A funny thing happened to People For the American Way (PWA) in Milwaukee last month. They came to town determined to defeat a pro-voucher slate running for the local school board. But they were so obsessed with the notion that somewhere, someone might be sending a child to a religious school with tax dollars that they completely misread the mood of the people. Their kickoff rally, on which they spent nearly $20,000, attracted no more than 150 people. "And it all went downhill from here," says John Gardner, a pro-voucher school board incumbent PWA targeted for defeat. On the assumption that everyone hated vouchers as much as they did, they set up phone banks to tell voters that Gardner was pro-voucher. Gardner was thrilled—"Throw me in that briar patch again." In the end, Gardner, who originally would have been happy just to eke out a bare majority, walked away with 60 percent of the vote.

For PWA, the election had been a must-win. If vouchers succeeded in Milwaukee (and no school system in the country had a better case for having them), it would open the door to school prayer, values instruction and what PWA saw as the slippery slope issue toward more religion in public life. Unfortunately for PWA, it was hard to portray the Milwaukee voucher plan as another racist plot. (Black activist Polly Williams had credited it a decade ago to serve newly black kids in the inner city.) The state legislature subsequently expanded the program in 1995 to include religious schools, prompting PWA to wage a three-year court battle to kill the program before it spread. But the Wisconsin Supreme Court declared the program constitutional last summer and the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear any challenge to the case. At this point, PWA's only hope for detailing the voucher plan was to sweep the school board races and kill the plan politically.

Instead, PWA suffered a total rout. All the anti-voucher candidates lost and all the pro-voucher candidates won, with the result that pro-voucher forces came out of the election with a 7-to-2 majority on the Milwaukee school board. Not only was the election a stunning repudiation of PWA's long-held contention that most people shared their belief that vouchers would irreparably wreck the wall between church and state, it showed—if proof were needed—that despite all the advantages of 300,000 members, a $10 million annual budget and the patronage of people like founder Norman Lear and board director Alec Baldwin, PWA was an organization adrift, on the wrong side of history and deeply out of touch with the values of everyday Americans.

A President Rich in Enemies
Hate Story
by Noemie Emery

Completely friendly, hungry for love, Bill Clinton has become, paradoxically, a fountain of hatred, a Johnny Applesed of discord and turmoil, sowing contention wherever he trots. People hate him, beyond the bad feelings engendered by far more contentious political figures. People hate Clinton who seldom hate anyone. Backers of Clinton hate Clinton haters. And this has nothing to do with the main emotion in the defense of Clinton by friends, if he does have friends. It is rather the fact that the people who are his friends because he is their enemies' enemy. So Clinton is the friend of those who might otherwise loathe him, or at least, take no interest. And who are Clinton haters, themselves? To those who hate him, they are mere and fascists, white men in suits who want to send women back to the kitchen, gays back to the closet, and blacks to the back of the bus. Clinton's former friend Taylor Branch said, somewhat paradoxically, that the people backing impeachment were the same ones who once backed segregation. (Never mind that most of the people who backed segregation are dead.) Three incidents before last year's mid-term election, which probably helped turn out the base of the Democrats, suggested to some that Clinton's enemies were people who tied blacks to cars and then dragged them for miles, hung guys up on fences and left them to die there, trapped down abortionists and shot them through windows in front of their sons. In an impeachment process that was largely marked by indifference—indifference to Clinton and to his purpose—such feelings powered the small Clinton rallies, attended by people at war with the right. The talk there was anti-white, anti-pro-Clinton. A defense of Clinton was not for something as amorphous as Clinton himself, but for other causes: "civil rights" (affirmative action), "choice" (unrestricted abortion), federal
PEOPLE McNUGGETS

I am writing concerning Mr. Horowitz’s article in the March 1999 issue of Heterodoxy titled “The Reds and the Blacks.” While I wholeheartedly agree with the main thrust of his article, I disagree with the statement, “The simple truth that the rhetoric of bad faith is designed to obscure is that blacks are not oppressed in America, nor is anyone else.” I think that some examples draw from my personal life and the current state of affairs in the land will suffice to demonstrate this fact.

I am a black man. It has been thirty years since I was last arrested for being a black man in a brown shirt and therefore fitting the description of a violent criminal sought by the police. Today, I am much more likely to be picking a peacock than a peacock picker. As he correctly points out in his article, I am one of the free-set black people in the world today, because I am an American. Furthermore, being an executive in a prestigious financial services firm, I am also one of the richest black people in the world. My work involves a significant amount of international travel. I have been amazed at the discriminatory and oppressive behavior of the U.S. Customs Service. I often travel overseas with a colleague who has a Hispanic surname. He never gets stopped. I have been stopped more than once by the Casillen paternal grandfather. He religious appearance is rather less “foreign” than yours. We are both native born Americans. It is remarkable how often he and I are singled out for special attention by customs agents, while our colleagues who are not pigmentedally impaired or burdened with “foreign” surname breeze through customs. Weren’t this an occasional event, I would dismiss it as an aberration born of too many laws enforced by too few bureaucrats armed with too little intelligence.

While I live in New Jersey, I work in New York City. Last year, I paid New York City thousands of dollars in taxes. Yet, I have no right to vote on how this money is used or which people will become the elected officials that dispense this largesse. Need I remind you of the list of facts delineated in the Declaration of Independence to support the claim that “The History of the Present King of Great-Britain is a History of repeated Injuries and Usurpations, all having in direct Object the Establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States?” Included amongst these is, “For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent.” Our nation has spent the last forty days conducting war against Yugoslavia. We have spent much of this decade conducting war against Iraq. Last year we attacked, without warning, Afghanistan and the Sudan. While little would warm my heart more than for Slovakia Milosevic and Saddam Hussein to be turned into party-size servings of “People McNuggets,” I think the direct involvement of American armed forces in achieving such an outcome is a valid subject for debate. Such an outcome may not actually be in the best interests of the United States. Such a debate is supposed to take place in our Congress as is specified in section 8 of our Constitution. Yet no such debate has taken place. Pacing Americans in harm’s way, and spending my money to do so, without such a debate is oppression.

Are these oppressive acts on a scale of the crimes committed against the Jews in Germany or African slaves in America? Of course not! Are armed men raping my daughter, killing my son and expelling me from my home? No! Do these acts mark my taking violent action? Certainly not! Nonetheless, and contrary to your claim, we are oppressed. Thank goodness we are possessed of the vestiges of a republic in which I am still free to petition my elected representatives and subscribe to journals such as Heterodoxy in an effort to end this oppression.

Kevin R. Tyson
Maribor, NJ

P.S. I think your story stems from what Malcolm X and Harry Gidwitz stated in 1964, “Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.” Your extremism is indeed not a vice, but the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. I feel constrained to object to what I perceive as an error.

LIBERAL PHYSICS

I am in general agreement with “The Way We See It” in your December/January number, but emphatically disagree with your characterization of physicists as conservative. Individually, physicists span the entire spectrum from Edward Teller and Eugene Wigner on the right to J. Robert Oppenheimer on the left. But if we look at the record of the two organizations that represent physicists, the American Physical Society: the short answer is that Oppenheimer has been its President, but Teller would not be elected dog-catcher by its members. If the American Physical Society were “conservative” it would not have rejected my offer of an American flag for display at its headquarters with no explanation given, or have celebrated its recent Centennial with a cover on Physics Today that emphasized its opposition to an anti-ballistic missile defense and its vehement defense of J. Robert Oppenheimer when he was denied security clearance. Physicists may not be as far to the left as English professors, but you have placed them much too far to the right in the interest not only of accuracy, but of national security. If physicists were all as conservative as Edward Teller, for example, we would probably have far fewer security leaks in our atomic weapons programs.

Lawrence Cranberg
Austin, TX

ACCIDENTAL ASIANS

I just finished reading Kenneth Lee’s review of Eric Liu’s The Accidental Asian, (February 1999), and I have just a minor quibble. Mr. Mr. Lee, in discussing the voting habits of Asian-Americans, refers to Asian-Americans as “… not being wedded to either party …”. Well, I usually prefer to vote for neither party, if the two parties to which Mr. Lee refers are the Republican and the Democratic parties. I usually vote Libertarian, and I wonder how Governor Jesse Ventura and those who elected him feel about statements such as this, implicitly referring to only two choices. Just a thought.

Enjoyed the review and Heterodoxy.

Dan Holmes
Via Internet

LETTERS ABOUT LETTERS

This is in response to two of the “Communiqués” in your March 1999 issue. As a certifiable male chauvinist pig (who is not a cold fish), fascist and heaven-bound person, I just had to react to Ms. Nellye Mcintyre’s little homily concerning the hateful content of your tabloid. Don’t you just get sick hearing from these folks who have managed to become so super-sensitive that there’s no longer any room for humor? On the other hand, Prof. Eric Graf expresses his concern regarding the absence of “editorial space for us lefties” in your tabloid. How typical of the “religious left” always wanting about how they’re denied access to the media. It’s somewhat analogous to those “vegans” in San Francisco who wanted Burger King to offer “veggie burgers” on their menus. If Eric needs a place to get published, maybe he could start his own little magazine.

Harvey Mallory
Via Internet
REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM

ANNALS OF APPEASMENT: In the good old days at the University of Massachusetts, you could always draw a crowd by pressing for racial preferences in student admissions. In the spring of 1977, for instance, militant students illegally occupied Goodell Hall for six days and extracted concessions from appeasers in the administration for a strengthening of the twenty percent minority quota. But this spring, in an attempt to repeat those glorious pasts, when large bands of demonstrators paraded through the campus, stonishing that there would be no peace if there were no increase in the minority quota, a strange thing happened. The administration and the campus police made it clear that no demonstrations or takeovers would be tolerated. The protest immediately petered out. It would be easy to think that this was the beginning of a national movement. But quite the opposite outcome was reached at UC Berkeley. Since mid-April, redshirts had been agitating for more positions for the school's moribund ethnic studies department, which one student, insisting on anonymity, described as "one of those departments everyone wants to have but no one wants to take courses in." Chancellor Robert Berdahl seems on the verge of hanging tough. There had been 135 arrests since the mid-April takeover of a campus building and students seemed almost as shocked by Berdahl's ability to get a spine as he himself did. But then six students went on a hunger strike and bedlam and liberalism took over. When the students reached the eighth day of their strike, an epidemic of hand-wringing about their health spread across the campus. Berdahl began to dither, unable to decide whether his role was that of Chichester or Quigley. Finally he caved, saying that he was fearful that the hunger strikers might expire. The agreement student radicals extracted from him was more than they expected: eight more full-time faculty positions for the department in which no one wants to take courses, along with some money for an Institute of Race and Gender Studies and, of course, money for a mural commemorating the historic moment of administrative acceding to be placed in Barrows Hall. The only bright spot for those who believed that the University could not degrade itself any further is that a precedent for others to follow may have been established. We can only see the day when a student pests a revolting to his head outside Berdahl's office and says he'll pull the trigger unless there is a ban on all classroom use of the works of Michel Foucault, or a group that stands at the top of the Campanile and threatens to jump if at least one Republican professor isn't hired in the social sciences.

PARKS THAT LOOK LIKE AMERICA: The National Park Service has decided that a major problem exists with the national parks—too many white people visiting them. This has led both Bob Stanton, the director of the agency, to devise a program that will make the parks supposedly more hospitable to minority visitors and the national parks currently over 90% white—representative of America, which is only 73% white. Stantons reforms will force park rangers to include more "western stories," such as the tales of black and female prisoners at Andersonville, the infamous Confederate-run POW camp. Minority visiting will now be an element in the performance reviews of park managers, and one national park, the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, has launched a Web site in Spanish as well as English in order to draw more Hispanic visitors. What's next, a transmogrified Smokey the Bear? A quota for black wolves at Yellowstone?

POISONED IVY: Despite the inestimable evidence showing that I, Rogeria Mencha, is the biggest fraud since Pildown Man, the Sociology Institute insists that the Ivy League universities—all eight of them—are still teaching I, Rogeria Mencha in one forum or another. Arthur Kinney, Politics 43 students ("Seminar in Comparative Politics: Power and Protest") are forced to read the work as part of a requirement for political science degree. Harvard's David Maybury-Lewis has kept the book on his reading list for Anthropology 184, "Ethnicity in the Americas: The Indian Question." The emerging defense of Rogeria is familiar to all who knew the Left: she was wrong for the right reasons.

However, it's no real surprise. Such coddling of student protesters is a shameful but all too common occurrence at major universities these days, in which administrators and a handful of students on the far left compete to see who can be more "progressive." After a while, while the university administrators, perhaps feeling nostalgic, cave in. Unlike the 1960s, the goals of the student protesters and the administration are no different—and why should we expect any resistance to strengthening ethnic studies from the people who thought it up in the first place?

LIVING UNDER COMMINISM: During the infamous Kitchen Debate between Nixon and Khrushchev, Khrushchev made the assertion that Nixon's grandchildren would live under communism. Nixon shook back that Khrushchev's grandchildren would live in freedom. Khrushchev's son, And, has managed to achieve both at the same time—a rather impressive achievement. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Sergei came to the United States and is currently applying for citizenship to the most free nation in the world. However, before conservatives become too gloeful about the son of a former Soviet dictator coming to these United States, it should be noted that he is a professor at Brown University, possibly one of the last vestiges of communism on the planet. This may be, to paraphrase Christopher Buckley, an irony that only a Russian could truly appreciate.

MINIMUM DAILY REQUIREMENT: In last issue in this space we reported on Boston College's wrangling with radical feminist Val Daly, who had gone ballistic when the College attempted to force her to accept two male students in her "Introduction to Ethics" class. Daly had gone on a leave of absence, to say nothing of the matter having been resolved. However, when Boston College over the fact that the school had "unlocked the catalog" and is telling people that she has retired. In a stunning defeat for Daly, a Middlesex Superior Court judge has ruled that Boston College has adequate cause to fire her for her constant refusal to admit men into her women's studies courses. Judge Martha Sammon noted that "Daly took the position that she would rather resign than admit male students to her class," and is granting to see that Boston College took her up on her offer.
The Decline of the West at Duke

by Benjamin Keppele

DUKE UNIVERSITY freshman Jay Strader first knew there was something wrong when he returned home after class. Vandals had broken into his dorm room and left an ominous message on his computer monitor—“We’re going to kick your ass.”

Days later, after this alarming event, Strader was shooting pool with a friend in the dorm’s recreation lounge when a dormmate noticed him. “That was a real asshole of a letter you wrote,” the young man started, referring to a letter Strader had recently written to the Chronicle, Duke’s student-run daily newspaper. The two exchanged words and insults, and the conversation became increasingly heated. Finally, Strader shot back, “Well, you’re really not defending your point by threatening me.” “Shut up!” the other snapped. “I’ll just come over there and best you up!” at which point he raised his fist.

Berlin Sokoa, a freshman and a friend of Strader’s, submitted a letter to the Chronicle supporting him. For Strader, the response was even harsher. The evening the latter appeared, three students came by his room and, standing outside the doorway, began screaming at him. It continued for at least ten minutes, and when Sokoa attempted to shut his door, they blocked his path. Only when Sokoa threatened to call the police did they leave. Two days later, Sokoa received an anonymous death threat.

What did Strader and Sokoa do to make their fellow students feel safe? They wrote letters to the Chronicle arguing against the creation of a Hindi major on campus, and offered spirited and provocative defenses of Western Civilizations and its values.

Strader and Sokoa thought their letters would encourage debate. Instead, they encountered a backlash so fierce that Duke’s police are now conducting an investigation of the affair. It has raised questions not only about the treatment of Western Civilizations on campus, but also about Duke administrators’ double standards in dispensing racial justice.

For Strader and Sokoa are white, and their harassers are Indian.

Duke’s Indian students have been pushing for a Hindi major for some time, and the issue came to Strader and Sokoa’s attention through Chronicle articles detailing the debate. Supporters advocate upgrading Hindi from its current status as a minor because, as the Chronicle noted in an editorial on April 7, it “would establish an accommodating climate for Hindu culture.” It would also “help create a sense of community among students interested in the field,” and while the proposed Hindi department would be small, it should not deter administrators from recognizing the diverse interests among the student population.” One supporter, Dharmesh Mehta, told the Chronicle on April 6 that the value of Hindi would be great because there is a large Indian population at Duke and it would be a “popular second major for many people.”

Jay Strader, however, found that the reality was quite different from what supporters were saying. Despite the supposed demand for a Hindi major, only two students at Duke are even minorng in the subject. And in a letter to the Chronicle’s editor on April 15, Strader noted that though most of the study body had registered for the Fall 1999 term, a full 75 percent of the seats offered in the university’s Hindi courses were still available. His mistake was to compare the study of Hindi to the study of statistics: “The former is a language spoken in a Third World country overwhelmed by disease and poverty, while the latter is a science of proven, inestimable value to all branches of industry and science, especially medicine in an area very important to many students.”

As Boston Globe columnist Jeff Jacoby later remarked when the deans at Duke had become public, this was “strident ... but clearly relevant and well within the bounds of campus discourse.” But the multiculturalists on campus went ballistic. DIYA, Duke’s student group for South Asian students, organized a letter-writing campaign to the Chronicle and posted a message on four Internet newsgroups asking that Strader be expelled and laterally. These letter-writers(stretched Strader as “ignorant,” “obstinate racist,” and possessed of a “low level of thinking.” He began to receive hate mail and was soon after threatened by his dominants.

But if Strader’s letter was like turning on a tap, Sokoa’s was equivalent to spraying someone with a garden hose. In a scathing poise to the Chronicle, he argued that: “The values of the West—the power of reason, the sanctity of individual rights and the unfettered pursuit of happiness—are superior to the values of a primitive and impoverished country like India. . . . were it not for the British, whatever ancient traditions and rich culture existed before their arrival would be enjoyed only by the very top of India’s feudal caste system.

Within two hours of the Chronicle hitting the stands on April 23, Sokoa began to receive hate mail. He was also demoted as “inutilty racist,” “profoundly ignorant,” and “vendicophoblc” in later editions of the Chronicle. Two days after the three Indian students confronted him outside his room, he received the following e-mail from an anonymous (and obscene) address:

“...so you think your neo-Nazi racist attitude is cool, huh? Well I’ve got news for you MR. 136 RAN- DOLPH. You are a cock sucking, dick licking, shit eating son of a bitch. If I were you, I would never leave your room (unless of course you return home to BETHESDA MD). You see, it’s pretty simple. If we ever see you out of your room around East, WE WILL BEAT YOU WITHIN ONE INCH OF YOUR LIFE and stop on you like the little shit you are. Don’t be surprised if you wake up to your room around East, or we will find you and when we do, you can only wish you had never written to learn, you little prick. That’s it, have a nice day!”

This harassment made both Strader and Sokoa understandably concerned for their safety.

Are you kidding? I carry Macon around campus. Of course I’m scared,” Sokoa says. “I’m especially scared because the University does not care. I’ve run into some of these characters around campus,” he says, noting that several angry students have made threatening gestures towards him.

And another student was reassured when, during a chance encounter with Duke’s president, Nen Kochans, Strader told her of the situation they were in. Her response was to declare that the threat were “probably just a scary way of blowing off steam.”

John Buzaus, Duke University’s Senior Vice President for Public Relations, strongly disputes that account.

“There’s much less here than meets the eye,” he says. “It’s clear that some of the students at Duke were upset by some of the descriptions [Strader and Sokoa used] in this case, and they hit back big time.” He also claims that Duke administrators and the University’s police department are investigating the entire affair, although both students say they are less satisfied with the university police department’s handling of the case. Strader says the police investigation “doesn’t seem as if [it] had been really quick or really intense.” as one might expect in a case like this.

As for Strader’s account, Buzaus declared it “patently false,” saying that Koolance was just attempting to calm him down, and that she immediately contacted the appropriate University officials.

But if University officials are investigating the matter, Strader and Sokoa don’t know about it. Both say they’ve received one phone call—via Duke’s student counseling office. Since then, they say, there has been no further communication—and or from the University. As Sokoa bitterly points out, there has been “nothing. Nada. Zilch.

“They want it on the record they that contacted us,” he says. “I have absolutely no reason to believe the University is going to do any thing to stop this harassment is there whatever. I expect they will do what they need to do to protect their image. Beyond that, they won’t do a thing.”

Furthermore, Strader says that while President: Koolance went through the motions of condemning the death threats and harassment, she certainly didn’t appear to take the situation seriously. I think that they’re trying to cover their tracks. She said it in such an off-hand manner! That’s exactly what happened!”
The students believe that the University would be treating this situation differently if they were minorities.
"It should have been amazing," Strader says. "There would be an instant response," he argues, with hundreds of letters to the University and to the Chronicle. Outside leaders brought in to bridge the state of racial tension, and not least, "it's possible some kind of action would be taken" against the people harassing him.

Sokka agrees. "Nan [Kohane] would be out there screaming bloody murder," he says. "If I were Indian, guy, black—anyone but a white male.
"It was a candlelight vigil they'd be having," he quips. "I'm surprised they didn't bring me up on hate-crime charges!"

Indeed, Duke University officials have been particularly aggressive when it comes to condemning and investigating such complaints when minority students or staff are the victims. In 1996, the University's Institutional Equity office organized an immediate investigation of three video mail messages containing racially inflammatory statements left for a black assistant professor, an affair that warranted the attention of the University's provost. In May 1997, University President N. John Seidman devoted an "front-page attention" to racial incidents on campus, which included slamming the conservative student-run Duke Review for its "Gail's Employee Bashin' Issue" which, despite never mentioning race, supposedly rocked black employees and prompted them as lazy and incompetent.

"It is a regrettable aspect of contemporary American life that members of minority groups all too often are treated in stereotypical ways. Such stereotypes were at work in the recent article in the Duke Review, which made unfair generalizations about an entire group of our employees, for example..."

In November 1997, University officials declared the mock lynching of a black doll drenched in tar to be "offensive" and "a hate crime," a situation blown up in the University's face when the culprit turned out to be two black undergraduates. In April 1998, the campus was in an uproar when, according to the Chronicle, three "white feminist...et poor Asian student...[and] staff...to make two black female students..."

In November 1997, University officials declared the mock lynching of a black doll drenched in tar to be "offensive" and "a hate crime," a situation blown up in the University's face when the culprit turned out to be two black undergraduates. In April 1998, the campus was in an uproar when, according to the Chronicle, three "white feminist...et poor Asian student...[and] staff...to make two black female students..."

What's Left of Western Civ

Western Civilization has declined at Duke, and the college's new Curriculum 2000 program is not likely to improve that. It's an essential part of the present curriculum, and will require that a student take a number of "core" courses. For our readers, on among other things, "Cross-Cultural Inquiring," "Given Inquiring," "Korea Language," and "Philosophers of the World.

Peter F. Fisk, a Political Science professor and chair of Duke's Curriculum Committee in the Department of Comparative Literature, said that the program will "create a substantial tightening of the requirements all across the line," meaning that all courses are viewed as "core" courses. He added that the "American courses don't do well. They are not seen as being in the core of the curriculum. It's a tough blow for them to have to work hard to foster a university that is just, fair, and inclusive." It would be great if the University had decided that some incidents are more important than others in the "demographic" shift on campus. In the matter of Strader and Sokka, the University's new hands-off position, tailored to the situation, is clear in Public Relations chief Burgess' carefully worded statement: "As repugnant as some members of the University community might find some of the language or sentiments used by others, it is not the place of the University administration to restrict what people say in letters to the editor in a student newspaper. The antidote for obscenity is free speech, and for the University, more speech, not less speech—speech that challenges the premises and arguments of others and which enables people of independent views to discuss these arguments and make up their own minds."

Many observers, such as Professor John Staddon, the James B. Duke Professor of Psychology at the University, weren't surprised that a campus controversy over the creation of a Hindi major happened. "Every group has been told that it should be represented in the curriculum. Duke has an Asian and African Studies program. Why shouldn't the Indians get theirs? The controversy arose partly because [Strader and Sokka] wrote perfectly civil, but confrontational, letters criticizing India and defending the colonized West. But their defense is that there is no room for the equally vitriolic views on the other side—and these are the educational establishment."

But despite the usual attitude of Duke's educational establishment toward the situation unfolding around Strader and Sokka, the entire affair has made them all the more determined to speak out.

"That one sentence in one letter could make people physically threaten me is something I didn't expect," Strader says. "It's something that Sokka didn't expect either, but he points out there is another problem that needs to be addressed. "(Students) come out of here not appreciating Western tradition. The only people who appreciate it anymore are immigrants. Americans is a country not based on race, culture or ethnic origin—but based on an idea. That's what kids aren't being taught, but should be."

In November 1997, University officials declared the mock lynching of a black doll drenched in tar to be "offensive" and "a hate crime," a situation blown up in the University's face when the culprit turned out to be two black undergraduates. In April 1998, the campus was in an uproar when, according to the Chronicle, three "white feminist...et poor Asian student...[and] staff...to make two black female students..."
Pastors for Castro

by Mark Tooley

Fidel Castro’s circle of open admirers may be contracting, but there are some American fedelinos who continue to keep the faith. Chief among them is a New York-based Baptist minister, the Rev. Lucius Walker, who, with his fellow “Pastors for Peace,” continues to function as a public relations agent for the aging Cuban dictator and lobbies tirelessly for full U.S. relations with his hemisphere’s last major outpost of tyranny.

Early this year, Walker helped organize what he describes as the largest U.S. congressional delegation to visit Cuba. Representing the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., Rev. Shirley Jackson (D-TX), Earl Hilliard (D-AL), Julia Carson (D-IN), Gregory Meeks (D-NY), and Barbara Lee (D-CA) all joined Walker, among them as full partners in Walker’s enthusiasm for the Cuban cadidato, some of them damped by the veil of humanitarianism which the Reverend has placed over his work for Castro.

“I would be honored to have a person like Fidel as president of my own country,” Walker enthuses in a recent interview. “He’s a person of great integrity.”

Walker founded Cuba’s National Council of Churches (NCCO) in 1988 from his hospital bed, while recovering from wounds he claimed were inflicted by the Contras during the Reagan administration. His main purpose was to support the “victims” of “low-intensity warfare” waged by the United States and its proxies against oppressed Third World peoples.

Walker had been fired as the NCCO’s Associate General Secretary for Church and Society in 1978 for chronically overstretching his budget. He handed his dismissal on the NCCO’s “drifting to the right.” Thereafter, Walker became executive director of the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO), a group founded in 1967 ostensibly to combat civil rights injustices, although in reality, IFCO promoted black Panther-style radicalism under the guise of “self-determination” for the inner city. Under Walker’s leadership, IFCO’s influence is based on international justice issues, such as combating U.S. “colonialism” in Latin America and supporting Marxist liberation movements in Central America. It became known as an elite group organization on the fringes of the Christian community, mainline church groups, such as the United Methodist, supported IFCO financially during the 1980’s.

Walker’s Pastors for Peace, which is an IFCO project, took a special interest in Cuba after the Cuban government invited him on a fact-finding tour. “We saw a country that had suffered under a dictatorship, a dictatorship that had been supported by the U.S.,” he lamented. He was shocked by the brutality of the Bay of Pigs invasion 40 years ago now. But for Walker, the clock never moves: he still blames all oppression in Cuba on the United States.

Since 1992, Pastors for Peace has been challenging U.S. trade sanctions against Cuba by organizing seven “Friendship Caravans” of material aid for Cuba and refusing to apply for a U.S. Treasury Department license. “To send simple aid to our Cuban brothers and sisters we shouldn’t have to ask the permission of their enemy,” Walker has explained.

For his efforts, Walker and his colleagues received medals handed out personally by Castro in 1996. Upon receipt of his award, the Baptist pastor from Brooklyn’s Harlem community system as exemplifying the social values preached by Jesus. Castro responded: “I do not have words for what they have done.” He called Walker’s work “one of the most beautiful stories of solidarity ever written.”

The reason Cuba is a “pariah,” according to Walker, “is because it will not help U.S. corporate interests or U.S. government policy but is committed to giving all that it has to its people.” Cuba offers “example to the rest of the Third World which the developed countries can’t afford because it places people ahead of corporate greed.”

Walker has said that Castro’s communist revolution achieved an era of equal rights, universal education, and healthcare. “Cuba has chosen to follow its own destiny, not to be a puppet of the United States. It has not bowed to the United States in the face of hardship from our economic blockade.”

He has defended Cuba’s one-party system, saying it permits two or more (Communist Party-approved) candidates to run for office. And Cuba’s limitations on free speech he blames on pressures Castro feels from his enemy, the United States: “Cuba is a country under siege.” Walker has said the trade embargo is part of America’s “racist immorality,” since Cuba is a majority black nation. “The U.S. uses human rights only to oppress.”

In 1994 Pastors for Peace organized a historic meeting between 100 U.S. church leaders and Fidel Castro when the Cuban dictator visited the U.N. “We did not want the revolution to be anti-church or anti-clergy,” Castro patiently explained to an appreciative audience. “We fought within the Party to establish that even those with religious beliefs should be able to join the Party and participate in government.”

“Sometimes the church has issued strong pastoral letters against the revolution,” Castro added. “We do our best to be tolerant.” He effusively thanked Pastors for Peace. “Like the early Christians, they have been willing to stand up for their beliefs, even against those who would crush them.” Castro told the assembled church leaders representing 20 Protestant, Roman Catholic and ecumenical groups: “We love you specially and always welcome you to our country.”

John Brown Campbell, general secretary of the National Council of Churches and a leading participant in the meeting, afterwards admitted that Castro’s regime has detained “some pastors” and closed churches. But he expressed his appreciation that Cuba “has made a priority of caring for the poor.” Walker closed in for closer ties between Castro’s regime and U.S. church leaders, such as Campbell, is a major goal for Walker. But breaking U.S. trade sanctions against Cuba with illegal caravans of “humanitarian aid” is an even stronger objective.

Pastors for Peace’s most hair-raising adventure came in 1996, when the U.S. Customs Service decided not to ignore Walker’s open violation of U.S. trade policy toward Cuba. A 300-horsepower caravan carrying 200 volunteers and 300 computers was blocked at the Mexican border south of San Diego by customs officers. To back them up, some 100 San Diego police officers and California Highway Patrolmen in riot gear lined up at the border, in case the caravanners should attempt to cross the border on foot.

True to expectation, Pastors for Peace activists disconnected from their vehicles and began running their computers toward the border, trying to ram through Customs officials and police officers. Ten members of the caravan were arrested, and several others were detained after resistance attempts to seize the computers. The melee injured one policeman and four Customs inspectors, three of whom required hospital treatment. According to Pastors for Peace, their activists had been trained in “non-violent tactics but had never seen law enforcement behave so brutally.”

Not least to miss an opportunity for publicity, Walker and three colleagues began a hunger strike on February 21, 1996 near the Mexico-U.S. border crossing. In April, they moved their fast to Washington, D.C., where they camped out in the United Methodist Building on Capitol Hill, strategically across the street from the U.S. Capitol and the Supreme Court.

“T’m 63,” Walker melodramatically pronounced, “I simply don’t want to live any longer in a country that continues to hurt people the way my country does.” He proclaimed to be living on a diet of water, lemon juice and maple syrup.

“Our government has pursued a policy of death toward Cuba for half of my life time,” said Walker. “Working with U.S. policy is to be in complicity with killing our neighbors 90 miles south of Miami, I’d rather lose my life than lose my soul.” He called himself with “our children’s groups” that are sending computers to “disaffected” groups in Cuba.

Representative Charles Rangel (D-NY) joined Walker in a press conference, where he announced the support of 60 congressmen for the release of the computers. Walker’s Salvation Baptist Church is located in the largely Hispanic district. The congressman commended Pastors for Peace as “dedicated Americans” who were trying to “ease the suffering of the Cuban people.”

Neither Walker acknowledged that the food, clothing and medicine for humanitarian purposes could be shipped legally to Cuba if licensed under the Trading with Enemies Act, nor did they explain why the computers could not have been shipped quietly through Mexico or Canada without the fanfare of caravans and civil disobedience.

Also attending the press conference were
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Rep. Esteban Torres (D-California), Rep. William Coyne (D-Pennsylvania), Rep. Sam Farr (D-California) and several others from the left-leaning church establishment, including Joan Brown Campbell. The ecumenical leader called U.S. policy towards Cuba “inhuman bondage.” Then Willy Wolf-Peissel of the United Methodists Board of Church and Society called the United States an “outsider nation” because of its sanctions against Cuba.

During his hunger strike, Freedom House, a Washington-based human rights monitor, sent Walker a list of 1,000 political prisoners, including Christian clergy, who are detained in Cuban prisons. Walker responded by contrasting “Cuba’s example of good will to its own people” with the “corrupting of hatred, abuse and violence by our own government against us.” He claimed the “U.S. is committed not to democracy but to the destruction of democracy.” And he blasted “right-wing Cubans” who left their homeland to live in Cuba’s economy. Unlike called Cubans, Walker said he would remain in his native land, despite the “harassment and abuse of power” by the U.S. government.

Walker’s hunger strike was enormously successful. Congressman Rangel and mainline church groups repeatedly lobbied the Treasury Department to release the confiscated computers. In late May, the Treasury Department finally acquiesced, turning the computers over to the United Methodist Board of Church and Society, in whose building the hunger strikers were encamped.

“This is the making of a new ecumenical coalition to address the moral issues around our policy on Cuba,” boasted Congressman Rangel, who commended the United Methodist, American Baptist, and Episcopal Churches, the National Council of Churches, and the Catholic Archdiocese of New York for their help. “Rev. Walker and his student supporters risked their lives to make a moral point about the right of Americans to help people in need whenever they may live.”

“We are thankful to God,” announced a grateful Walker. “Together, we have made an effort to appeal to the soul and integrity of our nation.” The computers were finally shipped to Cuba in September 1996. In solidarity with Pastors for Peace, United Methodist officials insisted they never asked for a license. But the Treasury Department did grant one to the church so as to close the issue. Walker still saw it as a victory. During one meeting with Castro, Walker

Walker concluded his housing oration by promising: “Today we end the blockade against Cuba. Tomorrow we end the blockade of the ghetto, of the poor, of the political prisoners in our own country. Our vision is a broad, large vision. We are the people who will build the new United States.”

It would seem that this revolutionary rhetoric would be alien to Americans for Humanitarian Trade with Cuba, a new coalition organized by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which includes corporate leaders like David Rockefeller and Wayne Andrews, former administrations officials, and former congressmen of both parties who argue that open trade with Cuba will ultimately undermine Castro. But included in this coalition—and giving it a whiff of moral uplift—are the left-leaning church leaders like Joan Brown Campbell of the National Council of Churches who have dressed the well-dressed Walker in sleepwear and who themselves are hardly motivated by opposition to Castro or, for that matter, enthusiasm for the principle of free trade.

Mainline church leaders placed a half-page ad in the New York Times last year to plead for full U.S. relations with Cuba. Signers included not only Campbell and Walker but a host of bishops, pastors, priests and nuns from mainline Protestant and Catholic organizations. The ad made no mention of human rights in Cuba.

The celebratory approach of some U.S. church leaders towards Castro ignores a poignant letter from a Cuban political prisoner several years ago. While then serving a 4-year sentence for disseminating “enemy propaganda,” Joel Dussell Martinez wrote in direct response to the “ministry” of Rev. Walker.

“How can a man who calls himself a believer support the Men of Ahab from whom this despicable evil policies that this country has ever known. We cannot ultimately have what we need in this country until we recognize what Cuba has in its country and until we join with Cuba in celebrating that revolutionary principle and way of life which Cuba represents in the world. We have never had a true revolution in the United States. What did we have? At least we had a coup. We had a takeover by the rich white man who had come to the United States from the rich white peas who had stayed back in England.”
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Thomas mocked the mentally ill by inviting a chicken. More profitably, Paw & Disorder director Ricki Salzen joined Todd Kennedy's labor sub-committee where she begged, cajoled, and (some say) tricked a hired Anil Hill into tying Senator Howard Metzenbaum's staffer, David Brodsky about Thomas's alleged sexual harassment of her. Brodsky then told NPA's Nina Totenberg, who then told the world.

For years, their self-justifying marketing practices have raised a lot of political hackles. "I don't care for the ACLU either," says Gini Bolick, litigation director of the Institute For Justice. "But they're bright. What you see is what you get. But I don't like these people. [All People For the American Way] at all. They are nasty ideologues who are not terribly honest about their motivations."

Paw, founded an anti-brief on behalf of performer artist Karen Finley's right to smear her body with hot chocolate at taxpayer expense and opposed the Communications Decency Act (apparently not so much on First Amendment grounds, though, as for fear the act might shut down gay sex on web sites).

For years, Paw has published an annual report, giving bits of "censored" books. It runs every word that Pat Robertson (and any other prominent Christian leader) ever utters on TV. Paw subscribes to religious right publications such as Focus on the Family and the Family Research Council, attends religious right conferences and conventions, and, as it notes in its annual report, keeps "exhaustive records of what ultraconservative groups communicate to their own constituencies." For web-savvy members, Paw sponsors a cosmetic-Christian website called Right Here Too, maintains a research library and publishes books on the right (such as "Hostile Climate," a state-by-state report on anti-gay activity with a foreword by Alan Chambers).

When the Catholic League protested gay activist Terrence McNally's "Coriolanus" (a play in which Christ gets drunk with his apostles, sleeps a priest, marries two gays and sleeps with Judas), Paw turned out such luminaries as Norman Lear, Arthur Miller and Woody Allen to demonstrate on the plays behalf. When Catholic offended over seized priests in the NCI series, Nothing Sacred, Paw urged its members to send letters, faxes and e-mails to the network keeping the series on the air. Just before last November's elections Paw paid for a $35,000 open letter in the New York Times signed by 40 historians condemning the Clinton's crime in the Monica Lewinsky case didn't rise to the level of an impeachable offense.

At other times, Paw has supported gay marriage. The Disney boycott, demanded confirmation of Bill Lee Lazo as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights and urged full implementation of the voter's voice law. It provided research materials for an infamous 1994 Anti-Defamation League report which called the Christian Right "bigot," "conspiratorial," "phony," "fervent," and anti-Semitic. More recently, it has started a campaign to defeat the house managers (called "RECALL THE RIGHT: POWERVOTE 2000"). In perhaps its greatest coup to date, a $1.2 million dollar advertising and direct-mail campaign to slap Supreme Court nominee Robert Bork. As part of that campaign, Anthony Podesta, Paw's first director, joined Ted Kennedy on how to derail the Bork nomination. (Kennedy charged that Bork would bring back beat-bender abortions and make black stand in the back of the bus.)

In an all-out effort to keep Clarence Thomas off the Supreme Court, Paw assigned four full-time staffers, several interns and field organizers to research the man's past. According to David Brock's The Real Anita Hill, Paw looked through videos of Thomas's speeches in hopes of finding one where, one rumor alleged, Thomas mocked the mentally ill by inviting a chicken. More profitably, Paw & Disorder director Ricki Salzen joined Todd Kennedy's labor sub-committee where she begged, cajoled, and (some say) tricked a hired Anil Hill into tying Senator Howard Metzenbaum's staffer, David Brodsky about Thomas's alleged sexual harassment of her. Brodsky then told NPA's Nina Totenberg, who then told the world.

For years, their self-justifying marketing practices have raised a lot of political hackles. "I don't care for the ACLU either," says Gini Bolick, litigation director of the Institute For Justice. "But they're bright. What you see is what you get. But I don't like these people. [All People For the American Way] at all. They are nasty ideologues who are not terribly honest about their motivations."

For his part, TV producer Norman Lear has never tried to hide his reasons for forming People For the American Way. "I was a Jewish kid growing up when Hitler came to power," Lear is quoted in Cal Thomas's new look, Bleeding by Right. "As Father Courtright ranted, as Carl McIndoe ranted, I don't know why or how it came about that at age thirteen or so I was on the radio I would listen to them, I didn't have any [friends] I could talk to about it because they weren't listening. I can't explain it, but I felt the threat as a Jewish kid." When WWII broke out, Lear quickly joined the Army Air Force and flew 36 missions as a redhead. "I couldn't wait to get involved," said Lear. "I love this country. I love this life and I love getting up in the morning."

Lear also loved writing comedies, a format to which, in the decade following WWII, he brought a highly original (and subversive) talent. By the late seventies, Lear was a wealthy and influential television writer/producer. His All In The Family comedy series, which featured the bigoted but lovable Archie Bunker, was largely based on Lear's own experiences, and described his movement as "fascism masquerading as Christianism," "the ultimate obscenity" and "the spiritual pornography of a debased religiosity." (A subsequent more temperate broadway parody merely described the Christian Right as an "altarmung new movement" which was teaching people "to hate but in a Christian way".

Given Paw's background as a comedy writer (and his single year of college) it's no surprise perhaps that when the Christian Right suddenly fing burst onto the scene as a political force in the late seventies that Lear initially seems a bolt out of the blue, without reason or legitimacy. In fact, Lear, along with the rest of the secular left, didn't understand that the rise of the Christian Right was actually a reaction to what born-again Christians saw as a 20-year assault by out-dated activists, attorney judges and biased media with its one-sided coverage and narrow-sighted adversarial visions. "The fact that the left has awakened the sleeping giant of American religious conservatism, which it never needed to do, notes Rabbi Daniel Lapin. It was the "fundamentalist left's" found "anti-Christian bigotry" that created the Christian Right by aggressively pushing the boundaries and constantly demanding more.

"We're talking about a lot more," says Lapin, who is both an orthodox rabbi and author of a new book on America's Judeo-Christian heritage called America's Real War. "It was foolish to push the issue toward the political center because that is something that leaves almost
In fact, argues Prager, the greatest danger to Jews isn't Christianity, he contends, but the lack of it. In the March issue of National Review, Prager described a recent speech he gave to Jews in North Carolina. "When some in the audience mentioned their fear of joining religion among Christians, I asked these audience members if they loved living their city. All of them said they did. It is a coincidence, I then asked, that the city you so love—for its wonderful people, its safety for your children, its fine schools and its values that enable you to raise your children with confidence—is a highly Christian city?"

It's good that America is a Christian country, Prager concluded. It's good for America and it's good for Jews. "Judaisation-loving, Old Testament-loving, classical American Protestantism... has been the greatest social and moral engine since Sinai."

For his part, even Norman Lear realizes that something has gone wrong with American society over the last 40 years. Starting in the early '70s, he began to give speeches (to sometimes quite surprised liberal audiences) lamenting the decline of spirituality and spirit-centered life, the country's decline into materialism and the disappearance of what he calls "our capacities for awe and wonder." Lear has even started to understand the role that PAW played in creating the problem he currently deplores. "Civic libertarian arguments may have discouraged discussion," he told author Thomas L. Friedman in a 1992 Commonweal interview, "but mainstream churches were unsuccessful in reaching out to Jews again Christian." Thus having opportunities for the Christian Right to fill breach.

Lear candidly admits that when he first entered the political arena, he "reflexively" wrote off "everybody who called himself a 'born-again Christian.'" But he says in the Commonweal piece, "we didn't come this distance without learning something." And it soon dawned on Lear that, in spite of what he regarded as their narrow-minded, retrograde social/political stands, Christian right leaders still were—in some sense way—responding to "people's deepest yearnings.

For Lear it was a kind of revelation: "Everybody in what appears to be the opposing army is following a leader. When you try to find out why... you begin to discover that they have some of the same hopes and aspirations you do. You begin not to write off a whole section of America just because they are following somebody or some out of their own needs. It is better to reach out to their needs. The religious right taught us a lesson, in spite of themselves.... We must begin to make commitments to higher values, to live a moral code that connects us with each other and with eternity."

It's hard to know how sincere Lear is about new found opportunities for religion's role in society (he declined to be interviewed for this story). Certainly, it's clear he takes great offense at Pat Robertson's assertions that he's "anti-Christian." Perhaps in reaction, as some reporters have noted, there are books about Christ on his office shelves. In interviews he frequently mentions his friendship with the University of Chicago Christian theologian, Martin Marty, and has been known to tell reporters that he'd still be better off if we followed Christ's Sermon on the Mount. PAW itself has also sought to present itself in a kinder, gentler way in recent times. Four years ago it signed an "anti-aggression" pact with 17 other activist organizations including the Christian Coalition to ratchet down the rhetoric and adopt a more moderate tone. Its web site couldn't look more middle-American (it features a patchwork collage of the American flag, Constitution, Capitol building and Supreme Court.) It's director, Carole Shields has six kids and is the daughter and granddaughter of Southern Baptist preachers. And PAW's general Counsel, Elliot Mineburg—in contrast to the volatile Pedastea—is more than ready to concede that if admired people might have other points of view.

("It's not surprising that they have very smooth spokespeople," says Bolick. "PAW has enough money to hire the very best. They don't have to be represented by people who can't hide their sainthood.

On the other hand, there are other indications that when it comes to basic ideology, PAW hasn't changed at all. Last October, when the director of PAW's New York City office asked Norman Lear to march in defense of an anti-Christain anti-Prophecy (Copies Christi) he was more than happy to oblige. And when Marshall Fritz of the Separation of Church and State Alliance attended a PAW "Threat to Democracy" workshop in Washington D.C. last May, he was, he says, "flabbergasted, puzzled, not quite quaintly at how, uninterested they were in news, sex, and how cowardly and insincere they were of views of other than their own.

Though a few, sayjings, like Rabbi David Saperstein warned (vainly) against the trends to "compromise the right," and one educator candidly confessed she couldn't "in good conscience" tell neely black mothers not to avail themselves of vouchers, others happily conjugated the Religious Right as "hate groups" and "racist scum" indistinguishable from the Klu Klux Klans. The sense of moral outrage even permeated policy discussions as when PAW president Carole Shields attacked vouchers as an "idiotic" idea and suggested that even privately-funded voucher programs were nothing more than less for less designed to make "a profit on children."

Fritz, who is neither shy nor quiet, says he tried not to ask too many embarrassing questions, such as why PAW supported giving the poor the stamp to use at for-profit grocery stores but opposed giving the poor educational vouchers to use private schools. But he couldn't help himself, he says, when, on the final day of the workshop, Norman Lear himself got up to speak. "Interns were holding cordless mikes. I waited till the end. I'm the last questioner." But when Fritz tried to speak, a PAW staff member took the mike from the intern and handed it to another staffer, who came up with some puffed-up-type question to ask Lear—"Was it fun to do the Archie Bunker show?"

When she was done, Fritz tried to speak again, whereupon, he says, PAW staffers handed the mic to yet another staff member. "I didn't get it at first," says Fritz, "I was so excited, I couldn't believe they would try to prevent me from ask- ing a question." Finally Fritz just put up his hand and Lear acknowledged him. "I told, 'The room has great acoustics. We don't need a mike,'" says Fritz. "Then I raised Lear of bow, years before, he had endorsed a great book called 'Compelling Delia.'" the first chapter of which had painted out the need for the separation of school and state at a way of protecting the right of families to pass on to their ideology without interference from the state. Then I asked him 'Do you still endorse this point of view?'"

Lear never answered the question, says Fritz. Someone had just earlier made a comment about needing a mikes and he played off that remark, saying, "oh, that must have happened before I could read."

Fritz left the conference thoroughly disgusted. PAW can talk all it wants about its opposition to "making a profit on children," he says, but the truth is a lot more simple. The reason People For the American Way hates vouchers is that it wants to keep kids in public schools—where it can undermine their beliefs in God—"All the rest are cover stories."

Paul Cottol is wrote "Reviving Hamlet" in the March 1999 issue of Hystedox.
five years before the fact, the Clintons ‘symbolize’ the intransigent boomlet liberal trait: self-righteousness and selfishness... self-indulgence... and boorish engineering... Clinton’s trans- parent lies, his evasions, his whitewashing of how small this is: a bright but erratic teenager struggling to impress his college counselor, not like a commander-in-chief.” Meanwhile John Lee maintains: “The 60s culture revolution dealt the country from restraints to liberation, discouraging religious observances and encouraging divorce, abortion and drug experimentation...” Many who want Mr. Clinton deplore that a perceiving, sexually out-of-control president is the last straw in an anything-goes culture.” It is not one Clinton—lit, sex, or money—that can remove the political, the whole of his being—which brings them in fine with group shows.

3. The unshakable Lightness of Clinton.

This is a cluster of Tory prejudices. George Will and Charles Krauthammer foremost among them, in love with the sweep and the pragmatism of history, who find Clinton too bimetal to bide. Everything about him grates on their nerve—his crying, the whining, his petulance; his declaiming way of speaking, his way dull programs, his tedium, his inattention. To them, his presence is inescapable, it is quite literally beneath their consciences. Their view through the second; has been that Clinton is too small for impressiveness; the precision would not be wasted on the likes of him. “Let him limp across the finish line. The great constitutional remedy should be reserved for weightier subjects,” Will wrote last August; Krauthammer agrees: “Driving him from office would simply make him a martyr...” He will finish out his term in an Ostial Office OI... forever dis- dained as a liar and a useless.” Will would even echo he hates Clinton, this fierce emotion seeming too much to waste on a man such as this President. For Will, “Clinton is defined by smallness,” and deserves disdain, but not hatred.

4. The Catholic School Crowd: Groups one through these tend to be rightists in theory, and therefore opposed to Bill Clinton en policy, if nothing else. But in this group, one finds Clinton haters who are centrist or Democratic, people who might like Clinton’s ideas, if he had any that went beyond self-preservation. It was William Powers in the National Journal who first dissected this group: “They vary from Roman Catholic background, most of whom have liberal to moderate Democratic leanings, yet who have noticeably not come to Mr. Clinton’s defense.” Among them he counts Chris Matthews of the San Francisco Examiner and CNBC’s bandwidth, (who used to work for the late Tip O’Neill); Jim Rutenberg of NBC News (who once worked for Cuomo and Mondale;); Coke Roberts of ABC News, (abstract of the late late

Boggs, a Democratic majority leader); and, above all, Michael Kelly, from the New Republic for anti-Clinton crusading, perhaps the most vehement critic of all.

The anger of this group focuses murders, not policy. As Powers explains, “The source of Mr. Matthews’ disgust with Mr. Clinton... has little to do with political ideology. Rather... it’s about the bad-saint values of Catholic vs. the excesses of moral relativism that he identifies with Hollywood... and Mr. Clinton. “You’re supposed to tell the truth. You’re not supposed to be perfect. You’re supposed to get a chance to do some harm when you don’t do the right thing.” There’s a ‘measure of redemption’ in this view, Mr. Matthews said. “Catholics are constantly having to examine their own behavior, beginning with the excesses of their church and their pleasures and success against the church’s moral values, and when they see someone bitterly pursuing what he wants, and really holding himself accountable for his failings, it drives them nuts.”

It drives Michael Kelly to utter discretion. “He must be impeached here or because he is a pig and a cad and a selfish brute,” Kelly wrote last year of Our Leader. “He must be impeached because he has an utter and absolute contempt for the truth, and for the law he has twice sworn to uphold.” That was for stay. He later called Clinton a crook, eating out the core of his party’s liberal heritage. And then came this “Lying corrupts, and an absolute liar corrupts absolutely, and the corruption spread by the lies of the absolutely mendacity Clinton is becoming frightening to behold.” One of the reasons he really hates Clinton is that he thinks Clinton has turned the party that led us into World War II and world leadership, that gave us the original civil rights movement, and that stood up for the interests of those without money into the defender of Larry Flynt and of perjury.

They all overlap, but each group that hates Clinton tends to hate him for one particular reason: the sex, police, the nomination; the culture warriors for breaking down standards; the Tory grandee for his total innequiveness. This Catholic group tends to hate him for his neglect of the communications he breaks, for the religion he mocks, for the degradation he brings to the secular culture of the country he desecrates The Oval Office (Monticello/): the Lincoln Bedroom (the lobbying): fall; the Lincoln Bedroom (the donors); and the Clinton National Cemetery (M. Larry Lawrence et al.). “The right is being waged today involving the second.” Matthews wrote in 1997, long before Monica surfaced. The charge, he said, is not that the Clintons “failed to make the right policies...” but that they followed the policy of not protecting the office.” Were Clinton “a true American president, he would have made a far more vigilant guardian of the country’s holy places.” Its “holy places.” “Its saloons.” In the eyes of this group, this has been our first truly bipartisan president. A view shared in part by group five.

5. The Policy People: Open the annual pages of the Washington Post during the past several years, and the chances are you will run into one or more of the purer examples of Clinton aversion to be found in the country, if not in the entire world. And not only because of the presence there of Charles Krauthammer, George Will, and Michael Kelly, but through the influence of four other people, all far less partisan, and with no knowledge of either the policy or the political side of Bill Clinton for years. These are Jim Hoagland and Fred Hiatt, who write about foreign policy, and David Broder and Robert J. Samuelson, who cover the political and/or the economic side. As baits their reputations for moderation and reason, they seem to hate Clinton for the best of all reasons: they care very deeply for round government policy, and they have come to believe him as they do not believe he will—and has—sold out the long-term interests of the world and the country for his fleeting political reasons—this he sees all issues as occasions of split.
In foreign affairs, this consists of buying off dictators so as not to make trouble, at least not while he stays in office. Hoagland cites Clinton’s "commitment to nuking through," instead of solving, the problem. Yet, an article in the "New York Times" states that the Clinton administration, while strong on rhetoric, is weak on practical, "offensive" military measures, and this lack of a solid, comprehensive plan could lead to the loss of "the Cold War." Hoagland argues that, while the "offensive" military measures are not enough, the "defensive" measures are also inadequate. He suggests that the Clinton administration should focus on building up the nation's military strength, rather than relying on "cold war" tactics.

On the domestic front, Hoagland argues that Clinton is facing a "perfect storm." He cites the "Perfect Storm" as an example of how a small event can lead to a larger crisis. He argues that the Clinton administration is not prepared for the "perfect storm," and that it is likely to be overwhelmed.

Hoagland also discusses the Clinton administration's response to the current economic downturn. He argues that the Clinton administration's policies have not been effective in stimulating the economy, and that the administration should focus on creating jobs and reducing the deficit.

In his article, Hoagland also discusses the Clinton administration's foreign policy, and the challenges it faces. He argues that the Clinton administration is facing a "perfect storm" in foreign policy, as well, and that it is not prepared for the challenges it faces.

Overall, Hoagland's article argues that the Clinton administration is facing a "perfect storm" in both foreign and domestic policy, and that it is not prepared for the challenges it faces. He suggests that the Clinton administration should focus on building up the nation's military strength, as well as creating jobs and reducing the deficit, in order to be prepared for the "perfect storm." 

---

To Summerson, this presents the "spectacle of a president actively striving to polemical public opinion against a policy that he deems best for the country..." There is no other way to describe President Clinton's behavior. He is trying to justify the ads to polemical public opinion to reach a desired policy. Rather, he is trying to influence public opinion to improve his own political standing, even if it subordinates that policy, that he claims is "the right thing to do." There was no article voted out of the House Judiciary Committee calling the president unfit for office for putting his polls numbers ahead of the national interest, but for many people who bailed his impeachment (and many who didn't), this is the worst of his many transgressions; far, far worse than a sexual misstep; worse even than provable lies. In the long view of history, this will be complained because the Clinton hadn't introduced more big government programs after health care imploded; he was especially angry at Clinton's proposal for a $1,000 tax credit to offset long-term nursing home costs. Clinton's cynical use of a 900 number, political ads, and social insurance, he complained, adding that "bogus propositions such as this do far deeper damage. They reinforce the view that government can't work." For many people, that government can't work is real. Other old ladies call Clinton a sell-out, and think he disgraces the cause. As John Patrick Digance writes in the Nation, "The president is consumed by his conflict in government's role in people's personal life, rather than reflecting 60's values, marks a historic rejection of the ethos of that generation. But some 60's veterans and New Deal Democrats cannot bring themselves to accuse their own game.

Conservatives, of course, call all of this the drive, which just goes to prove one made poor people on all sides. Cancelled by Bill Clinton, a common bi-partisan sentiment: Agreement on this point is not hard to come by, in fact, it emerges much else. 7. Though there are six or eight schools they have their separate and self defining reasons for hating Clinton, there are others on which they agree. For them, Clinton fails the great Meacham test he treats other people like dirt. "Clinton is incomprehensible," wrote Mickey Kaul six months into his presidency, and his chronic indifference to others, making crowds well hours for him while campaigning, "makes him a villain waiting for him in the White House Rose Garden," and aging Hoosier winters with hours in icy rain. Holding up traffic at LAX while he got his $200 haircut was compared to actor: "reporters know he cost it all the time." His wife yanked seven long-term employees to make room for cronies, and then got them with crones, to make herself look better. She used an usher for taking a phone call (about companies) from former First Lady Barbara Bush.

6. Joe Klein described them as "the tone and Daisy Buchanan of the baby boom political elite... carefree people... they smashed up lives, and didn't notice... too many lives and reputations have been made and broken - they have been forced to walk- the plank for trivialities, appearances, changes of mood." In times of trouble, they never hesitated to restore other others before them, to absorb the incoming fire. "How could the First Lady allow her Chief of Staff to spend $1,000,000 [now $20,000,000] in legal bills?" Klein asked, rhetorically. When Lani Guinier's nomination to a civil rights post in the decision (justified) political trouble, he not only dropped it, he dropped her - a friend, so she thought, of twenty years' standing. One does not have to belong to any political grouping to feel this it truly appalling behavior, unbecoming in anyone; disgraceful in the as-called head of a civil society, especially one who wants to be "party" to the New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd has noticed, "What is surprising... gives his hugging-bashing-sharing political style, is his absence of sentimentality when he doesn't have to. Many people found many more strange than was once thought her view of the country, he lied to the world, he lied to his aides, he lied to the press, he lied to his cabinet, he lied - ever and over - and in court. Almost worse than the lies was the manner of lying; a form of evasive that enabled him to speak, while still being
technically "true." Among many others, it was the liberal Jack Newfield who complained of "Clinton's ability to lie about the essence of some thing while seeming to tell the lawyer's kind of truth about the margins... it was a lie within the truth."

Talking about the same thing, George Will wrote of Clinton's "extraordinarily corrupting insult on the language," David Broder of "the use of language as camouflage," to make obvious things appear normal, or moral. Usually the very soul of restraint and of reason, Broder wrote last August that he had at first been repelled by the salacious details of the Starr Report, "but after watching David Kendall... smugly and condescendingly twisting words and degrading reality, I can understand what drove Starr to dump every bit of trash he had collected onto the president's head."

What a pity there is no charge called Contempt of Country to go along with the contempt of court that is now part of the permanent legacy. It is what this administration is about. What a pity too that there is no charge of general lackluster, on which the House and the Senate could vote. Many people were horrified, not merely that Clinton would mess around with a woman, but that he would fool around with a woman like that. As columnist Suzanne Fields wrote before Monica surfaced, "Bill Clinton may be our first black president, displaying a spectacular parsimony of spirit... Vulgarity and venality run through his tonic in friends as well as many of his business and political associates... why shouldn't he be in the Lincoln Bedroom to the highest bidders? What else is the Lincoln Bedroom for?" Why shouldn't he hire Little Rock's lawyer to Slave State to redecorate the White House in early Eliza Walling? Why shouldn't he arrange for a photo op on the fiftieth anniversary of D-Day, concerning stones placed on the beaches of Normandy, so that his a notorious evader of military service—could come on them by accident, and bite his lip soulfully, as he fashioned a cross on the beaches? Why shouldn't he make his best friend—and Hillary's partner—number three in the Justice Department, and then see him jailed for (embarrassment)? What other president has ever had so many friends like this? Does anyone remember John Kennedy, bored out of his guard, manfully sitting through cello recitals, because he thought it was his job to elevate the tastes of the people? Clinton gives us six-on-queens, boomimg on Lincoln's bed in a fit of trashy exuberance."

"If you inspect the guest lists over time," wrote David Broder in the Weekly Standard, you detect a shift away from literary and intellectual types toward movie stars... Not only are the big Hollywood Walk-of-Fame celebrities getting invites, so are the middle-aged figures who in days of yore would have been happy to appear on Hollywood Squares. As John Taylor wrote in 1993 after the first Clinton inaugural, "The whole circus—a reduced president nagging off Air Force One, several storks carrying the scoundrels to film rowing celebrities, obnoxious friends... conveyed the impression of ribes run amuck in the White House. It would have been hilarious if it wasn't so frightening."

"He tried the place," David Broder told Sally Quinn, speaking of this administration's tenure in the White House, and then said, in his columns, "Clinton acted—and still acts—as if he does not realize what it means to be president of the Untied States."

For this alone, everyone who honors his country should be in the end to boot Clinton. Clinton-loving is truly a labor of love.

Nearest Enemy is blah blah blah. blah blah, blah.

DO YOU FEEL SAFER TODAY THAN YOU DID 8 YEARS AGO?

In 1992, Chinese Communist intelligence agents had not been invited to the White House and given access to classified secrets.

In 1992, Communist China had no nuclear-missiles aimed at American cities.

In 1992, an American president had not squandered six previous years opposing anti-missile defenses that would protect American cities from attack.

In 1992, an American president had not solicited millions of dollars in illegal campaign funds from the agents of Communist China.

In 1992, national security controls had not been lifted at the request of large presidential donors to allow missile technologies to fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists and their client states.

In 1992, the Chinese Communist dictatorship had not stolen every weapon in America's nuclear arsenal.

In 1992...
Feeling Stalin’s Pain
by Newsom Pace

In the past decades far too many defenses of Stalin and Stalinism have appeared in the academic world. Most of these apologies, however, have been veiled by a fog of ambiguous phrases or postmodernist verbiage, allowing the apologists plausibility. In the unlikely event that someone might actually challenge this defense of the most monstrous figure of the modern era, such is not the case, however, with Theodore Von Laue’s new essay, A Perspective on History: The Soviet Union. Reconsidered, which recently appeared in The Historian (Winter 1999). Von Laue unambiguously and vigorously calls on historians to appreciate both Stalin and Stalinism.

Von Laue is not new, as might be imagined from such a communitarian fringe figure in the academic world. He is a senior historian (professor emeritus at Columbia University), who has written widely on German and Russian history. He is one of the authors of a much-used textbook, Sources of the Western Tradition, which is the journal that published his essay. Von Laue is not the journal that printed his appreciation of Stalin in a marginal publication, The Historian is the journal of Phi Alpha Theta, the national, academic honor society in history. While perhaps not as prestigious as The American Historical Review, it is a respected scholarly journal with a large circulation among history teachers and students.

Von Laue’s argument is unambiguous and his prose speaks for itself:

"But it’s [Russia’s] vast Eurasian territories, populated mainly by underdeveloped peasants and the natural resources necessary for building a modern state capable of holding its own with European countries and the United States.” (p. 384) “The liberal prescription, evidence of which has been well publicized in the West, has led to widespread vilification of his policies. But Western experience, evolved in relatively small and much more integrated countries, is inapplicable to the Soviet Union. No country—European or otherwise—has suffered as much at Russia in the First World War; Soviet leaders were fighting to save their country from utter collapse in the face of popular insurrection. Moreover, brutality has long been part of Russian life, and never more than during the Russian Civil War of 1917-1921.” (p. 385) "Regard for individual life was a necessary sacrifice in Lenin’s ambition to enhance life in the future. In Russia, necessary changes could be accomplished only by a highly centralized dictatorship mobilizing the Russian masses with the help of the semifeudal Marxist vision of human progress. In the West, individual freedom has always been anchored in powerful and ethnically nation states; under the circumstances, ideals of individual freedom would have been an invitation to disaster in the

Soviet Union.” (p. 385) "Can we then condemn a Russian patriarch, determined to surpass the influence and success of Western nations, for wanting in 1920 to spread the Soviet model and reveal to all countries the unanswerable crisis of their unanswerable future? After the collapse of the Russian empire, in short, the Leninist model offered the only rational alternative to chaos if Russian were to remain some standing in global politics.” (p. 386)

After this throat-clearing and ideological foundation-laying, Von Laue gets to the point: "Like Lenin, his successor Josef Stalin (1879-1953) dreamed of a republic of the USSR. Stalin was terrified by the dangers to his country posed by expansionists like Italy and Japan. Stalin knew that he had to succeed in transforming the anarcho-pessimists into cooperative urban-industrial citizens. Stalin forced them against the grain of tradition into a pattern of life utterly incomprehensible to most of them.” (p. 386)

"Of course, as the cold says it is not so simple, as the anarcho-pessimists were to propose for the Soviet Union. For the Soviet Union might have been slightly flawed coming out of the past, but was a "remarkable human achievement" by any other standards. "Inevitably collectivized provoked resistance, both unconscious and deliberate, and in its solitary vision and lonely life Stalin was haunted by real or imagined threats. Remembering his adversaries in the early days of Soviet rule, Stalin had reason to distrust his comrades, especially in this time of perilous change.” (pp. 386-387) "Yet Stalin’s style of leadership, although crude by Western standards, was persuasive among his disoriented peoples. The sophisticated design of Soviet totalitarianism has perhaps not been sufficiently appreciated. However brutal, it was a remarkable human achievement, despite its flaws. The Marxist ideology helped suppress the ethnic and national diversity within the Soviet Union in a common membership in a common communist future.” (p. 387) "But though he knew how to act in public role, Stalin himself retained a sense of fallibility and imperfection, remaining remarkably humble.” (p. 387)

And, of course, there is the fact, used by Stalin’s foreign friends over since the Great Helmsman’s heyday in May 1945, that much of his violence was understandable. "Stalin was a great force for good, for which he used terror as an instrument to transform traditional attitudes and to force subordination to the discipline imposed by the Communist Party—far greater than under Lenin. There is no need to go into detail on this subject as it has been highly dramatized. Suffice it to point out that Stalin has reason for fear. The experiment of recapturing in the 1930s was at its peak. In addition, external dangers were mounting; Japanese aggression in China, German rearmament under Hitler. While a terrifyingly shankstoned, restoring loyalty and discipline has been part of Bolshevik statecraft from the start, the need became especially urgent.” (p. 388) "Under the circumstances, a lower price of recapturing, as suggested by some critics, would only have encouraged anarchy and retarded the process of mobilization just as external pressures were mounting. In any case, by 1938 the terror was scaled down, and Stalin himself admitted that ‘mistakes had been made.” (p. 388)

And now, a transition from realpolitik to an appeal for historical literacy: How then are we to judge Stalin? Viewed in the full historical context, Stalin appears as a most impressive figure of the twentieth century. Born in obscurity, he rose to historic significance, a faltering human being of extraordinary qualities. He supervised the near-total transformation of peasant Russia into an urban, industrialized superpower under unprecedented adversities. Though his achievements were at the cost of enormous sacrifices of human beings and natural resources, they were on a scale commensurate with the cruelty of two world wars. With the heroic help of his people, Stalin provided his country, still highly vulnerable, with a territorial security absent in all his history.” (p. 389) "But, we, the proud source of Stalin’s model, have never performed the improved imitation under non-Western conditions in perilous critical times.” (p. 390)

Von Laue closes this essay with this admonishment: “We need…to let a loving compassion open our eyes to the alien realities in Russian and Eastern Europe and to the helplessness of the peoples, just as Goethe advised nearly 200 years ago.” (p. 391)

Loving compassion. Feeling Stalin’s pain. Von Laue may need日益的 education of scholarship, but one wonders how many of his colleagues, after finally seeing someone say the unsayable, cogently puffed their flak upon saying, and said to themselves, "Right on!"
Noble Savage Redux

Contested Eden: California Before the Gold
edited by Ramón A. Gutiérrez & Richard J. Orsi (The University of California Press, 1998, 396 pp. $22.00)

REVIEWED BY BRUCE S. THORNTON

The imagery of a lost paradise, obvious in the collection’s title, evokes not just the Noble Savage myth, but also the Biblical account in order to attribute the loss of the New World paradise not to the universal tragic consequences of migration and conquest, but rather to a bad choice on the part of human villains. In the multicultural academy, the Noble Savage takes his place in the anti-Western mythology of innocent “peoples of color” whose paradise was destroyed by the willful wickedness of Europeans.

Another dimension of the modern Noble Savage myth is his elevation to eco-critic living in balanced harmony with nature. In the current volume we are told, in the essay with the question-begging title “A World of Balance and Plenty,” that California Indians “were an integral and essential agent in the creation of a balance of land, vegetation, and animal life.” Their interventions were subtle and improving and always conserving. They were “stewards” who used nature “sustainably.” The Indians, in the words of “Serpent in the Garden,” were “indelibly fused culturally and spiritually to the land.”

The problem, of course, is that any evidence for this contact Indian behavior is scarce and third-hand, vulnerable to present concerns not just of contemporary scholars but of the original travelers and settlers who too often filtered their experience through myth. A more important weakness concerns the issue of population densities. All human communities everywhere can “live lightly” on the land as long as populations remain steady and low. Once populations increase, however, so does the pressure to maintain caloric living standards. This means among other things a more intensive exploitation of resources, sometimes leading to the total collapse of the society, as happened with the Moapa in Mexico.

The authors of these essays, however, never confront this key point about population size. Sometimes they fudge: California was “more densely populated than any area of equal size in North America,” which tells us anything. When a number is given—an estimate of 300,000 made in the Forties—we are not told how it was arrived at. But even if we accept that figure, that gives each and every Indian in pre-contact California about half a square mile of resources. Obviously, in that case, the Indians would have been able to interact with their environment in ways that left little permanent impact. The real miracle is that California today supports 30 million human beings and provides the food for countless millions more.

Throughout these essays we find academic myth, fad and fashion interspersed with useful, old-fashioned scholarship. The introduction rounds up the usual postmodern suspects such as the traditionalist straw-man who suppresses the “voices” of the oppressed, and the self-cancelling fiction that history is a mere fable justifying power and privilege. Historians and the histories they write have always been the imagined products of the period in which they were produced.” We are told, a statement that, if true, would give us no reason to believe anything we are about to read, since all the following essays depend on documentary evidence, most of which was produced by the wicked European conquerors, and thus presumably tainted by their various imperialist, colonialist, racist, ethnocentric, and sexist biases. These empty, postmodern rhetorical flourishes are so common these days that they have become the equivalent of the dedications to aristocratic patrons we find in Elizabethan poetry—conventional hyperbole that no one is expected to take seriously, but that helps pay the bills.

Likewise with another shaky idea uncritically endorsed in a few of the essays, the social construction of gender and identity, a theory skilfully presented as fact without the slightest shred of awareness that it has been subject to intense critical analysis. In “Engendering the History of Alta California” we are told—and we are not to consider these women as integrated, autonomous “subjects” independent of their environment’s power structures—an idea that is orthodoxy to the Foucauldian social constructionist. In contrast to such nonsense, many of the essays exemplify old-fashioned scholarship content to provide information supported by evidence. In its combination of empirical research and postmodern piffery this collection typifies a trend in academic publishing: most of the essays reflect traditional historical practice, and actually are quite useful, but the whole is packaged in the gaudy received wisdom of current academic fashion, complete with obligatory nods to postmodern quackery such as the social construction of identity or history as fable of power, and multi-cultural victim-melodrama like the Noble Savage echo of “color.” To be sure if this reflexive duality is a cause for concern, or whether it reassures us that despite the occasional forays into intellectual slackness, the ideal of empirical research as a search for historical truth still dominates.

Bruce S. Thornton is the author of Eros: The Myth of Ancient Greek Sexuality. His Plagues of the Mind: The New Epidemic of False Knowledge will be published this fall.
Limo Driver Fighting Aggressive Driving Conviction
by Judith Schumann Weizner

This morning, Jeffrey Djoystyk, a twenty-four-year-old Bronx resident, achieved the unhappy distinction of being the first driver convicted in Federal Traffic Court under the 2001 Federal Uniform Road Rage Amelioration Act (FURRAA). If the conviction stands, Djoystyk faces a fine of $2,500 as well as an increase in insurance rates of $3,000 per year for fourteen years and $1,500 per year thereafter. Depending on the outcome of his Standard Psychological Profiling Assessment he could also be barred for 90 years from operating any vehicle with more than 103.7 horsepower, which would effectively end his career.

Djoystyk, an airport limousine driver for the Ray-Cue Car Service, received a summons for aggressive driving on the Cross Bronx Expressway last April 1 as he drove his charcoal gray 1998 Elan Limo taxi to his first call in upper Manhattan. The ticket specified that he had attempted to forge an additional windshield wiper on the crowded highway at speeds greater than thirty miles an hour over the limit.

In court, Officer Dave Langman testified that when he stopped the Elan, Djoystyk hopped out of his car, explaining that he was late for a call for the first time in his career. Langman said that while the limo driver's personality had not struck him as particularly aggressive, the combination of speed, weaving in and out and attempting to squeeze between two slow-moving cars was the textbook definition of aggressive driving under the new law, and he had no choice but to issue the summons along with a Class F warranty to control his aggressive impulses.

Djoystyk's attorney, Nick Impetuzo, argued that the aggressive driving charge was unwarbled, as his client's speeding was not motivated by any aggressive feelings, but, on the contrary, from Djoystyk's aggressiveness to pick up a passenger who was supposed to be a Sharon Stone look-alike.

A check into Djoystyk's employment record revealed no complaints about either his professionalism or his personality. Tony Zena, owner of the Ray-Cue Car Service, testified that Djoystyk was a consistently cheerful employee with many repeat customers. Likewise, Djoystyk's therapist testified that his patient could only be characterized as happy, bumbling on many.

Lacking any evidence of aggressiveness, Judge Robert Dach reduced the charge to exorbitant driving, leaving Djoystyk off with a $700 fine and a warning to control his high spirits while he was behind the wheel. Djoystyk's good luck made the first, however, and when his ex-girlfriend, Vivian Lebbeh, heard that the charges had been downgraded, she was outraged, and immediately filed an affidavit describing the serious argument the pair had had that morning, which ultimately resulted in their breaking up. In her affidavit, she stated that Djoystyk had smashed both the apartment door and the car door before speeding away.

With her affidavit on record, Judge Dach dismissed the aggressive driving charge and ordered Ray-Cue to place Djoystyk on suspension pending the outcome of a second hearing.

Jeffrey Djoystyk

At this proceeding, Lebbeh stuck to her allegations, adding that the argument had actually begun the night before, and that Djoystyk had raised his voice twice before suggesting that they call a halt and resume their discussion in the morning.

Djoystyk admitted having raised his voice, but explained that he was upset, as he was a person in whom aggressive feelings built up slowly. He testified that he had suggested the time out because he figured that if they continued the argument in the morning, there would not be enough time for him to become aggressive before leaving for work, so no matter how intense the discussion might become.

Pointing out the remarkable degree of self-awareness exhibited by his client in attempting to minimize the possibility of developing aggressive feelings that might become the cause of dangerous driving, Impetuzo moved to have this charge upstaged from aggressive to exorbitant driving, which would reflect more clearly the true state of his client's mind.

Judge Dach denied the motion, noting that the true state of Djoystyk's mind was a matter of acute disagreement, and declared a recess during which investigators were ordered to locate additional witnesses who might shed some light on Djoystyk's temperament.

The hearing resumed a month later with testimony from Djoystyk's ex-girlfriend's ex-boyfriend regarding an argument he had witnessed between Djoystyk and her ex-husband, who had been the home plates umpire at a softball game at which Djoystyk had been called out on strikes. She swore that Djoystyk had yelled at her ex-husband after the call, even though he had been in good humor only a moment before. She remarked that she had been surprised to see his mood change so quickly, but added: questioning, she admitted that while she had certainly been taken aback at the resource of his reaction, she had not really been amused, as players often yell at her ex-husband during softball games.

The witness' ex-husband and several members of the opposing team testified that even now they thought Djoystyk's reaction to have been extreme, although Djoystyk's teammates insisted that his reaction had been mild, concluding that the fact that he had called out the umpire in the first place was a clear case of head-on collision.

Within a half hour order had been restored and a shaken Judge Dach, having ascertained that there was no further testimony to be heard, announced his decision to the assembled.

"With a preponderance of the testimony, in the case of Djoystyk's contention that he is slow to anger, I have no choice but to affirm the acquirers of the original charge. I also take note of the fact that Mr. Djoystyk has been a former striker, so the court cannot accept his contention that he put aside his aggressive feelings on the night before the morning in question in order to lessen the possibility that he might reach an unacceptable level of aggressiveness prior to getting behind the wheel.

"On the contrary, it is the court's belief that Mr. Djoystyk knowingly entered his car that morning in a state of heightened aggressiveness. He should consider himself very lucky that the charge cannot be upgraded to hostile driving, as his actions fortunately caused no accidents or injuries. He is guilty as charged. Additionally, since he twice attempted to alight the court as to his state of mind, I instruct the district attorney to charge him with perjury.

"Late in the courtroom ante, a stunned Djoystyk stood by as his lawyer responded to questions about the new charge. "The aggressive driving charge is a homicide," Impetuzo told reporters, "but it has to do with my client's personality, so I think we can appeal under the Americans With Disabilities Act. Perjury is a different matter. He's not a compulsive liar, so the ADA won't cover it, but we may be able to keep it if the court can be made to see that it was basically about sex."
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