

opinion.” (Tr., p. 10).

The Court itself responded to my objection to the cult issue by stating, “I agree that there is nothing that has come before the Court to support any cult analysis” (Tr., p. 20). Thus, the only grounds that Dr. Daum had for recommending a second examination were ruled to be without foundation by this Court.

Mr. Russell clearly approved of this “cult” ruse: he said “I’m still troubled . . . in light of his admitted lack of expertise or experience in dealing with cults. . . . Perhaps, I think maybe . . . someone experienced in the area of cults should re-examine.” (Tr., p. 16) Mr. Russell’s other concern, the length of the interview and Dr. Daum’s “legal area” experience are absurd, since Russell himself established him as an expert to do this examination, and I afforded Dr. Daum as much time as he felt was necessary, even though I objected to the examination from the start.

I make one last point on this issue of the grounds for the second examination. Dr. Daum’s *definition* of “shared delusional disorder” is that “while he [the subject], himself, is psychologically intact, he is so under the influence of *someone who is not psychologically intact* that he picks up beliefs. . . .” (p. 9). While he says that in his opinion I do not have this disorder, it is clear that to *conclude* that I *do* have this disorder requires establishing that someone else who is “influencing me” is not “psychologically intact.” It is clear that that there is no reason to examine me to determine if someone else is not “psychologically intact.” The real target of the “examination,” proposed by Mr. Russell and not objected to by my “counsel,” Mr. Gettings, appear to be my political associates. This would not appear to be a proper purpose for a psychiatric examination under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

III. Conclusion

I am most grateful for the Court’s indulgence in receiving and reviewing this petition. I regret the circumstances requiring me to make this application, but the circumstances were not of my making. In conclusion, I once again ask this Court to allow me to discharge Mr. Gettings as my attorney. This case goes well beyond “irreconcilable differences”; Mr. Gettings has, by acts of commission and omission, taken on the role of an adversary since he filed his Motion to Withdraw. I also ask the Court to vacate its order directing the second psychiatric examination because such an examination violates my Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights as I am presently unrepresented by counsel. Further, there is no probable cause for this second examination, the Institute which was designated by the Court to conduct the examination is an interested party in the proceedings, and the prospective examination implicates my political beliefs and associations which are protected by the First Amendment.

Finally, I assure the Court there’s nothing in this matter that I consider a “game.” I am concerned with nothing less than my reputation, my liberty, and my right to obtain justice.

Defeat of Koch opens new era for New York

by Dennis Speed

New York City’s Mayor Edward Koch was defeated in his bid for an unprecedented fourth term in the Sept. 12 Democratic primary by David Dinkins, who will face the Republican nominee, former U.S. Attorney Rudolph Giuliani, in the November election. A new chapter in the “human comedy” of the premier city of the United States is, therefore, about to begin.

The city’s monumental economic, financial, and social problems were never made the subject of the campaign. They were judiciously avoided except when, either by accident, or for expediency’s sake, it became inevitable that the candidates would have to speak to these questions.

Let us inform the reader of a few of the staggering challenges that face New York. By official estimate the city harbors more than 100,000 homeless men, women, and children; many analysts, social workers, and community activists place the number at 250,000.

In the spring of 1985, the official estimate of the number of AIDS victims, offered by then-Health Commissioner, David J. Sencer, was 400,000. If one accepts even a 24-month doubling rate for the AIDS virus, the figure would now be 1.6 million (although the city’s official figure as of August 1989, indicated that only 150,000 New Yorkers were infected.)

In areas such as the South Bronx, AIDS rates in neighborhoods have been calculated at 20-25%—exactly identical to the rate of homosexual-dominated areas, such as Greenwich Village.

The situation in public education is even more nightmarish. At Seward Park High School, on the Lower East side of Manhattan, for example, 3,500 students attend a school whose total capacity is 2,600; 85% of the students come from households where English is not the dominant language; 60% come

from families eligible for some form of public assistance; 50% from single parent homes; and almost 5% from homes where there are no parents at all. Approximately 40% of the students who entered the school in 1984, did not graduate as seniors in 1988.

Yet none of this seemed to truly faze the candidates for what is often termed “the second toughest job in America.” In fact, if not for a vicious racial murder, reality would have remained no more than a side-show for the manipulations so characteristically routine for the real estate and monied interests that routinely dictate how high a politician jumps in New York City.

The Bensonhurst attack

On Aug. 23, Yusef Hawkins, 16, was murdered in a case of mistaken identity and racial attack, in the Bensonhurst, Brooklyn section of the city. Five men of primarily Italian-American descent, were arrested for the crime over the following week.

This was only the most violent of several such incidents that had occurred over the summer.

Demonstrations protesting the murder only fanned the flames of bigotry; white “skinheads” lined the march route and shouted anti-black racial epithets.

While candidate Dinkins, who is black, refused to condemn the white people of Bensonhurst, saying, “We must never allow the despicable acts of a few individuals to be imputed to an entire community,” and visited the parents of the slain boy, Ed Koch did not.

Writer Joe Klein of *New York Magazine* characterized Dinkins’s statement as “a demonstration of responsible leadership of a sort almost never seen in the heat of a political campaign.” However, neither Dinkins nor Koch, nor any of the other candidates, identified the true cause of New York’s spiraling racial tensions.

The motor behind the growing unlivability of the city of New York is unquestionably the drug epidemic. In 1977, writers for *Executive Intelligence Review* spoke to New York Drug Enforcement Administration officials who estimated the annual “take” from drug traffic on New York City streets at \$15 billion.

This was before the state legislature passed the infamous marijuana decriminalization law. This was before the proliferation of “offshore” banking, “creative financial practices,” insider stock trading, and the “cocaine-for-information” arrangements of young Wall Street corporate “raiders.” This was before the crack epidemic of 1986, in which single individuals spent \$50,000 a year for the instantly addictive drug.

Probably, \$35-50 billion a year flows through the streets and banking coffers of New York City in drug money. Eighty percent of all violent crime in the city is drug related. According to eye witnesses, participants in the Hawkins murder had been drinking and using drugs for several hours before

the incident.

No one of the mayoral candidates has confronted the financial structure that supports the de facto legalized drug epidemic—and no one of them will.

Big Apple ‘Bonapartism’

Faced with this crisis, the city’s population could vote for Republican candidate and former U.S. Attorney, Rudolph Giuliani. However, two incidents have come to attention that have caused Giuliani to be questioned.

Giuliani’s prosecutorial methods evoked waves of protest when it was revealed that his investigators forced Simon Berger, a survivor of the Auschwitz concentration camp, to stand in front of a blackboard marked “Arbeit Macht Frei” — “Work Makes You Free,” the words over the gate at Auschwitz—after his arrest. “They came for me at 7:00 in the morning. It was like what happened to me in Germany,” he said. Berger was later cleared of charges.

Secondly, Giuliani, in 1982, was dispatched to Haiti as an official of the Justice Department to investigate human rights violations by the Duvalier regime. Giuliani concluded that Haitians who fled the regime in hope of finding asylum in the United States, were victims of “only economic” and not “political repression” and were, therefore, ineligible.

One hypothesis offered by analysts is that only a “Bonapartist” city regime with Giuliani as mayor, and former Brooklyn District Attorney Elizabeth Holtzman, as Comptroller of the city’s currency, can hope to keep order in New York. Giuliani and Holtzman could effectively “divert people’s attention from the city’s major problems by hanging and electrocuting a few drug dealers and AIDS-infected rapists, while the basic organized crime structure in the city went untouched,” one commentator suggested. Holtzman, a Democrat who like Koch supported marijuana decriminalization when they were both U.S. congressmen in the 1970s, is a leading collaborator of the Justice Department’s Office of Special Investigations, which has served as a conduit for use of Soviet-concocted “evidence” to illegally deport naturalized U.S. citizens, as alleged Nazi war criminals.

Koch’s absence is likely to be felt as a “real loss,” however, only by the media. “A life in which time is measured in news cycles rather than days, in which language is parsed in sound bytes rather than sentences. . . . He had little patience for the nuances of policy; his policies change or are created when the *news changes*,” was how one reporter characterized him.

Whether Dinkins or Giuliani becomes mayor, non-stop buffoonery by either Ed Koch or the media can no longer characterize the 6:00 nightly news reports from City Hall. New York’s new mayor will either decide to reverse the present policy direction, even if that means risking his political career, or merely play at governing a city that, as it enters the 1990s, is fast becoming a cross between Calcutta and Johannesburg.