

The K.F. Stone Weekly

(Formerly "Beating the Bushes")



December 01, 2014

"THE ONLY DEMOCRACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST" -- BUT FOR HOW MUCH LONGER?

Ever since its founding in 1948, one of the proudest -- and truest -- facts over which *khov'vei yisrael* ("Lovers of Israel") have been able to *kvell* (take pride in) is that this tiny patch of land is the only Democracy in the Middle East. And for the past 66 years, the democratic principles undergirding the Jewish State have been adhered to both in times of both war and peace, in days of calm and calamity. As many know -- and many, many more do not - Israel has never had a Constitution. Rather, its democratic principles are embodied in its "[Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel](#)," which was first made public on May 14, 1948. Among other things, this Declaration proclaims:

[The State of Israel] will foster the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; it will be based on freedom, justice and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel; it will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture; it will safeguard the Holy Places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Sadly - and for many of us frighteningly - recent actions and deliberations within Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's cabinet bring into serious question just how much longer Israel will remain a Democracy. Faced with a rising wave of violence, Netanyahu and his cabinet are readying a plan to legally formalize Israel's status as "the Jewish state." Netanyahu says it's a needed response to those who question Israel's right to exist. It doesn't take a political maven to figure out that the measure will unquestionably anger Israel's Arab minority and could easily draw

international condemnation, severely testing a delicate balance between democracy and the country's Jewish character.

The proposed legislation includes language that is widely seen as favoring the country's Jewish character over democratic ideals. One proposal would remove Arabic as a national language. Even a watered-down version proposed by Netanyahu says that Jewish law should "serve as an inspiration" for the legislature. What the precise definition of "serve as an inspiration for . . ." is anyone's guess. However, when one considers the strong and politically influential *haredi* (ultra-Orthodox) faction within both the cabinet and the Israeli *knesset* (Parliament), there is good reason to worry about the future of the secular Democratic Jewish State.

From the standpoint of the political chessboard, it would seem that Netanyahu is pushing this legislation in order to fend off the hard-line critics within his governing coalition . . . especially with a party primary coming up in January. Already, centrist members of his coalition -- notably Finance Minister Yair Lapid and Justice Minister Tzipi Livni -- have pledged to vote against the bill. It should be noted that their two left-of-center secular parties - *yesh atid* (Lapid's "There is a Future") and *ha-t'nuah* (Livni's "The Movement") - occupy 25 of Netanyahu's 68 coalition seats in the *knesset*. Without these 25 votes, it is likely that the government could collapse, thus triggering elections.

They are not alone in their condemnation. Former President -- and Nobel Peace Prize Winner -- Shimon Peres called the proposed legislation "*an unnecessary religious argument instead of a broad national agreement, which could turn a political conflict into a religious upheaval that would be difficult to stop.*"

Without question, Israel's Jewish character has been a well-established fact for a long time; her flag proudly sports a *magen david* (Star of David); her national anthem -- [*hatikvah*](#) ("The Hope") -- ends with the words:

עד לא עבדה תקותינו

התקוה בת שנות אלפים

להיות עם חפשי בארצנו

ארץ ציון בירושלים

Our hope is not yet lost;

The hope of two thousand years,

To be free people in our land,

The land of Zion and Jerusalem

And yet, for some, this has never been nearly enough; Israel's *religious* Jewish nature, they believe, must be codified, not merely implied. Netanyahu's legislation proposes to do just that, for the bill stipulates, among other things that:

- Arabic – the language of 20 percent of the country's population – will lose its historic status as an official language;
- That the equal rights of minorities to live anywhere in the country will be compromised;
- That Jewish law, which is assimilated into Israeli law, will be given preferred status; and, most of all,
- That Israel's definition as a Jewish state will prevail over its definition as a democracy.

Without question, the antipathy and ensuing violence between Israelis and Palestinians has been taking on an increasingly religious coloration. The horrific murder of Jewish scholars in the synagogue in Jerusalem's Har Nof neighborhood, the torching of a mosque outside the West Bank city of Ramallah and a fire-bomb attack on a historic synagogue in northern Israel had little to do with issues of economy, settlements or two-state boundaries. Rather, they are expressions of a growing religious tension, much of which centers on the iconic Old City plateau revered by Jews as the Temple Mount and Muslims as the Noble Sanctuary. An increasingly fiery and vocal minority both within Israel and the *galut* -- "The Diaspora" -- has been calling for the razing of the *Al Aqsa* mosque in favor of rebuilding The Temple. To a great extent, this is the faction to whom Prime Minister Netanyahu is paying political obeisance.

In a scathing editorial, the Israeli daily *Haaretz* (which occupies roughly the same position as the *New York Times*) said of this proposal: "*The much-needed debate on the dangerous ramifications of this law has been replaced by speculation on whether the government can survive after it is voted on. The question of whether Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu means to use the law as a way of catapulting his partners/rivals out of the ring so he can establish a new coalition, or to force a new election, is overshadowing any discussion of its foolish clauses. Thus, the State of Israel's identity – which was never subject to dispute since its founding – is liable to be held hostage to the desire of ministers and their parties to favor their political ambitions over the principles on which a democracy should rest.*"

Many say "It doesn't matter whether Arabs hate the legislation or the rest of the world gets angry; they hate us anyway. We've got to do what's best for us." Unbelievably, one New Jersey rabbi recently wrote a [blog post](#) calling for Israel to collectively punish Arab Israelis and Palestinians until they realize "they have no future in the land of Israel." In his post, he suggested that Israel essentially end civil and human rights for

many Arab Israelis and Palestinians. Beyond killing all terrorists and demolishing their extended families' homes, he writes, Israel should destroy entire Arab villages if more than one terrorist comes from them. All the residents of those villages, he writes, should be expelled.

This rabbi is not alone in his radical prescription. What he -- and many others -- are urging is that Israel jettison its democratic principles in the name of national survival; that it do to the Palestinians what the Palestinians do to them . . . before they do it. Here in the United States, we are repulsed when hard-right Christians talk about making our laws conform to their version of Christian morality. Likewise, we are dumbfounded by the idea of curtailing civil liberties in order to protect "the Homeland" from terrorists. We wonder at the way many of our politicians roll over quiescently whenever hard-corps Christians bang the gong of morality or militarists seek to shred our civil rights. But this is, to a great extent, what is going on in Israel

I can well understand the anger, the angst, the grave concerns that *khov'vei yisrael* have about the future existence and security of the Jewish State. But Netanyahu's plan is not the way to go. Neither is caving in to the political demands of religious extremists -- regardless of what their religion is. Israel cannot -- indeed, must not -- respond to the murderous attacks of totalitarian thugs by taking civil and human rights away from more than 20% of its population. Hyping the mass deportation of Palestinians has as much of a whiff of unreality in Israel as do mass deportations of illegal immigrants in the United States. If convocations and conversations between Israeli and Palestinian diplomats are fraught with difficulty and frustration, imagine the even greater danger attached when the two sides are "represented" by members of their most intolerant, millenialist factions.

I sincerely doubt that Netanyahu's legislation -- even in watered-down form -- will be enacted. Israelis across the political spectrum support safeguarding the state's democratic character. Even Naftali Bennett, who leads the *HaByit HaYehudi*, the furthest-right party in Knesset and strongly opposes a Palestinian state, came out quickly and vehemently last week against an Israeli city's ban on Arab construction workers. "Ninety-nine-point-nine percent" are nonviolent, he said, and Israel should not discriminate based on race or religion.

Israel must remain a democracy; it must continue to set the example. To do otherwise would be a betrayal of Jewish destiny. God forbid Israelis should wake up one day and, in the words of Pogo, say "We have met the enemy . . . and he is us.

And who knows: maybe the day will come when we can all *kvell* that "Israel is the oldest Democracy in the Middle East . . ."

Copyright©2007 Kurt F. Stone

The K.F. Stone Weekly

(Formerly "Beating the Bushes")



December 08, 2014

WHAT I DISLIKE MOST ABOUT DEMOCRATS

Over the course of this blog's first decade, I have frequently been accused of being a robotic political partisan; of what, back in the day was termed a "Mad Dog Democrat" (MDD). For those unfamiliar, this opprobrious term hearkens back to the days of the so-called "Solid South" and was meant to derisively identify any individual so tagged as being one who would "mindlessly support a mad dog so long as he was a Democrat." Historically, that was often the case, and not just in the Deep South. But back in the day the South was the country's leading bastion of Democratic office holders.

Down south, there were many many otherwise intelligent, open-minded citizens who



went to the polls, held their noses and then cast votes for such arch-conservative segregationists as Senators [John McClellan](#) (AR), [Richard Russell](#) (GA) [John Stennis](#) (MS) and [A\(bsalom\) Willis Robertson](#) (VA -- the father of the Rev. Pat Robertson) just because they were Democrats. (And lest we forget -- or have the Republicans remind us -- Virginia's long-serving Senator Robert Byrd was a member of the K.K.K. back in the mid-1940s.)

Yes, there was a time when the term "Mad Dog Democrat" was appropriate; every senator -- and the overwhelming majority of representatives and governors -- were Democrats. But beginning with the day President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the "Mad Dogs" began deserting the party and linking up with the G.O.P. Or, as Ronald Reagan (the only president to ever head a labor union) famously put it: "I didn't leave the Democratic Party; the Democratic Party left me."

A half century later, LBJ's prediction is more than true. With yesterday's defeat of Louisiana Senator Mary Landrieu by Republican Bill Cassidy, the next Congress won't have a single Democratic senator representing a Deep South state . . . with the exception of Florida's Bill Nelson. To make LBJ's prediction even more full-bodied, starting in January 2015, no Southern state will have a Democratic governor, and there won't be enough Democratic representatives hailing from Southern states to fill an average size school bus . . .

Although, I have never cast a vote for a Republican in a partisan election, I have also never considered myself to be a robotic MDD. Indeed, there are certainly areas where I think Democrats are thin, weak, and fall short, thus driving me up a wall. As 2014 moves to a close and the 2016 presidential cycle begins heating up in earnest, it is obvious that the Democrats' "bench" is woefully thin. Once one gets past former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, there are few - if indeed any -- Democrats who possess the stature, gravitas or name recognition needed to be considered future leaders of national import. Oh yes, there are those who trumpet Vice President Biden or Senators Elizabeth Warren (MA) and Bernie Sanders (VT). In the case of the former, the support is based largely on his long and outstanding political précis; with the latter two, it is as much for their principled stands on the issues as for their political smarts in the field. This "missing piece of the puzzle" is, and likely will be, a problem for the party's post-2016 future. Here, I fault Democrats for failing to have a robust "farm team" – an organizational structure which nurtures and raises up leadership for the future. Goodness knows the Republicans do . . . even if one finds their future leaders to be lacking in oh so many ways.



There are two other missing pieces in the Democrats' puzzle . . . and herein lies my biggest, most intense dislike about the Party of my birth:

An overwhelming lack of ego and spine.

As Michael Tomasky noted in a recent piece which appeared in *The Daily Beast*:

"Democrats are terrified of defending government. Oh, some of them do sometimes. But mostly they defend ends, not means. That is: They defend this or that program or policy goal, but they don't defend the vehicle that provides it, the federal government."

Let's face it: one of the major issues which separate Democrats from Republicans is about the nature and purpose of government – especially the federal government. For the ever-more conservative members of the G.O.P., the nature and purpose of the

federal government is pretty-damn narrow: national defense, highways and safeguarding the free market. Beyond that, Republican partisans are pretty much in agreement that "*Government*," in the words of Ronald Reagan ". . . is the problem, not the answer." For Democrats, the federal government has been an essential means of protecting civil rights – as well as the air we breathe, the water we drink and the national parks we visit; of expanding economic growth and stimulating research in science, medicine and technology. Sure, Democrats will occasionally mention that they are the ones who were largely – though not exclusively – responsible for Social Security, Medicare, the Civil Rights Act, the Americans With Disabilities Act – even the flawed-but-necessary Affordable Care Act. However, when it comes time to campaigning, most Democrats seem forget to mention that without the federal government, none of these programs would have survived birth. This is a mistake. Democrats simply cannot expect to ever get back into the good graces of the American electorate by skulking about in the political shadows, fearing that any pronouncement will give the opposition an opening to accuse them of being "Socialists," "Communists," or "enemies of America." Yes, the belief that the federal government can or should serve any useful purpose beyond the narrowest of bounds has been a growing commonplace ever since the days of Ronald Reagan. Heck, the suspicion that government is the enemy antedates The Gipper by at least a full generation: think Senator Robert Taft, Sr.

I for one am infuriated at the pathetic job of teaching, preaching and explaining that Democrats at all levels have done over the past several years. At a time when more and more people are incapable of seeing the illogic in demanding that government "stay out of our lives" while also demanding that politicians "keep your bloody hands off my Social Security," the Democrats should -- must -- be unafraid to explain "You can have one or the other . . . not both. The Republicans are the party of the former; we are the champions of the latter."

When the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] comes out with month upon month of upbeat reports -- as it has for the past several years -- why don't Democrats trumpet these findings? Because they are worried that Fox News and the Republicans will claim that the BLS is a tool of the Obama administration? As dear old Dad used to say, "Let 'em call you 'pisher' -- it doesn't make you one."

The other day, the Democratic Policy Chair, New York Senator Chuck Schumer, delivered a post-election analysis before the National Press Club. In many ways, it was one of the most significant speeches coming from any Democrat in a long, long time. For in it, he flatly stated: "*Together, Democrats must embrace government. It's what we believe in; it's what unites our party; and, most importantly; it's the only thing that's going to get the middle class going again. If we run away from government, downplay it, or act as if we*

are embarrassed by its role, people won't vote for our pale version of the Republican view; they'll vote for the real McCoy."

Acting in much the same way a coach does when he energizes a team at the beginning of a new season, Schumer is urging his fellow Democrats to grow a spine, be proud of what they stand for and not fear possessing a bit of ego.

In other words, start acting like Democrats!

Copyright©2014 Kurt F. Stone

The K.F. Stone Weekly

(Formerly "Beating the Bushes")



December 14, 2014

OF GIANTS AND PYGMIES

Come the fifth of January 2015, Congress will be without a handful of giants, all of whom have decided to retire. The upcoming 114th Congress will be the first since 1933



Sen. Carl Levin: A Giant

without a Michigan Representative named John David Dingell. (*It should be noted that there will still be a Michigan Representative named Dingell: John Jr's. wife Debbie.*)

Moreover, Michigan will no longer be represented by Carl Levin in the Senate; he's retiring after six 6-year terms. Likewise, the House will be without two California giants: Henry Waxman and

George Miller, both of whom entered Congress on January 3, 1975. And then

there's Iowa, where, after 30 years, Senator Tom Harkin has retired.

These five giants, who served in the House or Senator for a combined 206 years, were among the most powerful and respected members of Congress and collectively were responsible for enacting 163 laws signed by the President of the United States. Among their varied accomplishments:

Rep. John Dingell, Jr., taking a page from his father who served in the House from 1933-1955, introduced National Healthcare Legislation on the first day of every Congress. That would be from 1955 to 2014. He was one of the earliest fathers of the

Affordable Healthcare Act, and the longest-tenured member of Congress in the country's history.

Sen. Carl Levin, the longtime Chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, was generally recognized as one of the Upper Chambers most respected authorities on all things military. His brother Sandy, continues to serve in the House.

Sen. Tom Harkin will forever be known as "The father of the Americans with Disabilities Act" (ADA).

Rep. Henry Waxman was the father of both the Orphan Drug Act (1983) and the Clean Air Act (1990) and, as Chair of the House Energy and Health Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, held some of the earliest Congressional hearings on AIDS, universal health insurance and tobacco.

Rep. George Miller, the longtime Chair of the House Labor and Education Committee, successfully sponsored important legislation on behalf of workers and students, and was responsible for creating two new national parks: Death Valley and Joshua Tree.

Yes indeed, the 114th Congress will be without some of its giants . . . and pygmies as well.

Pygmies?

Yes indeed, pygmies.

When it convenes on January 5, the House will be without five world-class pygmies: Representatives Steve Stockman (TX), Kerry Bentivolio (MI), Steve Southerland (FL),



Paul Broun (GA), and the "pygmiest pygmy of them all," Michele Bachmann (MN). With the exception of Ms. Bachmann, who had announced her retirement back on May 29, 2013, the other four were either defeated in their House primaries (Southerland, Broun and Bentivolio), or lost in a primary for Senate (Stockman). Serving a combined 24 years in Congress, none of the five were known for their legislative accomplishments; between them they had precisely 0 bills which became law. Rather, they were far better known for quotable quotes and twerpy tweets:

Rep. Michele Bachmann: A Pygmy

Rep. Steve Stockman

In April, Stockman's Twitter account showed off his latest bumper sticker, which said, simply, "If babies had guns, they wouldn't be aborted."

At one point, Stockman went after the Kinsey Report, the epochal mid-20th century work by biologist Alfred Kinsey. He actually introduced a bill trying to get the federal government to defund any programs based on Kinsey's work. At the time, Stockman said "This indicates that the basis of sex education in America is a study of the systematic molestation of children as young as four-months-old."

In November of 2013, when the initial enrollment numbers for Obamacare were released, Stockman tweeted "About 110,000 people contract chlamydia each month, more than signed up for Obamacare. Obamacare is less popular than chlamydia."

Rep. Steve Southerland

When challenged on many of his positions regarding women, Southerland proclaimed: "I'm not sexist, look, I know some women. [That I'm related to]."

Invoked the shooting of former Arizona Rep. Gabby Giffords to make the case that his salary of \$174,000 per year as a representative was "not enough."

Southerland, being scored about how much members of Congress earn in comparison to the average wage earner, said: "If you think this job pays too much, with those kinds of risks and cutting me off from my family business, I'll just tell you: This job don't mean that much to me. I had a good life in Panama City."

Rep. Paul Broun, M.D.

A practicing physician, Broun has repeated declared that "God's word is true. I've come to understand that. All that stuff I was taught about evolution, embryology, Big Bang theory, all that is lies straight from the pit of hell. It's lies to try to keep me and all the folks who are taught that from understanding that they need a savior."

During his recent race for the Senate (in which he came in 5th in a 7 person Republican field), Broun's fundraising letters boasted that he was "the first Member of Congress to call [Obama] a socialist who embraces Marxist-Leninist policies" and said last month that given the chance he'd vote to impeach the president.

In 2008 Broun claimed that President Obama, whom he likened to Adolf Hitler and Karl Marx, was plotting an armed takeover with a civilian military force.

Rep. Kerry Bentivolio

Speaking before the Birmingham/Bloomfield (MI) Republican Club, Bentivolio said that it would be a "dream come true" to submit a bill to impeach President Obama. Bentivolio also said he had had meetings with lawyers asking them to "tell me how I can impeach" the president of the United States.

When asked "If you could make an amendment to the Constitution, what would it be?" Bentivolio responded, "I would entertain a debate on repealing the 17th Amendment." (**n.b.:** *This is the amendment which made the popular election of U.S. Senators possible.*)

And then there is Michele Bachmann.

Throughout her 4 terms in Congress and her utterly quixotic run for the Republican presidential nomination, Bachmann has been an eminently quotable gargoyle of fatuity. Consider but a handful:

"If we took away the . . . we could potentially virtually wipe out unemployment completely because we would be able to offer jobs at whatever level." (Jan. 2005)

"I wish the American media would take a great look at the views of the people in Congress and find out: Are they pro-America or anti-America?" (Oct. 2008)

"Carbon dioxide is portrayed as harmful. But there isn't even one study that can be produced that shows that carbon dioxide is a harmful gas." (April 2009)

"I will tell you that I had a mother last night come up to me here in Tampa, Florida, after the debate. She told me that her little daughter took that vaccine (HPV), that injection, and she suffered from mental retardation thereafter." (Sep. 2011).

"But we also know that the very founders that wrote those documents worked tirelessly until slavery was no more in the United States. ... I think it is high time that we recognize the contribution of our forbearers who worked tirelessly -- men like John Quincy Adams, who would not rest until slavery was extinguished in the country." (Jan. 2011. **n.b.** *The Founders did not work to end slavery, and J.Q. Adams was not a founder, but rather the son of a founder.*)

Yes, the upcoming 114th Congress will be a much poorer place because of the absence of Waxman, Levin, Miller and Harkin . . . and a far less entertaining place because of the absence of Stockman, Southerland, Bachmann and Bentivolio.

At least we'll still have Elizabeth Warren to marvel at and Louis Gohmert to kick around

Copyright©2014 Kurt F. Stone

The K.F. Stone Weekly

(Formerly "Beating the Bushes")



December 22, 2014

NORTH KOREA, CUBA AND -SIR CHARLES CHAPLIN

All the folderol concerning the Rogen/Franco/Goldberg film *The Interview*, the alleged North Korean hacking into Sony Pictures' cyber secrets and the latter's caving in due to the fear of God knows what . . . all this has led me to thoughts of Charlie Chaplin's 1940 classic *The Great Dictator*. At first blush this shouldn't seem too terribly odd; after all, both films *do* mock dictators.



What may well seem terribly odd at first blush is that President Obama's announcement concerning the normalization of relations with Cuba also brought Sir Charles' brilliant film to mind -- but obviously for much different reasons.

With regards to *The Interview*, I am by no means the only one who finds a link to Chaplin's *The Great Dictator*. However, where many find common cause by identifying both films as satires, I beg to

differ: *The Great Dictator* is satire of the most scathing and courageous kind. By comparison, from what we've seen of its trailer (and the opinion of another "Hollywood Brat" who actually attended a private screening) *The Interview* is not satire; its low-brow, scatological schoolboy humor. (Double click image below for full screen version:)

"Satire," according to writer Phillip Roth, "is moral outrage transformed into creative art." By that measure, Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* is satire at its courageous best. When Chaplin made his film -- with his own money -- Hitler had already taken over a big chunk of Europe and had many, many supporters in the United States. In lampooning him as "Adenoid Hynkel, the Phooey of Tomania," Chaplin was cutting a monster down to size; making him an object of derisive laughter. Rogan/Franco/Goldberg, on the other hand, weren't taking many chances; Kim Jung-Un is more at war with himself than the world, and has few if any supporters anywhere outside of a tight ruling elite in North Korea. Hitler's bluster was backed up with real bombs and real bullets; Kim's bombast is broad, but shallow.

Chaplin's Hollywood colleague's begged him to shelve *The Great Dictator* for fear that they would lose market share in Europe and South America. He ignored their pleas. In his autobiography he wrote, "*I was determined to go ahead, for Hitler must be laughed at ... I was determined to ridicule [the Nazis'] mystic bilge about a pure-blooded race . . .*" He released the film, got sterling reviews received 5 Academy Awards nominations, won the New York Film Critics Circle Award for Best Picture and earned the Little Tramp a cool \$9 million. (That's nearly \$150 million in [today's dollars](#)). It has been making money and new fans ever since, and has one of the highest ratings on the Internet Movie Data Base (8.5) and Rotten Tomatoes (92%).

By comparison, *The Interview*, which only a handful have actually seen, has a perfect "10" rating on the IMDB and a lowly 53% at Rotten Tomatoes. Personally, I believe that Sony Pictures and the various theater chains which refused to screen the picture made a mistake and set a dangerous and cowardly precedent. The fact that *The Interview* was green-lighted in the first place shows how far Hollywood has fallen since the days of the great studios. From what I can tell, it has neither the robust satire nor the biting wit of Chaplin's *The Great Dictator*; it is a \$47 million schoolboy prank.

Which brings us to Chaplin's film and President Obama's announcement regarding Cuba. What relationship -- if any -- could the two possibly have?

In a single word: leadership

Now that President Obama is in the final two years of his presidency, he has decided to don a Superman suit and accomplish things that Congress would not -- or could not get done. Predictably, his executive order normalizing relations with Cuba has drawn tremendous heat and ridicule from those who can be counted on to lambast his every move. At a recent press conference, Florida Senator Marco Rubio termed the president's action "Absurd," "Disgraceful," a "Concession to tyranny," and "Conceding to the oppressors." Moreover, Rubio, the son of Cuban immigrants said, "I now know for a fundamental truth that this is going to make the day democracy comes to Cuba even further away."

One can easily ask what has Congress done in more than half a century to advance the cause of democracy coming to Cuba -- save cutting off diplomatic relations and maintaining an economic embargo? The answer, in two words, is "absolutely nothing." They have used Cuba as a political wedge issue meant to keep a steady flow of votes and dollars coming their way. And so, into this void came President Obama who, exercising his executive prerogative made a leadership decision. And for leading -- instead of doing nothing -- he is vilified. He has also been vilified for his executive decision regarding immigration reform -- something which again, Congress has failed to enact. I have to believe that at this point in time the president expects to be vilified -- when he leads, when he compromises, when he waits to see what Congress will do.

At the end of *The Great Dictator*, Chaplin's Jewish barber -- his Hynkel doppelgänger -- addresses hundreds of thousands of his fellow Tomanians who are breathlessly waiting their leader's words of wisdom. In what has come to be known as the "Look up Hannah speech," the barber, dressed as Hynkel, speaks the words which are both uplifting and hopeful -- precisely what a leader is supposed to do. (*I must admit that despite having watched this speech more than a hundred time (!) it never ceases to bring a tear. It is, in my estimation, the finest speech ever committed to film.*)

For those who do not have the ability to watch Chaplin's speech, here is what he says:

I'm sorry, but I don't want to be an emperor. That's not my business. I don't want to rule or conquer anyone. I should like to help everyone if possible; Jew, Gentile, black man, white. We all want to help one another. Human beings are like that. We want to live by each other's happiness, not by each other's misery. We don't want to hate and despise one another.

In this world there is room for everyone, and the good earth is rich and can provide for everyone. The way of life can be free and beautiful, but we have lost the way. Greed has poisoned men's souls, has barricaded the world with hate, has goose-stepped us into misery and bloodshed. We have developed speed, but we have shut ourselves in. Machinery that gives abundance has left us in want. Our knowledge has made us cynical; our cleverness, hard and unkind. We think too much and feel too little. More than machinery, we need humanity. More than cleverness, we need kindness and gentleness. Without these qualities, life will be violent and all will be lost.

The airplane and the radio have brought us closer together. The very nature of these inventions cries out for the goodness in men; cries out for universal brotherhood; for the unity of us all.

Even now my voice is reaching millions throughout the world, millions of despairing men, women, and little children, victims of a system that makes men torture and imprison innocent people. To those who can hear me, I say, do not despair. The misery that is now upon us is but the passing of greed, the bitterness of men who fear the way of human progress. The hate of men will pass, and dictators die, and the power they took from the people will return to the people. And so long as men die, liberty will never perish.

Soldiers! Don't give yourselves to brutes, men who despise you, enslave you; who regiment your lives, tell you what to do, what to think and what to feel! Who drill you, diet you, treat you like cattle, use you as cannon fodder. Don't give yourselves to these unnatural men - machine men with machine minds and machine hearts! You are not machines, you are not cattle, you are men! You have the love of humanity in your hearts! You don't hate! Only the unloved hate; the unloved and the unnatural. Soldiers! Don't fight for slavery! Fight for liberty!

In the seventeenth chapter of St. Luke, it is written that the kingdom of God is within man, not one man nor a group of men, but in all men! In you! You, the people, have the power, the power to create machines, the power to create happiness! You, the people, have the power to make this life free and beautiful, to make this life a wonderful adventure. Then in the name of democracy, let us use that power. Let us all unite. Let us fight for a new world, a decent world that will give men a chance to work that will give youth a future and old age a security. By the promise of these things, brutes have risen to power. But they lie! They do not fulfill that promise. They never will! Dictators free themselves but they enslave the people. Now let us fight to fulfill that promise. Let us fight to free the world! To do away with national barriers! To do away with greed, with hate and intolerance! Let us fight for a world of reason, a world where science

and progress will lead to all men's happiness. Soldiers, in the name of democracy, let us all unite!

Hannah, can you hear me? Wherever you are, look up Hannah! The clouds are lifting! The sun is breaking through! We are coming out of the darkness into the light! We are coming into a new world; a kindlier world, where men will rise above their hate, their greed, and brutality. Look up, Hannah! The soul of man has been given wings and at last he is beginning to fly. He is flying into the rainbow! Into the light of hope, into the future! The glorious future that belongs to you, to me and to all of us. Look up, Hannah. Look up!

Indeed, look up . . .

Copyright©2014 Kurt F. Stone