

JPM: 07/28/04 2:30pm

1

JBM: What are the tactics Kerry and the Democrats should use to

beat Bush?

*Judith - return
double-speed by 10:30 A.M.
the tomorrow (Thurs.)*

NM: The Democrats demonstrated ~~their~~ tactics during their

convention. They will look to catch the swing voters and those

conservatives who are repelled by the Flag-Cons but are still loyal

to the Republicans. To do that, the ~~Democratic Party~~ ^{Democracy} will present

themselves

itself as the good, sensible, highly patriotic, serious party of the

resolute about terrorism, and passionately
middle class, strong for peace, reliable for war, as the only real and

loyal to the working class and the disadventage of
the cause - they make their subtlest claim! - they are not
true compassionate conservatives. The Republicans, in turn, will

do all they can to make the street protesters look like the ~~true~~ ^{disruptive}

concealed, and explosive heart of the Democratic Party.

words?

JSM/Mexico2 7/28/04 2:30pm

2

Word count: 108

JBM: How does Vietnam relate to this election? Is Iraq the same

kind of quagmire?

NM: Bad as Iraq has been up to now, Vietnam was worse. We

were there in force for ten years. Fifty thousand of our soldiers

(what is immediately comparable)
~~Comparable to Iraq is that~~
 were killed and two million Asiatics) ~~Even~~ the logic for being

~~there proved faulty.~~ *False.* The Domino Theory did not play out. ~~It did not~~
~~"spread" Southeast Asia from Communist.~~

may have been
 Southeast Asia was ~~a~~ mess afterward, but only Vietnam turned

well on the way before
 Communist, and it was ~~half there already~~ when we came in. The

major
~~(difference in Iraq is that)~~ *the two major branches of*
 we have exacerbated a religion that has

Had power over its subjects for more than thirteen centuries.

JMS-Mexia2 7/28/04 2:30pm

3

Communism had only been in existence since 1917 —fifty years,
therefore, by 1967. Its historic roots were not nearly so profound.

It is not the size of the casualties in Iraq so far that weighs on us so

much as the prospect of a century of unending terrorist acts *which*
we can excite but do not know how

Word count 153

to terminate through military force

Word count

NM:NMExtra2 7/28/04 2:30pm

4

JBM: Then there's Kerry's Vietnam service record versus Bush's.

NM: There is no comparison. Kerry was a legitimate combat

hero. Bush—put ^{his} ~~it~~ at its mildest—served his time in the National

Guard and never left the U.S. It will be interesting to see how the

Republicans will look to tarnish Kerry's war record.

word count ~~64~~

not 54 Lillith

JBMNMENT2 7/28/04 2:30pm

5

JBM Talk about the battle over the symbolism of 9/11—a bit more about why the Republicans chose New York and how 9/11 continues to affect the American political psyche.

NM The nightmare of 9/11 is that it struck at the ^{two} most famous ~~monoliths~~ pillars of the American economy. It attacked the implicit ~~also tore into~~ assumption that if you worked for the corporation at this elevated level, you were one of a new class of nobles and respected palace ~~servants~~. France would have been emotionally gutted in the

seventeenth century if Versailles had been razed and sacked ^{overnight} by ~~later-day~~ ~~more equivalent of latter-day~~ ~~foreign hordes~~. After all, those Twin Towers spoke of America's ^{of kings} even as Versailles spoke of the Divine Right phallic hegemony in the world. The average American male felt

FROM: MNM 7/28/04 2:30pm

6

gilded by the event, the average American housewife was
desolated by the terrifying possibility that one could work for years
to build a family and lose it all in an hour. Of course, the
Republicans chose New York as the place to hold their
convention, and for just these deep reasons. Who can say that it
will not work for them? Given the heroic deaths of the New York
firemen and police, the site will also appeal to working-class votes.
The Republicans will certainly not fail to make the connection that
the protesters are besmirching the memory of 9/11.

Word count: ~~214~~ [?] ~~29~~ = 185

-total ?

-total: 541 minus 42 words (word ct notations) for 529

~~29~~
~~400~~

28 July 2004

To: Hotel Guest Laura Dawn Murphy
room 306
Holiday Inn at Cambridge
fax: 617-354-1313

From: Judith
voice 718-858-0892

PLEASE DELIVER TO ROOM 306 AT ONCE

Dear Laura,

Attached please find 45 pages plus this cover sheet.

If there are any transmission problems, please call 718-858-0892

JBM: What are the tactics Kerry and the Democrats should use to beat Bush?

NM: The Democrats demonstrated the tactics during their convention. They will look to catch the swing voters and those conservatives who are repelled by the Flag-Cons but are still loyal to the Republicans. To do that, the Democrats will present themselves as the good, sensible, highly patriotic, serious party of the middle class, resolute about terrorism, strong for peace, reliable for war, and passionately loyal to the working class and the disadvantaged because—this may be their subtlest claim!—they are the true compassionate conservatives. The Republicans, in turn, will do all they can to make the street protesters look like the disruptive, concealed, and explosive heart of the Democratic Party.

Word count: 125

JBM: How does Vietnam relate to this election? Is Iraq the same kind of quagmire?

NM: Bad as Iraq has been up to now, Vietnam was worse. We were there in force for ten years. Fifty thousand of our soldiers were killed and two million Asiatics. What is immediately comparable to Iraq is that the logic for being there proved false. The Domino Theory did not play out. Southeast Asia may have been a mess afterward, but only Vietnam turned Communist, and it was well on the way before we came in. The major difference is that in Iraq we have exacerbated the two major branches of a religion that has had power over its subjects for more than thirteen centuries. Communism had only been in existence since 1917—fifty years, therefore, by 1967. Its historic roots were not nearly so profound. It is not the size of the casualties in Iraq so far that

weighs on us so much as the prospect of a century of unending terrorist acts which we can excite but do not know how to terminate through military force.

Word count 184

JBM: Then there's Kerry's Vietnam service record versus Bush's.

NM: There is no comparison. Kerry was a legitimate combat hero. Bush—put this at its mildest—served his time in the National Guard and never left the U.S. It will be interesting to see how the Republicans will look to tarnish Kerry's war record.

word count 54

JBM: Talk about the battle over the symbolism of 9/11—a bit more about why the Republicans chose New York and how 9/11 continues to affect the American political psyche.

NM: The nightmare of 9/11 is that it struck at the two most famous monoliths of the American economy. France would have been emotionally gutted in the seventeenth century if Versailles had been razed and sacked overnight by latter-day Huns. After all, those Twin Towers spoke of America's phallic hegemony in the world even as Versailles spoke of the Divine Right of Kings. The average American male felt gelded by the event, the average American housewife was desolated by the terrifying possibility that one could work for years to build a family and lose it all in an hour. Of course, the Republicans chose New York as the place to hold their convention, and for just these deep reasons. Who can say that it will not work for them? Given the heroic deaths of the

New York firemen and police, the site will also appeal to working-class votes. The Republicans will certainly not fail to make the connection that the protesters are besmirching the memory of 9/11.

Word count: 197

total: 582 minus 12 words (word ct notations) for 570

FROM :mN

FAX NO. :5084872136

Fri, 28 Jul 2006 3: 4PM F1

FROM :JMWORDCRAFT

FAX NO. :17186243782

Fri, 28 Jul 2006 3: 21 PM P1

JBMNMextra1 7/28/04 10:30am

1

JBM: What are the tactics Kerry and the Democrats should use to

beat Bush?

*The Democrats ~~visually~~ demonstrate
the tactics are*

NM: I think the tactic is obvious already. It is to catch the swing
their tactics during the Convention. They
will look to catch swing
voters and those conservatives who are repelled by the Flag-Cous

but are still loyal to the Republicans. To do that, the Democratic

Party will present itself as the good, sensible, ^{highly patriotic} serious party of the

middle-class *they will present themselves* *(it)*
middle, strong for peace, reliable for war, The Republicans, in

street
turn, will do all they can to make the protesters look like the true, *conservative*

and explosive heart of the Democratic Party.

Word count nm answer: 79 *90?*

**As the only real and true compassionate conservative*

FROM : nm

FAX NO. : 5084872136

JUL 28 2004 10:51 P2

FROM : JMWORCRAFT

FAX NO. : 17186243782

JUL 28 2004 10:54 P2

JBMNMextral 7/28/04 10:30am

JBM: How does Vietnam relate to this election? Is Iraq the same

kind of quagmire?

NM: Bad as Iraq has been up to now, Vietnam was worse. We

in force, Fifty thousand
were there for ten years ~~[C] in force~~, during which 50,000

~~show~~ and two million ~~Americans~~, ~~Quang~~
American soldiers were killed and the country received such

~~psychic lacerations~~ that we are still not over it. Even the look
Moreover, the ~~logic~~

~~for being there proved~~

logic was faulty. The Domino Theory did not play out. Southeast

Asia was a mess afterward, but only Vietnam turned Communist.

and it was ~~more than~~ half there already when we came in. The

in Iraq)
difference is that we have now so excited and exacerbated a religion

FROM :nm

FAX NO. :5084872136

Jul 29 2004 11:05:11 P3

FROM :JMWORDCRAFT

FAX NO. :17186243782

Jul 29 2004 11:06:11 P3

JBMNMextral 7/28/04 10:30am

that has had power over its subjects for more than thirteen

centuries. Communism had only been in existence since 1917---

fifty years, therefore, by 1967. Its historic roots were not nearly so

profound. It is not the size of the casualties in Iraq so far that

weighs on us so much as the ~~future prospects of unending small~~

a century of unending
~~wars and an oncoming century of terrorist acts.~~

Word count (nm answer) ~~155~~ 152

total document ~~554~~ 570?

~~minus word count notations 534~~

FROM : nm

FAX NO. : 5084872136

Jul. 28 2004 11:58 PM P4

FROM : JMWORDCRAFT

FAX NO. : 17186243782

Jul. 28 2004 11:24 PM P4

JBMNMoxtral 7/28/04 10:30am

JBM: Then there's Kerry's Vietnam service record versus Bush's

NM: ~~As far as Kerry's service record,~~ there is no comparison in

~~relation to Bush.~~ Kerry was a legitimate combat hero. Bush—~~to~~

put it at its mildest—served his time. *in the National Guard* ~~The greatest danger he faced~~

and never left the U.S.

It
~~was probably an airplane solo to get his wings.~~ What will be

to see
interesting ~~is~~ how the Republicans will look to tarnish Kerry's war

record. ~~I doubt that Kerry will allow them to ignore it.~~

FROM : nm

FAX NO. : 5084872136

Jul 28 2004 1:5 PM P5

FROM : JMWORDCRAFT

FAX NO. : 17186243782

Jul 28 2004 1:11 PM P5

JBMNMxmtml 7/28/04 10:30am

word count (nm answer) 70

*Put it in
Context*

JBM: Talk about the battle over the symbolism of 9/11 — *a bit*

more about why the Republicans chose New York and how 9/11

continues to affect the American political psyche.

NM: The nightmare of 9/11 is that it struck at ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{most sacred} ~~highest~~

~~temples of the corporation, the shining pillars of the American~~

It attacked the implicit assumption
~~economy, with its suggestion that if you worked for the corporation~~

at an elevated level, then you are the new class of nobles and
~~respected palace servants of our land~~

in America. In the psychological sense, it struck America as hard

JBMNMaximal 7/28/04 10:30am

6

In the Seventeenth Century
 as France would have been emotionally gutted if Versailles had
~~vazed and completely~~ *by foreign hands*
 been sacked overnight in the time of Louis the Fourteenth.

After all these
 Perhaps even more. These Twin Towers spoke of America's

in the world *by the world*
 phallic hegemony. The average American male felt gelded, the

the terrorizing
 the average American housewife was desolated by the terror of
possibility that one could work for years
 working for years to build her family only to lose it all in an hour.

Of course *chose*
 I would assume the Republicans were clever enough to choose New

and for just
 New York as the place to hold their convention
 for these deep reasons and who can say that it ~~cannot~~ *will not* work
 for them? ~~But given the heroic deaths of the~~
~~firemen and police, they the site~~
~~for them? They will look to make the connection that the~~
~~will also~~ *also* appeal to working-class voters.
 The Republicans ~~will certainly not fail~~ to make
 protesters are besmirching the memory of 9/11.

the
connection
between the

Word count nm answer: 161 (20?)

JBM: What are the tactics Kerry and the Democrats should use to beat Bush?

NM: The Democrats demonstrated their tactics during the convention. They will look to catch the swing voters and those conservatives who are repelled by the Flag-Cons but are still loyal to the Republicans. To do that, the Democratic Party will present itself as the good, sensible, highly patriotic, serious party of the middle class, strong for peace, reliable for war, as the only real and true compassionate conservatives. The Republicans, in turn, will do all they can to make the street protesters look like the true, concealed, and explosive heart of the Democratic Party.

Word count: 108

JBM: How does Vietnam relate to this election? Is Iraq the same kind of quagmire?

NM: Bad as Iraq has been up to now, Vietnam was worse. We were there in force for ten years. Fifty thousand of our soldiers were killed and two million Asiatics. Even the logic for being there proved faulty. The Domino Theory did not play out. Southeast Asia was a mess afterward, but only Vietnam turned Communist, and it was half-there already when we came in. The difference in Iraq is that we have exacerbated a religion that has had power over its subjects for more than thirteen centuries.

Communism had only been in existence since 1917—fifty years, therefore, by 1967. Its historic roots were not nearly so profound.

It is not the size of the casualties in Iraq so far that weighs on us so much as the prospect of a century of unending terrorist acts.

Word count 153

JBM: Then there's Kerry's Vietnam service record versus Bush's.

NM: There is no comparison. Kerry was a legitimate combat

hero. Bush—put it at its mildest—served his time in the National

Guard and never left the U.S. It will be interesting to see how the

Republicans will look to tarnish Kerry's war record.

word count 54

JBM: Talk about the battle over the symbolism of 9/11—a bit more about why the Republicans chose New York and how 9/11 continues to affect the American political psyche.

NM: The nightmare of 9/11 is that it struck at the most famous pillars of the American economy. It attacked the implicit assumption that if you worked for the corporation at this elevated level, you were one of a new class of nobles and respected palace servants. France would have been emotionally gutted in the seventeenth century if Versailles had been razed and sacked by foreign hordes. After all, those Twin Towers spoke of America's phallic hegemony in the world. The average American male felt

gelded by the event, the average American housewife was desolated by the terrifying possibility that one could work for years to build a family and lose it all in an hour. Of course, the Republicans chose New York as the place to hold their convention, and for just these deep reasons. Who can say that it will not work for them? Given the heroic deaths of the New York firemen and police, the site will also appeal to working-class votes. The Republicans will certainly not fail to make the connection that the protesters are besmirching the memory of 9/11.

Word count: 214

total: 541 minus 12 words (word ct notations) for 529

And... the insert.

(p. 23)

final 2 7/26/04 pm

squeal over this one—that maybe the worst thing in the

world, might not be that we suffer a disaster. Pearl Harbor

after all, galvanized America. Without Pearl Harbor we

might never have been able to go to war in the company of

the Russians. Indeed, Roosevelt was accused of knowing

about Pearl Harbor in advance and welcoming it. Well, I

wouldn't go that far. I don't think the administration knew

that the World Trade Center was going to be attacked. Still

some odd things did happen that day. Immensely odd. There

was more than unbelievable inefficiency. I don't know that

the 9/11 Commission did all they could with that. They were

determined, after all, to bring in a unanimous report. That

always means that the radical ends are cut off. It's like

playing poker without the Aces, Kings, and Queens, the twos,

threes, and the fours.

JBM: What were some of the odd things that happened?

fnal 2 7/26/04 pm

5

NM: Well, first of all, the flights themselves. Whenever commercial planes go off-course, they receive an alert from their flight-center. If they don't correct their course, fighter planes scramble to meet them. That's standard operating procedure, I believe. It's assumed a hijacking has taken place. That didn't happen with the first plane. It flew from Boston right into the World Trade Center. All right, you could say there's a great tension that builds up in flight controllers. Day after day you're on the alert. But rarely does anything happen. Past a certain point you can get cynical. You know, "Another asshole's wandered off-course." You don't necessarily keep paying the required attention. That is hard to believe in the first place, but what about the second plane that was off-course? Why were there no fighter planes up in the air looking to divert it? The second plane didn't hit the other tower until seventeen minutes later. That is more than difficult to explain. Especially when no one was told

Final 2 7/26/04 pm

afterward. Then, there are extraordinary questions to ask about the plane that struck the Pentagon, or the one that crashed in Pennsylvania. Some serious suspicions can certainly be aroused. It may yet become an overwhelming national question. Because, after all, who did 9/11 benefit? Not everyone who wanted to go to war with Iraq, as well as all the putative empire-builders who were ready for an event that could ignite the nation. Now, the great irony of Iraq, the only good that might come out of all that waste, is that it may have deadened these empire-building notions for a good decade or two. Because after conquering a country that offered so little military resistance, the ensuing cost has been prodigious and abysmal. Temporarily, we have said goodbye to the notion that America can run the world through force. My God, we'd need twenty million young men in uniform to a start.

final 2 7/26/04 pm

JBM: Recently, Al Gore called for the resignation of all

administration staff underneath Bush and Cheney. But

George Tenet is the one who retires, and suddenly. Why?

NM: The CIA was miserably compromised. Everybody went

to great lengths to say that the administration did not lean on

the CIA to produce the results they wanted, but I can promise

you, the CIA did not ignore what the administration was

calling for. Bush never had to say to Tenet, "You better do it

my way," nor did Tenet say to the next person, "My way is

the highway." No, it was all covert signals and a paucity of

written record all the way down to the poor guy at the bottom

who said A is A but now says, "Oh, yessir, A is Z." People

in the CIA are often career-motivated. They know the right

thing to do for their career. It doesn't always have anything to

do with the right stuff so far as intelligence is concerned. And

that you learn quickly. The top people in the CIA got there

among other reasons, by knowing what was wanted from the

final 2 7/26/04 pm

top. Intelligence in itself is ideally an ascetic activity. Like most ascetic endeavors, it can be miserably corrupted. That's true of every intelligence agency in the world. They all end up doing what they feel is needed for their country, for their own career, for their next immediate step. So, the CIA was abominably compromised by the move to go to war against Iraq. Most analysts who had information that Iraq had very little or nothing in the way of WMD soon gave it up. The urge to satisfy the president became so intense that Tenet, who was probably a good director, got carried away. And he said—what was that marvelous remark? He shot both arms into the air to say, "It's a slam dunk." Apparently, he didn't know that the most electrifying slam dunks are done with one arm, not two. I expect George Bush doesn't know the difference either. However, I won't slam-dunk them on this. They were, after all, trying, for once, to converse in metaphor. In any event, Tenet had to get out. It would have

Final 2 7/26/04 pm

been intolerable for the administration and himself to face the discord of the oncoming music.

JBM: He said the biggest reason he was retiring was for the well-being of his family.

NM: Samuel Johnson once said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." I would add that the family is the last refuge of a politician who's retiring in disgrace.

JBM: What happens if there's a terrorist attack between now and the election?

NM: I don't know whether it'll benefit Kerry, or Bush. That's hard to decide. Bush has been saying to America: "I've made America more secure. I've made America safer." He could be hurt badly by a large attack. On the other hand, there is a knee-jerk reflex in Americans to rally behind the president when there's a catastrophe. So, I can't pretend to know the answer.

Protesters, Flag-Cons and The Big Empty

JBM: Let's start with *Fahrenheit 9/11*. I've seen it three times and with each viewing, I became more aware of Michael Moore's tricks. I would say about 50% of the film is indisputable, particularly the portion on Iraq, but in the first half he uses too many needless tricks.

NM: I don't disagree. I saw it for the first time last night, and was upset through the first half. You don't make your case by showing George H.W. Bush and a Saudi sheik shaking hands. On a photo op, important politicians will shake hands with the devil. Moore seems to think that if you get people laughing at the right wing, you will win through ridicule. He's wrong. That's when we lose. Back with the Progressive Party in 1948, we used to laugh and laugh at how

dumb the other side was. We're still laughing, and we're further behind now.

On the other hand, the stuff on Iraq was powerful. There, he didn't need cheap shots. The real story was in the faces. All those faces on the Bush team. What you saw was the spiritual emptiness of those people. Bush has one of the emptiest faces in America. He looks to have no more depth than spit on a rock. It could be that the most incisive personal crime committed by George Bush is that he probably never said to himself, "I don't deserve to be president." You just can't trust a man who's never been embarrassed by himself. The vanity of George W. stands out with every smirk. He literally cannot control that vanity. It seeps out with every movement of his lips, every tight-lipped grimace. Every grin is a study in smugsmanship.

JBM: His face does bring out the rage of the left. Never before have I seen so many people's blood boil at the sight of

an American President. Especially in New York. Of all the cities out there, why would the Republicans pick New York to hold their convention?

NM: I would say they are hoping for ugly attacks. If I were a voice in top Republican circles, I might be offering this advice: "What we need for New York is a large-scale riot. Some of those activist kids will be crazy enough to do a lot on their own, but we can do better with a few of our guys, well-placed, ready to urinate on the good American flag. Let us recognize that if we lose, all we've been doing since 2000 is bound to come out. Back a couple of years ago, Karl Rove was saying that we could gain a twenty-year hegemony by winning the next election. He hasn't said it lately, not since the worst of Iraq came through. Because now, we could be out of power for those same twenty years. So I recommend that we put as many of our people into the protest movement

in New York as we can find." Or so, at least, speaks the cool

Republican planner I envisage in my mind.

JBM: There could be such people out there. But the

Republicans may not even need them. There are thousands

of 15-, 16-, 17-year-old anarchists, who are truly angry.

These kids don't really know what anarchy is all about, but

they do know that when they throw a brick through a

window, it makes them feel good and there's a chance they

will end up on television. This feeds into the celebrity craze

that America is under right now of "Get on TV, man! That's

when you're really important!" This may be the first protest

where there will be as many cameras as protesters.

NM: Some of them will have footage to sell afterward. The

networks and cable companies will be looking for clips.

JBM: Right, but it's also for the demonstrators' own

protection. A cop is much less likely to bash a protester in the

head if he's holding a video camera.

NM: I must say, I hadn't thought of that.

JBW: I feel we've entered a realm where the question is, whose propaganda is better? The left is beginning to figure out that they can't beat the right with intelligent argument. They need punch phrases that get to the heart of the average American. If that's the case, what is the future for our country?

NM: That's not my first worry right now. Do the activists really know what they're going into? That's my concern. Or do they assume that expressing their rage is equal to getting Kerry elected? It could have exactly the opposite effect. The better mode may be to frustrate the Republicans by coming up with orderly demonstrations. Now when I was young, the suggestion to be moderate was like a stink bomb to me. An orderly demonstration? What were we, cattle? You have to speak out with your rage. Well, I'm trying to say, we would do well to realize that on this occasion, there are more

important things than a good outburst. I wish we could

remind everybody who goes out to march of the old Italian

saying: "Revenge is a dish that people of taste eat cold."

Instead of expressing yourself at the end of August, think of

how nicely you will be able to keep expressing yourself over

the four years to come if we win. Just keep thinking how

much the Republicans want anarchy on the street. I say, don't

march right into their trap.

JBM: What can activists do to avoid that?

NM: Well, the trouble with being in a cautionary position, is

that you're limited. You're trying to slow down a wave.

Everyone expects excesses—it's a question of how many

there will be. Most of the leaders of most of the activist

organizations are responsible, most of them, certainly. And I

think some of them see the peril. They will do well to look at

their own ranks, and see if they've got some peculiarly rotten

apples in the barrel.

JBM: One of the problems with this movement is that there's no leader, per se. There are spokespeople for each group. But this is a movement that has grown organically and has relied on the goodness of human nature almost to a fault. And, I believe it's coming to a head where, without somebody directing the huge crowd that's going to be there, without saying, "this is what the movement believes in," Middle America will see nothing but anarchy.

NM: You make me think of the march on the Pentagon in 1967. There was a marvelous guy named David Dellinger, now dead, who led it, and a man named A.J. Muste, an old anarchist, also gone, a fine old anarchist. They got together and realized they had to find some kind of umbrella organization that could have input to all the activist groups. And they succeeded. They had a series of discussions with the various elements. And there was virtually no disarray to speak of, compared to what it could have been. The march on

the Pentagon even ended up having a final effect that was impressive. I think it was the beginning of the end of the war in Vietnam, and for a very simple reason: Lyndon Johnson saw 50,000 mostly middle-class people come to Washington to stage a set of demonstrations that were going to be opposed by troops and police. LBJ knew people well. From his point of view, most middle-class people were hardly full of physical bravery. If they were going to pay their own money and come by car or bus or train to march into the possibility of being hit over the head with a cop's club, then there had to be millions of people behind them.

JBM: I don't know that there's time to change the mood before the RNC begins.

NM: I don't think there is, but my hope is there are also going to be enough people whose most powerful passion will not be to get on TV, but to defeat Bush. And you know when a crowd is unruly, simple things can calm them, too.

JBM: Such as?

NM: Such as one guy who has enough authority and charisma to say, "Fellows, let's not blow it!"

JBM: There are techniques to stop an all-out brawl that I've seen in action which have worked. When a cop hits a little hippie in the head, instead of charging, if everybody sits down and the cameras are rolling, whoever is in charge of the police at that given time knows, this is going to look horrible; this is going to make news. But, as you say, you need someone to stand up there and calm the crowd.

NM: It's far more powerful than a good drug; it's extraordinary. It's hard to tone down. This is why I feel dread about what's coming up. I think with all the cautionary words in the world, things are likely to bust loose. If I were a powerful Democrat, I would already be discounting the losses, thinking of how do we recoup. Those losses could be wide-spread.

JBM: I don't know that we can make it through another four years of Bush.

NM: Oh, we'll make it through although I'm not saying what we'll be like at the end. By then, Karl Rove may have his twenty years. Just think of the kind of brainwashing we've had for the last four. On TV, Bush rinses hundreds of thousands of American brains with every sentence. He speaks only in clichés. You know, I happened to run into Ralph Nader recently in Chicago and I, like a great many others, was looking to dissuade him from his present course. He's a very nice man, maybe the nicest man I've met in politics—there's something very decent about Nader, truly convincing in terms of his own probity. So I didn't feel, "Oh, he's doing it for ugly motives." Didn't have that feeling at all in the course of our conversation. Still, I was trying, as I say, to dissuade him, while recognizing that the odds were poor I'd be successful. At one point, he said, "You know, they're both

for the corporation, Kerry and Bush." And it's true; both candidates are for the corporation, and I do agree with Nader that ultimately the corporation is the major evil. But in my mind, Bush is the immediate obstacle. He is a collection of disasters for America. What he does to the English language is a species of catastrophe all by itself. Bush learned a long time ago that certain key words, "evil, patriotism, stand-firm, flag, our-fight-against-terrorism," will get half the people in America stirred up. That's all he works with. Kerry will be better in many ways, no question. All the same, he will go along too much with the corporations who, in my not always modest opinion, are running America. At present, I don't see how any mainstream politician can do otherwise. Finally, they are working against forces greater than themselves.

JBM: Can we talk about the moderate Republicans' role in this election? Like McCain, for instance. He came out strong for Bush. Why?

NM: McCain, I think, wants to be president. He certainly has every right. All the same, successful politicians have to make hard choices. Very few good people can do it because the hard choices are so often godawful. In addition, you have to smile standing next to people you despise. Even a relatively honest man has to become pretty phony. If you don't know which way the wind is blowing, you're dead as a politician. You can have the honesty and incorruptibility of Ralph Nader, but, as we see, that does not get you elected. So, even McCain must have said to himself, "I could be president. I could be a much better president than George Bush ever dreamed of being. Whereas, if I go with Kerry, and Kerry loses, I'm doomed—I will be a black sheep to my own party. And if Kerry wins, I'll be a lame duck vice-president all the way. On the other hand, if I go with Bush and he wins, in four years I'm the logical choice to be the Republican

candidate. Indeed, win or lose for Bush, I'm the front-runner Republican candidate for 2008."

JBM: However, if McCain comes out strong for Bush—say, he were even to run as his vice-president, and Bush wins, I can't imagine McCain would be able in all good conscience to put up with what Bush would do with another four years. How is he in a strong position to run for president if he kowtows to Bush?

NM: Politicians do have their vanity. McCain might think, "George is an empty vessel. If I were vice-president, I could influence him. He might become a better chief executive if I were vice-president." That could be the barb on the harpoon that hooks McCain. "I owe it to the country to make George W. Bush a better president." Yes, McCain could decide, "I have to bite the bullet and work for a man I truly despise. But it's necessary. America needs it." The moment a

politician says to himself, "America needs it," he can shift the direction of the wind within the halls of his own brain.

JBM: Let's talk about protest as an end in and of itself. Are there benefits other than the political?

NM: Yes. I think so. People who run protests have a chance to exercise power where they couldn't otherwise, since generally they are against the system in one large way or another. Yet, some of them have serious talents for organizing, directing, and leading. And people who join very often get a good bit of therapy. Literally. They are not only able to vent real rage, but can test their courage.

JBM: Well, they are also doing something about the way they feel politically.

NM: That's the third benefit—a dubious one. You can feel, yes, you're working to change the system, but are you changing it, or confirming it? Never assume that a protest is going to accomplish what you want it to. Media

interpretations dull the impulse, warp it, or even choke it off.

If you could talk to the people you really want to reach out there, people far from New York, talk to them face to face, eye to eye, they might listen, because you do have things to say. Of course, you have to stay cool. Americans get nervous when listening to anyone who's keyed up. Major politicians are always cool. The one moment, for example, when Howard Dean went over the top, remember? The media never forgave him. And the mass of TV viewers followed like sheep. Dean had committed a no-no—he had expressed some pain and anger loudly. The media destroyed his campaign on the spin. The problem with protests is that you have to pass through that immense filter of the news media. So you do get on TV for your fifteen seconds of Warholian fame. All your friends say, "Hey, man, you were on!" As if you've accomplished something. You might have been screaming. You might have had your face painted with

ketchup to look like blood. Even if you manage to be semi-reasonable on the air, the odds are against speaking incisively and calmly. Because, you've just got the one moment. So, all too often, protests accomplish the opposite of what they desire. Over the long-term, protests can do a lot, but not at once. For example, when we had the March on the Pentagon in the Fall of 1967, the immediate reaction was bad. The media trashed us. But we did have a positive effect over a period of time. In contrast, the demonstrations in Chicago in the summer of '68 probably lost Humphrey the election.

JBM: Why?

NM: Well, liberals did react against the open, ugly and unforgettable spectacle of the police smashing into the front ranks of the marchers, but even more voters felt that anarchy was loose in the street so they blamed the marchers for aggravating the cops. A great majority of Americans are very much keyed to public order. We're a country where everyone

who came here tore up old roots by leaving their home country. That creates a long-term anxiety, So, in America, the reluctance to cause disturbance is always sitting there in opposition to the other big American desire—which is to express oneself, to be free and free-spoken. I can speak from my own experiences as a candidate for Mayor in the New York primaries of 1969. I thought people would want what I offered. But I was opting for too much change. In politics, people want continuance. Americans don't want their lives disturbed. That's the basic problem with protest. It's good for the protesters, but not always so good for the candidate you want to get in.

JBM: Let's go back to the '68 protest. What were its successes?

NM: I think it was not too bad for a lot of people who were in it, individual kids who discovered that they did have the balls to protest. Because when you do, you have to pass

through your fear. After all, you can get beaten up. Not everyone can face that possibility. So it could have been good for some of those who forced themselves into the protest, good for their self-respect down the road.

JBM: Don't you think that, in large part, due to the protests, the Vietnam War ended?

NM: That was one large reason. But I've always felt that what made the suits who run so much of America truly nervous, was the notion that they could no longer trust the kids who came to work for them from the best universities. In that sense, protests against the war were serious, were effective. But that's not the situation today.

JBM: When you have an issue, such as, "End the war in Vietnam," it's a set goal. You know what you're going for. One of the problems with this movement is that there's no specific goal to be achieved, aside from "Get Bush out." A lot of the protesters I ask, "What exactly are you protesting at

the Republican National Convention?" No two answers are the same. Perhaps it is because there are too many abominations being committed to pick one.

NM: When and how are you going to protest? Which group would you join?

JBM: On August 30, I plan to march with KWRV.Org, The Poor People's Campaign. That's Cheri Honkala's organization. After that, I'm not sure.

NM: OK.

JBM: I guess my question is: What could the protesters do that would further the cause?

NM: What they could do is not what they're going to be allowed to do. It won't all be their fault. You can be damn sure Pataki and Bloomberg do not want to embarrass George Bush. If these demonstrations ever hurt Bush, and he still gets reelected, New York will be penalized in terms of receiving money from Washington. That's one reason Bloomberg and

Co. are keeping them from having massive peaceful protest marches near the Garden. If a million people were to walk down 5th Avenue—which is where it should be—that could have a significant effect. Especially if it was a peaceful march. But the Republicans don't want a peaceful demonstration with that number of bodies. One of the things about the Pentagon march back in '67 is how peaceful it proved to be. Despite all the negative media hype that came out afterward, the second word that came, if slowly, was "peaceful—these people were peaceful." The ideal is exactly to have a huge, passive demonstration. If it could take place without calamitous incidents, odds are Kerry will probably win. But a combination of riots with media coverage will give Bush a huge spike.

JBW: Would you say New York is part of America, or is it its own entity?

NM: You want to talk about great American cities, speak of Boston, Chicago, New Orleans, San Francisco. Put up your own favorites, if you have any. Los Angeles, if you must. But New York is our only world-city. It does not have a hell of a lot in common with the rest of America, it doesn't even have much to do with upper New York State. Which is why all those years ago I said, let's separate. I saw New York as eventually becoming comparable to Hong Kong, a semi-independent city-state. For better or worse, it may yet happen.

JBM: Do you think Kerry or mainstream Democrats are going to associate with the protesters at all?

NM: I think they'll have people out there, trying to put a little oil on these very troubled waters.

JBM: How so?

NM: Well, they have contacts. Power is power. We were talking earlier about what people get out of a protest

movement. A leader who's pretty good at exercising a little local power doesn't mind getting a little more. Hell, Kerry started as an activist. So there will probably be hints from his people: "We'll treat you right when we get elected." I can't believe Kerry's people will sit by passively and say, "Oh, dear, isn't this awful," like I'm saying right now.

JBM: Are you going to come protest with me?

NM: No. Even if I believed in the efficacy of the protest, I wouldn't go. I can't walk any more without two canes.

Standing in place is worse. It drives me nuts. Two arthritic knees. So, I'm out of it. I won't go in a wheelchair. I want to be able to defend myself if things go wrong.

JBM: What if there were no protests?

NM: I'm not sure that would be a loss. There's so much anger at Bush. It isn't as if more anger has to percolate.

JBM: Then what do you think will be the Democrats' tactics?

NM: I'd say they demonstrated their tactics during the July convention. They will look to catch the swing voters and those conservatives who are repelled by the Flag-Cons but are still loyal to the Republicans. To do that, the Democrats will present themselves as the good, sensible, highly patriotic, serious party of the middle class, resolute about terrorism, strong for peace, reliable for war, and passionately loyal to the working class and the disadvantaged because—this may be their subtlest claim!—they are the true compassionate conservatives. The Republicans, in turn, will do all they can to make the street protesters look like the disruptive, concealed, and explosive heart of the Democratic Party. You know, I can't remember an election when the stakes were so high. There has been, after all, such mendacity about the entrance into Iraq. It sits like an incubus over the first week of November.

JBM: Doesn't Vietnam relate to this? In Iraq, aren't we in the same kind of quagmire?

NM: Bad as Iraq has been up to now, Vietnam was worse. We were there in force for ten years. Fifty thousand of our soldiers were killed and two million Asians. What is immediately comparable to Iraq is that the logic for being in Vietnam proved false. The Domino theory did not play out. Southeast Asia may have been a mess afterward, but only Vietnam turned communist, and it was well on the way before we came in. The major difference is that in Iraq we have exacerbated the two major branches of a religion that has had power over its followers for more than thirteen centuries. Communism had only been in existence since 1917—fifty years, therefore, by 1967. Its historic roots were not nearly so profound. It is not the size of the casualties in Iraq so far that weighs on us so much as the prospect of a century of unending terrorist acts which we can agitate but do

not know how to terminate by military force. Whether

this fear will work to Kerry's benefit, I can't say. The question is how clear will it be in the awareness of Middle America that Kerry was a combat hero and Bush was a National Guard fight suit. It will be interesting to see how the Republicans will look to tarnish Kerry's war record. Not all Republicans, however. I think a minority of conservatives are ready to go for Kerry.

JBM: You really do?

NM: I've been saying for a couple of years that Bush is not a conservative. He's what I call a flag conservative, a Flag-Con. He's not as interested in conservative values as in empire building. The classic conservative, someone like Pat Buchanan, or, to a more complicated degree, Bill Buckley, do believe that certain values in society must be maintained. The classic conservative believes in stability. You make changes grudgingly and with a great deal of prudence. Don't

move too quickly is the rule of thumb, because society, as they see it, is essentially a set of compromises and imbalances that can be kept going only by wisdom and, to use the word again, prudence. So you don't go off in wild, brand-new directions. None of this characterizes Bush. As a Flag-Con, he is surrounded by the tycoons of the oil industry, plus neoconservatives, plus gung-ho militarists who believe that since we've created the greatest fighting machine in the history of the world, it's a real shame not to use it. These three different groups came together on a notion that I would call "exceptionalism." The more ideological among them believe that when the Cold War ended, it was America's duty to take over the world. They believe God wanted America to run the world. All too many Americans do believe that. Just look at the patriotic fever every time there's an occasion for people to show their flags. Very few fascist nations ever failed to put a huge emphasis on getting people to wave flags.

This is not the same as calling America fascistic—we are not next door to fascism yet—but even as certain people fall into a pre-cancerous condition, I would say America could be approaching a pre-fascistic condition. And, the basic notion behind such an impetus, what the Flag-Cons fear, is that America is going to lose its pre-eminence in the world unless drastic steps are initiated. As, for example, taking over the oil of the Middle East, as well as enlarging our reputation as a superpower to such a degree that China, Japan, and Europe will not be ready to stand up against us in any important way. These Flag Conservatives would argue, I expect, in their private colloquies, that if they don't embark on such steps, America's control of world economics could be lost forever. There are many indications that the Chinese and the Japanese are much more suited to live in a technological world than we are. Our long prosperity has one irony built into it. We have become a pleasure-loving nation. Fifty years ago, Americans

were more hard-working. They still believed it was good in and of itself to work for most of your life. That's no longer so true. In science, our college youth are weak when it comes to studying the so-called STEM subjects—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Living with technology is, after all, not always so agreeable. If one's going to sum it up in four words: more power, less pleasure. And Americans are pleasure-loving. The majority of the Chinese have not had that opportunity. Perhaps they can put up with monotony, boredom, and cruel repetitive working environments far better than we can. No one's ever been able to convince me that sitting in front of a computer all day is a good way to live, especially if you're not using the computer creatively to search for new information you really want, but, on the contrary, are carrying out tasks that you have nothing much to do with, other than serving the business needs of others. The exceptionalists would not phrase it this way, but I think

they feel the need for America to become a Roman power in contrast to other nations who will serve as our hard-working Greeks. Let China be our Greeks, and Japan, England, even—while we're about it! After all, the Romans used the intelligence of the Greeks to carry out necessary tasks that Romans no longer had the desire to fulfill.

JBM: But I don't think it's possible any more to take over the world with military force.

NM: Can it be that Iraq is telling us as much?

JBM: Let's go back to why the Republicans selected New York for the convention. Do you think they still have hopes of cashing in on the memory of 9/11?

NM: A couple of years ago, New York may have seemed like the perfect place to go, the event had been so traumatic. And there is large political profit in offering emotional closure to a national nightmare like the fall of the Twin Towers. 9/11 felled the two most opalescent monoliths of the American

economy. It also attacked the implicit assumption that if you worked for the corporation, you were part of a new upper class. To offer an analogy, let us suppose that in the seventeenth century Versailles had been razed and sacked overnight by latter-day Huns. France would have been emotionally gutted. So it was with us. After all, those Twin Towers spoke of America's phallic hegemony in the world even as Versailles declared the Divine Right of Kings. Many an American male felt gelded by the event. Equally, the average American housewife was desolated by the terrifying possibility that one could work for years to build a family and lose it all in an hour. How could the Republicans not chose New York as the place to hold their convention? Given the heroic deaths of the New York firemen and police, the site will also appeal to working-class votes. The Republicans will certainly not fail to make the connection that the protesters are besmirching the memory of 9/11. But a couple

of years have gone by, and we've also learned there are a few things wrong about the picture we've had of 9/11. A new set of conspiracy theories are building. There are just too many facts that are not readily explicable. There may well be room after the convention for the protest movement to look into 9/11 with some critical incisiveness. I am no longer a conspiratorialist—I spent too many years wandering around in the byways of the Warren Report. But, there are elements here which are not easy to explain. I don't believe for a moment there was direct complicity. In America, we don't go in as yet for major political coups—there's too much to lose for the powers that be, and we are still a democratic society. You can't pull off a conspiracy of that dimension without having so many people involved that they'll spill stuff all over the place. But, there may have been a sentiment in the administration—let them scream and squeal over this one—that maybe the worst thing in the world might not be that we

suffer a disaster. Pearl Harbor, after all, galvanized America.

Without Pearl Harbor we might never have been able to go to war in the company of the Russians. Indeed, Roosevelt was accused of knowing about Pearl Harbor in advance and welcoming it. Well, I wouldn't go that far. I don't think the administration knew that the World Trade Center was going to be attacked. Still, some odd things did happen that day.

Immensely odd. There was more than unbelievable inefficiency. I don't know that the 9/11 Commission did all they could with that. They were determined, after all, to bring in a unanimous report. That always means that the radical ends are cut off. It's like playing poker without the Aces, Kings, and Queens, the twos, threes, and the fours.

JBM: What were some of the odd things that happened?

NM: Well, first of all, the flights themselves. Whenever commercial planes go off-course, they receive an alert from their flight-center. If they don't correct their course, fighter

planes scramble to meet them. That's standard operating procedure, I believe. It's assumed a hijacking has taken place. That didn't happen with the first plane. It flew from Boston right into the World Trade Center. All right, you could say there's a great tension that builds up in flight controllers. Day after day you're on the alert. But rarely does anything happen. Past a certain point you can get cynical. You know, "Another asshole's wandered off-course." You don't necessarily keep paying the required attention. That is hard to believe in the first place, but what about the second plane that was off-course? Why were there no fighter planes up in the air looking to divert it? The second plane didn't hit the other tower until seventeen minutes later. That is more than difficult to explain. Especially when no one was fired afterward. Then, there are extraordinary questions to ask about the plane that struck the Pentagon, or the one that crashed in Pennsylvania. Some serious suspicions can

certainly be aroused. It may yet become an overwhelming national question. Because, after all, who did 9/11 benefit if not everyone who wanted to go to war with Iraq, as well as all the putative empire-builders who were ready for an event that could ignite the nation. Now, the great irony of Iraq, the only good that might come out of all that waste, is that it may have deadened these empire-building notions for a good decade or two. Because after conquering a country that offered so little military resistance, the ensuing cost has been prodigious and abysmal. Temporarily, we have said goodbye to the notion that America can run the world through force. My God, we'd need twenty million young men in uniform for a start.

JBM: Recently, Al Gore called for the resignation of all administration staff underneath Bush and Cheney. But George Tenet is the one who retires, and suddenly. Why?

NM: The CIA was miserably compromised. Everybody went to great lengths to say that the administration did not lean on the CIA to produce the results they wanted, but I can promise you, the CIA did not ignore what the administration was calling for. Bush never had to say to Tenet, "You better do it my way," nor did Tenet say to the next person, "My way or the highway." No, it was all covert signals and a paucity of written record all the way down to the poor guy at the bottom who said A is A but now says, "Oh, yessir, A is Z." People in the CIA are often career-motivated. They know the right thing to do for their career. It doesn't always have anything to do with the right stuff so far as intelligence is concerned. And that you learn quickly. The top people in the CIA got there, among other reasons, by knowing what was wanted from the top. Intelligence in itself is ideally an ascetic activity. Like most ascetic endeavors, it can be miserably corrupted. That's true of every intelligence agency in the world. They all end

up doing what they feel is needed for their country, for their own career, for their next immediate step. So, the CIA was abominably compromised by the move to go to war against Iraq. Most analysts who had information that Iraq had very little or nothing in the way of WMD soon gave it up. The urge to satisfy the president became so intense that Tenet, who was probably a good director, got carried away. And he said—what was that marvelous remark? He shot both arms into the air to say, “It’s a slam dunk.” Apparently, he didn’t know that the most electrifying slam dunks are done with one arm, not two. I expect George Bush doesn’t know the difference either. However, I won’t slam-dunk them on this. They were, after all, trying, for once, to converse in metaphor. In any event, Tenet had to get out. It would have been intolerable for the administration and himself to face the discord of the oncoming music.

JBM: He said the biggest reason he was retiring was for the well-being of his family.

NM: Samuel Johnson once said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." I would add that the family is the last refuge of a politician who's retiring in disgrace.

JBM: What happens if there's a terrorist attack between now and the election?

NM: I don't know whether it'll benefit Kerry, or Bush. That's hard to decide. Bush has been saying to America: "I've made America more secure. I've made America safer." He could be hurt badly by a large attack. On the other hand, there is a knee-jerk reflex in Americans to rally behind the president when there's a catastrophe. So, I can't pretend to know the answer.

JBM: One final question. Starting with the WTO protest in Seattle back in '99, a culture has formed around the anti-

corporate, anti-globalization, anti-Bush movement. Where do you think it's going? Where should it go?

NM: A good many people of the right, not Flag

Conservatives, but true conservatives, can feel in accord with men and women on the left concerning one deep feeling. It is that the corporations are stifling our lives. Not only economically, where corporations can claim, arguably, that they bring prosperity (and, frankly, I'm certainly not schooled enough in economics to argue that point pro or con), but I can say the corporation is bad for us aesthetically speaking, culturally speaking, spiritually speaking. Just contemplate their massive empty architecture, their massive emphasis on TV commercials which are a seed-bed for interrupted concentration, and their massive complacency about their virtues. They tend to flatten everything. They are the Big Empty. One of the virtues of Michael Moore's movie, if I can go back to it for a moment, is that you could see all the faces

of the present administration, those empty faces, those handmaidens and bodyguards of the Big Empty. And then Moore contrasted them to all the faces of American soldiers over there: Innocent, strong, idealistic, or ugly, but real faces, real people. Plus all those suffering Iraqis. Obviously, people in such torment are always dramatic and eloquent on film. Still, most of those Iraqis had different kinds of faces. That shade of alienation from natural existence had not yet gotten into their skin. They might be hard to live with but they were alive. Whereas the people running this country are all—with the notable exception of one guy I'll get into in a moment—kind of awful. They don't look as human as thee and me. That's a large remark, but I support it. The one exception, oddly enough, and by this I'll probably antagonize a good many people, is Donald Rumsfeld. Of that whole gang, he's the only one who seems real to me. In other words, I might not agree with him on anything, but he does believe

in what he says. It isn't as if he searches for the most useful response he can come up with at the moment to wield or save his power. He's interested in his ideas first. The power is subservient to the ideas.

JBM: What makes you say that?

NM: Because he's real. He reacts. He doesn't weigh his words. If something makes him angry, he's angry. If something pleases him, he smiles. If he has doubts about how the situation is going, he expresses those doubts. In that sense, he's the only one of that coven I'd call an honorable man. Let me emphasize: I can disagree totally with people I consider honorable. But, never have I seen an administration, which has had, by that measure, so few honorable men.

JBM: Back to Seattle. Where is the protest movement going? Because it is not going to stop after the convention.

NM: It certainly won't. After all, how much can we hope for from this election? If Kerry gets in, he can repair some of the

boundless damage Bush wreaked on foreign opinion. But

Kerry will still be essentially pro-corporation. No major American politician can afford not to be. In fact, if you outlawed the corporations tomorrow, America would have food famines, a frightening loss of jobs, name it. They are installed for decades to come, and we can't look for quick results. The war against the corporation is profound, as it should be. They are deadening human existence. That, I think, is the buried core of the outrage people feel most generally. There is, after all, a profound difference between corporations and capitalism itself, at least so long as capitalism remains small business. The small businessman is always taking his chances. He leads an existential life. He's gambling that his wit, his energy, and his ideas of what will work in the marketplace will be successful. He can be a sonofabitch, but at least he's out there in the middle of life.

JBM: He's creating something as well.

NM: He could be creating something that's awful. But at least, he's taking chances. Whereas, the corporation is the reverse. The corporation turns capitalism inside out. The majority of them no longer give their first concern to the quality of their product. Since they have the funds to advertise on a large scale, it diminishes their need for a good product. Marketing can take over by way of language and image. Over the years this has produced a general deterioration of the real value of products for the same real money.

JBM: Well, I agree we're fighting a spiritual war against the corporation. And what we're missing right now is the ability to say, "We can provide for you, we can make sure you have jobs, and food." What they're offering is stability. What we're offering is a deeper quality of life.

NM: To win this war will take, at least, fifty years and a profound revolution in America. We'd have to get away from

manipulation. What we've got now is a species of economic, political, and spiritual brainwashing, vastly superior to the old Soviets, who were endlessly crude in their attempts. Our governmental and corporate leaders are much more subtle. Remember years ago, when you were around 15, you were wearing a shirt that said "stussy" on it? And, I said, "Not only do you spend money to buy the shirt, but you also advertise the company that sold it to you." And, you said, "Dad, you just don't get it." All right, you were right, I didn't get it. But now, I notice, you don't wear logos on your shirts. **JBM:** I try my best not to. It's hard to find a shirt that doesn't have a logo these days.

NM: There's one more point I'd like to make. I don't sneer at people who enter protest movements. At the least, it can be good or even necessary for their personal development. But I would like these kids to disabuse themselves of the idea that they are going to have some immediate exciting political

effect. If they have any, it could be negative. And if Bush wins, we're a most divided nation. Kerry can put it together better than Bush. Bush can't solve any of our problems. He never was able to. That may be the main reason he looked to empire-building. He had nothing to offer but world conquest. So, if he's reelected, what will he do if things remain bad in Iraq? You'll look back on the Patriot Act as being liberal and gentle.

JBM: I will never look back on the Patriot Act as being liberal and gentle. While the protests will not have a direct, political gain—

NM: You agree with me on that?

JBM: Yes, I feel confident in saying that given the parameters of how we will be allowed to protest, I don't see any way it could have a direct, political gain. However, I do feel that when you're out there, and see all the different types of people who have come together—particularly now with

the mixture of groups that will be there—you do get a sense that the spiritual revolution may be awakening. And that's the only hope, I believe, against the total corporatization of America.

NM: All right, but if we lose the election, it's going to be a very expensive spiritual education. I would be much happier if the protest movements could spread their activities over the next four years, rather than bringing it to focus prematurely. I don't have a great deal of hope that most of the people involved are really thinking of this election so much as expressing the need to vent, to gain some self-therapy, and to express their outrage at what's been done to them, plus their need to gain power in the counterculture. There's all sorts of motives, some noble, some meretricious. But, it's a poor time to exercise our most dramatic democratic privileges. What we do have over all the years to come is the confidence that we breathe a cleaner spiritual air than the greedbags who run

our country and so it is not impossible that over decades to come, much that we believe in will yet come to be. But I do not wish to end on so sweet and positive a note. It is better to remind ourselves that wisdom is ready to reach us from the most unexpected quarters. Here, I quote from a man who arrived at objectivity a little too late in life:

"Naturally, the common people don't want war, but after all, it is the leaders of a country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag people along whether it is a democracy, or a fascist government, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. This is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in every country."

That was Hermann Goering speaking at the Nuremberg trials after World War II. It is one thing to be forewarned. Will we ever be forearmed?

SIDE BAR

WORD COUNT 167