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Editorial

The Constitution and the Court

Whenever a vacancy occurs on the Supreme Court and the President nominates a replacement, or an issue surfaces which is believed to lie within the jurisdiction of this court (like abortion), then the word constitution and its derivative unconstitutional appear regularly in the press. Constitution is a word of many uses, originating with the notion of making something (like a house). But the chief legal meaning is either a set of laws, precedents, customs for governing a country (like England) or a written document with the same purpose (as in the United States).

This simple document, containing some 6000 words, that can be read in less than half an hour (including amendments), is the fundamental law of this country, a concept that signifies that no law that conflicts with any of its provisions or even any of its ideas is valid (or constitutional). Of course a document written 203 years ago is bound to be slightly out of phase with modern activities and conditions. For instance, does freedom of the press cover radio and television, unknown to the Framers (as the signers of the Constitution are called)? The interpreters of the Constitution, the justices of the Supreme Court have now agreed that all media are included, although film was once specifically excluded.

That is one kind of interpretive task. Another comes about when two provisions, especially rights of the individual and rights of society, conflict (for instance, an individual’s right to a fair trial, or due process, and the press’s right to publish the news of the trial, when the former usually prevails). These conflicts are inevitable because the Constitution tries to protect two warring entities: the individual, who desires freedom, and society, which must try to limit it, in the interest of the social contract that defines civilized society.

Because the Constitution is more often cited than read, many false beliefs about it
can be found among the citizenry. It is fondly believed that taxation without representation is unconstitutional. But in fact that phrase is no more than a slogan used by the colonists protesting against the mother country. It appears nowhere in the Constitution and cannot be derived from any of its provisions. Similarly, the right to privacy is not a constitutional right, though it may derive from other unmentioned (or 'unenumerated') rights, as provided for in the ninth amendment.

Moreover, the Constitution was written in the language of the eighteenth century, whose diction has shifted somewhat over the years. The disagreement over the second amendment, with its reference to "a well-regulated militia" and "the right of the people to keep and bear arms," has created intense perplexity among those who wonder whether the Framers would have contemplated the right of everyone to own a machine-gun, as some enthusiasts claim.

Another semantic difficulty arises with the word mereceau, which today refers to a crime of a certain category, less grievous than a felony. But the Constitution in the section on impeachment (Article II, Section 4) states that the President and other Federal officers may be removed if convicted (as well as impeached) of "treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors." The word here must be understood in the sense it inherits from its French origin (maneau, to behave), literally misbehavior, perceived as in the same category as the other high crimes, for example, obstruction of justice, abuse of power, and the other charges leading to the impeachment of Richard Nixon. Impeachment itself also comes from French (empecher, to prevent or hinder) and is preliminary to conviction, not equivalent to it, as some believe.

Like other Republican presidents of recent times, Nixon believed in strict construction, the idea that the interpreters of the Constitution must limit themselves to the actual words of the text or to the intentions of the Framers. Apart from the impossibility of determining what might have been in their minds in 1787, this principle overlooks the possibility that the Framers were wise enough to realize that times change and that only the broadest language would allow the necessary flexibility for taking account of this. Conservatives abhor judicial activism, their name for what the Framers might be thinking if they were alive today. The contrast between strict construction and judicial activism misrepresents the situation. The job of the justices is really quite other, the result of the necessity they are under to deal with an unyielding ancient text.

As a result, the justices are both literary critics, interpreting an abstruse text, and high priests determining the meaning of a scripture that has no precise relevance to some modern situations. As Judge Souter, the newest justice, noted in his nomination hearings, the Supreme Court must combine a respect for precedent, tradition, and a seeking of underlying principle with practical good sense in reaching its decisions. He did not say, but it is clear that he understands, that the Supreme Court does not merely interpret—it makes law every time it reaches a decision, thus usurping to some extent the legislative function. But this it cannot help and no amount of conservative bravado can mask this fact. What counts is that the people making these decisions not be driven by ideological fervor but that they be capable of humane intelligent thinking reminiscent of the best produced by the Framers.

The Constitution is a valuable document, but it is not a bible: it does not contain all the answers. It is a guide to the kind of society that the Founding Fathers had in mind and where it has gaps these must be filled, either by the Congress or the Supreme Court. The quality of those entitled to conduct that inquiry will determine to some extent the laws of the future and the resulting society.
The Historicity of the Holocaust and the Historical Jesus

Lee W. Gibbs

The Holocaust is a watershed event in human history in the sense that it has disrupted some of the most cherished ways of thinking in Western civilization.¹ Death camp survivor Elie Wiesel gave poignant expression to the subversion of cultural ideals when he wrote: "At Auschwitz, not only man died, but also the idea of man... It was its own heart the world incinerated at Auschwitz."² Meanwhile, at the religious level, post-Holocaust believers and theologians have been forced to rethink conventional Jewish and Christian views about the nature (and even the existence) of God, striving to comprehend how God as traditionally conceived could have remained "silent" or "absent" while such unprecedented evil was taking place.³

Given the cultural and religious significance of the Holocaust, along with the increasingly overwhelming historical evidence that has now been compiled to document its authenticity,⁴ it is shocking to discover that there is a small if dedicated group of individuals calling themselves "revisionists" who are not only playing down the guilt and responsibility of Nazi leaders for the Holocaust, but who are even arguing that the Holocaust itself never happened, or at least not on the massive scale claimed by those whom they designate as "traditional" (and mostly Jewish) historians.

The questioning of the historicity of the Holocaust by such persons, the majority of whom unhesitatingly identify themselves as "Christian" and advocates of a "Christian" European and/or American civilization, raises some important questions concerning the critical presuppositions and methods employed by historians in the exercise of their craft, the nature and reliability of historical evidence, the identity of the "revisionists" and how they deal with historical evidence traditionally marshalled to document the authenticity of the Holocaust, and the character and credibility of the sources which they so readily and unquestioningly accept as the basis...
for their knowledge of and faith in Jesus, an individual who lived almost two thousand years ago and who, in an age very different from our own, was believed by his followers to have worked miracles and to have been raised from the dead.

I.

History is the study of the human past. The past survives only in events that have been remembered and in the testimony of records and relics. The past can never be restored as it originally happened in its complex and intricate entirety. Furthermore, twentieth-century historiography has become aware of the part played by the historian's own perspective in the study of history. Every historian is now known to be inevitably influenced by her or his cultural context and by the fundamental assumptions and attitudes of the time. Personal beliefs and values shaped by such cultural factors as language, family, religion, culture, and class are now seen to determine choice of subject matter and degree of personal involvement in the reconstruction of particular past events.

Professionally and morally responsible historians, becoming as fully aware as possible of their own predispositions and values, strive to maintain their intellectual integrity by disciplining these subjective factors through self-imposed critical historical methods and by a firm commitment to reconstructing past events as fairly and accurately as they are able. Writing critical history requires a rigorous reading of documents, fair selections of representative data, and honest questioning and evaluation of all the available sources.

Nevertheless, current awareness of the subjective factors which always influence even the most objective historical judgments, entails the further recognition and acceptance of the fact that history must be constantly revised and rewritten, not just because new evidence comes to light, but because every age and every historian looks upon the past from a different historical and personal point of view. Therefore, every historical subject is and must be continually open to reinterpretation or "revision" as each new generation of scholars rewrites the history of the past in the light of its own perspective and perception of values.

The term "revisionism," however, is now used more specifically to designate dissident positions that have recently been taken by historians of the political "left" or "right" against more "traditional" interpretations of several different topics, including the placing of blame for the outbreak of the Cold War and the Vietnam War on the one side, or for World Wars I and II on the other. World War I revisionists, for example, have argued that Germany was not as much to blame as Great Britain for the outbreak of hostilities, while World War II revisionists have identified the unjust conditions of the Treaty of
Versailles along with vindictive British and American foreign policy as the major causes for the outbreak of hostilities.  

Some of these right-wing World War II revisionists have proceeded to challenge the prevailing historiography concerning the mass extermination of Jews by the Nazis, charging that the atrocity stories about firing squads and gas chambers are "myths" invented to discredit the German people. The most noteworthy among these revisionist historians who have written about what they allege to be "the hoax of the Holocaust" include Paul Rassinier, David L. Hoggan, Austin J. App, Richard E. Verrall (a.k.a. Richard E. Harwood), Thies Christophersen, and Arthur R. Butz, an Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. These authors are all, from the perspective of "traditional" historians of the Holocaust, "overtly anti-Semitic," "Nazi apologists," or outright "Neo-Nazis." The most important works by these authors have, in fact, been printed by such publishers as the Noontide Press (a subsidiary of Liberty Lobby, one of the best-financed anti-Semitic organizations in the United States [see afterpiece]), Revisionist Press (founded by a splinter group of the pro-Nazi German-American National Congress), and the Institute for Historical Review in Torrance, California, American counterpart of the Historical Review Press in Surrey, England (closely affiliated with one of the leading English racist groups known as the National Front).

The anti-Holocaust works of the revisionists are marked by recurring themes and repetitive arguments; the political overtones of their challenge to the historical occurrence (or at least the gigantic scale) of the Holocaust quickly emerge as an attempt to undermine the modern nation-state of Israel and all external support for it. In striving to achieve this goal, revisionist historians rehabilitate Nazi ideological principles concerning the threat to "Christian civilization" by Zionism on the one side, and by Jewish-inspired and Jewish-led Communist Bolshevism on the other.

According to the revisionists, Israeli leaders and supporters are said to have created and then utilized the "profitable hoax" of the Holocaust to promote Jewish solidarity at the expense of all other peoples (especially the Palestinian Arabs), and to support the economy and "aggressions" of Israel by "politically blackmailing" West Germany into paying monetary restitution for "alleged unspeakable criminal acts" committed by the Germans against the Jews during World War II.

Having to their satisfaction established the thesis that the systematic extermination of Jews by the Germans in World War II is a propaganda hoax contrived and perpetuated by Zionists and supporters of Israel, the revisionists then proceed to discredit the "myth" by systematically undermining the
documentary and statistical evidence cited by traditional historians, pointing out along the way to what they argue would be "the incredible logistics" for perpetrating mass murder on so colossal a scale. In order to achieve these ends, revisionists have to suppress some of the sources, distort or misread others, and invent or forge still others of their own.

II.

The primary sources which constitute the raw material for historically documenting the Holocaust, and which surpass in quantity and comprehensiveness the records of any other historical event, may be classified into the two broad categories of official records (state papers, government archives, diplomatic reports, institutional files, memoranda, and minutes, including the transcripts of the Wannsee Conference which took place in Berlin on January 20, 1942, and where the Endlösung or "Final Solution" of the Jewish problem was decided on) and private papers (memoirs, diaries, letters, and eyewitness accounts). Although none of these sources can be simply accepted at face value and have to be carefully examined by the critical historian, they are all marked by a contemporaneity that guarantees immediacy by virtue of the writers' direct association with the historic events and minimizes distortions that arise with the passing of time.

Most Jewish records and personal accounts that were buried in and later exhumed from Polish soil are now part of the collections of the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, the central repository in Poland of Holocaust archives. Moreover, at the close of the war, Jewish historical committees were formed in many of the displaced persons' camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy to gather and preserve the thousands of survivor accounts that were dictated or written. When the camps were disbanded, most of these collections were transferred to the Yad Vashem, the Israeli Holocaust Memorial in Jerusalem. The Yivo Institute in New York City, too, has over two thousand such survivor accounts. Video and cinematographic records of survivors' recollections are still being taped, catalogued, indexed, edited, and transcribed in video archives at Yale University, UCLA, and Gratz College in Philadelphia, among other repositories.

Since the greatest bulk of historical evidence for the Holocaust was assembled for and utilized in the war crimes trials at Nuremberg and elsewhere, the revisionists have from the outset attacked both the legality and the morality of these trials. Citing Soviet war atrocities and American mistreatment of Japanese during World War II, they claim that all of the most damaging documentary evidence from the German side concerning the Holocaust was either fraudulent fabrication or extracted by torture and/or brainwashing.
On these grounds, revisionists reject out of hand any confession or eyewitness testimony which derives from Russian-Communist Poland, including the memoirs of Rudolf Höss, the SS Commandant at Auschwitz, and of Milos Nyiszli, the chief physician of the camp crematoria, along with the damning deposition of Kurt Gerstein, the SS officer who ordered and delivered the large quantities of Zyklon B for the death camps at Belzec and Treblinka, and the testimony and confession given by Adolf Eichmann during his 1961 war crimes trial in Jerusalem.

Similarly, revisionists discredit all Jewish eyewitness testimony recorded in diaries and survivor accounts as exaggerated propagandist "atrocities stories," including Anne Frank's *Diary of a Young Girl* (1952), which is peremptorily dismissed as "part of the fabrication of a propaganda hoax," the two best known of the literally thousands of survivor accounts that have been written, namely, Primo Levi's *Survival in Auschwitz: The Nazi Assault on Humanity* (1958), and Elie Wiesel's *Night* (1982); and what has been described as "the most extraordinary archive ever created," namely, the eyewitness testimonies written down and buried at Auschwitz by members of the Sonderkommando, that is, by a work squad of Jewish prisoners whom the Germans had temporarily spared from the gas chambers so that they could remove the dead from the gas chambers and cremate them.

Revisionists repeatedly argue that there is absolutely no direct documentary evidence that verifies a systematic German program to exterminate the Jews, and that there is not a single direct eyewitness testimony for massive shooting or gas-chamber executions. Due to the deadly efficiency of the Nazi camps, even traditional Jewish historians of the Holocaust have been forced to admit the scarcity of direct eyewitness accounts by Jews who actually experienced and witnessed the workings of death and destruction. Lucy S. Dawidowicz, for example, has written:

> The only witnesses to the death agony of the Jews in gas chambers were German observers who watched through a peep-hole—either technicians checking on the speed and effectiveness of the poison gases or visiting dignitaries. Aside from the technical description by Rudolf Höss, commandant at Auschwitz, only one testimony has survived of the final Jewish ordeal. It was written by Kurt Gerstein (1905-1945), ... who committed suicide while under arrest in a French military prison as a war criminal.

In light of this undeniable scarcity of direct eyewitness testimony by death camp survivors, revisionists have continued to maintain their claim that any and all evidence that exists or has been used to document a systematic plan on the part of the Nazis to exterminate the Jews has been contrived, forged, or extracted under torture. It is curious that revisionists are quite willing to accept the authority of any and all war crimes
trial documents or affidavits that "attest that the German war camps were well administered" and that "humane conditions generally prevailed."

According to revisionist interpretation, the German concentration camps were primarily coerced labor camps that were administered to expedite the German war effort. The large numbers of gas ovens (there were forty-six by the end of the war at Auschwitz alone) were, according to these historians, crematoria that were built for disposing of the bodies of prisoners who regularly died from natural causes that included overwork, malnutrition (especially toward the end of the war when rations were understandably scarce), and from the typhus epidemics that occasionally ravaged the camps.

The so-called gas chambers were, say the revisionists, what the Germans claimed them to be, namely, showers where the prisoners bathed and where they and their clothing were fumigated. The large quantities of Zyklon B that were ordered for the camps were for the use intended by the manufacturers, that is, to "delouse" the prisoners and to kill vermin. Photographs of piles of emaciated corpses lying in front of crematoria are either contrived atrocity propaganda or, when authentic, pictures of prisoners who have been racked by disease and who have died from natural causes.

The German camps are also described by revisionists as "transit camps," that is, as an essential part of the Nazi program for evacuating and resettling Jews and other political undesirables. When the revisionists acknowledge the occurrence of what they sometimes refer to as "the mythical Conference" that was "supposed" to have taken place in Berlin Am Grossen Wannsee, the "final solution" (Endlösung) of the Jewish problem is interpreted as having meant for SS Major-General Reinhard Heydrich and other leaders of the Third Reich, "the forced deportation and relocation of the Jews from Germany and Nazi-occupied countries," not extermination. The Nazis first intended to resettle the Jews on the French island of Madagascar, and later, when that proved unfeasible, in Palestine. After the German invasion of Russia in 1941, however, the "final solution" specifically referred to the massive resettlement of these Jews in the East.

The revisionists argue that there is no adequate basis for determining or even estimating the number of Jews who lived in Germany or German-occupied countries before or after World War II. Pointing out that many fled to Russia, to Palestine, to other European countries, and to the United States, they claim that traditional historians of the Holocaust have greatly exaggerated the number of Jews in Europe before 1939 and then incredibly reduced the number that remained alive after 1945.

They correlate their argument from statistics with logistical considerations which, they argue, "now prove that it
would have been entirely impossible for the Germans to have exterminated six million Jews, even if they had decided from the first to do so, and of which policy there is no proof whatsoever. Such logistical arguments deal with the number and size of the so-called "gas chambers," the chemical characteristics of Zyklon B as a killing agent, the number and efficiency of the gas crematoria, and the feasibility and efficiency of burning or burying huge numbers of corpses in large trenches.

In short, in the rewriting of history from this revisionist perspective, there were no gas chambers and there was no Holocaust. Furthermore, almost all of the European Jews who had supposedly been victimized in this fictitious event survived, and many are still alive today.

The professionally indefensible and morally reprehensible methodological tactics employed by revisionist historians with regard to this relatively recent event and the overwhelming body of primary source material that bears witness to its authenticity raise some revealing corollary questions about how they treat the historical evidence concerning the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth who, as the founder of Christianity as a major world religion, is also the source of that "Christian European and/or American culture" which they are so zealous to defend. In general, they are thoroughly uncritical in this regard and simply accept on faith the veracity and credibility of all the ancient texts, especially those incorporated in the early Christian writings known as the New Testament—as bearing fully adequate testimony to the historical existence and mighty deeds of Jesus.

Any assessment of the way revisionist historians of the Holocaust deal with the documentary evidence concerning the life and teachings of the historical Jesus must first, however, come to grips with the nature and viability of the sources themselves which survive and must necessarily be utilized in any historical attempt to reconstruct the past.

III.

The archaeological evidence for the study of Jesus and of early Christianity is sparse, so the major sources of information are literary documents. Just as contemporary revisionists deny the happening of the Holocaust, so there have been some scholars who have denied the very existence of Jesus on the basis of lack of external evidence and the uncertainty or mythical character of the sources which do exist.16 Although the four Gospels gathered at the beginning of the Christian New Testament are the primary sources which provide most of our knowledge of the historical Jesus, there are a few non-Christian references which exist. This external evidence remains very limited, however, for it speaks more of the movement founded by Jesus than of Jesus himself.17
There are, for example, three allusions to Jesus in the works of ancient Roman writers: in a report of Pliny, governor of Bithynia in Asia Minor, to Emperor Trajan (c. 112 C.E.); in the *Annals* of Tacitus (c. 115 C.E.); and in the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars* by Suetonius, a contemporary of Pliny and Tacitus. These references in pagan literature (almost a century after his death) do not provide any information beyond what is known about Jesus from Christian writings; they do, however, show that non-Christian historical writers had no cause to doubt that Jesus existed, and that they considered his death and continuing influence significant enough to merit a few brief remarks.

The allusions to Jesus in ancient Jewish literature are limited to the *Antiquities* of Josephus (c. 93 C.E.) and the *Talmud*. Of the several references in various editions of Josephus, only one is now regarded by scholars as genuine: “Ananias called the High Council together, convicted in its presence James, the brother of Jesus, who was called the Christ, and some others... and had them stoned.” Like the statements by the Romans, this passage adds nothing to what is known about the historical Jesus from Christian sources.

The few remaining references made by rabbis in the first two centuries of the Common Era and later included in the *Talmud* are of a polemical and derogatory nature, and are further obscured because Jesus is never mentioned by name. Implying that Jesus was an illegitimate child who in his later life practiced magic, he is accused of leading the people astray, of mocking the officially sanctioned interpreters of the Law while falsely maintaining that he neither added to nor took away from the Law of Moses, and of justifiably being condemned as a heretic who was sentenced to be stoned (the Jewish method of capital punishment) but was in fact killed by “hanging” (the Roman method of execution by “hanging” upon a cross).  

The actual references to the historical Jesus in this Talmudic commentary on the Law are of very limited importance, but they do provide abundant and valuable information about the times and the cultural environment in which Jesus lived. The same may be said about the Dead Sea Scrolls preserved by the Jewish Essene community at Qumran and discovered in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Although scholars have long recognized that there are similarities in the organization, practices, and beliefs of the Essenes and the early Christian community, there is no direct historical evidence that Jesus himself was ever an Essene or that his followers were directly influenced by Essene views in interpreting the person and mission of Jesus.

In short, it must be concluded that the Jewish sources, like those of pagan antiquity, yield minimal information about the historical Jesus. They do, however, collectively convey...
independently of Christian tradition that someone known as Jesus lived, had some kind of public ministry, was executed, and continued to attract disciples even after his death.

And finally, before turning to the major sources for reconstructing what can be known about the historical Jesus, some evaluation must also be made concerning the so-called "New Testament Apocrypha." Literally, the word "apocrypha" means writings which are kept secret and not made accessible to the public; more generally, however, the word is used in a derogatory sense, referring to writings which do not correspond to the "canon" or "rule" of the early Christian church, and were therefore rejected from the official collection of documents known as the New Testament. Granted that the decision not to incorporate these writings into the New Testament reflects the early church's perspective of what was "genuine and valuable" over against what was "valueless and heretical," modern critical historians have concluded, with the exception of a few sayings mostly attributed to the resurrected Jesus, that these documents bear the stamp of a later period and yield no reliable information about the history of Jesus or his proclamation.19

Recognizing that the documents incorporated in the Christian New Testament are biased and incomplete, the critical historian must ultimately turn to them alone as the major sources for what can be known today concerning Jesus.

IV.

The first thing that must be noted in assessing the value of the New Testament documents is that there are no originals, nor is there any certainty concerning the dates when any of them were written. Most or all of the individual books were probably first written on papyrus and used until worn out and discarded. The earliest surviving papyrus fragment is from the Gospel of John and has been dated between 125 and 150 C.E., the closest the historian can come to the actual composition of a New Testament book—a gap of at least thirty to forty years after the writing of the original.

A second matter of major importance is that, even though Jesus and his immediate disciples spoke Aramaic (a Semitic language related to Hebrew somewhat as modern Italian is related to Latin), the documents included in the New Testament were written in Greek (not the classical Greek of Homer or Aristotle but the simplified koiné or common Greek which had by the first century become the lingua franca of the entire Roman empire). Hence, quite apart from the manifold problems encountered by anyone who translates material from one language into another, literary scholars have been engaged in a decades-long debate over whether some of the New Testament books (particularly the Gospels) were written originally in Aramaic and later translated into Greek, or were
originally composed in Greek but incorporated Aramaic source material, some of which was handed down orally and some of which may have been written.²⁰

The witness of the New Testament writings to the life and teaching of Jesus is further complicated by the fact that the oldest surviving copies of the entire twenty-seven books, made on vellum or animal skin and found in codices, are all imperfect. The most authoritative of these codices date only from the fourth and fifth centuries C.E. and, when compared with each other, are found to contain substantial textual variants as well as numerous scribal errors and "corrections."²¹

One particularly dramatic and noteworthy example of such variation among ancient textual traditions concerns the ending of the Gospel of Mark. Some of the most authoritative texts break off at verse 8 of chapter 16, thereby leaving the Evangelist’s account "incomplete" in the sense that there is no account of Jesus’ resurrection or of his appearances afterward to his disciples. Both a shorter and especially a longer ending (Mark 16:9-20) which are found in a few of the other ancient texts (see the final note in the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament), and which have been traditionally handed down by Christian scribes as the authentic conclusion to the Gospel, are now judged to be later second-century attempts to "complete" the text in accordance with the endings of the other three Gospel accounts. This textual variance has precipitated a heated scholarly debate that remains unresolved (and probably irresolvable) as to whether the Gospel of Mark actually ended at 16:8, or whether the original ending was lost soon after its composition, thereby implying that the Gospel has survived only in a mutilated form.

Moreover, even though the four books known as "Gospels" were bound first in the oldest copies of the New Testament, they were not the first documents to be written. All of the authentic letters of Paul (dated between 48-62 C.E.) are older than the first of the Gospels to be written. Paul, however, has little to say about the historical Jesus, and does not add anything that goes beyond what the later writers of the Gospels were to include. Paul refers to Jesus as born of a woman, standing in the lineage of David, having brothers (among whom he names James) and disciples (among whom he names Peter and John), living under the Jewish law, celebrating a last meal with his disciples before dying by crucifixion, and being buried. Paul also bears witness to the belief of the early Christians that Jesus was raised from the dead and that he appeared several times to his most intimate band of disciples before ascending into heaven.

The fact remains that the four Gospels in the Christian New Testament remain the chief sources for the historical knowledge of Jesus. These documents, as all recent critical historians have recognized, were written down at least a
generation (forty to seventy years) after the death of Jesus, and were never intended to be modern biographies that accurately chronicle the events of Jesus’ life. They are rather products of the early church’s claim that Jesus is the long-awaited Messiah who has come to bring in the Kingdom of God; they are written to bring about the conversion of non-believers and for the edification of the faithful.

Moreover, even the most superficial reading of the Gospels brings to light the fundamental difference between Matthew, Mark, and Luke on the one hand and John on the other. The Gospel of John, the last to be written, originated around the end of the first century, while the so-called “synoptic” Gospels were written down in their present form sometime between 70 and 85. There are historical discrepancies between the Johannine and the synoptic accounts of the ministry of Jesus, and especially in the accounts of the passion of Jesus that climaxes in his crucifixion. It is not possible to harmonize all of their conflicting statements, and controversy continues among New Testament scholars as to which of the accounts is to be preferred about any given event.

Twentieth-century scholarship has also demonstrated that the structure and the content of each of the Gospel narratives reflect the particular theological interests and perspective of its author. The Gospel of John, for example, has taken over a collection of miracle stories, to each of which the author attached long “speeches” or meditations of Jesus in which the meaning of these mighty works is elaborated: new birth, the bread and water of heaven, the true worship of God, eternal life, the light of the world. The writer of Mark has arranged his materials around the theme of “the Messianic secret,” in which Jesus reinterprets his Messianic mission in non-political terms of vicarious suffering and death, and not even his disciples fully discern during Jesus’ lifetime that he is the Messiah who has come to bring in the Kingdom of God. The author of Matthew, a Jewish Christian writing for Jewish Christians, presents Jesus as a new Moses, interpreting and reinterpreting the Jewish Law with authority, and proving Jesus to be the Messiah with prophetic texts from the Hebrew Bible. And Luke, a Gentile Christian writing for Gentiles, places Jesus’ life with greater precision within the context of major events in world history and focuses upon the time of the Christian church as an essential part of the ongoing history of God’s salvation of his people.

A comparison of the peculiarities and the overall structures of the four Gospels compels admission that the historian is simply in no position to reconstruct with any precision the sequence of events in the life of Jesus. Even the Gospel of Mark, the oldest of these documents, must be judged to be of questionable value if judged from a strictly historical point of view. 22
In one of the most important books on this subject published in the twentieth century, Albert Schweitzer in 1906 brought an end to what is now referred to as "the old quest of the historical Jesus," that is, to any hopeful attempt on the part of historians to reconstruct an authentic portrait of Jesus or his teaching which is relevant to people living in a later time. In Schweitzer's influential view, Jesus was interpreted as a first-century Jew who fully shared the eschatological beliefs of many of his contemporaries concerning the present drawing to a close of the old age and the imminent coming of the Son of Man to bring in the Kingdom of God, when the dead would be raised and judged with the living. Schweitzer once summarized his own interpretation of Jesus in the following words:

In the knowledge that he is the coming son of man, Jesus lays hold of the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and he throws himself upon it. Then it does turn and crushes him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, he has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of the one immeasurably great man who was strong enough to think of himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to his purpose, is hanging upon it still. That is his victory and his reign.

Schweitzer's evaluation makes clear the difficulties encountered by any modern historian who attempts to understand or appreciate the ancient world view held by Jesus and his early followers in first-century Palestine, or who desires to make Jesus intelligible and relevant to his or her contemporaries. Moreover, the paucity of historical evidence and the conflicts in testimony provide a basis for doubt about the reality of Jesus, whether he was one person or several by the same name. The testimony of the disciples and the gospel writers is tainted by their obvious interest in supporting the claims of divinity and forwarding the aims of the early church. The unquestioned evidence is sparse and the interest of the parties in making the most of it is unquestionable. Any skeptic could easily demonstrate the unbelievability of the entire structure.

Revisionist historians who dismiss or minimize the historicity of the Holocaust criticize and attempt to undermine the authenticity of an overwhelming body of diverse source material which includes original documents: eyewitness testimony, personal confessions, photographs, and the remnants of the camps themselves—all of which are less than fifty years old and reflect the immediacy of direct involvement in the events which were transpiring. Yet these revisionists accept without question the bits and oddments of the New Testament story, the surviving documentary evidence concerning the life, words, and public ministry of an individual who lived almost 2,000 years ago. In this case, no original documents—in
the sense that they were written by the authors' own hands—are available; the most authoritative sources that do exist are far from being objective and depend upon an earlier oral tradition which allowed the mixing of authentic material with later secondary accretions. Still, to a believer, the weight of historical evidence indicates that Jesus was a real historical human being of Jewish descent who existed within a certain geographical space at a particular time.24

The moral of this comparison of accounts of two separate sets of events is that all reconstruction of history is subjective, dependent not only on the factual evidence but on the historian's world-view and will to believe. Those who wish to rehabilitate the moral reputation of Nazi Germany and to continue their belief in Jewish duplicity will ignore all evidence in the pursuit of their ignoble purpose. And those to whom the Christian story is a basic tenet of belief will hold firm to it regardless of its tenuous historical basis. In evaluating any history, therefore, we must always take into account the faith of the historian. 0

Notes

1Although there are paradigmatic and universal implications of the "Holocaust" (Hebrew sho'ah, a sacrifice offered up to God that is wholly burnt by fire), it remains specifically a Jewish tragedy and sorrow. The number of non-Jewish victims murdered by the Nazis (including Russian prisoners of war, political opponents and resisters, homosexuals and others defined as "asocial," Gypsies, slave laborers kept under incredibly inhumane conditions, and countless victims of mass reprisals and indiscriminate terror aimed at subduing the civilian populations of occupied territories) was almost equal to that of the Jews. Yet none of these other victims were so zealously singled out for total destruction or pursued so relentlessly by the Nazis throughout the whole of Europe as were the Jews.


4The study of the Holocaust is an interdisciplinary field that deals with an international literature written in many languages. Some grasp of the vast range and complexity of this literature may be attained by perusing the some 9,014 entries in Abraham J. Edelheit and Herschel Edelheit, Bibliography on Holocaust Literature (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), and Martin H. Sable, Holocaust Studies: A Directory and Bibliography of Bibliographies (Greenwood, Fla.: Penkevill Publishing Co., 1987).


6See Lucy S. Dawidowicz, The Holocaust and the Historians (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981). For a still useful description of the historian's task and procedures, see also Marc Bloch, The Historian's Craft, trans. Peter Putnam (New York: Vintage, 1953). Bloch was Professor of Medieval History at the University of Strasbourg and of Economic History at the University of Paris before becoming active in the French Resistance; he was captured, tortured, and executed by the Germans in 1942.

7World War I revisionism was launched late in the 1920s with Sidney B. Fay's The Origins of the World War. The most responsible revisionist work on World


On the Jewish records buried in and later exhumed from Polish soil, see Dawidowicz, *A Holocaust Reader*, p. 8.


best-selling The Passover Plot: New Light on the History of Jesus (New York: Ban-
tam, 1967) is more journalistic than scholarly in its approach.

A large number of these apocryphal materials were discovered at Nag Ham-
madi in Upper Egypt in 1945-46. The texts may be found in Edgar Hennecke,
(Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963). See also Robert M. Grant with David Noel
Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus According to the Gospel of Thomas (London:
Fontana Books, 1960); R.M. Wilson, ed. and trans., The Gospel of Philip (New York:
Harper & Row, 1962); and Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus (New York: 

See, for example, Charles C. Torrey, Our Translated Gospels (New York: Har-
pot & Brothers, 1936).

On the nature and problems of New Testament textual criticism, see H.G.G. 
Herklotz, How Our Bible Came to Us: Its Texts and Versions (New York: Oxford 

A lively debate continues among New Testament scholars as to whether a 
more or less accurate outline of actual historical events can be discerned behind 
the literary structure of the Gospels. For an example of the affirmative position, see T.W. 
Manson, The Servant Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus 
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961); for the negative, see Rudolf 

The first edition of Schweitzer's The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study 
of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede appeared in 1906, and the second and 
enlarged edition in 1913.

It is worth noticing that even this minimal historical assertion concerning the 
existence of Jesus was challenged by the original Nazi ideologists, who found the 
name of Jesus too well entrenched and too valuable for propagandist purposes 
to attack. They therefore denied that Jesus was a Jew and declared that his 
Galilean ancestry was Aryan and Nordic. In this scenario, the Apostle Paul be-
comes the arch-villain who betrayed Jesus by founding his church upon that 
Judaism which he had died to destroy. This theory of the Aryan Christ was fully 
developed by the official philosopher and spokesman of National Socialism, 
summary of Rosenberg's position, see Peter Viereck, Meta-Politics: The Roots of 

Acknowledgment of sources for the early images of Jesus.

P.11: F. van der Meer, Early Christian Art (U. of Chicago P., 1967); Gertrud 
Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art (New York Graphic Society, 1972); Schiller.

P. 12: Irmgard Hutter, Early Christian and Byzantine Art (Universe Books, 1971); 
Hutter; Joseph Lewis Hunt, Christ in Art (L.C. Page, 1900).

P. 13: John F. Butler, Christianity in Asia and America (E.J. Brill, 1979); Butler.
The Liberty Lobby

Jerry Crowe

In the preceding article Professor Gibbs compares the historical evidence for the existence of the Holocaust with the evidence for the existence of Jesus of Nazareth. Here is the result of further inquiry into one of the main purveyors of Holocaust revisionism—the Liberty Lobby.

The Liberty Lobby emerged in 1957 as an umbrella organization for various right-wing causes. In announcing their appearance on the American political scene in the August 1957 issue of Right, the Liberty Lobby claimed they "would serve as a contact between 'patriots' and Congress and would engage in research and news-gathering services for 'patriots and conservative groups." The founder of the Liberty Lobby is Willis Carto, described by The Nation as "a leader of the Holocaust-is-a-fraud crowd," who writes under various names, most prominently, E.L. Anderson, Ph.D. Even though he is a very active private citizen, not much is known about Carto. Born in 1926, he was in the army in the 1940s, but reports differ as to whether he actually saw service in the Philippines, or Japan, or both. He attended Cincinnati Law School, but did not receive a degree there or attempt any other higher education. He worked as a collector for Household Finance in San Francisco. By the early 1950s, Carto became deeply involved in the right-wing movement and formed a group called Liberty and Property, "which never became a major organization." Beginning in 1960, the Lobby published a newsletter entitled The Liberty Letter. According to their circulation figures, readership grew from under one hundred thousand during the conservative stir around Goldwater beginning in 1965 to more than two hundred thousand subscribers within four years.

In the January 1958 issue of Right, Taylor Caldwell, a novelist and outspoken radical rightist who writes for the John Birch Society, in an article entitled "Unite with the Liberty Lobby" discusses the new organization. He states that there is a "paramount need for conservative unity" and that if conservatives gather under the Liberty Lobby’s umbrella, they will have a louder voice in Washington.
Throughout the 60s, the Lobby sent various representatives to Capitol Hill to speak against civil rights issues. At a 1967 Senate hearing, Dr. Henry E. Garrett, a past president of the American Psychological Association, spoke for the Lobby. "Explaining that he was retired and could speak on the civil rights issue as he saw fit, Garrett maintained that Negroes were a ‘younger’ race than whites, that they had lighter brains with less-developed frontal lobes, and that historically blacks had never achieved a literate civilization in Africa." 6

In August 1975, the Lobby discontinued publishing the Liberty Letter, replacing it with The National Spotlight, later named The Spotlight. A tabloid newspaper, The Spotlight acts as a central meeting place for the more isolated paramilitary constituencies and the broader right-wing movement.

The Liberty Lobby has connections with a number of publishers and has a publishing company of its own, The Noontide Press. The Liberty Library boasts quite a number of esoteric works. For example, in Sex Versus Civilization (1967), Elmer Pendell discusses the need for a national eugenics policy. Pendell feels that "dumber couples" have more kids than "smarter couples," so that "problem makers" out-breed "problem solvers." Pendell asks for marriage laws based on eugenic principles, taking into consideration prospective parents’ I.Q., completed schoolwork, class standing, and general character in determining how many children a couple should be allowed to have. He says the government should enforce this through mandatory sterilization.

Another work that the Lobby is fond of distributing is Francis Parker Yockey’s Imperium. First published in 1949 by Westropa Press in Britain, Imperium has been reprinted by several companies. In Frank Mintz’s words, “Imperium stands as a strange exhibit in an underground history of ideas, representing a last and subterranean gasp of the pro-Axis tendencies within the interwar nativist movement.”

According to The Nation (December 11, 1989), the Liberty Lobby was respectfully welcomed in late 1989 when it asked to testify before Rep. Stephen Neal’s banking subcommittee on a measure to reform the Federal Reserve Board. Reforming the Fed has long been one of the Right’s favorite axes to grind, going all the way back to before the Liberty Lobby was known as such, to the anti-Semitic writings of Henry Ford, who wrote that The Federal Reserve Act was conceived by Jewish bankers who wanted to rule the world by controlling America’s currency supply. The Nation stated that Ralph Nader’s group, Public Citizen, shows concern that no one in Congress spoke against the Lobby. In fact they treated it as though it were a legitimate organization, whereas many people and various organizations would be very upset if they allowed “Louis Farrakhan to testify on a drug bill.”
Willis Carto is also deeply involved with The Institute For Historical Review in Torrance, California (Carto’s current residence). The Institute organizes annual conferences on why the Holocaust didn’t happen. It also publishes the quarterly *Journal of Historical Review*, which features the works of such enlightened savants as Robert Faurisson, the French literature professor recently found guilty of falsifying history and given a 3-month suspended prison sentence. Recent articles appearing in the journal have been: “The Mendacity of Zion,” “The Holocaust and the Myth of the Past as History,” “The Fake Photograph Problem,” and “Human Soap.”

The Spotlight claims that the Lobby and the Institute are unrelated, but Carto is behind both organizations. Noontide Press published the anonymous *Myth of the Six Million* in 1969, marking their entrance into holocaust revisionism literature. During the 70s, the Lobby distributed *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, by Arthur Butz, a professor of Electrical Engineering at Northwestern University. *The Hoax* of course refers to the Holocaust, the facts of which Butz claims have been greatly exaggerated.

Many Liberty Lobby groups have as their mailing address either 300 Independence Avenue SE, Washington, D.C., or 132 Third Street, a side entrance to the same building, which Carto owns. Carto refuses to speak publicly or to receive any members of the press. The Anti-Defamation League of B’nai Brith calls him “probably the most influential anti-Semite in the United States today.”

The members of the Liberty Lobby appear to be taking full advantage of their constitutional rights to speak and think freely, even though 99.9% of their fellow Americans, if they knew about the Lobby, would think they are seriously deluded if not insane.

**Notes**

1 *Right* was a monthly newsletter of a San Francisco-based organization, Liberty and Property. *Right*, in the five years of its existence (1955-60), drew not only from racial theories but from the wider stock of conspiracy and culture doctrine to fashion a propaganda style which anticipated the tactical and ideological tenor of the Liberty Lobby. [Frank Mintz, *The Liberty Lobby and the American Right* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985), p. 70. Mintz is a professor of history at George Mason University.]

2 Mintz, p. 85.


4 Mintz, p. 70. 5 Mintz, p. 88. 6 Mintz, p. 91. 7 Mintz, p. 24.


The Automobile—Mother of Weird Inventions

Richard Bauman

Has anything inspired more ingenuity in invention over the past century than the horseless carriage? Surely not!

Ideas that promised to make cars better, faster, and safer have emerged from the minds of inventors like popcorn in an overheated popper. Most of the kernels have turned out either overdone or half-baked, but every once in a while a useful idea pops up.

Long before cars had radios, motorists longed to hear music while driving. So it was that about 85 years ago Daniel Young of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, conceived the Auto Organ. The heart of Young’s idea was an organ keyboard attached to the back of a car’s front seat. A musically capable passenger could thump out a tune as they chugged through the countryside. In Young’s imagination hundreds of cars with happy people in them were enjoying organ music while touring on a Sunday. It probably wasn’t a bad idea, except that the roads were so full of pits and potholes that the sounds produced by such an organ would not be musical.

Leander Pelton, another inventor, promised to resolve a dilemma drivers still face daily—finding a parking space. In 1926 he designed a car that could be parked anywhere. Because cars sit on four wheels, they take up a lot of space at curbs and in parking lots. Pelton’s car could be parked standing on end. In the drawings submitted with his patent application, where the car’s back bumper should have been, there was a vertical platform with heavy-duty rollers. According to Pelton’s description, the driver would merely tip the thing back onto the platform. When vertical, it could be pushed into any appropriate-sized parking space.

Unfortunately, Pelton had not thought through the details of his invention. It was never clear, for instance, how the car was to be tipped from horizontal to vertical and back down again. Also, there was the messy matter of the gasoline, oil, and water that would spill out of the car once it was upended.
Since none of us has ever seen such a car it is safe to assume that Pelton never solved these problems.

Wouldn't it be fun to have a somersaulting car? Charles Ramage thought so. Ramage, from Longden, North Dakota, designed a vehicle that would, in his words, "impart a thrill to the driver and afford great amusement . . . to onlookers." With this contrivance a driver could roll his car end-over-end any time the urge came upon him.

In fact, it wasn't a conventional auto, but a chassis with a steering wheel, engine, seat, etc., within a semi-circular roll cage. A lever beneath the contraption would catapult it over, and its momentum would bring it back onto its wheels.

While Ramage wanted to turn his car over, other inventors were trying to devise ways to prevent skidding. One novel approach, according to the March 1911 Popular Mechanics magazine, was to install "a heavy gyroscope wheel, which is turned directly by the engine . . . in front of the radiator of the automobile. Thus . . . by its own contained energy, it tends to keep the machine from moving out of a straight line." This worked about as well as Pelton's Vertical Park car, since the gyroscope would also keep the car going straight when it needed to turn.

Another idea that failed was an exhaust pipe vacuum cleaner. Using a special fitting, a hose was connected to the tailpipe about mid-way between the engine and the exhaust. With the car's engine running, exhaust gases flowed through the tailpipe and supposedly created suction in the vacuum cleaner hose. The idea was that dust and dirt could be extracted from the car's upholstery, sucked into the exhaust system and carried out the tailpipe. It seems to have been as effective as the anti-skid gyro from the same era.

During World War II when gasoline was rationed, Solomon Axlerod of New York City invented a car that didn't use any gasoline. In fact, it didn't use any fuel at all. According to a 1945 Mechanix Illustrated magazine, his contrivance looked like a small car but human power replaced the gasoline engine. The driver and the right seat passenger rode on bicycle seats and pedalled the car. The rear seat passenger just

Daniel Young's plan for an early automotive "sound system"—an organ in the back seat of the automobile.
went along for the ride. Unfortunately, Axlerod's invention was patented too late: the war was nearly over, and when it ended gasoline rationing would end.

Several inventors have tried to make automobiles do more than provide transportation. Joseph Grant, for instance, designed an automobile that washed clothes. It consisted of an oblong tub bolted to a car's running board. Inside was a series of paddles. When the tub was filled with water, soap, and soiled laundry, the bouncing of the car over rough roads provided all the agitation necessary to wash a load of clothes. For stubborn stains, though, an extra twenty miles of driving was recommended.

Robert Martin's idea was probably better suited to today's commuters than to the drivers of 1930. Martin patented an automobile oven that sat right under the driver's seat. The car's engine-exhaust pipe would be routed around and through the oven. The inventor believed that enough heat was generated by hot exhaust gases to cook food thoroughly. Thus, in Martin's view, a driver could put something into the oven, and after an hour or so of driving would find the food cooked and ready to eat. Martin did not say how the driver/cook prevented the meals from overcooking when stuck in traffic.

Packard introduced the first automobile air conditioning in 1939, but in 1907 S.C. Carroll of Dallas had already thought up a cooling system for car passengers. His system worked automatically, if not continuously. In his design, beneath each passenger's seat cushion there would have been a small bellows. Connected to the bellows were a couple of tubes: one to draw in outside air and the other to direct it at the person. The bouncing of the car over rough roads would cause occupants to bounce, too. Their bouncing operated the bellows, and it squirted fresh, cool air into their faces. So far as is known, Carroll's idea didn't get beyond the drawing board.

Many of the devices we take for granted on cars today were first used on other vehicles and later adapted for cars. For example, rubber tires were first seen on horse-drawn carriages in England in 1876. They provided a smooth, quiet, and comfortable ride. Authorities, however, deemed them a safety hazard because carriages so equipped were "noiseless" and gave no warning to pedestrians.

Windshield wipers, on the other hand, were originally designed for trolley cars. And it wasn't better visibility and safety that energized Mary Anderson, of Elmwood, Alabama, the inventor. She was concerned about the health of trolley motormen who had to get out in the rain and wipe moisture off the windshields.

Even traffic laws are nothing new. In China, over 2000 years ago, there were laws covering maximum size and speed of vehicles in certain areas. There were even traffic officers to
control traffic movement at major intersections. In ancient Mesopotamia, it is believed, authorities established "no parking" zones for chariots. Those foolish enough to violate the law made a serious mistake. Punishment for parking violations was death!

Nearly everybody who owns a car wearies of its appearance from time to time. But buying a new car every six months or so isn't practical. And besides, many would be satisfied merely with being able to change its color scheme once in a while. In the 1950s an inventor rose to the challenge. He designed a hollow, clear plastic top for cars. It was connected to three or four containers filled with colored liquids stored in the trunk. The colored liquids could be pumped into the car's top from one of the containers. Thus, one could have a red-topped car one day, a blue-topped car the next day, and a green top the third day.

In encounters with pedestrians the car always wins. In an effort to correct this lopsided statistic, Hans Karl of New Jersey patented a "Pedestrian Protector" in 1932. Karl's creation was an incredibly complex device involving levers, springs, and blankets. It was supposed to keep pedestrians from being injured in a collision. The key component was a bar that stretched across the front of the automobile. If the moving car made contact with a pedestrian, it automatically slammed on the vehicle's brakes. At the same instant, a blanket shot forward, and according to Karl, "a falling person will fall upon the blanket so the clothes will not be spoiled, but his fall will be softened." Although Karl carried out dozens of demonstrations (including movies) showing how his Pedestrian Protector worked, there were few buyers.

An invention that is a dud when first introduced might become successful later. Such changes of heart by car manufacturers and the public have happened dozens of times.

In 1907, for example, the Welch automobile had an adjustable steering wheel. It could be moved closer or farther away depending on the driver's preference. It was a flop! In recent years, of course, tilting and telescoping steering columns have become desirable options on automobiles. The probable reason that Welch's adjustable steering wheel didn't appeal

Hans Karl's "Pedestrian Protector." A blanket was supposed to shoot out from under the car to catch the victim before he or she hit the ground.
was its solid steering column. When the driver moved the wheel away from himself, the solid steering column protruded through the center of the wheel. It not only interfered with the driver’s ability to turn corners, it was a dangerous spear pointing at the driver’s chest.

Other ideas tried in early cars, discarded, then later revived, range from important safety features to simple design improvements. In 1912, for example, some Oaklands and Hupmobiles were made with all-steel bodies. Most manufacturers shunned this costly idea. By the mid-1930s, though, virtually all U.S. auto makers had adopted all-metal construction. Some 1912 Pierce-Arrows had headlights molded into the fenders, but it was not until the early 1940s that most new cars adopted this streamlined look. Although back-up lights are standard equipment today, as late as 1964 they were still optional equipment on many models. The 1921 Willis-St. Claire, however, had them as standard equipment. When hydraulic brakes for cars were first introduced, manufacturers ridiculed the idea. One manufacturer who favored mechanical brakes in an advertisement asked the question: "Do you want to trust your life to a piece of rubber hose?" By the mid-1930s, though, hydraulic brakes were standard equipment on all cars.

Automatic chokes were available on Oldsmobiles and Packards in 1932. They disappeared shortly thereafter, but were revived in the 1950s.

In the 1950s one inventor devised a cap for automobile master cylinders that could signal low brake fluid. Through an electronic sensor it would flash a light on the instrument panel to warn the driver of potential brake failure. Nothing much came of it at the time. But since 1968 all new cars, by law, must have dual master cylinders (which hold brake fluid) and a dashboard light to signal low brake fluid and brake system malfunction.

 Millions of gadgets, gizmos, and devices have been patented for cars, but only a minuscule number of them ever went into production. Despite the overwhelming odds against having an idea that will be used by an auto manufacturer, inventors keep trying—thank goodness. Some are simply amusing, some are before their time, and some are even adopted to make our driving more convenient, more efficient, and safer.
Joe Clark’s Challenge to American Education

Melvin Drimmer

Joe Clark has been getting a lot of press recently. Clark was the controversial principal of Eastside High School in Paterson, New Jersey, a depressed working-class town across the Hudson River from New York City. An autocratic and often charismatic leader, Clark used a bullhorn and baseball bat as weapons to bring order into his school. He expelled three hundred student troublemakers, ran the drug pushers out, cleaned the walls and bathrooms of graffiti, stopped school violence, disciplined and purged more than one hundred fifty teachers who did not accept his educational philosophy and leadership style, raised examination scores, and restored order to this ghetto school, made up almost entirely of Black and Hispanic students, one-third of whom came from families on welfare.

The story of how he shaped up this run-down school, a paradigm of all the ills of urban public education, has been made into a successful motion picture by the same director, John Avildsen, who directed the enormously popular Rocky. The public responded by making the movie, Lean on Me, a success at the box office. Not everyone was supportive, however. Joanna Connors of the Cleveland Plain Dealer called the film a celebration of "totalitarianism." "If it didn’t have a black hero," wrote Ms. Connors, "the neo-Nazis would love this movie." The New York Times called for Clark’s resignation. To the Times, he conducted a "reign of terror." He has become "an unguided missile... abusive of students, parents and teachers, insubordinate to authority and contemptuous even of constructive criticism." The Paterson Board of Education voted 7-1 to bring disciplinary proceedings against Clark for insubordination and for authorizing mass suspensions of disorderly and over-aged students. The Board of Education again voted to suspend Clark, and the City Council called for his firing.

"I participated in the civil rights movement," Melvin Drimmer says, "and went to Atlanta in 1963. In jail 1964 for a brief time. Went to Africa in 1967 and took 21 trips there until 1981 as President of the American Forum for International Study. Concerned about Black and minority issues. Also Black-Jewish relations." Drimmer earned his Ph.D. at the University of Rochester and subsequently attended the Postdoctoral School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London. He has been teaching at Cleveland State University since 1972. His book, Issues in Black History, Reflections and Commentaries on the Black Historical Experience, published in 1987 by Kendall/Hunt, has just been reprinted.
after a variety show performed at Eastside High contained a striptease number.

Clark was not at a loss and he had many supporters. He challenged the Board of Education, defiantly declaring they were "not going to run me out of town." Clark also challenged drug pushers and those he called "leeches," threatening to "beat the hell out of them" with his Louisville Slugger. And in true autodidactic fashion, Clark responded to the call for his resignation with his trademark, a barrage of multisyllabic words. It was "Nothing more than a toxic cynicism perpetuated by jealous, invidious, insidious, surreptitious sapsuckers."

As expected, Clark's tough stance found ready support in the Reagan administration. William Bennett, then Secretary of Education, found in Clark the leadership that was lacking among American educators. In defense of Clark, Bennett said, "Sometimes you need Mr. Chips, sometimes you need Dirty Harry." It was rumored that Clark would leave Eastside High and join Bennett in his new job as the Bush administration's drug czar. Clark did resign as principal and, catapulted into national prominence by the successful film, he is now travelling on the lecture circuit, speaking before large audiences about his tough educational philosophy and commanding fees in excess of ten thousand dollars an appearance.

Clark's critics have pitted his hard line style against that of another Black inner city principal, George McKenna, of George Washington Preparatory High in Los Angeles. McKenna has publicly criticized Clark's authoritarian approach. McKenna has put more emphasis on reaching even the "unreadable." Throwing these students out of school is not the answer. "We want to fix the schools, but you don't have to do that by seeing the kids as the enemy," argues McKenna. "Our role is to rescue and be responsible." The students are often the victims of environmental and social problems, and the schools have to deal with this reality within their own confines. McKenna believes that Clark's tactics would not be tolerated except for the fact that the students he deals with are "poor black children."

Altogether, Clark's style of leadership has raised the larger question of the role of discipline in educating students in American schools. How much discipline is necessary? Or does it apply only to ghetto schools?

Clark's hardline tactics would probably not work or even be tolerated in suburban schools where students are college-bound and adhere to standard middle class values. They are controlled, for the most part, by an intact family structure. Although they might not have any intrinsic interest in learning, they see in their parents' success the relationship between schooling and material wealth and rewards.
For inner-city students, the situation is entirely different. Too many come from broken homes, where parental authority is weak or non-existent, and where the values which surround them are made in the streets. Angry and frustrated, these children act out their rage in the schools through the destruction of property, challenging of authority, and violence. Discipline and order are the first necessities for inner-city education. One of Clark's students was quoted as saying, "a lot of students here have it bad at home. But they come in here (Eastside High) and say 'This man (Joe Clark) wants something for me. I can do better.'" Clark represents a strong authority figure where none existed. He emphasizes patriotism and values. Unlike the streets, which are governed by the relativistic philosophy of "anything goes," Clark seems to stand for something of value.

We have long known that private and parochial schools are value-oriented. In them discipline is the first order of the day. Even inner-city parents scrimp and save to send their children to value-oriented schools, oftentimes to compensate for the lack of values at home and in the society which surrounds them. In these schools, religion plays a vital role, as do ROTC, athletics, music and singing clubs, the wearing of uniforms, patriotism, and school traditions, all of which emphasize time tables, order, discipline, and accountability.

At about the same time the Clark story was making headlines, the New York Times ran a story from Dallas, Texas, about a Mexican-American girl who was trying to get admitted to West Point. She came from a poverty-stricken neighborhood and attended a public school that was 80% Black and the rest Hispanic. She was the only member of her large family to graduate from high school. She ascribed her success in high school to a movie she saw on television about the discipline at West Point, and she immediately identified with the military academy. She transferred that discipline to her own life. Recently she broke off a relationship with a young man at school because "he didn't want to make enough of his life." Her goals now were "to be honest. To obey my mother and elders. To graduate number one. To study a little more. To prepare for West Point."

What holds true for this Mexican-American woman also holds true for Asian-Americans who are succeeding in droves. Self-discipline. Hunger for success. Encouragement by family and teachers. Minimizing television. Accepting a new value system and new friends. At Juilliard School in New York, where the student body is estimated to be 25% Asian and Asian-American, the president, Joseph Polisi, reported that "it's not just being Asian that makes them good musicians. It's a matter of dedication, family support, and discipline."

Joe Clark is working in the trenches. All around, he and his students were surrounded by urban decay, poverty, bad
neighborhoods, a drug culture, lack of parental authority and positive adult role models, and a larger culture emphasizing materialism, fueled by television and popular music. So he had to begin with what he had, and the reality of where he was. The members of Paterson’s school board who condemned Joe Clark’s authoritarian tactics, I am sure, had none of their children enrolled at Eastside High School. Possibly they had never even set foot for more than a few minutes in an inner-city school.

Possibly I would not have wanted Clark to be the head of my children’s suburban school in Shaker Heights, Ohio, where most of the parents are successful professionals and business people. But I certainly would want Clark to be in charge of an inner-city school. The bullhorn and the baseball bat may not be applicable to all educational situations. And Joe Clark’s hands-on approach may not be the panacea for all the ills of American education. But on the urban battlefront, it may be the right formula.

---

**The Well-Ordered Inner City School**

*Are More Joe Clarks the Answer?*

Robert H. MacNaughton

Dr. Drimmer makes it perfectly clear. He wants Joe Clark, and others like him, to be the principals of inner city schools. As Dr. Drimmer points out, it is a desire that has broad support. Research has long suggested the importance of a well-ordered, safe environment to the development of an effective school (Austin 1979, Edmonds 1979). Furthermore, citizens and teachers know that much of the life of the school goes on outside the classroom independent of the established procedures of an individual teacher. Youngsters walk in halls, eat in the lunchroom, play on the playgrounds, and interact with each other in rest rooms, learning centers, gymnasiums, and other locations around the school. The discipline of individual classrooms affects the whole school, and the discipline of the total school impacts on individual classrooms.
Schools often differ widely as to the degree of prevailing order. Indeed, two schools with proximate locations and serving neighborhoods with seemingly similar socioeconomic backgrounds have been known as the "good place to teach" and the "zoo." In my former capacity as Director of the College of Education Field Service Office at CSU, I have visited all of the Cleveland senior high schools, many of them dozens of times, and I can attest to the truth of this. Although credit for success for these school differences generally goes to the principal, until recently the reasons for these differences had not been objectively determined.

**Effective school research**

Recent studies have helped identify factors that contribute to development and maintenance of a school environment conducive to learning (Pinell et al. 1982, Wayson et al. 1982, Austin 1979, Edmonds 1979, Howard 1978). A constant in all of the studies of well-managed, well-disciplined schools (including inner-city schools) is the existence of a clearly stated school plan or policy. Typically the parts of the plan are contributed by all faculty, parents, and students concerned, and the plan is adopted to encourage good discipline rather than to address a particular problem.

The successfully disciplined school, the research agrees, has high faculty morale. Teachers feel good about the school, identify with the school and have high expectations of their students. Teacher responsibility in effective schools is important. Teachers deal with routine disciplinary problems themselves. Administrators are expected to handle severe cases and provide periodic training and support to teachers needing assistance in the classroom.

All these studies emphasize the critical role of the principal. The successful principals took responsibility for creating good learning environments. Principals who handled discipline effectively had high visibility, spending about 25 percent of their time in the halls, cafeteria, and the classrooms. They stood in front of buildings in the mornings, not only to prevent tardiness, smoking, or loitering, but also to demonstrate friendliness.

The successful schools also had strong ties with parents. Parents helped to develop school codes, scholarship programs, and budgets. The schools reported clearly defined homework assignments, emphasis on attendance, and clear communication of behavior standards.

Effective school management emphasized the success of students. The successful school universally recognized positive behavior by means of honor days, awards, messages to parents, special publicity, names posted in a prominent place, prizes, trips, and privileges.
Well-managed schools studied the causes of discipline problems. Efforts were made to examine office referrals to look for persistent patterns in behavior problems, such as low grades, poor reading, family problems, drugs, or disputes with a particular teacher. Similarly, an effort was made to detect the causes of in-school suspension, in which students were offered counseling and special assistance with studies. Some schools reported after-school clinics and even retreats for in-depth assistance. Others used systems of teacher advocates, linking a teacher to a particular problem student. Still others maintained part-time out-of-school work programs, programs that emphasized awareness of problem attitude change, referral services, treatment and special educational programs.

**Joe Clark and effective school research**

So how does Joe Clark compare with these descriptions of effective school management? We lack a systematic study of Joe Clark as principal. However, if we accept the popular media descriptions of his administration, the answer is that in some ways he compares very well. Certainly he epitomizes the principal who not only believes in the importance of a well-ordered school as an essential ingredient to learning, but puts his beliefs into active practice. Principal Clark appears to be a model of active enforcement of rules, through visibility and active, energetic monitoring of halls and classrooms. He also seems to practice a good deal of personal reinforcing of positive student behavior.

But some of his actions run counter to the research on effective practice. If one accepts Mr. Clark’s statement, "all things emanate from me" (Time, 1988), the development of a reasonable set of school codes was not established by faculty, parent, and student input. While Mr. Clark has the loyalty of some teachers, his boast of ousting a hundred teachers during his term in office by "expurgating them through a vast variety of methods" (Time, 1988) doubtless had a negative impact on faculty morale. Not only would such action create grievances and lawsuits in many states, it would impede his ability to gain faculty support in a school-wide effort to improve discipline. There was no mention of programs to provide in-service assistance for teachers needing help with the perennial problem of classroom management and discipline. In dealing with students, Joe Clark’s emphasis seemed to consist primarily of threat and punishment. There is no report of efforts to examine causes of student problems or special assistance and special programs; there is mention only of mass expulsions.

**The Clark approach**

Two things need to be noted about the Clark approach. First, in spite of the research on effective schools, all who look at school discipline problems recognize the factor of
personality. There are teachers and administrators who can use unorthodox discipline strategies effectively, but the same methods when used by others have great negative impact. Baseball bats, bullhorns, abusive remarks to teachers, and other practices that defy the axiom of discipline with dignity may have had some success at Eastside High because of Clark’s personality. But procedures linked to a particular type of personality are not transferable and cannot be easily modeled. This is a crucial weakness if the practices of Joe Clark are to serve as a direction for other inner city administrators (Johns, MacNaughton, Karabinus, 1989).

Secondly, there is the question of strong school spirit. The necessity for a safe, orderly learning environment in the school is recognized as essential to pupil achievement. Teachers need and should receive all kinds of assistance to achieve this task. But the attainment of the goal of an orderly school must be accomplished without the destruction of an equally important goal—the development of a positive ethos that encourages intellectual excellence and psychological well-being. Maintenance and even encouragement of a practice that permits actual or implied bullying, inflicting of pain, arbitrary suspension, and dismissal of faculty is widely perceived as a violation of human rights. Such a policy is fraught with possibilities for abuse and is neither consistent with nor appropriate to the achievement of a positive ethos in which students can learn effectively.
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Has the Time Come to Legalize Drugs?

Richard C. Stephens

The problem with drugs, according to some authorities, is not addiction but crime, the result of the large amounts of money involved with their use and sale. As a result, today in the United States there is renewed interest in the topic of legalization of drugs. Interestingly, legalization has been advocated by the conservative right (William F. Buckley and Milton Friedman), the left (Mayor Kurt Schmoke of Baltimore and the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws), the center (former Secretary of State George Schultz), and those who cannot be classified (the Libertarian Party). This curious convergence results from a variety of impulses. Ideological purity and consistency, as in the case of Libertarians, guide some. Others appear to be more pragmatic. Over the past decade, the much ballyhooed "war against drugs" has been waged by governments at all levels. Strategies have frequently changed: first, "interdiction," then "cutting the supply at the street," and most recently "reduction of demand" through zero tolerance policies (that is, all drug law infractions—even minor ones—would be enforced). Yet, despite these hugely expensive efforts (in 1987 it was estimated that the government spent $10 billion for enforcement at the Federal level), the war is going poorly. The Federal government's best efforts, it now appears, are not really successful; battles are constantly being lost, even in the nation's capital. Drug-related street crime continues to rise and data collected by the National Institute on Justice indicates that drug use among those arrested continues. Others worry that the so-called "drug epidemic" will spread and the fear is that crack, "crank," and now "ice" might spread to the suburbs. All of these problems provide a powerful incentive for an exploration of alternatives.

It is not surprising that the legalization of drugs has been given a fresh look. But just what does legalization mean? It probably has as many definitions as it has advocates. Some argue for a strategy known as "decriminalization," which eliminates or lessens legal penalties on users while still maintaining sanctions for drug sellers. Others propose complete
and unrestricted access to all drugs for all persons. Such persons reason that in a free society individuals ought to have the right to use and abuse their bodies in any way they choose. Most proponents offer a system whereby the government would control and possibly market drugs in much the same way that alcohol is currently sold in state stores in some parts of the U.S. The government would set the levels of purity of the drug, heavily tax the substances (with the proceeds going for drug abuse prevention, education, and treatment efforts), and restrict sales to adults. Because this is the most popular of the proposals, it deserves the most detailed examination.

Morality and legalization
One of the principal arguments against legalization is that it is immoral. Our Judeo-Christian heritage teaches us that use of mind-altering substances which distort our perceptions, our mood, and our capacity for reasoned judgment is bad. (Jews capture their advocacy of moderation in an expression comparing non-Jews to habitual drunks. Similarly, my Southern Baptist aunt has never let demon rum pass her lips.) To permit substances more powerful than alcohol (some might say poisons) to be freely distributed would be the absolute height of immorality, according to these believers. Opponents also like to point out that the majority of Americans simply do not favor legalization. In fact, a Gallup poll conducted in June of 1988 determined that only 16% of Americans favored legalization whereas 74% were opposed. Four percent favored legalization of certain drugs and another 6% had no opinion. In the terms of this survey, Americans dislike the idea of legalization.

Legalization advocates, on the other hand, assert that it is hypocritical and morally inconsistent to allow two very potent and dangerous drugs, both of which are addicting, to be openly sold and yet to deny access to drugs which are in many cases milder, at least in terms of their chronic effects. For argument’s sake we can contrast heroin—probably the most feared drug in America—with nicotine. Heroin is a powerfully inebriating opiate which is both physically addicting and potentially physiologically dangerous. In a single episode there is the danger of death by overdose. In the U.S. in a year’s time, however, probably no more than a few thousand die from such overdoses or other heroin-related deaths. Further, despite repeated efforts to find other long term physiological effects of heroin, only chronic constipation has been determined to be a consequence.* Contrast this with the effects of cigarette smoking. Nicotine, a much less inebriating substance, is highly addictive (some say as addictive as heroin) and very dangerous. Over three hundred thousand die of lung cancer and other diseases directly attributable to tobacco products every year. Countless others suffer from emphysema

---

*It is true that many intravenous users suffer from a wide variety of diseases, including AIDS, hepatitis, endocarditis, and tetanus. However, all of these diseases are traceable to the use of unclean needles and are not due to the direct effects of heroin itself.
and other severely debilitating diseases which limit their ability to lead healthy and productive lives of normal length. The contrast between heroin and tobacco is not atypical: many of the illegal drugs (especially marijuana and possibly even cocaine) are similarly less dangerous than tobacco and alcohol.

Advocates of legalization maintain that the "morality" argument loses much of its power when one considers actual consequences. It does not make sense to allow some dangerous and potent "social" drugs to be freely consumed, with only mild opprobrium attached to their use, while condemning as criminal the use of other possibly less dangerous drugs.

**Legalization means more people will use**

Probably one of the most potent arguments against legalization lies in the claim that whole new groups of drug abusers would be created should all of these drugs suddenly become available. The evidence on this point is mixed. It is true that most Americans have never had access to these drugs. In 1985, for instance, the national household survey of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) found that almost 80% of Americans said that they had no opportunity to use cocaine, probably one of the more readily available of street drugs. How many of them would use cocaine should it suddenly become available to them? We do know that between one and three percent of all American physicians—who more than anyone ought to be aware of the dangers of drug use—are abusers of narcotics or other drugs to which they have ready access in their practices. These facts seem to imply that there might be a risk of creating many new abusers should these drugs be made more readily available.

Yet there is evidence on the other side: that many would not abuse these drugs, most of which when used moderately are probably no more dangerous than alcohol or tobacco. Some of the evidence is provided by the NIDA survey conducted in 1988. The statistics on cocaine use, presumably one of the most instantly gratifying and addicting of all the street drugs, show that 11.4% of all Americans have used cocaine at least once in their lives. Yet only 8.2% of these users have used it one hundred or more times in their lives. Thus, a relatively small percentage uses this drug at levels that might be labeled either misuse or abuse. We can conclude that most simply choose not to use or abuse the drug regularly.

Indeed, it would appear that alcohol constitutes much more of a threat in this regard than does cocaine. For instance, 85% of all high school seniors surveyed by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research in 1988 reported that they had drunk alcohol at least once in the last year. And 35% of all seniors made the astounding admission that they had
drunk five or more drinks in a row in the two-week period prior to the survey.

How is it possible for people to make "recreational" use of such drugs as heroin and cocaine and not become addicted? The answer seems to lie in the values of the user. Sociologists have long known that ethnicity is strongly related to rates of alcoholism. For instance, Italians have dramatically lower rates of alcoholism than the Irish despite the fact that alcohol is consumed every day in Italian society. Professor Andrew Greeley of the University of Arizona has shown that there is a similar difference in alcoholism rates among these two groups in America even after three generations in this country. These rates differ because of the different role that alcohol plays in the two societies. Alcohol, usually consumed in the less potent form of wine, is drunk at meals in Italian households. Outside of this context drinking is relatively rare. In Irish culture, alcohol—often in the more potent form of distilled spirits—is consumed much more frequently in a wider variety of settings. Alcohol is used to facilitate conviviality, and Irish males often define their manhood by how much liquor they can hold. Drunkenness is not reproved among the Irish in the same way as among Italians. Thus culture—expressed as norms and values—defines what is acceptable drug use behavior among the two groups.

Can such cultural control mechanisms be transferred to drugs other than alcohol? The answer is most assuredly "yes." In a pioneering study, the late Professor Norman Zinberg of Harvard University found that many heroin users, perhaps as many as three million, were able to maintain recreational patterns of use of this addictive drug. They did so through utilization of a series of rituals and sanctions which defined proper use. For instance, they limited the amount of money they spent on heroin, did not use it during times when it might interfere with their familial and occupational responsibilities, restricted the duration of use so that they would not become addicted, eschewed personal interactions with addicts, and maintained self-concepts that insulated them from coming to think of themselves as addicts.

This group of subjects was not atypical. A similar study of another group (returning veterans who were addicted to narcotics in Vietnam) was equally decisive. Professor Lee Robins of Washington University in St. Louis discovered that most such addicts were easily able to give up their compulsive use of narcotics once they returned to the United States. They simply returned to their old neighborhoods and towns where such use was neither encouraged nor tolerated. Other activities in their lives took precedence. Interestingly, those who had most difficulty with drugs on return home were generally those who had experienced significant drug use before they went to Vietnam.
Excerpts from the Testimony of the Honorable Kurt L. Schmoke Submitted to The U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

"The cornerstone of a policy of harm reduction is treatment on demand. This means having treatment available to any client at the time he or she makes the crucial decision to get off of drugs. For most addicts, that moment comes and goes many times. But addicts are frustrated because help is persistently unavailable at the time that they seek it. Baltimore's Addict Referral program, which specializes in rapid medical intake and referral of addicts, turned aside 1303 addicts in the last 11 months—or well over 100 per month. These are addicts who need treatment and counseling within an 8-12 hour period, otherwise they'll go out and get another fix. One in ten Baltimoreans has a substance abuse problem, but only one twentieth of these people can be helped in our existing treatment programs. These numbers are typical of large cities across our nation."

"A proper medical strategy would be based on a highly regulated regime set up to pull addicts into the public health system. This regime would control the access, purity and price of all drugs. A public health strategy, in other words, does not, and should not, mean easy availability of drugs. Experience shows we can regulate the use of drugs much more artfully than that. Alcohol is more carefully controlled than cigarettes, and currently illegal drugs could be much more carefully controlled than alcohol."

"It costs Baltimore City [prisons] $20,000 to $30,000 per inmate per year. We provide effective drug treatment for $1500 per person per year. I was recently told that it costs less money (a lot less) to send someone to Penn State than to the state pen. The point is, we need to realistically evaluate where we're putting our limited financial resources. Will more laws, more police and prosecutors, more trials, and more jails buy us the drug-free security we want? Or would we be better off focusing our money and talents on educating young people about the dangers of drugs."
Thus, it is possible to maintain self-control over these drugs. Millions of Americans who use the benzodiazepines (i.e., Valium) and the barbiturates (i.e., Seconal) do so every day. And, as we all know, there are tens of millions of Americans who use alcohol recreationally and moderately. Whether the social and cultural control mechanisms discussed above can generalize to all Americans remains an open question. We know that when a society, such as that of the indigenous Native Americans, was exposed to a previously unknown substance such as alcohol, the results were devastating. American Indians had no social way of coping with the distilled spirits introduced by Europeans and the legacy of that cultural inability ravages this people even after centuries. Does America run a similar risk by introducing these substances to a society which may lack appropriate cultural control mechanisms?

**Legalization and crime**

One of the more potent arguments in favor of legalization is the link between the illegal status of these drugs and crime. One elementary fact about these drugs needs to be understood; there is nothing intrinsically expensive about them. Heroin, cocaine, marijuana, LSD, and all the other illegal substances are probably no more costly to produce than tobacco or alcohol products. These drugs are currently expensive solely because they are illegal.

This status leads to crime in several different ways. First, abusers of these drugs must find money to "feed their habits." A heroin habit costs about $30 per day. Opponents of legalization point out that drug use does not cause crime in the sense that many addicts had established their criminal careers prior to their addiction. While the relationship between street crime and drug use is very complex, we do know that as habit costs increase, so does crime. Thus, addicts must commit a large amount of street crime (mugging, burglary, shoplifting, etc.) to pay for their escalating drug use. While drug use does not necessarily cause crime, it nevertheless "drives" it. Thus, advocates say, if drugs were legalized, their cost would dramatically decrease and this decrease would be reflected in dramatically reduced rates of street crime.

Equally important, violent crime would also be reduced. Homicide is the leading cause of death among young Afro-American males. Homicides contribute greatly to the shorter life expectancies of heroin addicts and other kinds of drug abusers. In addition, there is a great rate of assault and other forms of violent crime that is endemic to the drug subculture. Finally, injury and death to law enforcement officials are an inevitable consequence of the struggle over drugs. Legalization would effectively destroy the illicit drug marketplace. Fights among pushers over turf, robberies of dealers, and maiming
and killing of police officers would decrease because the profit incentive of this illegal activity would have been removed.

Not only would legalization affect street-level crime: organized crime would lose one of its major sources of income. Indeed, it is estimated that drugs account for half of all of organized crime’s “take.” The impact on society would be enormous. Our local homegrown mobs would suffer and the international drug cartels would disappear. The graft and corruption of highly placed dishonest leaders in the drug-producing countries would decline as would the intimidation and assassination of honest officials. And the corruption of international banks and companies which launder drug money would be eradicated. Our own criminal justice officials would be less tempted to compromise with crime.

A less costly criminal justice system
Should drugs be legalized, there would be enormous economies in the criminal justice system. It is estimated that in 1987 the total government expense for the enforcement of the drug laws was $10 billion. About a tenth of the 555,000 prisoners in state prisons and one-third of the 50,000 prisoners in Federal prisons are there as violators of drug laws. In 1988, it cost American society approximately $2 billion to incarcerate drug offenders. In Cleveland alone, the Drug Use Forecasting Study estimates that over two-thirds of all those arrested (regardless of their charge) have used some psychoactive substance (other than alcohol, nicotine, or prescription drugs) in the forty-eight hour period before their arrest. Over half of such individuals have used cocaine in that time period. The Cleveland Police Department alone has over 45 officers in its narcotics squad. In short, the law enforcement costs are enormous. Many of these costs would be dramatically reduced, if not totally eliminated, should drugs become legalized.

Legalization and civil liberties
Because of the widespread publicity attendant on the “war on drugs,” Americans are becoming increasingly frustrated over the inability of the government to successfully wage this war. They see what the mass media shrilly call a menacing epidemic sweeping the United States. And they see law enforcement officials who have not, they believe, been provided with the appropriate legal tools to win this battle. Accordingly, many Americans have expressed a willingness to surrender some of their Constitutional rights in order to fight this menace. A number of constitutionally questionable strategies have been proposed. This has included the right to enter private property without a search warrant should police suspect that illegal drug-related activity is occurring on the premises. William Bennett at one point had proposed using Federal troops for patrol and other traditionally civilian law
enforcement functions in the test-case city of Washington, D.C. Some have proposed that Federal military forces be used to intercept and arrest persons in interdiction programs at our borders.

All of these proposals constitute new and, in my opinion, extremely dangerous incursions on our Bill of Rights. I believe that the last two decades of experience with the highest levels of the Federal government tells us that we cannot always trust our leaders to respect our fundamental rights as citizens. To provide these leaders with new powers that the Constitution has reserved to its citizenry would be a potentially massive erosion of Americans' rights. Obviously, should drugs be legalized, the need for these draconian measures would be obviated.

In his recent book, *The Great Drug War*, Professor Arnold Trebach documents the abuses of law enforcement officials who have ignored the civil liberties of citizens in their well-meaning zeal to curb drug abuse in America.

Already concern about drugs has spawned a new and growing industry. This is the drug-testing establishment. Throughout the nation, large numbers of employers in both the public and private sectors require new job applicants, and often their current employees, to undergo the practice of urinating in a sample bottle while being observed by another employee. Often, a positive finding, which occurs by error 10% of the time or more, culminates in a job candidate being rejected or an employee being dismissed. Note that these urine tests do not reveal whether a person has used alcohol, which by far should be the drug of greatest concern to employers. Nor do they reveal the level of use of the illicit drugs. A person who may have smoked marijuana at a party on a Friday night, or even passively breathed in marijuana while at that party, might test positive on a Monday morning.

**Legalization and youth drug use**

Another major argument against legalization might be the increased exposure of youth to drugs, should these substances become freely available. Not only would drugs become easier to acquire, but society would seem to be delivering the message that drug use is acceptable. Of particular concern is the fact that, while some studies show that moderate use of these drugs may be relatively benign, these effects have generally been documented only for adults. The consequences for children and for those undergoing the powerful biochemical and physiological changes of puberty are little understood. Opponents argue that even if access to these drugs were prohibited by law, enforcement would probably be no more effective than it currently is with alcohol and tobacco. If youth truly want to get alcohol or tobacco products, they can easily find them.
Advocates concede this point. They also point out, however, that youth already have access to many of these illegal substances. For instance, the University of Michigan 1988 national high school senior survey reveals that 85% of these youths say that they can "fairly or very easily" obtain marijuana and 55% say that they can find cocaine. When youth currently obtain these drugs illegally they are subject to the risks that they do not know their quality or potency. Indeed, at times they are not using the substance they believe they have purchased. For instance, dealers will sometimes "dust" poor quality marijuana with the very powerful Phen-cyclidine ("Angel Dust"). The unsuspecting youth then may undergo a very disquieting episode dramatically unlike the mild "high" expected from marijuana. Finally, the moneys which the government would obtain from legalized drug sales profits or taxes would allow it to mount expensive and widespread education and prevention campaigns to discourage youths from using drugs. For these reasons, then, proponents maintain youths would actually benefit from the legalization of drugs.

Legalization and declining drug use

Opponents point out that the recent calls for legalization occur just at a time when it appears that the United States is "turning the corner on drugs." They claim that drug use is declining in the United States, particularly among the young, the most vulnerable population. Further, they observe that anti-drug attitudes are hardening, again especially among young persons. NIDA data would support this viewpoint. Both the high school senior survey and the national household survey report enormous declines in drug use in the population. For instance, in 1979 daily use of marijuana reached its highest level among high school seniors, one in ten students reporting use at this level. In 1988 daily use declined to 2.7% (one quarter of the earlier number). Similar trends are detected in the American population at large.

There has been a corresponding decrease in attitudes favorable to drug use. While in 1978 only about a third of high school seniors disapproved of the use of marijuana once or twice, that figure had climbed to 61% in 1988. Disapproval of cocaine use has increased from 77% to 89% for the same time period. Hence, given data that drug use is declining as a problem in American society, opponents ask: "Why capitulate now?"

Legalization and the ghetto

It is clear that if there truly is a drug epidemic in this country, it is occurring primarily in the ghettos, barrios, and other inner-city areas of this country. It appears that crack is ravaging these areas. Opponents reason that legalization of drugs would simply amount to chemical enslavement of
these, our most disadvantaged citizens. For they believe that if drugs truly became widely available, the epidemic would become even more widespread in what they consider to be our most vulnerable population. An entire generation of residents in these areas would be immediately lost to drugs. Future generations, as well, might be endangered as the phenomenon of "crack babies" spreads. In short, further social and cultural disintegration would result.

The history of drug laws in America
Most Americans probably think that mind-altering drugs were always illegal in the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, for the greater part of our history, drugs were freely available in this country. Prior to the passage of the Harrison Act in 1914, there were no Federal laws which prohibited the distribution of drugs. (Many states and localities, however, restricted the use of some drug categories.) The Harrison Act basically required that narcotics could be dispensed only with a prescription from a physician. Since the Harrison Act, however, more and stricter drug laws have been passed at both the Federal and state levels. Indeed, the use of almost all mind-altering substances, with the notable exceptions of alcohol, nicotine, and caffeine, is now either totally illegal (as in the case of heroin) or permitted only under the direction of a physician.

But prior to 1914 virtually all Americans had free access to the most powerful mind-altering substances. Opium products, including raw opium, paregoric (tincture of opium), codeine-containing cough syrups, and a number of other similar pharmacological products, were available over-the-counter at apothecaries and other retail outlets. Many patent medicines, available in stores and through the mails, contained what are now illicit drugs. For instance, Mother Winslow's Soothing Syrup had both alcohol and opium; one of its uses was to mollify teething babies. Vin Mariani, a widely used patent medicine, contained a healthy dose of cocaine. Of course, the "coca" in that most famous of soft drinks, Coca-Cola, was originally cocaine, only later to be replaced by caffeine, a milder stimulant.

In addition to these over-the-counter preparations, one could go to physicians who themselves created "iatrogenic" addicts. Prior to the development of the germ theory and the scientific basis of medical treatment, physicians could often do little else than treat the symptoms of a disease. Clearly, one of the most objectionable of these symptoms was pain. Thus, the physician of the latter nineteenth century often turned to his most effective medicines—the narcotics—and with the aid of the recently developed hypodermic needle, he could palliate the pain felt by patients.
Indeed, David T. Courtwright in his book, *Dark Paradise*, estimates that the typical addict during the nineteenth century was a middle-aged, middle- to upper-class white female whose addiction to morphine or opium was caused by her physician. While there were also underworld addicts who frequented opium dens, this underworld pattern became predominant only after physicians began to change their prescribing patterns. In fact, Courtwright maintains that there were never more than a few hundred thousand narcotic addicts in the United States prior to 1914 and that the rate of addiction was in significant decline well before the passage of the Harrison Act. The decline in use was due more to changing prescription and sales patterns than to the influence of the Harrison Act.

Why, then, was the Harrison Act passed? The answer to this question is a complicated one that has been addressed in a number of books. The temperance movement branched out to embrace restrictions on the sales of narcotics. Public opinion, the cries of moralists, the newly emerging scientific medicine, the desire for professional respectability, and the regulation of the profession by licensing, all caused the pharmaceutical and medical industries to demand regulation. Concern about America’s increasingly important role in international affairs and global economics also fueled the reform movement. (The United States was a leader in criticizing the British opium trade in China on moral grounds and took a leading role in developing international anti-narcotics conventions.) Plain old-fashioned bigotry, which associated cocaine use with Blacks, opiate use with Orientals, and marijuana use with Mexicans, also played a part in helping to shape anti-narcotics legislation. These and many other pressures eventually led to the passage of the Harrison Act, which was the precursor of a large number of Federal and state laws which have increasingly criminalized the users of psychoactive drugs.

The important messages here are that drugs were not always illegal in American society, and they did not seem to cause any major social damage when they were freely available. They became illegal for a variety of reasons unrelated to their real threat to the fabric of society. Thus, there is historical precedent for a relatively drug-free America despite the fact that drugs were often widely available to Americans in the past.

**What should we do?**

De-criminalization (where the user is only mildly sanctioned and the seller dealt with more severely) is both hypocritical and naive. It does not take into account the fact that many users of street drugs are also lower level salespersons (especially for narcotics, cocaine, and crack). There is also a definite danger that a relatively large population of new users
some of whom will become non-moderate users) may be created should all of these drugs suddenly become legal, inexpensive, and readily available. Almost certainly, these drugs would be diverted to juvenile populations. Our experience with alcohol and tobacco adequately supports these assertions.

But one cannot avoid being deeply concerned about the enormous costs of our present policy. Society spends billions of dollars on the war against drugs. Many lives, both of users and non-users, are profoundly affected by anti-drug efforts. Street crime and corruption are rampant, and our drug policies carry a major share of responsibility for these phenomena. Of most concern to the average citizen is the potential threat to our most cherished civil liberties (with reference to search warrants and protection from self-incrimination) posed by the relaxed oversight of drug police.

The drug problem in America truly is a perplexing dilemma, and all courses of action, or indeed of inaction, pose serious threats. Something needs to be done. Those who have a practical stake in drug eradication, like Mayor Schmoke of Baltimore, are looking to some version of legalization as the best and perhaps the only way to rescue their fellow-citizens. We need to become better acquainted with the consequences of legalization. While we can look to the experiences of other societies such as Holland, England, and Switzerland—and their experiences have been mixed—they cannot be those of America given our own unique cultural, historical, and ethnic milieu.

Accordingly, I would propose a social experiment whereby we attempt to answer some of the nagging questions posed by legalization. I believe that we should establish a tightly controlled study in one or more cities or states whereby legalization (possibly even for a limited number of drugs) could be tested for a few years. We could monitor drug abuse rates through analysis of survey data, hospital emergency room admissions, health provider and coroner statistics, criminal justice data, and other information to assess the impact of legalization for the nation as a whole. While such a study is replete with methodological and pragmatic problems, I believe that it could be accomplished and that the data provided, even if imperfect, would be better than the limited and largely conjectural information currently available to us.

The photographs on pages 39, 40, 41, and 43 are of confiscated drugs and drug paraphernalia. The photos are courtesy of The Cleveland Press Collection, Cleveland State University Archives.
"Surprises from the Other"

Photographs by Janet Century

Janet Century, whose work appears on the following pages, has been a photographer for over ten years, producing black-and-white and color pictures for a number of corporations, agencies, and social services. She has also provided the photos for four children's books, done numerous photo stories for local publications, and worked on assignment for national publications such as Newsweek and Ladies' Home Journal. Recently her photo essay "Former Enemies, Future Friends," based on her trip to Vietnam with a veterans organization, was published in the Beacon Magazine. Her work has been selected for the May Show of the Cleveland Museum of Art and other juried fine art photographic exhibitions. She was recently commissioned to create a photo mural that has been put on permanent display in the lobby of Rainbow Babies and Children's Hospital. Ms. Century is a sociology graduate of Beloit College and a graduate of the Cooper School of Art's commercial photography program and of the Humanism in Action program of the Gestalt Institute of Cleveland.

Asked what kind of cameras she uses, Century says she favors those with "a sharp lens and accurate variables." But the right equipment is not all that is necessary for the successful photographer; creativity is also an indispensable ingredient. "I look for the elemental, connective threads beneath appearances, among people and in the environment, and for the humor and the special moments where unpredictable elements come together.

"The images that work and that are ultimately seen are the remainders of a painstaking editing process. I am always looking for an image that persists, one that can move a heart. Photography is a medium that begins with material that is seemingly objective and through selection puts a subjective stamp on it. These are my moments, my personal vision immortalized through my camera. But these opportunities are gifts. Being in the right place and time is half the battle. Being open to what is happening, to the surprises from the Other, is the key."
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A Good Left Hand

Joseph Ferrandino

The booth was in the underground arcade below the State Buildings in Albany. It was a "Health Information Center" thing set up by the government, a few machines where the public could test its reflexes for free. One of these machines tested reaction time.

I spread my palm on the one outlined on the panel and waited for a light to flash. When it did, I slapped a button with that same hand and looked up to check my time. I was annoyed by how slow I was. It took too long, it seemed to me, to move my hand from the start-off point to the nearby catch-on button. I don't remember the exact lapse of time, what specific fraction of a second I took.

I was annoyed by how slow I was, so I tried the test a number of times, hoping, I guess, that my best effort would exceed my first attempt. The results were about the same. Nowhere near the excellent mark; most times I hit middle of the wide average patch.

But I really didn't need that machine to tell me my reflexes had slowed a bit. I knew it when a hooking line drive bounced off my face in a softball game. It was a play I had made with a little grace when I was fifteen years old. In a hardball game at thirty-five, that shot would have crushed my cheek. I saw the ball, got enough glove on it to hear a tick, but couldn't grab enough to make that catch. And now I'm five years older. This machine only confirmed what I knew but refused to believe.

The next machine really surprised me. This one tested relative hand strength. It compared the strength of an individual's left hand with his right, not his strength compared to others.

I squeezed the metal grip and an old-fashioned gauge told me how hard I had squeezed it. It told me this on a scale of zero to one hundred and fifty. I squeezed that grip as hard as I could and hit eighty with my right hand. That was about what I've come to expect.

I squeezed it with my left hand and hit just a shade over one-twenty-one. I repeated the sequence a couple of times to make sure there was no mistake. The difference was only a couple of points either way on every try.
I know it is no big deal, but I am right-handed. I was convinced of its being my stronger side. But I was wrong and a dumb machine told me so. At forty years old I finally understood as false something I had formerly believed and acted upon. My left hand is certainly stronger—though clumsy to use.

The real reason I felt stupid is because someone had told me, a long time ago, that I had a good left hand. He didn't spell it out for me and I didn't understand. So I did not believe Willy Grunes. It took me twenty-five years to learn this simple truth about myself, to learn my strong side is the left.

The last time I saw Willy Grunes was in Sunnyside Gardens, a boxing arena in Queens. It was February of 1965. Willy came to see me fight that night. He did not say a word to me.

Willy Grunes had been my boxing trainer for two years before this fight. He trained me in the Hansen Street Y in Brooklyn, near the base of the Williamsburg Bank. I sparred with amateurs like Tony Bordenado and Bobby Roman, and pros like Jimmy DuPree. Willy handled fighters—guys who wanted to fight—from beginners like me to guys who could fight for titles.

There was a weekday routine the older guys had, the routine I followed in summer. Willy was in the gym all day. The fighters showed up at different times, depending on what they did for a living. There were guys showing up at all times of the day. And Willy gave each of us his attention.

We all trained the same way. We jumped rope, we shadowboxed, did sit-ups and time on the speed bag. We did these things to the three-minute rhythm set by a bell on the wall. We exercised, worked up a sweat, waited for our turn on the heavy bag with Willy.

That was when Willy Grunes was a teacher, a master of boxing skills. He'd call you over—usually just point your way—and you knew it was time to get the bag gloves and learn something.

"T'row a jab," he'd say to me.

I jumped into my stance and snapped a jab. Willy didn't see it, he was yelling at the guy on the speed bag. He didn't have to look at a guy to know he was doing it wrong. Willy knew when we stumbled. The rhythm skipped and Willy yelled "do it right." I flicked the jab Willy didn't look at.

"I heard only one punch," Willy said.

"That's what I did," I said. "You told me to throw a jab and I did."

"I also told you never t'row one by itself. Two jabs. Always two jabs when you t'row one. T'row a jab."

I doubled them up. Stepped in and twisted my fist to make that slap when it snapped the bag. Thrown like that, a
jab can open cuts on another guy's eyes. A sharp jab is a useful tool.

It's so important that the first few months I spent in the gym, I spent learning my stance and double jabs. Over and over. Check my feet. Keep my elbows close inside and hide my chin.

"You wanna get tagged?" Willy'd say.

"No," I'd say.

"Then don't stick out your chin like a dummy."

We worked on my stance until it became a reflex. Everything in boxing evolves from a basic stance. The ideal stance is the one that enables a fighter to protect himself when he's in a position to punch. It is that state of equipoise from which a fighter can slip a punch and counter or snap a hook without getting tagged. It's that fluid point of contact between offense and defense where one becomes the other at speed.

The ability of a shortstop to catch a hard ground ball in exactly the position from which he intends to throw it is the best example, I guess. The good ones do not approach making the catch as a separate operation from making the throw. It's conceived and executed as a single motion, as opposed to a shortstop who makes the catch then takes the time to adjust to a throwing mode. That hitch, that hesitation, makes for careers in the minor leagues.

For each boxer, the stance is varied to accommodate individual physique and particular skills. The ideal stance is modified for each fighter and assumes a different image—Floyd Patterson kept his hands at the sides of his head, the "peek-a-boo" style it was called; Roberto Duran kept his hands straight out front in predatory fashion—but each stance has in common the element of equipoise as the starting point of all technique.

This is true not only for fighting, but for writing as well. The two have a lot more in common than rhyme. I studied under another master, Gordon Lish, who taught "The Tactics of Fiction" in a writing workshop. Gordon stressed—like Willy Grunes before him, only in a different form—the primacy of stance in the writing of prose. Because I had learned it from Willy, I understood what Gordon meant. My experience proved it valid and the lesson made good sense, so I applied it. But Gordon Lish is another story. This one is about when I trained with Willy Grunes and what I mean by a good left hand.

I must admit that back then, when I first began training with Willy, I was not really sure what he meant. All those weeks of getting into a stance. Willy hit my elbows, tried to tap my chin and the skin around my eyes, stuck his fingers into my solar plexus to make me bend and drop my guard. Get into a stance and throw jabs. Step in and double them up.
Now do it again. And again. This went on for weeks and I wanted to learn something else. I had had a lot of fights in the PAL, Parks Department, and American Legion tournaments. I felt I already knew these simple things and wanted to learn complex "secrets."

To this day, whenever I'm startled, I snap reflexively into my stance. Willy knew what he was doing. There are times when a boxer can't think on his feet about things like keeping his arms in the most useful spots, like when he gets caught with a combination to a two-second standing nap. It's the reflex of his basic stance that keeps him on his feet. Stance gives a boxer the chance to snap back before he goes down for the count.

I appreciated how important the stance and a good jab was when Willy taught me how to throw the rest of my punches. Crosses, uppercuts, short left hooks. How to bang at the body or go for the head. Every punch, every combination, can be formed out of the stance with proper footwork. Stepping in and pivoting. Keeping both feet moving together to keep them in place for whatever you wanted to do.

It was easy, after a while, to get into a stance and hold it while keeping still. The hard part was to maintain that stance in motion and at speed within the confines of the ring while another guy tries hard to knock you out. The stance makes it possible to adapt, on your feet, to abrupt changes in situation. Both offense and defense can be applied depending on whether you're landing your shots or getting hit on the head. Style is the interpretation of these techniques through the basic stance in motion. That is what Willy Grunes knew, what I learned from him and try to apply in other contexts.

Willy could look at my hands and know my feet were too far apart. He did not miss a thing.

When I learned the basic punches—almost a year into my serious training—when I learned how to throw all of the punches, Willy taught me how to put them together. He taught me all the combinations he felt I could handle, given my ability. These combinations were designed to score points and win decisions, not intended to knock guys out.

He taught me how to hook off a jab, the single most effective move I ever mastered in the ring. From day one, Willy insisted I double-up on my jab. Always two. No variation. And it became a habit for me. I could snap them out like a piston and back up any guy my size.

"I got a good move for you," Willy said. "With your left hand, it's perfect."

The good move was simply this: during the first round of a fight, I doubled-up on every jab. Bap-bap. Every time. And the other guy, after a while, began to expect it. I started the second round the same way until Willy yelled and I stepped
in with the jab, twisted my hips to pivot and hit the guy with a short left hook while he was waiting for the second jab. I loved that combination. It felt good to throw—the heavy bag really hopped when I popped it—and more than once that short left hand gave me the edge I needed to win. That move—when it connected clean—really scrambled eggs.

I can't recall how many rounds I sparred doing nothing but setting up the hook. Willy told me I had a good left hand. I just didn't understand him. I still wanted to knock guys out with my right like I believed a fighter was supposed to.

Willy never explained it to me. In fact, he never talked much. I never heard him say anything that wasn't connected in some way or the other to boxing. No small talk. No "how are you?" or "how do you feel?" All he wanted to know was if you were ready for the heavy bag and did you want to spar. Only once did he talk to me out of that context. And even then, it was in parables.

I was jumping rope, doing it hard, pushing myself for three minutes. Willy excused himself from whoever was on the heavy bag, and stood in front of me.

"The rope is only this thick," he said, holding his thumb and forefinger a quarter-inch apart in front of my face. "Why do you jump like you're going over a wall, dummy." Then he turned around and walked back to the heavy bag.

I learned my mistake and worked on skipping lightly over the rope instead of jumping like I used to. But Willy never made it clear. I learned the difference between jumping rope and gracefully skipping over it. It is the difference between ducking two feet out of the way of a punch or simply slipping it by an inch. The results are the same—you make the guy miss—and you don't work against yourself in the process. Willy would never explain it like that: he preferred his fighters to figure it out. I misunderstood his metaphors, I guess. The fact is, I never really knew him.

Willy Grunes spent his days in the gym training fighters. At night he worked the corner while he watched them fight. That is all I know about his life.

I met Willy Grunes in 1963. He was in his sixties then, a tall man but stoop-shouldered, his back was hunched. He always wore a cardigan sweater, even on days when the gym was hot. On those days, he just rolled up the sleeves. His hands and arms were enormous. He had a rugged face, a face that was hard to look at without wondering what he'd been through, a long face with a solid chin and pointed nose, dark circles under milky eyes. Both those eyes—they used to be blue—were cloudy behind whatever it was that covered them like frost on a windowpane.

I was introduced to him by a friend of my family, a guy who fought professionally as a welterweight in the fifties, a
guy who had been trained by Willy. I had already been boxing on my own for two years, at the Boys Club and places like that with local coaches. When this friend—his name is Artie, he fought under the name of Sid Haber—when I told Artie I wanted to get serious with boxing, he turned me on to Willy Grunes.

The only thing I had to do was show up at the gym ready to work. Willy never asked for money. He didn't give lessons like that. He just showed up at the gym and taught guys what he knew about boxing, guys who wanted to learn and listen to him. We did what he said because Willy knew, and we wanted to learn, the tricks.

He did handle a pro when I knew him, a light-heavyweight named Jimmy DuPree who could fight. Willy believed DuPree could do okay against guys like Pastrano and Torres, even Dick Tiger who had moved up from middleweight. DuPree was fighting ten-rounders and moving into serious contention. I guess Willy got his end of those purses. I don't know for sure. Jimmy DuPree got jammed with some personal problem before Willy could move him up against the bigger names.

Willy sort of trained us on speculation. If any of us turned pro, it was understood, I guess, that Willy saw some of the prize. After a lifetime in the business, Willy Grunes was not a wealthy man. He just about got by but never complained. One fighter who went all the way would provide enough for his old age.

Willy had a knack for spotting raw talent. And he knew what things to teach each guy depending on the fighter's agility, strength, and his ability to take a punch. DuPree, a power-puncher, was trained in a different style than a guy like me who had to rely more on boxing. When we sparred, Willy told me to jab and move, not let Jimmy hit me. His instructions to DuPree were to cut down the ring and rip my head off in a corner. Not really—we were sparring—the idea was for him to gorilla me into a corner where he could tag me with both hands. I had to jab and slip away, keep moving, keep piling points and stay up on my toes.

Another thing Willy was good at was finding a fighter's best asset and showing him how to use it to his best advantage. Artie Haber, my friend, was a lefty when he first started training with Willy. Willy immediately turned him around and taught him a righty stance, hiding Artie's real power in a wicked left hook. One afternoon, in my father's backyard, I put the gloves on with Artie Haber and we sparred. I was fourteen years old at the time, and I guess Artie was thirty-five. I got wise and hit him with a few cheap shots.

He shook his head and hit me with a short left hook that buckled my knees and made my ears bleed. He caught me
before I bounced off the concrete and carried me to a chair. It was the hardest I have ever been hit.

So Willy sized me up, he knew things about me I did not know about myself. My left hand, for instance. He knew it was stronger than my right, but he never said it straight out. Willy just put the information into practical use, teaching me to hook off a jab, slip punches, how to box and not slug it out. I could hit but was no knock-out artist.

Willy even introduced me to people that way, as "the kid with the good left hand." I went to the old Garden a lot, I liked to watch the lightweights—Joe Brown, Carlos Ortiz, Ismael Laguna—it was the days of Big Jim Beattie and Oscar Bonavena, when Cassius Clay revitalized boxing, raising interest in it to a peak not seen since World War II.

One night, Willy grabbed me by the arm and dragged me across the lobby. We stopped at a black guy, about my height, with square shoulders and narrow eyes.

"Champ," Willy said. "Here's the kid. The one I told you about. The one with the good left hand."

The guy smiled and shook my hand.

"Kid," Willy said. "This is Emile Griffith."

I was awestruck. Emile Griffith. The Welterweight Champion of the World. There he was, no fanfare, no followers, just another well-dressed guy at the Garden to catch the fights. He waved and smiled, but made no big deal. The guy had dignity.

Emile Griffith is the boxer who killed Benny Kid Paret in the ring. He could hit that hard. And Willy introduced me, not by name, but as the kid with the good left hand. I was flattered. In a couple of years, I thought, I'd be ready to fight this guy. But I still didn't know what Willy meant. About my left hand, that is.

When I came home from Albany, I told my wife about the arcade and reflex machines. I told her how, twenty-five years before, cranky old Willy Grunes knew my stronger side, a fact which I myself was unaware of until I squeezed that grip.

"He must have had good eyes," she said.

I told her Willy Grunes was legally blind. He was, from those creamy cataracts. He was a guy who was legally blind but when it came to seeing clear he never missed a move. He saw the fighter's whole body—he knew from the way your fist hit the bag exactly where your feet were; he saw why you failed to get the most out of a punch and where you were open to get hit—Willy Grunes saw a lot of things other people overlooked. That was his teaching style.

He didn't concentrate on what a fighter did well, on the things that spring from instinct. He focused his attention on the weak points, where a fighter was vulnerable and off-
It seemed like he was always picking at you because he always harped on the things you did wrong. On the things that needed improvement. And he kept on harping until you corrected the mistakes. He never gave a compliment in any shape or form. Even when he referred to me as the kid with the good left hand, it was a statement of fact, merely an expression of the way in which Willy thought of me. Everything he taught to me was based upon that stance. Every move we worked on was designed to exploit that fact while using it to compensate for a weak right side. It took me twenty-five years to figure it out.

The condition of his eyesight, on the other hand, kept him from seeing things the way most of us do. He was focused on boxing, knew it by feel, and on those terms he was anyone’s equal. And Willy never talked about anything else. He talked about boxing as if nothing else existed. Willy Grunes, though legally blind, had a way to see things coming. He predicted the outcome of my last fight six months before I fought it.

That last fight was another time Willy knew more about me than I understood about myself. By the time I was sixteen, I had had about fifty fights, moving up from neighborhood bouts to the Settlement House tournaments. I wanted to box in the Golden Gloves. I felt that I was ready.

I was sparring almost every day with Tony Bordenado—he went to the finals in ’65: he was no stumblebum—and holding my own against him, I thought, although he was twelve pounds bigger. I wanted to enter the Sub-Novice class in the lightweight division.

Willy said no. Told me I wasn’t ready yet, I needed a year, maybe two, I should keep learning and wait until I could win it. I refused to listen. I told him I wanted to enter the Gloves. He told me to take a walk.

So I did. I trained on my own at the American Legion, sparring with guys who knew even less than I did. I wanted to fight in the Gloves that year.

I fought at Sunnyside Gardens. I saw Willy that night, watching me from the aisle.

In the second round I caught the guy with a short hook off a jab and it crossed his eyes. I threw it, just like that, as natural as walking down a street. I double-jabbed, stepped in, backed him up. Jabbed and twisted my hips. My fist didn’t move more than eight inches before it hit his temple. It worked like a charm and the guy went blank. I snapped another jab. A hook to the eye. A straight right hand to his chin. The guy covered up on the ropes. I kept punching his arms until I wore myself out. I could not put that kid away.

But I remember that sequence of punches clearly. The way they flowed, everything in balance from the balls of my feet to the balled-up fists in my gloves, I hit that kid with all my
weight, a one-two-three combination I know in my heart
could not have been thrown smoother by Sugar Ray Robinson
himself. Robinson threw them much harder, of course, and a
lot more often. That's why he stayed around long enough to
dominate his class. But for those few seconds I put into action
what I knew and it was flawless. I dwelled on it too long, I
guess. The kid did not go down, he covered up, and I did not
know how to open that clamshell defense. There is a way, but
I hadn't learned it.

The rest of the fight was on the street, both of us cursing
and punching wild, a bloody, sloppy thing. I lost the decision.
Willy Grunes turned around and walked away before they an­
nounced the winner. He already knew. He saw the fight. I
have not seen Willy since.

I have also not boxed in a ring since then. Not against a
human, that is. When I was in the army, I boxed a muzzled
ape in a Georgia carnival. I won five dollars for every round I
stayed in there with it. In the fourth round it jumped on my
shoulders, knocked me down and pounded me for a good
long time until its master called it off. Even if I had known
about my good left hand, I couldn't have beaten that muzzled
beast. The crowd hooted, and that was it.

In fact, knowing about my left hand is easier than putting
it to good use. I still do everything righty, it's comfortable that
way. Besides, to change that now would be to live in a mirror­
image world, and who needs a hassle like that. Things are
hard enough without doing them backwards. There is one
slight change it has made, though. It's easier to carry the
heavier grocery bags from the car up the steps with my left.
The knowledge has improved my stance.
Poland Revisited

Jan P. Muczyk

As the Pan Am plane approached Warsaw, I was curious, apprehensive, and excited. This was my first return after a 41-year absence. My father, my sister, and I, a farm boy three months shy of my ninth birthday, left Poland with little more than the clothes on our backs for Camden, New Jersey, in October 1947. My mother would join us approximately 14 months later. Now I was returning to deliver a series of invited lectures at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow (also known as the University of Cracow).

Forty-one years is a long time, and I was uncertain whether or not I had sufficient command of the Polish language to deliver an interesting lecture. So, although after a week or so my subconscious memories of the language began to flood back, I felt more at ease for having specified that my lectures be delivered in English. Even though I had prepared for my trip by some study of language and history, I was for all practical purposes an American looking at Poland as an outsider.

By Western standards the Warsaw Airport is incredibly small and inadequate. In light of the fact that Warsaw is a capital city of approximately 1.8 million people, the size of the airport constitutes a powerful statement about the post-WW II intentions of the Polish Communist government and the current ability of Poland to engage in international trade. I did not fly directly to Cracow because its airport, which is open to international civilian traffic only during the tourist season, was being remodeled. So I travelled from Warsaw to Cracow by car (a three-and-one-half hour trip on a mostly two-lane paved road like most roads in Poland). I thought the chauffeur, like most Europeans, drove like a madman, although he didn’t think so.

The three most common cars—small, smaller, and smallest—are made in Poland, originally under license from Fiat. I managed to get into the smallest one several times (a feat that ranks alongside the major engineering achievements of the 20th century). Cars imported from the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia are also frequently seen, plus a few from Western Europe as well. Trucks are not as numerous or as large as in the U.S. The railway system appears to be extensive, and the
Polish airline (LOT) is expanding. In fact, LOT has just purchased two Boeing 767 wide body jets that can fly direct from Warsaw to New York or Chicago. Yet horse-drawn vehicles still play a significant role as a supplement to the Polish transportation system. Much farming is likewise performed with horses. Both I and my wife, who joined me the second week, and who loves horses more than she loves me (and is often complimented for her good sense), were impressed with the excellent condition of the animals, when food shortages were evident in all stores, hotels, and restaurants.

On my first evening in Cracow, one of my hosts, a professor at the university, took me to dinner at the Forum, the city’s best hotel, which has not only the best Polish kitchen in Cracow, but also overlooks the Vistula (Wisla) River and Wawel Hill, perhaps the most hallowed ground in Poland. Most of the Polish kings were crowned at the Wawel Royal Cathedral, even after the capital was moved to Warsaw in 1596, and are buried there, including Poland’s most beloved Queen, Jadwiga, and her husband, King Jagiello (formerly the Grand Duke of Lithuania), who defeated the Teutonic Knights at Grunwald (Tannenberg) in 1410, strengthening the association between Poland and Lithuania, and after whom the Jagellonian University is named. The crypts of the cathedral also hold the remains of the patron saint of Poland, St. Stanislaus; her greatest poet, Adam Mickiewicz; and the revered Polish patriots, Jozef Pilsudski and Tadeusz Kosciuszko, remembered by Americans for his aid during our Revolutionary War.

The Forum’s restaurant was an excellent one, even though many of the items on the menu were not available, as was the case in practically every restaurant that I patronized. It appeared to me that much of the scarcity of foodstuffs was created by farmers withholding their goods from the government, even if it meant feeding them to their horses, because of the very low prices that the government was willing to pay.

Wawel: the cathedral. Photo courtesy of The Cleveland Press Collection, Cleveland State University Archives.
The Polish government had yet to learn that the only thing that price controls accomplish is to create scarcity and a black market. In any case, I didn't come to Poland to eat. If that had been my objective, I would have visited my mother, whose home in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, has the best Polish kitchen anywhere. But I was so touched by the view of Wawel Hill that I tried to end every day I was in Cracow savoring a cognac and the view from the lounge atop the hotel.

Before we parted that evening, my host cautioned me that the men of Cracow were traditional and still practiced remnants of the code of the petty nobility, the szlachta, which at one time was quite numerous in Poland. This code requires a very formal address to individuals (Pan, "Lord," and Pani, "Lady"). Also, this code requires that on meeting a lady, a gentleman click his heels and kiss her hand. I decided against developing this habit, since if I slipped up in the U.S., surely, sooner or later, some woman would call the police.

Cracow is a medieval city with a heavy Renaissance flavor, and many of its buildings were designed by Italian architects. Unlike many Polish cities, it survived the war intact. I did not have a full appreciation, however, of all that had survived. One afternoon the eighteen-year-old daughter of a university professor undertook to guide me around the city. I immediately informed her that she need not show me any churches, since I had already seen them all. She smiled as only an ingenue can with a hint of mischief on her lips and replied, "I don't think so." There must be fifty churches in greater Cracow that are treasures of considerable aesthetic and historical significance, representing Romanesque, Gothic, and Baroque styles, some dating back to the eleventh century. And one would have to be a mathematics major to count all the churches in Cracow, known for good reason as the "City of Churches."

Old Cracow, which at one time had been a walled city but is now surrounded with a park where the walls once stood, is a living museum. A few pieces of the wall, including the barbican, have been preserved. The heart of Old Cracow is the main market square with its renowned Cloth Hall (Sukiennice) and the Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary famed for its carved wooden altar by Wit Stwosz. This splendid Gothic edifice has two spires, and from the taller, on the hour, a trumpeter plays the same haunting tune, the hejnal, which he stops in the middle of a note. Legend has it that during the thirteenth century, when the Tartars (Mongols) made it a practice of invading "Golden Cracow," a trumpeter was sounding a warning of an attack when a Tartar arrow struck him in the throat in the middle of a note. Eight hundred years later, the Poles still honor the memory of the fallen trumpeter. The hejnal now is also the time-signal of the Polish Broadcasting Company.
The Cloth Hall is surrounded by numerous Renaissance buildings. In one, the Wierzynek, now a well known restaurant, wealthy merchants once entertained Polish kings and their guests. Although many of the menu items were unavailable even in this restaurant, its special ambience made me forget any such inconvenience.

Museums abound in Cracow. The top floor of Cloth Hall is an art museum featuring the patriotic works of Jan Matejko, and the oldest building of the Jagiellonian University, Collegium Maius, not far from Cloth Hall, is now a museum. Copernicus lived in this building for four years, and the instruments that he used are on display, as is the first globe (1510) with the Americas depicted on it (in the wrong place), and one of the pianos on which Frederick Chopin composed. The university library also contains many treasures, including Copernicus' manuscript, *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*. Another noteworthy museum consists of the Chartoryski collection, which includes Da Vinci’s "Lady with an Ermine," as well as Rembrandt’s "Landscape with the Good Samaritan."

One section of Cracow, called Kazimierz, after its founder, King Casimir the Great (1333-1370)—once a separate city—has special meaning to Poles of the Jewish faith. Here Jewish culture flourished for centuries. An old Jewish cemetery miraculously survived the Nazi occupation, and the venerable synagogue is being restored. Although Casimir the Great also founded the Jagiellonian University, he did not endow it, and I shall give you one guess who did.

The university, founded in 1364, is one of the ten oldest in the world and numbers among its alumni Copernicus; King Jan Sobieski III, whose victory over the Turks in 1683 at the gates of Vienna ended forever the Turkish threat to Western Civilization; Jozef Pilsudski, the victor over the Russians in the 1919-20 Russo-Polish war and an illustrious leader of Poland.
During the inter-war period; the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski; Pope John Paul II; and many other luminaries.

During the first week, I delivered my lectures and concluded most of my official business, which included the consolidation of ties between Jagiellonian University and my own university, Cleveland State. In the second week my wife, Dianne, joined me for some sightseeing. We took advantage of a four-day religious holiday, Corpus Christi, to see many churches and services. We were impressed by the many devotions that were dedicated to the goal of beatifying (first step toward sainthood) Stephan Cardinal Wyszynski (1901-1981). This man was largely responsible for preserving the Catholic Church in Poland during the post-WW II period, the only Eastern European country for which these claims could be made. When the Russians were occupying Poland toward the end of the war, the fate of organized religion was uncertain, so it became common practice for bishops to administer certain sacraments at the same time which, under normal circumstances, would be separated by years. When Stephan Cardinal Wyszynski was a young bishop of Lublin (a larger city not far from Zamosc) and I was a young boy, he administered first holy communion and confirmation to me on the same day. This has been a source of pride to me ever since, and those who already find me insufferable can hardly wait for his sainthood.

A must for the tourist is the 600-year-old Jasna Gora monastery at Czestochowa, approximately an hour and a half by car from Cracow. This walled city is one of the holiest places in Christendom because it contains the widely Postcard showing the famous monastery of Jasna Gora, with the crowds greeting Pope John Paul II (pictured in inset).
worshiped icon of the "Black Madonna" to whom many miracles are attributed, including the defeat of the Swedish army in 1655 at the gates of Jasna Gora. The Swedes plundered so many Polish treasures during that war, before they were driven out by the forces of Hetman Stefan Czarniecki at Zamosc, that one now needs to go to Sweden to study Polish history. Henryk Sienkiewicz, the first Polish author to receive the Nobel Prize for literature in 1905, four years after the creation of the prizes, chronicled the war in his novel, The Deluge.

An interesting day trip can be organized to Wieliczka, a town that contains a salt mine that has been operating since the Middle Ages and is considered one of the oldest continuous enterprises in the world. Much of the mine today is a museum, with amazing salt sculptures in practically every exhausted chamber, including an entire church with altar and salt crystal chandeliers. One puts on the equipment of a miner and descends to the various levels by the same elevators used by the salt miners.

The best amber, bursztyn in Polish, is found on the southern coast of the Baltic Sea, which is now the northern border of Poland. Amber has become one of the most popular commodities through which the Polish government acquires much-needed hard currency. Dianne, who not unlike many other women is genetically predisposed to fine jewelry, helped the cause by buying enough to make her an honorary Pole. For centuries all Polish women of good breeding were obligated to wear amber (hardly an onerous duty) because of the significance of amber and the "Amber Trail" in the history of Poland, as well as Lithuania and Prussia. The Amber Trail stretched from the Baltic coast (the source of amber) to the Black Sea, and for centuries the Teutonic Knights (who enforced a monopoly on amber) transported it to Constantinople, where they exchanged it for spices, silk, and other highly desired commodities.

Poland is dotted with castles and palaces that can be seen on day trips: Lancut Palace, on the way to Zamosc; Niedzica, located in the mountains and only accessible by boat; and the Pieskowa Skala Castle, also within a couple of hours of Cracow. Of course the Wawel Castle next to the Royal Wawel Cathedral, one of the most spectacular, is right in the city. Several castles and palaces in Warsaw are also obligatory; at the top of the list is Wilanow Palace, the residence of King Jan Sobieski III. The castle and palaces of Poland are alone worth the trip.

Only an hour or so from Cracow is Oswiecim, better known by its infamous German WW II name of Auschwitz-Birkenau. One must see this place, honor the dead, and remember. The Jagiellonian University remembers that on one day alone, November 6, 1939, one hundred and eighty-three
faculty were arrested and sent to Dachau and Sachsenhausen, and never afterward heard from.

I was surprised that so many Jews were visiting Poland when I was there, but I should not have been. For what was Polish territory at one time or another had been the center of Jewish culture since the thirteenth century, and many Jewish traditions and movements can be traced to this land, including Zionism, Hasidism, and the Orthodox Movement.

No country suffered as much as Poland during WW II. Out of a population of 35 million people, over 6 million perished, or approximately 18% of the population. Of those, 3 million were Poles of the Jewish faith. Russia, second after Poland, lost 11.2% of its population, and Yugoslavia 11.1%. Germany, which started it all, lost 7.4%.

I did take one overnight trip to the place of my birth, Sahryn, never a large place, and of it little is left. We lived in many places during the war, including the evocative Renaissance city, Zamosc, designed by the Italian architect, Bernardo Morando. The city was founded by a famous Polish magnate, Jan Zamoyski (1542-1605), known in his day as the "Polish Medici." Many an enemy of Poland (Russians, Turks,
Cossacks, Hungarians, and, of course, the Swedes) was finally halted at the walls and breastworks of Zamosc, when it appeared that all was lost. The old part of the city has been restored, and it still reflects the kind of life that was led in it at the zenith of its glory.

If Poland suffered more than any other country during WW II, then Zamosc and its environs suffered more than any area of Poland, with the possible exception of Warsaw. The Zamosc region was declared by the Germans as a "resettlement zone" to be cleared of native Poles and resettled by Germans. Toward that end, Poles were evicted in the most barbarous manner from over 300 villages in this region in 1942-43. Although Germany surrendered to the Allies in May 1945, the Polish Freedom and Independence Movement (WiN) continued to fight in the region until February 1947, when 40,000 men laid down their arms. These were the people who were unwilling to trade the German spurs for the Russian whip until they absolutely ran out of choices. Before and during WWII many Ukrainians and Byelorussians lived in this area west of the Bug River, which became the new border between Poland and the U.S.S.R. They were forcibly resettled after the war, as were the ethnic Germans who lived east of the Oder-Neisse River and the Poles who lived east of the Bug River. The wagon trains were ubiquitous at the time, as was the human misery associated with such mass uprooting of people from their ancestral lands.
When I was born in Sahryn right before the war, it was in the middle of an east-west line through Poland. Now Sahryn, while still in Poland, is approximately 12.4 miles from the Russian border. Because of the border revisions negotiated at Yalta and Potsdam, Poland became smaller and was shifted westward, since it also acquired territories that for hundreds of years were under German control. Poles still lament the loss of Lwów (Lvov) and Wilno (Vilnus), two cities that played a cherished role in Polish history and culture, especially through their great universities, right up to 1939. But in all fairness, the Ukrainians also have a claim on Lwów, and the Lithuanians on Wilno. One of the consequences of this dreadful war is that Poland, for the first time in many centuries, has a homogeneous ethnic and religious population.

My family was not immune to the carnage that went on in this area beginning in 1939. The house in which I was born was burned down in 1945 with my paternal grandparents in it. My father's only brother was executed in full view of his wife and three children. My father was shot but somehow survived his wound. And there were many other atrocities. We were liberated by the advancing Russian army while on the way to Germany into forced labor. The timing was fortunate because I was suffering from a serious leg infection at the time, and the pounding of the wagon and the dust from the road were anything but salubrious. Yet, for some reason I wanted to go back and see this land, and I am glad I did.

Dianne and I visited Warsaw, which, unlike Cracow, survived the war as a heap of ruins. After the second Warsaw uprising, Hitler vowed that a city would never stand on that site, and the German army, with the Russian army directly across the Vistula River doing absolutely nothing to stop it,
razed what was left of Warsaw's buildings in the order of their importance to Polish civilization. Hitler was wrong. A city stands on that spot, but it is largely a post-WW II city with a character very different from its pre-war precursor. Still, the oldest sections of the city ("Old Town" and "New Town") and buildings with immense historical significance to the people were faithfully reconstructed as the first order of business in accordance with surviving paintings. This remarkable gesture, by a people who at the time suffered so much and possessed so little, besides a surplus of hunger and misery, should tell the world how Poles feel about their nation and their culture.

While touring "Old Town," we encountered a reconstructed house with a plaque on the front that read: "On this spot stood the house in which was born in 1867 a baby girl by the name of Maria Sklodowska." This little girl grew up, went to the Sorbonne (because an assistantship for a woman scientist was not available at the Jagiellonian University), married Pierre Curie, and in 1903 won her first Nobel Prize, for physics, and in 1911 her second Nobel Prize, for chemistry. One of the new elements that she discovered, polonium, she named for her homeland. Seldom have I been moved so deeply as when standing in front of that house, and I am sure that the Jagiellonian University would like to have that decision back.

The Germans attacked Poland from the west on September 1, 1939, and the Russians did likewise from the east 16 days later. Overwhelmed by two of the mightiest war machines of the day, she capitulated. Prostrate, Poland still managed during the rest of WW II to field the fourth largest number of uniformed soldiers (228,000) who fought the Axis powers (after the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., and England). The Polish Second Corps of Montgomery's Eighth Army commanded by General Wladyslaw Anders distinguished itself at Tobruk (1943), at Monte Cassino (1944), and at Bologna (1945). General Sosabowski's Polish Parachute Brigade paid the ultimate price in the ill-fated Allied attack on Arnhem. The First Polish Armored Division, led by General Machek, played a crucial role at the Falaise Gap in the breakout from the beaches of Normandy, and accepted the surrender of Wilhelmshaven at the end of the war. Polish fighter pilots accounted for 20% of RAF strength. Two exclusively Polish squadrons (302-Poznan and 303-Kosciuszko) alone destroyed 109 Luftwaffe planes (12% of the total), and accumulated a loss-kill ratio of 1:9, which was unsurpassed in the Battle of Britain.

The Polish soldiers (Polish First and Second Armies) and airmen fighting alongside the Russians on the eastern front (General Wojciech Jaruzelski, the leader of the Polish Communist Party until recently and the current President of Poland, was among them) were no less courageous. They
were led, however, mostly by Russian officers, since the Russians slaughtered 4500 Polish officers in the spring of 1940 at Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Byelorussia. The bold effort of the Home Army in the second Warsaw uprising in 1944 remains an inspiration to the Polish people.

The first Warsaw uprising took place from April through July of 1943, when Poles of the Jewish faith, led by Mordechaj Anielewicz, who had been herded into the Warsaw Ghetto, decided that their deaths would not go unresisted and unheralded. Men, women, and children, remembering Masada and armed only with handguns, some grenades, and homemade bombs, kept a battle-hardened brigade of SS infantry at bay for three weeks. Seven thousand of these valiant innocents were killed: a similar number were incinerated in their hiding places, and the remaining fifty-six thousand were shipped to Treblinka. Greater valor one cannot find anywhere.

Yet Poland's reward was to become a vassal state of the Soviet Empire, fettered by the stifling economic and oppressive political systems that the U.S.S.R. imposed. It is quite remarkable that under these conditions any intellectual life could possibly take place. Yet, Witold Lutoslawski and Krzysztof Penderecki have become leading composers, Waclaw Sierpinski founded the "Polish school of mathematics," Aleksander Ford innovated in the realm of cinema, and Jerzy Grotowski became the dean of avant-garde theater directors. The Nobel Laureate, Czeslaw Milosz, has been recognized as one of the foremost poets of the day. (Incidentally, Pope John II, formerly Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, is also an accomplished poet.)

In the "communist workers' paradise," the joke has it, the government pretended to pay the workers and the workers pretended to work. Under such a make-believe system the goods on store shelves were also make-believe. The dollar stores, called PEWEX, were much better stocked, but they did not accept Polish currency, the zloty. While it is true that the official Polish economy was a shambles, the unofficial economy (the market oriented economy) was growing and offered the only hope for a better life. Those people who had access to hard currency, either by participating in the "second economy" or by going abroad as guest workers, and then returning, did reasonably well. The others were barely getting by. One saw new construction everywhere. Government construction was monotonous to the point of tears. Private construction, on the other hand, evinced imagination, especially in the form of new churches.

Pollution problems are massive. In the Russian scheme of things, Poland was assigned the role of heavy industry. Steel mills are operating with old technology, with no safeguards for the environment. Most buildings are heated with high sulfur coal, and buses, cars, and trucks lack emission controls.
"Golden" Cracow is now called "dirty" Cracow. It is understandable that President Bush earmarked $15 million dollars of his recent aid package for fighting pollution in Cracow (which has been designated as an "international" city) because pollution now threatens to succeed where the armies of Poland's enemies have failed—in destroying Cracow's precious legacy.

I have no intention of describing, or even of enumerating, all of Poland's social ills, but one, which is endemic to Eastern Europe, needs mentioning. Alcoholism is rampant, and the Polish government is as much at a loss about how to deal with it as the U.S. government with the drug problem. An American staying at the Jagiellonian guest house, who enjoys jogging very early in the morning, asked a group of us who the people were who were staggering along the streets and sidewalks of Cracow every morning at 5:00 a.m. Our Polish acquaintance responded, "they are yesterday's people."

A few weeks after my visit, Solidarity candidates in the parliamentary election swept practically every seat that they were permitted to contest, and now have the opportunity to run the country. When I attended a Solidarity meeting, all that the members wanted to know was whether or not Americans approved of what they were doing. When I informed the Solidarity members that I was delivering a paper on U.S. labor/manufacturing relations and invited them to attend, they informed me unapologetically that their first priority was to establish Solidarity as the major opposition party, and that labor/manufacturing relations could wait. Poles remember Yalta and Potsdam, but their love for the U.S. appears to be unbounded, nonetheless.

We must be a little patient with Solidarity, for so far they have had only the opportunity to resist and criticize, and it will take them some time to learn how to govern and forge a viable economic policy. We must recognize that Solidarity consists of an alliance between factory workers, intellectuals, and farmers, hardly natural allies. As long as there existed a common threat, Russian imperialism and the noxious order that it
imposed by force, Solidarity was united. In the absence of the common threat, the major elements of Solidarity are beginning to separate on the basis of historic divisions. It appears that Lech Walesa will head the workers, Tadeusz Mazowiecki will lead the intellectuals, and both will compete for the support of the farmers and former Communists. It is difficult at this juncture to predict how many parties will form and survive from the division of Solidarity and the ensuing process of alliance formation, but it is likely that a multi-party system in the western democratic tradition will evolve.

One year after the Communists lost the reins of power, Poland has made the transition from a poor socialist country to a poor capitalist country. Goods are now plentiful in Polish stores, but without government subsidies they are much more expensive. Many do not yet have the money to purchase these products, and will not until Poland rebuilds its economy along free market principles. But in order to do so it must receive substantial economic aid from the west because 45 years of Communism have left the nation bankrupt. Fortunately for the Poles, assistance is on its way. Now it is a matter of time.

Joseph Stalin was right after all when he observed that "implementing Communism in Poland is like trying to fit a cow with a saddle." He should also have known that the Polish body politic is unsuited for the yoke of any master. During the 123 years (from 1795 until 1918) when Poland was removed from the maps of Europe by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, there were numerous truculent Polish uprisings, led by men like Jozef Pilsudski, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Kazimierz Pulaski, Prince Jozef Poniatowski, and Jan Henryk Dabrowski. Pulaski, who was unsuccessful in his efforts to keep Poland from being partitioned, came to America, trained cavalry for George Washington, fought courageously for American independence, and died of wounds sustained in the Battle of Savannah. Poniatowski and Dabrowski were also unsuccessful in their attempts to overthrow Poland's masters. They became Marshals of France and fought for the "Polish Cause"
under Napoleon’s banner. Soldiers like these proved the point once and for all that Poles believe the first two lines of their national anthem and Dabrowski’s marching song:

Poland has not perished yet
So long as we still live.

We must not conclude that all of Poland’s heroes, while she was occupied by foreign powers, were warriors. Her glory was also reflected by such artists as Frederick Chopin, Ignacy Jan Paderewski, and Joseph Conrad (Teodor Jozef Konrad Nalecz Korzeniowski, and who would blame him for changing his name).

Also, we should continually remind ourselves that Poland’s backbone has always been her peasants. Their story was told as well as it could be by Władysław Reymont in his novel, The Peasants, for which he was rewarded with the Nobel Prize for literature in 1924.

The actions of Solidarity have been remarkably pacific and out of character with Polish insurrections of the past. The earlier leaders would not have been honored with the Nobel Peace Prize, had it existed, the way Lech Walesa was. Yet this approach appears more effective than its violent alternatives, for what not long ago appeared as an inevitable, interminable domination by the Soviet Union may turn out, after all, to be nothing more than a brief moment in Poland’s 1,000 year history. ☐
Raise the Bismarck?

Jon Kohl

"I said to the German people that we will do all within our power to keep the location of the Bismarck a secret, and that we will turn over the exact coordinates of the ship to the Germans, and that what happens to the Bismarck in the future is in the hands of the German people." These words were spoken to the German government by Robert Ballard, a senior scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, who found both the Titanic and the Bismarck on the bottom of the Atlantic.

Will the Germans allow an in-depth, hands-on investigation by Ballard's robotJason that one day will possibly lead to the raising of the well-preserved Bismarck? Probably not. The Germans have been very firm in the past on the question of sunken war vessels: Leave our dead at rest. Ballard observes their view is similar to the American with respect to the Arizona or to the British with their battle-cruiser, Hood, which was sunk in the sea-fight with the Bismarck.

The Bismarck, launched on St. Valentine's Day, 1939, was the newest, fastest, largest, most heavily armed and armored warship in the entire world. On that day in Hamburg before Hitler and a large crowd of notables, the granddaughter of Prince (also Prime Minister, Chancellor, and General) Otto von Bismarck, builder of World War I Imperial Germany, baptized the new warship (with French champagne) bearing her family's name. The Bismarck was the embodiment of the Third Reich at sea. The best crew and officers were picked to man her. Captain Ernst Lindemann had earned his distinction as an outstanding gunnery expert and an officer, reliable, tenacious, and exceptionally seaworthy. Hitler and Admiral of the Kriegsmarine (German Navy) Erich Raeder together chose Admiral Gunther Lütjens for the position of Fleet Commander of the task force comprising the Bismarck and the heavy cruiser Prinz Eugen.

Berlin knew it, London knew it, and the crew knew it—there was not a single ship in the world that could stand up to the Bismarck. And once the task force broke out into the open Atlantic, Allied convoys, the British lifeline, would fall like sheep to a wolf. British warships were too thinly spread out to avert this eventuality and the Admiralty fearfully awaited
news of other German heavy warships emerging from their protected berths: the Tirpitz (Bismarck's sister ship) and the pocket battleships Scharnhorst and Gneisenau, Admiral Lütjens's former task force. If any of these ships linked up with Bismarck, cargo traffic in the North Atlantic would be stopped, and the Royal Navy would be hard-pressed to do anything about it. The crew knew this too.

During war, reputations last only until the next battle—then they must be won all over. The battle cruiser Hood for much of two world wars was the Royal Navy's most powerful warship. Her exploits gained fame in all England. If any ship could do the job it would be good old Hood. On May 24, 1941, Bismarck took less than six minutes to break her in half and sink her with only three survivors out of a complement of 1,419. Then Bismarck trained her 15-inch guns on the Prince of Wales, Britain's newest battleship, and sent her fleeing in fire and smoke.

Every available British ship joined in an epic chase, nerve-racking and suspenseful to observers around the Atlantic and around the world. Everyone in the British Isles especially paid attention to this historic naval fight, that some say led to the end of the battleship era. On 26 May, a chance hit on the Bismarck's rudder by a 20-year-old torpedo biplane launched from Ark Royal, a British aircraft carrier, slowed the Bismarck enough for the British fleet to catch up and surround the ship, now alone. If the German battleship had been able to reach the protection of German land-based airplanes or if submarines had been nearby she might have been able to avoid her fate. She would have been behind a screen the Royal Navy, low on fuel, could not penetrate. Instead, British battleships battered her with torpedoes and large shells. Early on, the Bismarck's main guns were disabled and, henceforth, it was execution. But she did not sink.

The highest surviving officer, Lieutenant-Commander von Müllenheim-Rechberg, a gunnery officer, wrote: "Bismarck displayed an almost unbelievable staying power. She was also a high point in German shipbuilding. It required the collective efforts of a British fleet of five battleships, three battle cruisers,
two aircraft carriers, four heavy and seven light cruisers, and twenty-one destroyers to find and destroy her. In addition more than fifty aircraft of the RAF's Coastal Command participated in her destruction. The British ships fired 2,876 shells, some at point-blank range, and did not penetrate the Bismarck's armored hull, not even once. By this time, the Germans had already exploded scuttling charges and flooded the main compartments. A British heavy cruiser finally unloaded two torpedoes into her side, at which point Bismarck slowly capsized.

Admiral Tovey, commander of the British ships, said in his final report of the chase: "[Bismarck] put up a most gallant fight against impossible odds, worthy of the old days of the Imperial German Navy, and she went down with her colours flying." Only 115 survivors (of 2,200 crewmen) made it ashore, most of them picked up by the Dorsetshire, an English cruiser. While Bismarck was lying completely on her side, Captain Lindemann walked out onto the starboard side of the hull, saluted, and went down with his ship. Later a survivor wrote, "I always thought such things happened only in books, but I saw it with my own eyes."

Present-day Germans may rightly desire to leave the mighty hulk at rest, remembered as it was in its fatal sea fight.

Notes
2 All remaining quotations taken from Battleship Bismarck: A Survivor's Story by Baron Burkard von Müllenheim-Rechberg. (Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 1980).
3 The Discovery of the Bismarck by Robert D. Ballard, a beautifully illustrated account of the Bismarck and of Ballard's discovery of its wreckage at a depth of about three miles, has just been published by Madison Press Books, Toronto. Photos on this and the preceding page appear in Ballard's book.
Poetry

David Citino

The Carp of the World

God, praying for a crappie, cast
the 10 lb. test line into
the brooding Cuyahoga currents,
His bait bologna and dough,

but after eons of patience
He struck only a great carp,
chaos-dark, sheen of PCB’s
rainbowing its whiskers, tumors

fat as crowds at County Services
stuck like lampreys to its flanks.
He reeled it in, tried for fire
with an old Zippo until it went dry

and then the matches, Lonely?
Let Me Be Your Fantasy For Only
Two Dollars Per Call, which
He’d found in the Cathedral pew

where he liked to sleep, beyond
the Galleria’s trendy tinsel din,
but the oily railroad ties
wouldn’t catch, and the smoke
He called Nightlife, and the sparks gathering upward toward AmeriTrust
He named The Urban Milky Way, and threw the carp back in.

Hunger drove Him to the suburbs where for millennia He foraged in dumpsters, hands squishing rancid milk and shellfish,

His need creating obese cops, white as priests, who cruised by, cursing, in new Chevrolets. Since muscatel was His only defense,

they threw the book at Him.
The carp’s been growing, its progeny prospering in stream and sea, and on that day we get what’s coming,

the carp will writhe, flailing hideous, misshapen tails, roiling the putrid mud and tides, and give it to us, one last flood.

David Citino writes, “This poem swam up to me one day, waved its great tail and demanded my attention. A sense of place is nearly always the first thing about a poem that I decide, and the place I choose most often—although I’ve lived elsewhere and have done some traveling—is Cleveland, its river and lake and general topography imprinted indelibly in my mind and on my heart.” Citino is a professor of English and the director of the creative writing program at Ohio State University. He is the author of five books of poems, the most recent being The House of Memory from the Ohio State University Press.
Teeth Mother

white on the ceilings of nightmare. in skulls, luminous in the grave. what holds the shape of spit. in the teeth of the evidence and cold "like pearls." wake up. grandma's, in glasses. do the teeth win or the smile? gold in mirror, flashing behind the tongue. gold words, hard glittering phrases. and then what about the pepsodent smile, is it the wolf or grandma, does this matter? teeth, eat, death, should we not write, "he bared his teeth"? and what of that first and final toothless cry? all vowels, someone screaming behind or under velvet.

The Question

You ask, when the last Human has died Will God fold up the world And put it away?

Clean and stern Your six-year-old vision, the last human, Indeterminate sex, kneeling there In the empty street

Dying alone, the memory Of the world fading to grey

And then God deflating the hills, Rolling up seas, Putting the forests back In their segmented boxes,

Putting it up on the shelf. Taking down Something else.
Alcatraz

Seen from the boat, a jail's grey ghost.
Gold bracelets glitter as we wave
to the group of tourists there, who wander
the cellblocks, climb the catwalks,
looking like tired Boy Scouts. Our guide says
it's a tough tour, no heart patients
allowed. He thinks no one ever escaped
from Alcatraz. California's too-bright blue
burns my eyes, they close. He's wrong. I
escaped. The prison held the world's worst women,
I kissed my murderess roommate goodbye
and made a clean arc into the bay.

I do the crawl for days, not even tiring,
with strange birds following overhead.
I come ashore at last on white sand. You
and California are not yet invented.

"My poetry tends to be simply recording of my
daily life," Janet McCann says. ""The Question" is
based on that specific question having been asked by
my youngest son, and my wondering what was
going on in his head when he asked it. "Teeth Mother"
is based on my wait in the
dentist's office. . . . I want
poetry to be accessible to
all who read for pleasure
and enrichment, not just
to other poets." An as­
sociate professor of English
at Texas A & M Uni­
versity, Ms. McCann lists
among her other interests
animal rights and parent­
ing. Her poems have ap­
peared in Southern
Poetry Review and Kan­
sas Quarterly, and in
1989 she received an NEA
grant for poetry.
Milo Awakes
from a Dream of Flying

Hardly can this world contain
the freedom Milo sees,
as the first glimmer of morning
slips into his room
and hurries the urgent movement
beneath his eyelids. Emily Dickinson
sits with an open book on her lap,
instructing Milo on proper procedure:
dip low when it's unexpected,
and swallow the vertigo when you veer
toward clouds. Never touch down,
for you don't know when
they'll let you up again.
Overanxious, Milo brushes his foot
against her cheek as he takes off.
He squeezes through windows inches wide,
them, like light, fades when turning
a darkened corner. This is worth sacrificing
everything for, Milo decides, sailing
through a flock of swifts. He won't stop,
even for death.

Daylight
ruins it all. Outside,
it's raining and Milo remembers
another autumn morning, years before,
waking at a friend's house on Vancouver Island,
drinking instant coffee
and having nowhere to go.
The rain misted the windows and the world
was golden and wet and full
of mystery and drama
and possibility.

This,
too, was a dream.
Milo Examines the Nature of Color

color, hue; tint, tinct, tincture, tinge, shade, tone, cast; key.
—Roget’s Thesaurus

Milo colors his world damask when she shakes in bed, crying and pushing him away. He stands—shaking, too—in a corner, waiting for another of her brief sicknesses to dry up.

Cucumber green—that’s the color for Milo when she’s gardening, staring down the rows of flowering squash coming up too fast and too big, choking off the other sprouts.

Play the lapis lazuli blues, Milo, on your ancient dobro. Every accidental crack in your voice is as pure as the smooth-worn face of a tombstone. Sing anything but what you feel.

Overhead, the sun burns oil, gold, sulfur, mad and madder yellow, then white—lifting Milo up as she watches, waving good-bye, eyes bedazzled.
Milo Watches Cable TV with the Ghost of Marianne Moore

Drunk again, he nudges—a little rudely—the great savant of snails and octopi. She’s engrossed, scribbling notes and asking questions of the screen about these rhinoceroses. “You never saw them in the circus, just the zoo.” The program through, she yanks the remote control from him, and—quick as a kangaroo rat—jumps from channel to channel, with comments for each: Of CBN, “Such eye-shadow!” Of soft-porn, “I don’t need to see what I can imagine quite well.” The Dodgers-Mets game depresses her—“Where are Gil Hodges and Round-Tripper Duke? Where? Los Angeles? I fear this won’t do at all.” She takes solace in MTV. Sipping beer, he watches the flash in her eyes. The colors, vivid and changing constantly, draw her in; “Don’t tell,” she whispers, as a guitar solo peals (but of course he will). A travel show pans up the face of Milan’s Cathedral. “Mother and I were there—many, many years ago.” This recollection of the past seems to tire the elderly woman. Her eyes aren’t so sharp as they once were. He pats her arm, tells her to rest, changes the station to Discovery.

A pit of fer-de-lances writhes, as handlers draw their venom out (the bane effects the cure) and release them—harmless temporarily.
The image of children has changed radically over the years, as social ideas have become secular. Under the religious influence of earlier eras, children of any age were held responsible for their misdeeds. As society became more secular, the notion of sin-driven guilt diminished, until today we have reached the other extreme, that parents are guilty if children misbehave. After the fall of Rome, when social and religious ideas became intertwined, the treatment of children as little adults subject to moral corruption became dominant. The Renaissance humanists were the earliest thinkers to dispute this notion, notably in their writings about education. Montaigne, in his essay "Of the Education of Children," expresses views that eventually became commonplace:

I have always disliked the discipline of most of our schools. They might have erred less harmfully by leaning toward indulgence. They make them slack, by punishing them for slackness before they show it. Go in at lesson time: you hear nothing but cries, both from tortured boys and from masters drunk with rage. What a way to arouse zest for their lesson in these tender and timid souls, to guide them to it with a horrible scowl and hands armed with rods! Wicked and pernicious system! ... How much more fittingly would their classes be strewn with flowers and leaves than with bloody stumps of birch rods!

The entire essay is consistent with progressive twentieth century education.

But Montaigne was a precursor, far ahead of his time. Not until the eighteenth century did the desire to reform education become widespread and serious. In the selections that follow (arranged in chronological order) one can trace the gradual realization that children are not adults, that their education is important, and that it ought to take place in an enlightened atmosphere.

The quotations are part of a larger collection of ideas about childhood by thinkers of all periods. They have been compiled by Irving and Anne D. Weiss while preparing their book, A Dictionary of Childhood. These selections are limited to consistent with progressive twentieth century education.

Irving and Anne D. Weiss became interested in the various perceptions of childhood "through collecting examples of children's writing in English, 15th century to present, working title I Sit on My Botom. and from experience of our own family life, two children born abroad, two in the United States. The main purpose of A Dictionary of Childhood, " the authors explain, "is to demonstrate that solemn observers throughout the centuries have had to say about childhood, about the birth and bringing up of children, can put parents and teachers in touch with their deepest feelings as ordinary child-centered texts cannot do." The Weisses are teachers, freelance writers, and editors. Previous collaborations have produced American Authors and Books: 1640 to the Present Day and the Thesaurus of Book Digests: 1950-1980.
thinkers of the critical eighteenth century. The headings are the Weisses', the arrangement mine.

—Louis T. Milic

PUNISHMENT
I must whip my children for going into bad company instead of railing at bad company for ensnaring my children.
—Richard Steele, The Tatler (October 4, 1709)

PARENTAL RIGHTS
The desire of dominion is a never-failing consequence of the pride that is common to all men; and which the brat of a savage is as much born with as the son of an emperor. The good opinion we have of ourselves makes men not only claim a right to their children, but likewise imagine that they have a great deal of jurisdiction over their grandchildren. The young ones of other animals, as soon as they can help themselves, are free; but the authority which parents pretend to have over their children never ceases. How general and unreasonable this eternal claim is naturally in the heart of man we may learn from the laws which, to prevent the usurpation of parents and rescue children from their dominion, every civil society is forced to make, limiting parental authority to a certain term of years.
—Bernard Mandeville, The Fable of the Bees (1714)

UPBRINGING
We make our children fear and obey us purely out of self-concern, molding them in our own image. On the model of our own greed, arrogance, and cowardice, we teach them how to manage money, when to act superior, when to submit. Since it never occurs to us that our children may have natures of their own, we never dream of trying to make them original, independent, and bold.
—Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de Vauvenargues, Reflections and Maxims (1746)

GENEROSITY
Children's future tempers, as to benevolence, may be guessed at by their willingness to part with any thing they are fond of.
—Samuel Richardson, Pamela (1755)

HYPOCRISY
How can children credit the assertions of parents, which their own eyes show to be false?
—Samuel Johnson, Rasselas (1759)
AUTHORITY

Treat your pupil according to his age. Begin by putting him in his place and keep him in it so firmly that he will not think of leaving it. Then he will practice the most important lesson of wisdom before he knows what wisdom is. Give him absolutely no orders of any kind. Do not even let him imagine that you claim any authority over him. Let him only know that he is weak and you are strong, and that therefore he is at your mercy. Quite early let him feel the heavy yoke which nature imposes on man, the yoke of necessity in things as opposed to human caprice. If there is anything he should not do, do not forbid him, but prevent him without explanation or reasoning. Whatever you give, give at the first word without prayers or entreaty, and above all without conditions. Give with pleasure, refuse with regret, but let your refusals be irrevocable.

—Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emile (1762)

LOVE IN CHILDREN

There is, I believe, no impression that affects so strongly a young mind as the supposition of being dear to another.

"The Middle-Class Compassionate Family," anonymous engraving, c. 1780.
Though originating merely from self-love, it incites a reciprocation. The very idea that you are pleasing, stimulates you to render yourself really so, even though there be not that similarity of manners and disposition on which a union of souls is usually founded.

—George Anne Bellamy, *An Apology for the Life of George Anne Bellamy* (1767)

**SPOILING**

I thank you for your intelligence about my godson. . . . Pray let him have everything he likes: I think it is of great consequence while the features of the countenance are forming. It gives them a pleasant air, and that being once natural, and fixed habit, the face is ever after the handsomer for it, and on that much of a person's good fortune and success in life may depend.

—Benjamin Franklin, Letter to Mary Hewson (1771)

**EDUCATION**

It is at the very instant a child receives motion and life that it receives its first instruction: it is sometimes even in the womb where it is conceived, that it learns to distinguish between sickness and health. . . . In these first moments what can be true instructors of infancy? The various sensations it feels: these are so many instructions it receives.

If two children have the same preceptor, if they are taught to distinguish their letters, to read and repeat their catechism, &c. they are supposed to receive the same education. The philosopher judges otherwise: according to him, the true preceptors of a child are the objects that surround him; these are the instructors to whom he owes almost all his ideas.

—Claude-Adrien Helvétius, *A Treatise on Man* (1777)

**HUMANITY**

Suppose a man, who had never seen a child, were to be thrown upon an island with no other inhabitants upon it at the time but children; how surprisingly would he be entertained with the little people, their language, their manners, their sentiments! We must suppose him all the time to have a persuasion, that they are a species of mankind, and we must divest ourselves of our habitual notion of the imperfection of children in all respects, so as to think of him addressing himself to them as he would do to any nation of his own size, with which he was utterly unacquainted. He would no doubt find out their ignorance. But upon my word I doubt if they would not appear to him more enlightened than the savage nations which have of late been discovered.

—James Boswell, *Boswell's Column* (1781)
LOVE IN PARENTS

Dr. Collier observed, that the love one bore to children was from the anticipation one's mind made while one contemplated them: "We hope (says he) that they will some time make wise men, or amiable women; and we suffer 'em to take up our affection beforehand. One cannot love lumps of flesh and little infants are nothing more."

—Dr. Arthur Collier, as related by Hester Thrale Piozzi in Anecdotes of Dr. Johnson (1786)

DISCIPLINE

An inflexible adherence to any rule that has been laid down makes children comfortable, and saves the mother and nurse much trouble, as they will not often contest, if they have not once conquered. They will, I am sure, love and respect a person who treats them properly, if some one else not indiscreetly indulge them. I once heard a judicious father say, "He would treat his child as he would his horse: first convince it he was its master, and then its friend."

—Mary Wollstonecraft, Thoughts on the Education of Daughters (1787)

LANGUAGE AND MATHEMATICS

I have never thought a boy should undertake abstruse or difficult sciences, such as mathematics in general, till fifteen years of age at soonest. Before that time, they are best employed in learning the languages, which is merely a matter of memory.

—Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Ralph Izard (1788)
PARENTAL OBLIGATIONS
Parents, in the order of Providence, are made for their children, and not their children for them; they are only their trustees, at the most. They have no just title to any more than a distributory use of their goods even whilst they live; they ought perhaps as frequently as their place admits to go gradually out of life and let their children into a partnership or more than partnership with them. After a certain age it were better gradually to slide out of life—and let the children gradually into the succession. No rule can be fixed, in a matter infinitely variable according to circumstances. But it is good to have it in one’s eye. Which is nearly all that can be said of moral and prudential rules.

—The Correspondence of Edmund Burke, Volume VII (January 1792-August 1794)

CURIOUSITY
Children always want to look behind mirrors.
—Joseph Joubert, Notebooks (1795)

EDUCATION
I had a writing teacher and a dancing teacher; the writing teacher traced letters in pencil and I had to go over them in ink; the dancing teacher made me walk and execute a few steps on the table, but I am certain it was money misspent for I really learnt to write and dance much later. This is how a too precocious education usually leads one nowhere.
—Catherine the Great (1729-1796), The Memoirs

BOYS’ SCHOOLS
The expression may appear ludicrous; yet there is not, in the course of life, a more remarkable change than the removal of a child from the luxury and freedom of a wealthy house to the frugal diet and strict subordination of a school; from the tenderness of parents, and the obsequiousness of servants, to the rude familiarity of his equals, the insolent tyranny of his seniors, and the rod, perhaps, of a cruel and capricious pedagogue. Such hardships may steel the mind and body against the injuries of fortune; but my timid reserve was astonished by the crowd and tumult of the school; the want of strength and activity disqualified me for the sports of the playfield; nor have I forgotten how often in the year forty-six I was reviled and buffeted for the sins of my Tory ancestors.
—Edward Gibbon, Autobiography (1789-1794)

FREEDOM
I always admired the sentiment of Rousseau: "The boy dies, perhaps, at the age of ten or twelve. Of what use, then, all the
restraints, all the privations, all the pain, that you have inflicted upon him? He falls, and leaves your mind to brood over the possibility of your having abridged a life so dear to you." I do not recall the very words; but the passage made a deep impression upon my mind, just at the time when I was about to become a father; and I was resolved never to bring upon myself remorse from such a cause. I was resolved to forgo all the means of making money, all the means of living in anything like fashion, all the means of obtaining fame or distinction, to give up everything, to become a common labourer rather than make my children lead a life of restraint and rebuke: I could not be sure that my children would love me as they loved their own lives; but I was, at any rate, resolved to deserve such love at their hands.

—William Cobbett (1763-1835), The Autobiography

**HUMILIATION**

It is moral when we do something derogatory to the child’s longing to be honoured and loved (a longing which is an aid to moral training); for instance, when we humiliate the child by treating him coldly and distantly. This longing of children should, however, be cultivated as much as possible. Hence this kind of punishment is the best, since it is an aid to moral training—for instance, if a child tells a lie, a look of contempt is punishment enough, and punishment of a most appropriate kind.

—Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Education

**PARENTAL OBLIGATIONS**

My father held the same views as his mother concerning the education befitting children whose parents enjoyed a position at court. Thus mine was rather left to take care of itself.

Parents considered that they had done enough for their progeny by opening a career for them and securing for them advantageous posts; by marrying them and increasing their allowance.

Paternal care had not yet come into fashion; the fashion was indeed the very reverse when I was a child; thus my early years were cheerlessly spent in an outlying district of Paris.

—Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, Prince de Bénévent (1754-1838), Memoirs of the Prince de Talleyrand
Review


James Borchert

For some time now Clevelanders have hotly debated the extent to which their city has actually recovered from its bouts with default, decline, and despair. While the outcome of this debate remains unclear, there is no doubt about the renaissance of scholarly interest in the city. After many years of neglect, Cleveland’s past is the subject of an increasing number of useful studies, including Kenneth Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape* (1976); Eric Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture: 1876-1976* (1979); Todd Swanstrom, *The Crisis of Growth Politics* (1985); *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform* (1986), and *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (1987), both edited by David Van Tassel and John Grabowski; as well as the work of the Cleveland Heritage Program, especially *The Birth of Modern Cleveland* (1988), edited by Thomas Campbell and Edward Miggins. This year witnessed the publication of Gary Polster’s *Inside Looking Out: The Cleveland Jewish Orphan Asylum* and a reprint of William Ganson Rose’s massive 1950 compilation, *Cleveland: the Making of a City.*

Of these efforts, the *Encyclopedia* is clearly the most important work (see earlier review in *Gamut*, Issue 24). With its brief historical overview and over 2,500 entries beginning with the “AHS Foundation” and ending with “Zorman, Ivan,” it provides a vast resource for researchers and Clevelandophiles alike. The book does have a number of limitations, including a price tag of $35; weighing nearly 5 pounds, it is printed in very small type, even smaller in the index. And, save for maps, the volume lacks illustrations.

To make the project more accessible, editors Van Tassel and Grabowski through the auspices of Indiana University Press have projected a series of smaller illustrated volumes about the city; *Cleveland: A Concise History* is the first. While most of the contents of this thin book appeared in *The
Encyclopedia as "Cleveland: A Historical Overview," there are several significant changes: Carol Poh Miller's section on the "Rise of the Industrial City" (1860-1929) replaces Ronald Weiner's essay, and she added a chapter on "Comeback City? 1980-1989," while the editors provide 54 illustrations to the text. Although targeted at the secondary school market, Cleveland is an important book for all interested in the city's past, present, and future.

Cleveland utilizes a chronological organization and social history approach. The first two parts trace the community's history from Moses Cleaveland's 1796 survey and the ensuing settlement through the successive developments of a hamlet, village, and eventually a commercial city in the years before the Civil War. The last two parts, comprising two-thirds of the book, follow Cleveland's transformation into a major industrial center prior to the Great Depression and the city's effort to adapt in the post-industrial era that followed. Within these larger time frames, the authors discuss the area's economic, social, political, and cultural life. Cleveland receives major attention, but suburban development is not slighted.

Although an appendage of New England and the Connecticut Land Company, the young town drew a considerable proportion of its population from New York. Development of canals and then railroads expanded the city's commercial activities while migration from Germany and Ireland swelled the population in the years before the Civil War. Nevertheless, it was the postwar period that witnessed the greatest growth and transformation. New and expanded enterprises in oil refining, iron and steel, and automobile manufacturing produced great wealth for industrialists as well as jobs for unskilled workers. Emigration of southern and eastern Europeans helped swell the city's population and make it the sixth largest city in the U.S. in 1910. From World War I on, African-Americans from the South replaced this migration and helped Cleveland maintain its ranking into the 1940s.

In the belief of many Clevelanders, the city continued to be among the nation's elite well into the 1960s. Championships in professional baseball and football as well as the prominence of the Cleveland Orchestra helped mask sharp shifts in industry and population. Despite this widely held view, Miller correctly dates Cleveland's decline from the Great Depression: "The year 1930 marked a watershed in the city's fortunes . . . The depression years . . . thus mark a distinct period in the city's life—an end to prosperity—from which . . . Cleveland has never fully recovered" (130).

Miller notes that "as early as 1930, census figures showed that Cleveland was 'decaying at the core'"; by the early 1950s "the city stood at a crossroads" with "its central business district and its neighborhoods . . . deteriorating . . . crime worsening, and thousands of city residents . . . leaving for new homes
in the suburbs" (134, 156). Efforts to correct the decline, such as urban redevelopment, often exacerbated problems while city leaders focused programs on downtown and largely ignored the neighborhoods. If default in December, 1978, marked the city's low point, Miller found "the roots of the city's fiscal problems reached back at least as far as 1965" (178). By 1980, the sixth city had slipped to eighteenth.

Miller provides a balanced assessment of Cleveland's comeback since default. On the credit side, she notes the transformation of the Flats and warehouse district as well as office construction downtown. On the debit side, the city lost about 3,500 households per year during the 1980s. By 1990 Cleveland had become a tale of two cities: a well-to-do corporate downtown, and residential neighborhoods increasingly marked by poverty.

Cleveland is not without problems. While any broad treatment of the city's history must be selective, the discussions here are often thin; important aspects remain underdeveloped. Although the book conscientiously presents Cleveland's ethnic, class, and cultural diversity, these groups seldom appear as actors in the city's history. There are occasional contradictions: Wheeler more correctly notes "Cleveland was not a hotbed of abolitionism," while Miller calls the city "a center of the abolition movement" (57, 74). There are some minor errors throughout, such as the oversimplified dating of the end of the Baker Motor Vehicle Company. Although the book is effectively illustrated throughout, several photographs have little or no connection with the text while others are not adjacent to the section they illustrate. Surprisingly, the volume lacks a bibliography.

Despite these cavils, Cleveland is a well-written, interesting, and valuable book. Based on solid research, it provides a much needed interpretive and synthetic history of the community. Most important, it provides a useful perspective to evaluate the city's past as well as its efforts to "comeback."
Letters

His/her/its/their

The Editor,

In a recent commentary Editor Louis Milic called attention to the current fashion for removing so-called sexist bias from the language. In particular he worried about the use of the masculine pronouns for the "unmarked" form in such sentences as "Everyone should clean off his desk before leaving." Mr. Milic suggested that the zealots might be appeased if the neuter form "its desk" were substituted, with the added caution that "its" be written in bold type or other distinctive way to set it off.

The English-speaking public has long been way ahead on this matter. The most commonly heard form of the sentence about clean desks, even among educated people like college professors, is "Everyone should clean off their desk before leaving." Of course such usage violates the logical rule about number but apparently the average speaker—even before the current fetish about sexism—found that the number confusion was not only tolerable but perhaps useful even when the referent sex was unambiguous—"Which of you guys left their glove on the field?" Although the adjectives like "each" and "every" and the pronouns like "everyone" and "someone" describe a singular person or thing, they also refer to a class of objects. The single member referred to is anonymous, abstract and only vaguely specific. It is precisely in those cases that we are comfortable with the plural form "they" or "their" as in "Who would have thought they would find such arguments in The Gamut?"

Jack A. Soules

Careful writers avoid the construction suggested by Professor Soules. The baseball example ignores the fact that girls play the game or that they use "guys" unisexually. The last example proves the point that the plural is not a solution because it is ambiguous: they can refer either to the antecedent of who or to some external group. Although usage reigns, it need not tyrannize and careful writers are free to avoid ambiguity wherever possible.

Louis T. Milic
More Good Bookstores

Dear Ms. Pastoret:
I enjoyed very much reading your article entitled "Where are Cleveland's Bookstores?" However, I was a little disappointed that you did not mention one of the really exciting book outlets here in Cleveland. I am referring specifically to the Bookstore on West Twenty-Fifth, just north of the West Side Market.

This bookstore is operated by Mr. Michael O'Brien, and it is my belief that his collections of old and new volumes, particularly second-hand volumes, are really the best in Cleveland.

I would strongly recommend, as a "fellow bookworm" (forgive me for using the male denotation), that you visit this easily accessible facility. I am sure that you will agree that it should have been reviewed in your fine article.

Robert J. White, M.D., Ph.D.
Cleveland, Ohio

The Editor
It seems rather curious to me that an article about Cleveland's bookstores, in the Cleveland State University journal, The Gamut, doesn't include its own bookstore: Barnes & Noble.

We have been here since 1974, do more than 25% of our general book business with the outside community, advertise in the Yellow Pages, sponsor the Kwickie Board for 3 days on the annual WVIZ annual auction, have autograph parties for best-selling authors, pay taxes, etc.

We don't just deal with what some refer to as a "captive audience" which means selling textbooks to students, but sell to a wide group of customers in the Greater Cleveland area.

Not only does Barnes & Noble at CSU offer the usual best-sellers and trade books, but we have an out-of-print section gleaned regularly by collectors and other dealers.

In addition, many of our sections devoted to a single subject (Women, History, Political Science, Business to name a few) are better than any in this area, due to the professionalism of our staff, whose manager is Garth Proctor, a 15-year veteran of book buying, and Cathi Archer, the best professional book buyer in the city.

Sure I'm blowing our horn, but it seems Ms. Pastoret's travels keep her from seeing what is in her own backyard.

Sidney Waldman, Bookstore Manager
Barnes & Noble, Cleveland Ohio
HERBERT ASCHERMAN JR.

Portrait Photographer
1846 Coventry Village, Suite 4
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118
(216) 321-0055

Official portrait photographer for The Gamut.
On September 24, 1990, Northern Ohio Life magazine presented to the editors of The Gamut its 1989-1990 Award of Achievement in Media "in recognition of outstanding contributions to the quality of life in the region," specifically for the "triannual journal they created ten years ago on the broad premise that a periodical should offer readers information on topics they might not investigate on their own." We continue to operate on this premise.