

capacity to function best in a cooperative milieu, its retention of power in the competitive arenas could be better justified. Civil administration in government is one such area, and I think the women and minorities that are starting to take hold there are, by and large, doing a superior job.

If, after achieving success in their effort to cut welfare to the poor and disadvantaged, the Republican Congress continues to fail to cut corporate welfare, the moral emptiness of their position should be clear to all

No one that I've read has made the point that Clinton's behavior, and the impeachment effort based on it, demonstrate once again the failure of the Christian religionist moral code in action. The code goes too much against human nature. Clinton flouted it with his sexual behavior and by lying to cover it up which was a very human response to a very human "failing". Those in government out to punish him are sinners throwing the first stone. They fail (even more miserably than he) to apply the core teachings of Christ to their conduct of public office. They would like to be able to impeach Clinton for his character, but have been unable to find an instance of his slipperiness resulting in malfeasance in office.

because this largely Southern and rural constituency is more populous than the plutocracy. Their ignorance and bigotry are clearly an embarrassment to the urban CEOs, bond-holders, and financiers that hold the real power in this country. The South and rural districts have been over-represented in Congress throughout our history. By wooing the white Southern voter away from the Democrats, the Republican party has become afflicted with the racism and xenophobia which so divided the Democrats. And yet, without them, they lose much of their popular base.

But there is a common thread uniting the business, military/police, and religious right constituencies: *patriarchalism*. The world belongs to the rich old white guys and the rest of us just live in it. I must include myself in “the rest of us” not only because I’m merely old and white, but because I decided long ago not to let the acquisition of money run my life. We, as white males, seem to be born with the assumption that it is our privilege and responsibility to make the rules by which the rest of the world lives. Eventually, we will have to give this up as we experience increasing pressure from everyone else from remote ethnics to our own women.

Let me give some examples of patriarchy-in-action closer to home. Your address to Native Americans when you were state senator, would be one instance of white patriarchalism even if it were only a matter of style and not content. For another example, at the last Whidby family reunion I attended, I was telling your late father that I had been leading a very fulfilling life earning my living as a bassist. His comment was, “I hope you don’t play it like a banjo.” He was famous for his barbs, so I was not offended, but his remark was redolent of patriarchalism (who is he, after all, to have an opinion about how I should conduct my musical career) and racism (the banjo is an instrument of African origin) of which he was surely unaware.

These ancient privileges are starting to erode, which is why old white men are so frantic to retain their power. Lower class men, on the bottom of the heap in every other regard, reap self-esteem from patriarchal power over their families. In their minds, feminism and black sexual hedonism form the direst of threats to “family values”, the last bastion of their own worth.

The question is: OK, if the white patriarchy is on the way out (unless violent means are resorted to), what’s to replace it that’s not worse? I think we’re in the process of discovering that. That’s why the Hillary role in the Clinton White House is so controversial: she seeks to transcend the traditional “first lady” expectation. The hatred she inspires in the radical right is deeply irrational. Rush Limbaugh really is a big fat idiot. On the other hand, a matriarchy (possible only if women developed the clout to seize it) isn’t the answer, either.

Patriarchy-based patriotism, capitalism, and fundamentalism stress the virtues of *competitiveness* over *cooperation*. Women, it seems to me, function more naturally in a system (or sub-system), where cooperation is the key to functionality. If the patriarchy were to identify those areas of public life where the need for cooperation outweighed the need for competitiveness, and then cede power in those areas to people demonstrating a

Dear Jack, (Metcalf, my cousin; at that time Congressman--11/9/98

Dual congratulations on winning re-election and losing Newt. Of course, it's obvious that he's positioning himself for a run for the Presidency. Two more years of responsibility for legislative constipation could only further compromise his leadership credibility. But with popularity ratings like his...

The recent repudiation at the polls means that the Republican Party is bound to go through a period of soul searching. Gov. George Bush of Texas has made a useful beginning by observing that by dividing, one can conquer, but not rule. You will have your input to this redefinition of direction, so please forgive me if I attempt to nudge that input a little to the left.

Please excuse, as well, the arrogance implicit in my apparent assumption that my opinions should be of any practical worth, but the present situation is chaotic, and chaos gives rise to possibility. The present situation hands you power that you would most likely normally overlook.

First, let's get down to basics. The philosophy of the Republican Party is based on three pillars: *patriotism*, *capitalism*, and *fundamentalism*. (And these pillars are erected on the foundation of wealthy white *patriarchy*.) In practice this translates into *burgeoning expenditures for the military and police*, an *ever-increasing drift of wealth to the already-wealthy and away from the poor*, and the *enforcement of religion-based standards on the conduct of our private lives*. One of these three objectives has *always* driven Republican riders attached to bills that Clinton would otherwise be inclined to sign. For example, even the raising of the minimum wage, if you remember (and which I praise you for voting for), carried a rider benefiting the wealthy.

Unless they can be persuaded that peace can be achieved only through the intimidation of superior force, that the rising tide of corporate profits will also lift their boat, and that innate human sinfulness requires state intervention, these fundamental Republican goals will tend to alienate the majority of the voters who want to live in peace and freedom, are not particularly wealthy, and want to determine for themselves how they conduct their private lives. To win, Republicans resort to divisive tactics, brandishing their economic clout, appealing to the public's greed, anger, envy, and false pride, while demonizing the supposed sloth, envy, and lustfulness of blacks, hippies, and the less well-off, while the advertising industry seeks to maximize everyone's gluttonous tendencies. The result is a cynical and fractious electorate. As a consequence, minorities, the young, and the poor fail to register and vote. I understand there's a right-wing think-tank that works hard at promoting low voter turnout. That may be a winning strategy, but political power based on less than 20% of the potential electorate has little credibility.

Even though their fundamental practical role in politics is to represent the interests of the wealthy and the corporations, Republicans are currently in thrall to the fundamentalists