviewed. Julius Butler who was the chief prosecution witness and. Unlike Mark Furhman can't be tarred as a gnat see is a black man who became a a lawyer and a church elder. And whose life and. Reputation have been destroyed now by Johnnie Cochran. Nobody interviewed him. The New York Times ran a huge front page story on John Moe Pratt teacher. Treating him as they

were in Viet Nam war hero and as a much put upon victim. Of F.B.I.. Repression the traditional. Kneejerk. Left wing view of these events. So so extreme that the. Michael killing in the in The New Republic said the Times was. Institutionalizing the left wing view of the sixty's which is what The Times. Has done.

On the other hand to revert to my optimistic self again. My book which was blacked out in large sections of the... There was no Sixty Minutes report on these killings. Geraldo was not interested. Time and Newsweek. Which had reviewed the on the other books of Peter Collier and I wrote. Didn't review it. With the Boston Globe and the. You know I could just go on forever the Chicago Tribune... There is a phenomenon out there called Talk Radio and of course if you don't get the reviews it will kill your book and nobody will read it or hear of it. But if I was on two hundred hours of talk radio on television and it got its audience.

To take this. From the personal. One of the most egregiously mis reported stories which has contributed to the death of. Hundreds of thousands of people. Is the AIDS story. In this country. AIDS. As an epidemic that was created by as Camille Paglia has pointed out the sixty's attitude towards which. Promoted from promiscuous sexuality, public sexuality, the public health system was simultaneously subverted and the public health. Figures. Right up to Everett Koop himself. Abdicated their responsibility totally in following traditional public health methods. To protect the lives. As it happens of young gay males. And for twenty, well that's not quite twenty years but. Seventeen years, nobody, there was not a single press report investigating whether they should be the following of Public Health methods. Like testing. Like contact. Tracing like closing the. The clubs. Which allow which were actually the sender's and focal points of. The generation of this. Now and this year finally in the Atlantic ran a story. And several gay writers got Gabriel a all tell Michelangelo Signorile and Larry Kramer. Have taken a stand which has caused them much grief in their own community. Just to report what the UP with having a logical. Studies show which is that AIDS is spread this way. And this epidemic will continue. Despite the discovery. Even if they were to discover a cure. Just like. Syphilis which is totally curable by penicillin is a huge epidemic. This epidemic will go on until the media. Gets away from its politically correct view. And and reports the story as it is.

In summary, what can I recommend I think we need to return. I think everybody needs to read. George Washington's rules of civility which. Rick revived. A year ago or so. To learn civility and dialogue we have to re store. Of the civil dialogue between the sides. Every editorial room should be diverse. In terms of politics. And ideas and least. With the urgency that it is now being diversified. In terms of race gender and other categories. And I think that that will go a long way towards making our free press. Truly free.

**Richard Brookhiser:** We could have editorial rooms like Washington's cabinet in fact. Hamilton and Jefferson. Andrea Dworkin.

**Andrea Dworkin:** Hello thank you and. For having me here and I thank the free press. And I like to tell you about two sort of epics. Of My Life The first was when I

was eighteen and I went. I was sent to the women's house of detention in Manhattan. As. Because I had been an anti Vietnam War protest and. While I was in the prison. I was assaulted by. Two of the prison doctors. And I heard quite badly. And I went to the press with that. Because I thought that was an awful thing. I didn't really understand what had happened to me. But I knew that I was bleeding. And I knew that I was hurt. And the newspapers. Ran with it. This was in 1965. So it was when they were still some responsibility to telling the facts. When people so-called public people still had some kind of control over what facts about their own lives were known. Or you could still bring libel suits have somebody publish stuff about you that was completely untrue or are wrong.

My experience with the press was horrendous of course, I needed the press, I went to the press. But I didn't know what would happen to me and what happened to me was that everywhere I turned was the press. Now I was a student in college I was a Bennington. And I was told for instance by one major newspaper. Who want to take pictures of me and I said I have. Sorry I have. Paper. I have to write. And they said well you know will you will use a photo. You know. We can we can get a picture of you we'll just photograph you through your window. Well you know it's no problem for us was what they were saying.

And the other thing that happened during this is that because this was a story about a woman being sexually violated. And there was no women's movement at the time. I found out what it was like to be treated like a piece of pornography in public because what happened was that I got stacks and stacks and stacks and stacks of obscene letters. Mostly from men who were very turned on apparently by what had happened to me. And I was very poor and have a lot of money so when I would be down in New York testifying or whatever I had to do to try to do something about the prison. People would crowd me on the street. Because they knew who I was and. Then I would sort of. Run somewhere else. Because I don't have money in my pocket. Pocket for a taxi or something like that so I'd run into the subway and then I'd be stuck there. Because people would know who I was and I had a courtly man would come up and say well you know. Why don't you let me help you through this and I'll get you to where you're going and I'd say. Thank you very much. And we'd be walking and talking and then he'd say so you know what the. What did it feel like. And can I rub up against you now and I am telling you there were not exceptions to that rule.

I left the country. When I did everything I could about the house of detention. I learned from this experience that a writer needs privacy I wanted to be a writer. There's that. Confusion in this country between being famous and being a writer. I wanted to be a writer. I learn from this that if your life is public. You can have the privacy in which to be creative and to think you can have ordinary dialogue with ordinary people.

Now, the controversy concerning my work in the last twenty five years, I tried to think of a nice and understated way to characterize it. And this is what I came up with, ignorant, functionally illiterate and filled with prejudices and stereotypes. I think that

there's a double standard for male and female writers I think that women writers are expected to be physically pleasing. And that. What a woman says the substance that she uses is a much less important than how she looks and how... basically subservient she is in public. And I only thank the Lord that that wasn't the case when Balzac was writing or when Botha lair was writing. And that George Eliot took a pseudonym. I'm so glad.

Controversy in my opinion does not sell books. When the author is stigmatized as opposed to being a celebrity or being famous for me that has men being portrayed in photography magazines for the last twenty five years. As a piece of sexual garbage. And having the readers of Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler. Be given a license to hate me, while masturbating over pictures over drawings, over photographs of me. I have consented to none of it. I consider it completely violating. I have brought two lawsuits against hustler they both were thrown out of court.

I want to say that booksellers, book publishers and booksellers book publishers barely care about ideas in my experience. And most are very antagonistic to writers. They don't think writers know anything especially about the people who read the books. Of the writers. And the rest of the media has no standard for truth at all. Even for. Factual truth. Which after all should not be really so hard for a reporter. A journalist to be able to find out.

My final point is that it is my view that the free market is no friend to artists, or to anyone with new ideas. And that as a writer I live in a world where new ideas as fine writing beautiful writing different writing has no value. But women's bodies hung from trees are treated as if they are ideas. Right and I find this. Some thing that is a cultural way of silencing women. Threatening women. And basically telling women that were worthless. From beginning to end. Thank you.

**Richard Brookhiser:** We have, we have a this kind of a paradox built into this panel because we're all. Everyone here has complained about the media and. And how how stories get told how stories get out. And yet we're all privileged. I mean we're we're up here because we've all whatever the hurdle is and however. Onerous it is we've all gotten over it. In one way or another. So I just I just wonder. I just one of the writers of anyone. If anyone wants to address that paradox does that somehow fact what we say or is that. Is that only true for us. Is it not as. You know not as open as it should be. Go ahead.

**David Gelernter:** 'Does our position as authors per se, give us a warped or atypical or illegitimate view of the presses of the media?' I guess it does...

**Richard Brookhiser:** Well, first of all, as published office. I mean you know lots of authors running around out there who are who have books you know and they don't get published. Ours got published in ours of. You know been reviewed. Pretty well reviewed and. In some cases or at least at some times. So. So. Is that a sign of. Getting back to David a little bit as a sign of hope or shouldn't we be so encouraged by the fact that we're up here.

**David Gelernter:** I think the fact that my books have been published as a tremendously hopeful. Well I just can't think of a better indicator of intellectual health of the country.

I think that in fact it's easy for published authors to forget that the threshold for getting over for getting. When you're an unpublished author is high and continues to get higher. In the demographics are against you and I and I think it's easy for us to be. To be somewhat smug about they. About the privilege of being published which. More people probably ought to have than I have got on the other hand there are books published which probably ought not to have been published.

So, the demographic factors is more important than then than we often think about I mean we live in an age where there's a tremendous. Population of explosion. Of writers I mean there are writers. Around every corner there authors underfoot everywhere. There's huge numbers of titles. And at the same time the number of serious press outlets in which books are discussion. Discussed. Is way down from what it was fifty years ago say. When there were eight major daily newspapers in New York at least half of which had serious book columns.

So, under the circumstances with so many authors and. So many books. And so few outlets for serious discussion. There's tremendous pressure and I don't know that the present during. So bad under the circumstances.

**Andrea Dworkin:** I spent from the years 1986 to about 1996 having my work published in England because I couldn't get it published here. And it would be published here after it was published in England only because somebody could publish it very cheaply. By simply using the same everything.

And you know so. I want to say that I thought I'm immensely privileged to be able to publish in my own language and that my English publishers at the time Secor and Warburg. Made a commitment to me that they would keep me being published until American publishers. Would start to publish my work. In the way that it should be and so I see a different I don't see it as a privilege I think. I mean I'm a. I'm a writer because it's. It's not it's not just a profession it's a vocation it's. What my life is. I'm very willing to make many sacrifices and have, but I don't think that the American publishing industry is very interested in work. That is at any kind of challenge to the status quo comments.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** You know it's easy I think which would you say no we are we whining. You know all our books are published in pubs read very fine press. They've got different books got different degrees of attention but they got serious attention oh here we sit and they probably lots of people in this audience and. In the certainly in the city. Who would kill for such a good imprints and have the attention that we got. I can't complain about the attention I got I got far more attention than I ever thought I would. I thought this was going to be a book. That would sell eight hundred copies to eight hundred academic Well the university library so I think if you think I'm smart only prove to you I'm not I got a small grant for this when I was doing the initial

research. In exchange for which has many academics do I signed away the royalties. So.

Right but it does get when the when the deniers right right right who want to kill me you know. But when the deniers but does give me now it's come in handy as in I'm all over the Internet. And you know you can bring my name up. And it's just the attacks on me. When they claim I've made all this money I can say Ah. So maybe not again half a consolation. But what disturbed me was. And I was very appreciative for the attention given to the topic but.

What disturbed me was the sort of risque way in which it was treated in the failure to understand that we're dealing here with the bigger issue. And of course the idea that. You know the only lead in certainly in the talk show example. That the only way to deal with this is his sort. And it turns certain elements of controversy.

So I appreciated the attention to the topic but I was disturbed. Which I shouldn't have been because I've been watching television and reading American papers for. My whole life you know. By the low level of the conversation, so.

**David Horowitz:** I think we live in an extraordinary. Time for writers I mean given. You know given the fact that the rules are set by it being a democratic and. Organized by a market. Which is the only way that I know that it can be free. Other ways have been tried and that has you know dried up opportunities rather quickly. Los Angeles which is not a serious. Place in many ways it's not like the York and we didn't have a real bookstore I mean they had but maybe there was one. When I arrived there ten years ago now. You know you can get Borders or Barnes and Noble's in a crown. Within. You know. Close reach you have Amazon dot com with two and a half million piles. I don't think there's ever been a. Right. It's not think I know there's never been in the history of the world a time when so many people have access to and want to us if your audience. You generally have your audiences as small. It's because you haven't understood. Either you're driven by some internal force that makes you write the way you write in a difficult way or you haven't understood how. How the market works and. As it is what sells. So I think there's you know the opportunity these opportunities of small books when I studied Chinese at Columbia. And forty years ago. You go in the library. And you have to pick these. You know for the. Confucius and Chinese you'd have to pick up these little pages now you can go into your whines and Noble and get fourteen translations of. Of loud so can you this is just to pick an obscure. Issue I. You know I think in terms of availability. In terms of accessibility. This is tremendous. Now of course when you have a lot of voices out there. Everybody's clamoring for attention as you can tell from the four writers up here. And it's natural to writers people actually say that Karl Marx got all his theories of exploitation. From having been a writer. And that. That's that's where it works but. So I you know it's. It's just a matter of looking at the glass half empty or half full or being the defense minister the optimist on the subject.

**Richard Brookhiser:** OK maybe we can take some questions. If you want to address the question everybody say that or if you have a specific person in mind say

that. Have we answered everybody's question. Well while you're gathering your courage it occurred to me when Andrea Dworkin was speaking that. It's interesting to compare this moment with the period that I've been writing about and I sometimes try to get a. Audiences going but by saying. If George Washington were brought back. They say 'what would he think?' The thing I say is he would be astonished at the press. Was so good because it was really terrible two hundred twenty years ago, I mean the notion of not getting facts right the notion that that was something that anyone would even consider. Two hundred twenty years ago. I mean you know reporters and journalists political journalists were liars they were partisan liars and they were corrupt. You know you could James Calendar switched sides because Jefferson didn't give him the postmaster ship after the election of one thousand nine hundred. And so he went from retailing Alexander Hamilton sexual scandals to Thomas Jefferson sexual scandals, and it was all about a postmaster ship, that's all it was.

**Andrea Dworkin:** He was much more successful with the latter...

**Richard Brookhiser:** Well, it's had longer legs it got made into a movie. So also also. You know. And also Hamilton confirmed the story and Jefferson was silent so I think that's why Jefferson's had longer legs. So any questions on are are discontents. Yes I guess the microphone will go to you

**Audience Member #1:** I have what is unfortunately really a comment, but the question is 'what do you think of my coming?' And this is about the gentlewoman who is concerned about the denials. You know I've read, I'm not a Jew, but I'm very interested in Jewish... you know I'm married to a Jewish woman. And I'm very interested in these... And I, I read a bit about the Holocaust and my point to... I would like to make it optimistic is that... when you read something like, like Anne Frank. When you read something like Primo Levy. Nobody can write something like that and be false and anybody in the next thousand years from now. Somebody understands our language. And reads those works they will know. And I only mentioned two things on a long list, but of course, That. Let me at this add one thing. This isn't to say we shouldn't do anything but one thing we can do is as promulgated those works in all languages, and all libraries to the end of the earth.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** I think I think you're absolutely right. I don't think that's a problem here of. the data is so immense. It's so vast that for the National Archives has I forget how many thousands of linear feet of documentation that and this French and French archives different. And now bought from former Soviet archives is a tremendous amount of documentation. So it's not that I'm worried about. But there are people who always who are willing to believe in the conspiracy theorists. That's why rank on the fan of the I.R.S. I can assure you that every time there's a conspiracy theory. That gets pushed about. I go a little bit bizerk. A Because I see it as part of that. That bigger picture we can't trust with. What they're telling us.

And so I don't worry that you know they'll be a day when no one will believe. But I worry about the inroads that that. That people make. I worry also because you know we live in an age where maybe deconstructionism is a bit passe you know because they



figured out the pulled the man was a Nazi which is not by chance he wrote it up we wrote his own history because you can rewrite anything including your own story. But still the sense that. I'm entitled to my opinion. You know and. Back that kind of view and. I would hope that a prima Levy would always stand as. As a as a voice of. Of truth and believe delivery I would. It was as optimistic as you.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Would you debate Paul to if you were alive.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** I was gonna say, given that he's dead that would be you know. Be the bad news for me of this from what I debate him. About It depends what the topic was whether there was a Holocaust or not no absolutely not.

**Richard Brookhiser:** No, no, but, alright maybe because Paul the man concealed his past but if there were. If there were say a Heidegger. Who was willing to espouse the beliefs that Heidegger. Had in one nine hundred forty four. Would you debate such a person.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** I would probably debate an anti-Semite. Which. Which Heidegger wasn't a Nazi which he was and had his. His past been written by you and I read I didn't laugh I had a grand behind I rent which is which is interesting because she was doing that at the same time that she was writing I've been in Jerusalem where she was attacking Jews. For collaborating with the enemy and I think there's a story to be put together there but in any case. I would probably debate and answers and have the baited anti-semites you know I've gotten on those talk radio shows and night they come out of the woodwork you know. But I probably would. Even though I think it's futile. It's not... I've given up on trying to change their mind so I didn't write this book to change people who believe. Denial in denial because to believe in denial you really have to have something. Loose and be a hater. You have to really hate because if. If the deniers are right. All the survivors are wrong. All the people who lived in towns and villages around those camps or so the trains going in day after day filled with people coming out empty. Are wrong. And most importantly a best source of witness of the perpetrators all the perpetrators who said. It happened and I did it.

But I said what I did write this book to change deniers minds I wrote this book to sort of immunize those who might think that there was something to what they were saying I want and I kept fighting when I was writing the book. It was not a pleasant experience to write it. Being. To a debate with them.

**Andrea Dworkin:** I think that it's come up in what several people have said this thing about adversarial. Media that the only way you get on is if you debate. The. The thing that you're fighting. What. The person who is. Embodies most of what you despise. And that has certainly been the case for me. For the last ten or fifteen years with pornographers.

I have refused to debate them. I think they're, I don't want to be in the same room with them. And at first what I did was agree to debate their lawyers. Now this is only an apparent difference this is not a real difference. I just felt a little cleaner. But then I stopped feeling even a little cleaner.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Would you debate ACLU types?

**Andrea Dworkin:** I did for a long time and let me tell you just one story about that because I really I did it for a long time and. I was once in a situation where I was and I was a small T.V. show and a man I had debated from the A.C.L.U. lots of times was there and even though promises have been made to me that this wouldn't happen, Al Goldstein who publishes was also there. They totally and completely ignored each other they. The ACLU lawyer had nothing to do with Goldstein. I found out a couple of months later. That this lawyer was Goldstein's private lawyer. He had worked for him for years. He was still working for him. I mean I found that. So stunning and so shocking. It was clearly such a says just set up masquerade. And so deeply dishonest and as far as I know I mean I do have to say that the A.C.L.U. has been completely unscrupulous in defending pornographers.

**David Horowitz:** I'm going to have to dissent here I. I understand the feelings on both sides here but I and I and I often. I mean sometimes you just get tired of dealing with with people who are either arguing in such a low level or are so. I mean it's just such a hateful. But I don't think we can ever abandon the pretty principle of dialogue I say this is somebody who I am... Peter Collier and I am probably written the only book critical of the sixty's which is odd because the sixty's is in very bad repute generally. And for very good reason. In the country as a whole it just shows how intellectually terrorized I would say the. The high culture. Is in this country.

I think our universities are at their lowest intellectual ebb in their entire history. Because of the ruthless way in which the left has gotten control of the relevant liberal arts. Departments and has. Rooted out and. Blocked and excluded voices that they happen to disagree with.

I was invited to the University of Pennsylvania where they have a large course on the sixty's taught by three professors. I would welcome debate with people who disagree with me on this issue. I you know just willy nilly happened to be a historical phenomenon and I ended ramparts I was there. You would think that a professors teaching students would you know even if they wanted to just spew whatever they wanted to spew all over me would have me into the class and saying here's a living specimen. And this is what he thinks or thought then and thinks now. But I was boycotted completely. And they put out on the Internet, there was a communication don't... To the students don't go to hear Horowitz talk. This is a very bad situation.

I don't see how you can draw a line. Whether it's. You know Holocaust deniers or you know Klu Klux or Z. may not want to be drawn into the pit you know and get into a pissing contest. Contest with a skunk or something like that. But the principle of dialogue. And the principle that everybody should have some kind of access at some. In some way. At least to a point of view in that you have to deal with it. I think is very important and shouldn't be abandoned.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** I want to strongly disagree with you, I'll debate somewhere discuss or enter into conversation with someone who may think the Holocaust. Is not at all unique it's just one in a whole series of genocides and I may think it's unique or or whatever I'll debate someone who thinks that the Unite the Jewish councils

were collaboration is another that and. Not it's had or. I think there's a difference. I debating someone with a different point of view. Denial and I think to some degree it would and it was talking back to fits in in this to do now is not a point of view. It's. It's closer to intellectual pornography. You know and I think that that. You know to talk about dialogue with people who just law I make up is very different and to talk about people with a radically different point of view.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Well, that's an interesting point because when the Soviet Union still existed I remember my mother had I'm an editor of National Review and I got a call to debate some Soviet guy at a school in the Bronx and I said I don't debate communist. And the reason was not just that I dislike them it was that a member of the Communist Party was going to be a liar. I mean you can just count on that that. If he said true things they would be by accident I wouldn't be. Because he was. You know because he wanted to say true things that he you know his notion of truth was different and he and his line. You're just going to get that I don't want to. Want to do it.

But we have we have a question on the floor here.

**Audience Member #2:** As a former N.P.R. producer, admittedly low level Junior Editor producer. I was often asked to create controversy. And I found it going against my will and I'm wondering what kind of specific steps the members of the panel could suggest that could help the broadcast media understand how to perhaps deliver us from this era of bluster and controversy. You know because there is a lot of pressure and money, whatever out there, so if you have some ideas I'd greatly appreciate it.

**David Horowitz:** Why would you want to deliver the era from controversy. This is what, I mean, this is what democracy is about, bluster. Well, I mean I you know I don't think every controversy has to be bluster, I'm still concerned about this, let me just say that because I'm going to invoke Andrea here that although I Andrea Dworkin and I probably disagree. On everything, I admire her courage. In standing up and getting battered. I mean I'm. I with identify it. It is not easy when you're doing intellectual work. To have people. You know calling you names and. But. But what's impossible is what Andrea and Catherine MacKinnon have called you know silencing that I find it odd. Catherine MacKinnon one of the. You know. Most household names the in intellectual culture who. If she writes A. You know. Thirty page essay can get it put the tween hardcovers and. You know. We viewed everywhere. These things that she's being silenced in any way. But I think that what's implicit in that and. You know having to publish books in England and not in your own country. You know is an emblem of that is the worst thing that can happen to a writer or a point of view and I don't. I mean I would like to see but I don't see a way that you can draw a line and say well. You know a whole of course to die or I won't talk to. I mean I can see. You know. Not selling them ad space and I. In a college newspaper. But I cannot see. And or a pornographer and. Envy and I would disagree on pornography or somebody that you know I mean. We all have. You know passions. That are intense. As I say you have having been on both sides of political issues. I understand that in every person is

an is the will not just to refute. The other side as Lennon said but to eliminate them. I have felt this. I have felt this myself the impulse. I have felt this against me. An awful lot. I have seen it in other people. And so that one of the prices of. Of having a democracy. Is this kind of tolerance is that. Ensuring. You know what Voltaire said I will defend. You know. Your right to say that.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** I'm not saying they don't have a right to say it, they can stand outside Tavern on the green and say whatever they want but that doesn't mean that the Free Press has to invite them to be on the panel. When I was writing this a. I wrote the book. A University of College in Buffalo got an ad from one of the deniers and wanted to run it they called me and asked me. What do I think about that they said you read my book you know what I think about it. Why are you asking and then the guy wrote this editorial about. You know. He was going to run it because he was going to have an open mind and I wrote him back and then I said the problem with having an open mind sometimes your brains fall out. You know and I think that that he had lost the sight that. You know. I don't usually quote The Harvard Crimson when the Harvard Crimson refused the run Holocaust denial material. It said "this is not an iconoclast a point of view this is utter bullshit" which has been discredited time and time again I think we have to differentiate between. The most I kind of class the points of view and other. And I think that's also a responsibility of people who shape. And I think the. People see in this panel and. Any people has room to shape. And intellectual world such as it is that there are things that are just utter. And you don't and the things that are crazy point of view.

But everybody has a right to say it I'm not I'm not going to get the first amendment.

**Andrea Dworkin:** May I just try to comment on David and answer your question and in the same. At the same time. I think it's partly a moral issue. I think that one of the things that you have to do if you're in public at all. A public figure in any way is to decide how you want to live your life. What you're going to do. Who you're going to talk to. How you're going to talk to them. When, where, why and I think that becoming an entertainment for people is extremely degrading. And I think that there's a moral line. That some of us just don't want to cross. In terms of. Not just the debate. But the debate being an entertainment. And I think back to going back to your question I think back to the. Morton Downey show of people remember that. All right. I was invited on and dozens of times I never went on it. I have turned down. I and. Maybe the only person in the world. I say this. Probably not. But I turned down. Something. You know no idea. I turned down Oprah. And that was because yes. I have. It's and it's really not because I have a death wish. But because it was it's supposed to be a debate about date rape. With someone for whom I had absolutely no respect. And for someone who and I this. To me is also. Stepper said this is also my criterion. Someone who lies. All the time and. Since they refused to do anything else but that format I didn't feel I could participate in that. When I was growing up I remember learning. Mendus things from talk shows. And I and I don't understand why why they're not on I don't mean. In it's firing line was. Was brilliant in the sixty's

is probably more responsible for spreading sixty's culture. Than anything else because of the. The long deep discussions. And David says kinds open end. Was a brilliant show. Not always good. But you know. Tremendously committed and important there were lots of good talk shows. Dick Cavett whom I don't like good. Talk show. All right everything was an entertainment. Then there was a place. In that box. Even though they were all he three networks. And now I have ninety nine channels. I can find anything I want to listen to. So I'm saying when people are interested when they have interesting ideas. Seem James Baldwin on television. That was phenomenal for me I mean that almost changed my life and. One of the things that television. Can do. In particular is to let kids like me who you know. Live. In other places. And want to be writers and have these aspirations. Know that it's possible to do it because look. You're looking at someone who did it.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Well, it's a funny situation because you know it. As you say. The quality has gone down but. But then the replacements don't last me. Morton Downey is gone and something else equally bad. Pops up but. But it withers so I think people what people are saying by that is that they're not really satisfied with it either. Maybe that's all they get or maybe they. They like it at first but but ultimately it doesn't. Just give them nourishment.

We had a question, the man with the beard.

**Audience Member #3:** I guess I wanted to introduce an issue or. At such a comment and see what you folks have to say about access. I got more free books tonight that I've gotten. A decade. Because I'm not in publishing. I'm not a writer I'm not N.P.R.. I don't have access that I buy my books. I deal with this with other. Know what I'm saying is is that. I think that it's easy to live in this world where. If you need a book. You can call an agent or a friend or a publisher I've worked on. You know. Radio shows where you just call publishers and they send you books that even matter if you're ever going to book a guest. They'll send it to you. You know we can go to the strand and get review copies that people are actually making money on selling to the strand. Because they're getting so many copies. I'm wondering how that relates to you. I know that you have some. You've all talked to various degrees about your role in marketing your books through the press. And I remember being a seven year old kid and not being allowed in Waldenbooks. Because it was an evil chain and my mother said this is going to control what kind of books people can buy. That was such an innocuous store compared to what we have now and three or four years ago I was going up to the Upper West Side Barnes and Noble and it first opened with someone who was dying to see it was visiting from out of town. And she wanted to get some Raymond Carver. The only Raymond Carver they had. Was the short cuts collection because the movie had just come out. I'm going to have less experience and helpful Well the fan of David maybe but anyway I'm just might my last one is that it does this brief. Do you guys have any experience with this is this something. You know the point of purchase hand selling thing.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Yeah, we'll do this question and one more, then we'll wrap it up. David.

**David Gelernter:** Yeah you know the fact that there are loads of gigantic bookstores doesn't mean that doesn't mean that the bookstores are any good I mean my own experience was that. Is that Barnes and Noble or Borders are going to have ninety five percent garbage in the stuff that you're looking for is never there. But on the other hand. You can get it I mean I also have the sensation of never having had access to as much stuff as I have available today not because I'm a writer but. Because there is hours on dot com I can order anything I want from any publisher. I can walk into a library and get what I want. There. I can get all sorts of garbage on the web. If I feel like it. I mean I buy it. We are deprived of. Printed material in fact. Maybe we've got too much of it. But I certainly agree that the that this huge change stores are getting a free ride are bad news in a lot of ways because they're so tasteless and indiscriminating and the stuff that they carry.

Any other... One last question?

**Andrea Dworkin:** Could I just...

**Richard Brookhiser:** Urm, Deborah has a plane to catch.

**Deborah Lipstadt:** Speak, speak, speak.

**Richard Brookhiser:** Oh, okay.

**Andrea Dworkin:** It's just to say that. I actually do buy books, the free press has been very nice to me and they've been sending me books that I asked for now and then but mostly I buy books. And I'm compulsive about bookstores I love being in them and. That's a part of the culture that's disappeared. But what I would say is that. The problem isn't that. That people get free books. Is the problem is that that the reviewers don't value the books that they get that that they're writing for money that they're not reading because they love to read. That's the problem.

Well, seeing no for their hands and recalling rule eighty, which is 'be not tedious and discourse, unless your audience be pleased with their wealth', I want to thank my members of the panel. Thank the free press and thank all of you.

**C-SPAN Voice-over:** Monday we'll have live coverage as the National Transportation Safety Board meets in Baltimore to discuss their investigation into the crash of T.W.A. Flight 800. You can see the...

The Ted K Archive

Richard Brookhiser, Paula Duffy, David Gelernter, David Horowitz, Deborah  
Lipstadt & Liz Maguire  
Media Coverage and Free Press Issues  
Sept 24, 1997

[c-span.org](http://c-span.org)

**[www.thetedkarchive.com](http://www.thetedkarchive.com)**