

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	From Margo Cullen to Lisa Branch Re: Race conference on Oct 15-16 [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	09/04/1998	b(6)
002. email	From Margo Cullen to Rebecca Blank Re: Race conference on Oct 15-16 [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	09/04/1998	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
CEA ([Randall Kennedy])
O/Box Number: 950000

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/04/1998 - 07/09/1999]

2019-1029-F

in593

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	From Margo Cullen to Lisa Branch Re: Race conference on Oct 15-16 [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	09/04/1998	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
CEA ([Randall Kennedy])
OA/Box Number: 950000

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/04/1998 - 07/09/1999]

2019-1029-F

jn593

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Margo Cullen <MCullen@nas.edu> (Margo Cullen <MCullen@nas.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-SEP-1998 13:19:40.00

SUBJECT: race conference on Oct 15-16

TO: Lisa D. Branch (CN=Lisa D. Branch/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Received message from Francine's email that she is out and therefore am forwarding this message to you on her behalf.

Thank you.

----- Forwarded by Margo Cullen on 09/04/98 01:13 PM

Margo Cullen
09/04/98 12:03 PM

To: Rebecca_M._Blank@cea.eop.gov
cc: francine_p._obermiller@cea.eop.gov
Subject: race conference on Oct 15-16

Becky:

I am Faith Mitchell's administrative associate and Faith has asked me to send you the "draft agenda" as it stands today. I have attached it (Word 6.0./Win) and also imported it below.

We also have now produced a conference brochure and will send you some in the mail today.

In addition, I will be accompanying Faith to the meeting on Sept 14 of the Advisory Board and therefore am providing my information for clearance into the building. I understand Faith has already received clearance previously.

My info: Margo Louise Cullen, DOB: (b)(6) SS#: (b)(6)

[001]

I look forward to meeting you on the 14th.

(See attached file: Agenda.904)

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20418

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
Research Conference on Racial Trends in the United States

National Academy of Sciences Auditorium
October 15-16, 1998

DRAFT AGENDA

October 15

8:00 am Continental Breakfast - Great Hall, NAS

8:30 Opening Remarks by Conference Chairs
Neil Smelser (CASBS), William Julius Wilson (Harvard)

9:00 History and Future
Christopher Edley (Harvard)

Changing America: Indicators of Well-Being by Race
Rebecca Blank (Council of Economic Advisors)

9:45 Group Discussion of Demographic and Immigration Trends
Discussion Leaders:
Reynolds Farley (Russell Sage)
Mary Waters (Harvard)
Paper Authors:
Gary Sandefur (Wisconsin): "Overview of Demographic Trends"
Min Zhou (UCLA): "Current Trends in Immigration"

10:40 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

10:55 Group Discussion of Income, Wealth, and Welfare Trends
Discussion Leaders:
TBD
Sanders Korenman (Baruch College)
Paper Authors:
James Smith (RAND): "Overview of Income and Poverty Trends"
Thomas Shapiro (Northeastern): "Wealth and Racial Stratification"
Robert Moffitt (Johns Hopkins) & Peter Gottschalk (Boston College):
"Welfare Programs and Labor Markets"

12:00 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

12:15 Box Lunch - Great Hall, NAS

October 16

1:00 Group Discussion of Education Trends
Discussion Leaders:
TBD
Thomas Kane (Harvard)
Paper Authors:
Gary Orfield (Harvard): "Overview of Educational Equity"
Ronald Ferguson (Harvard): "Trends for K-12"
Daryl Smith (Claremont): "Racial Dynamics in Higher Education"

Sharon Robinson (ETS): "Educational Assessment and Learning"

2:15 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

2:30 Group Discussion of Labor Force Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Ken Chay (Berkeley)

Marcus Alexis (Northwestern)

Paper Authors:

Harry Holzer (MSU): "Labor Force Trends for Males"

Cecilia Conrad (Pomona): "Labor Force Trends for Females"

John Sibley Butler (Texas) & Charles Moskos (Northwestern):
"Trends in the Military"

Thomas Boston (Georgia Tech): "Minorities and Business

Ownership"

3:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

4:00 Group Discussion of Neighborhood and Geographic Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Roberto Fernandez (Stanford)

Paul Jargowsky (Texas)

Paper Authors:

Douglas Massey (Penn): "Overview of Racial Segregation and
Neighborhood Conditions"

Manuel Pastor (UC Santa Cruz): "Geography and Opportunity"

5:00 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

5:15 Adjourn

5:15 - 6:15 Reception - Great Hall, NAS

October 16

8:00 am Continental Breakfast - Great Hall, NAS

8:30 Group Discussion of the Meaning of Race and International
Comparisons

Discussion Leaders:

Anthony Marx (Columbia)

Richard Alba (SUNY Albany)

Paper Authors:

Orlando Patterson (Harvard): "Overview of Cross-National
Perspectives"

Michael Omi (Berkeley): "The Changing Meaning of Race"

9:30 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

9:45 Group Discussion of Trends Among Asians, Latinos, and Native
Americans

Discussion Leaders:

Rodolfo de la Garza (Texas)

Matthew Snipp (Stanford)

Paper Authors:

Albert Camarillo (Stanford) & Frank Bonilla (Hunter):

"Trends Among Latinos"

Don Nakanishi (UCLA): "Trends Among Asians"

Russell Thornton (Stanford): "Trends Among Native Americans"

10:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

11:00 Group Discussion of Racial Attitudes, Affirmative Action, and Political Participation

Discussion Leaders:

James Jones (Delaware)

Jennifer Hochschild (Princeton)

Paper Authors:

Larry Bobo (Harvard): "Overview of Racial Attitudes and Beliefs"

Carol Swain (Stanford) : "Affirmative Action and Alternatives"

Michael Dawson (Chicago): "Overview of Political Participation"

12:00 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

12:15 Box Lunch - Great Hall, NAS

1:00 Group Discussion of Justice Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Alfred Blumstein (Carnegie-Mellon)

Darnell Hawkins (Illinois)

Paper Author:

Randall Kennedy (Harvard): "Overview of the Justice System"

1:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

October 16

2:00 Group Discussion of Health Trends

Discussion Leaders:

David Hayes-Bautista (UCLA)

Beverly Coleman-Miller (HSPH)

James S. Jackson (Michigan)

Paper Authors:

Raynard Kington (NCHS) & Herb Nickens (AAMC):

"Overview of Racial Trends in Health"

Vonnie McLoyd (Michigan) & Betsy Lozoff (Michigan):

"Behavior and Development in Children & Adolescents"

Renee Jenkins (Howard): "Physical Health Issues in Children & Adolescents"

David Williams (Michigan): "Trends For Adults"

Eugene Oddone (VA), Laura Peterson (VA), Morris

Weinberger(VA):

"Trends For Veterans"

- 3:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience
- 4:15 Concluding Discussion of Racial Trends and Research Needs
William Julius Wilson, Neil Smelser, (others?)
- 4:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience
- 5:00 Adjourn

- Agenda.904===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D25]MAIL401226642.226 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_14662209_cea_html_1.msoff

Attachment Number: [ATTACH.D25]MAIL401226642.226

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	From Margo Cullen to Rebecca Blank Re: Race conference on Oct 15-16 [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	09/04/1998	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
CEA ([Randall Kennedy])
OA/Box Number: 950000

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/04/1998 - 07/09/1999]

2019-1029-F
jn593

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Margo Cullen <MCullen@nas.edu> (Margo Cullen <MCullen@nas.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-SEP-1998 12:04:50.00

SUBJECT: race conference on Oct 15-16

TO: Rebecca M. Blank (CN=Rebecca M. Blank/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Francine P. Obermiller (CN=Francine P. Obermiller/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Becky:

I am Faith Mitchell's administrative associate and Faith has asked me to send you the "draft agenda" as it stands today. I have attached it (Word 6.0./Win) and also imported it below.

We also have now produced a conference brochure and will send you some in the mail today.

In addition, I will be accompanying Faith to the meeting on Sept 14 of the Advisory Board and therefore am providing my information for clearance into the building. I understand Faith has already received clearance previously.

My info: Margo Louise Cullen, DOB: (b)(6) SS#: (b)(6)

[002]

I look forward to meeting you on the 14th.

(See attached file: Agenda.904)

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20418

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
Research Conference on Racial Trends in the United States

National Academy of Sciences Auditorium
October 15-16, 1998

DRAFT AGENDA

October 15

8:00 am Continental Breakfast - Great Hall, NAS

8:30 Opening Remarks by Conference Chairs
Neil Smelser (CASBS), William Julius Wilson (Harvard)

9:00 History and Future
Christopher Edley (Harvard)

Changing America: Indicators of Well-Being by Race
Rebecca Blank (Council of Economic Advisors)

9:45 Group Discussion of Demographic and Immigration Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Reynolds Farley (Russell Sage)
Mary Waters (Harvard)

Paper Authors:

Gary Sandefur (Wisconsin): "Overview of Demographic Trends"
Min Zhou (UCLA): "Current Trends in Immigration"

10:40 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

10:55 Group Discussion of Income, Wealth, and Welfare Trends

Discussion Leaders:

TBD

Sanders Korenman (Baruch College)

Paper Authors:

James Smith (RAND): "Overview of Income and Poverty Trends"
Thomas Shapiro (Northeastern): "Wealth and Racial

Stratification"

Robert Moffitt (Johns Hopkins) & Peter Gottschalk (Boston

College):

"Welfare Programs and Labor Markets"

12:00 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

12:15 Box Lunch - Great Hall, NAS

October 15

1:00 Group Discussion of Education Trends

Discussion Leaders:

TBD

Thomas Kane (Harvard)

Paper Authors:

Gary Orfield (Harvard): "Overview of Educational Equity"
Ronald Ferguson (Harvard): "Trends for K-12"
Daryl Smith (Claremont): "Racial Dynamics in Higher Education"
Sharon Robinson (ETS): "Educational Assessment and Learning"

2:15 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

2:30 Group Discussion of Labor Force Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Ken Chay (Berkeley)

Marcus Alexis (Northwestern)

Paper Authors:

Harry Holzer (MSU): "Labor Force Trends for Males"
Cecilia Conrad (Pomona): "Labor Force Trends for Females"
John Sibley Butler (Texas) & Charles Moskos (Northwestern):

"Trends in the Military"
Thomas Boston (Georgia Tech): "Minorities and Business
Ownership"

3:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

4:00 Group Discussion of Neighborhood and Geographic Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Roberto Fernandez (Stanford)

Paul Jargowsky (Texas)

Paper Authors:

Douglas Massey (Penn): "Overview of Racial Segregation and
Neighborhood Conditions"

Manuel Pastor (UC Santa Cruz): "Geography and Opportunity"

5:00 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

5:15 Adjourn

5:15 - 6:15 Reception - Great Hall, NAS

October 16

8:00 am Continental Breakfast - Great Hall, NAS

8:30 Group Discussion of the Meaning of Race and International
Comparisons

Discussion Leaders:

Anthony Marx (Columbia)

Richard Alba (SUNY Albany)

Paper Authors:

Orlando Patterson (Harvard): "Overview of Cross-National
Perspectives"

Michael Omi (Berkeley): "The Changing Meaning of Race"

9:30 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

9:45 Group Discussion of Trends Among Asians, Latinos, and Native
Americans

Discussion Leaders:

Rodolfo de la Garza (Texas)

Matthew Snipp (Stanford)

Paper Authors:

Albert Camarillo (Stanford) & Frank Bonilla (Hunter):

"Trends Among Latinos"

Don Nakanishi (UCLA): "Trends Among Asians"

Russell Thornton (Stanford): "Trends Among Native Americans"

10:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

11:00 Group Discussion of Racial Attitudes, Affirmative Action, and
Political Participation

Discussion Leaders:

James Jones (Delaware)

Jennifer Hochschild (Princeton)

Paper Authors:

Larry Bobo (Harvard): "Overview of Racial Attitudes and Beliefs"

Carol Swain (Stanford) : "Affirmative Action and Alternatives"

Michael Dawson (Chicago): "Overview of Political Participation"

12:00 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

12:15 Box Lunch - Great Hall, NAS

1:00 Group Discussion of Justice Trends

Discussion Leaders:

Alfred Blumstein (Carnegie-Mellon)

Darnell Hawkins (Illinois)

Paper Author:

Randall Kennedy (Harvard): "Overview of the Justice System"

1:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

October 16

2:00 Group Discussion of Health Trends

Discussion Leaders:

David Hayes-Bautista (UCLA)

Beverly Coleman-Miller (HSPH)

James S. Jackson (Michigan)

Paper Authors:

Raynard Kington (NCHS) & Herb Nickens (AAMC):

"Overview of Racial Trends in Health"

Vonnie McLoyd (Michigan) & Betsy Lozoff (Michigan):

"Behavior and Development in Children & Adolescents"

Renee Jenkins (Howard): "Physical Health Issues in Children & Adolescents"

David Williams (Michigan): "Trends For Adults"

Eugene Oddone (VA), Laura Peterson (VA), Morris

Weinberger(VA):

"Trends For Veterans"

3:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

4:15 Concluding Discussion of Racial Trends and Research Needs

William Julius Wilson, Neil Smelser, (others?)

4:45 Selected Questions and Comments from the Audience

5:00 Adjourn

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D99]MAIL45075564D.226 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_c4655704_cea_html_1.msoff

Attachment Number: [ATTACH.D99]MAIL45075564D.226

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: slate_evening-errors+stone_cf+al.eop.gov@bounce.infobeat.com@INET@LNGTWY (slate_evening-errors+stone_cf+al.eop.gov@bounce.infobeat.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JUL-1999 20:30:08.00

SUBJECT: SLATE EVENING DELIVERY: Fri., July 9, 1999

TO: Charles F. Stone@EOP (Charles F. Stone@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE EVENING DELIVERY: Fri., July 9, 1999

--feature: Proxy War

--book club: Monumental Memories

feature

Proxy War: Liberals denounce racial profiling. Conservatives denounce affirmative action. What's the difference?

By Michael Brus

In Brent Staples' memoir *Parallel Time*, he recounts a game he used to play while a student at the University of Chicago. Staples, who is black, would pace the streets surrounding the campus after dark. When he spied a white couple strolling toward him arm in arm, he would walk directly at them, at a normal pace. The couple would first tighten their grip on each other. Then, as Staples continued to head toward them, they would panic, release their grip, and scurry apart. Staples would breeze between them, without losing a step, without looking back. He called it "scattering the pigeons."

The "pigeons" feared Staples because of his blackness--they were using his race as a proxy for potential criminality. Using superficial traits to infer deeper characteristics in people is common and need not be racist. Generalizing from what is easily and quickly knowable to something that is hard to know for sure is what economists think of as minimizing information costs. If the clouds turn dark and ominous and it starts to thunder while you're out for a stroll, you can find a phone and call the weather service, or you can ignore them on the grounds that predictions about the weather are often wrong, or you can take cover under the assumption that it's probably going to rain. But using race as a proxy is sensitive, for good and obvious reasons.

If skin color as a proxy for criminal intentions were a precise

tool--that is, if every young black man strolling the sidewalks were a mugger--it would be hard to criticize. And if the implied generalization had no validity--if a young black male was no more likely to be a mugger than anyone else approaching on the sidewalk--it would be easy to label as racist. But, like most such generalizations, it is valid but not perfect. A young black man is more likely to be a mugger than a young white man--but the assumption that any particular young black man is a mugger will usually be wrong. So is using race as a proxy racist?

This is what the current "racial profiling" controversy is about. Racial profiling is when police use race as a reason to search someone's car or to frisk a pedestrian. Almost all black men have tales of being stopped by a cop for no reason other than their skin color. It's derisively known as "DWB": the crime of driving while black. Earlier this year the governor of New Jersey, Christine Todd Whitman, fired the state police superintendent for telling a journalist that blacks were more likely to commit crimes than whites. But she has since admitted that state police systematically stop cars simply because the driver is black. And racial profiling has many defenders who say it is sensible, hard-nosed policing of the sort that has led to a dramatic drop in the nation's crime rate.

One generalization that can be made about racial profiling--a valid but not perfect generalization, of course--is that conservatives tend to support it, while liberals tend to regard it as racist. In another controversy, the one over affirmative action, the opposite generalization holds: Liberals tend to support it, while conservatives tend to regard it as reverse racism.

And yet affirmative action and racial profiling are essentially the same. Affirmative action amounts to the use of race as a proxy for other, harder-to-discern qualities: racial victimization, poverty, cultural deprivation. Few critics of affirmative action are against compensating victims of specific and proven acts of racial discrimination. And the critics often positively endorse programs giving a special break to people who've overcome economic or cultural disadvantage. What they object to is generalizing these conditions from a person's race. Defenders of affirmative action say, in essence, that as policy-making generalizations go, this one is overwhelmingly valid--and that more justice will be lost than gained by insisting on scientific precision.

Defenders of affirmative action and defenders of racial profiling even resort to the same dodge in defending their cause against colorblind absolutists. They say they, too, think it's wrong for a person to be promoted and/or arrested just because of his or her race. But, they say, it's OK for race to be one factor among many.

Here is Gov. Whitman, quoted in the New York Times Magazine last month, explaining the difference between profiling (good) and racial profiling (bad):

"Profiling means a police officer using cumulative knowledge and training to identify certain indicators of possible criminal activity. Race may be one of those factors, but it cannot stand alone. Racial profiling is when race is the only other factor. There's no other probable cause."

This precisely echoes Justice Lewis Powell's famous explanation of permissible affirmative action in the 1978 Bakke case:

"Ethnic diversity is only one element in a range of factors a university properly may consider in attaining the goal of a heterogeneous student body. ... In [a constitutional] admissions program, race or ethnic background may be deemed a 'plus' in a particular applicant file, yet it does not insulate the individual from comparison with all other candidates for the available seats."

The factor fudge satisfies some critics, but it doesn't solve the racial proxy dilemma. Stopping and frisking a driver or admitting a student to Yale is a yes-or-no decision. As legal scholar Randall Kennedy wrote in his book *Race, Crime, and the Law*, "Even if race is only one of several factors behind a decision, tolerating it at all means tolerating it as potentially the decisive factor." When it's the decisive factor, it might as well have been the only factor. If it's never decisive, it's not really a factor at all.

The main difference between affirmative action and racial profiling is that one singles out blacks for something desirable and the other singles them out for something undesirable. Reasonable people can differ about whether using race as a proxy is OK. Obviously it depends on how valid the generalization is in any given case, and how costly or impractical it would be to get alternative information. When you fear a man approaching you may be a mugger, you may not be able to find out in the next five seconds whether he happens to be a University of Chicago intellectual headed for the New York Times editorial board. On the other hand, race is not just any proxy, and probably should be used more sparingly--especially by the government--than the narrow logic of probabilities would justify.

Racial proxies are a tough call. But it's safe to say that anyone who is outraged by racial profiling but tolerates affirmative action, or vice versa, has got it wrong.

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

South Park: A Duck Soup for the '90s
<http://www.slate.com/MovieReview/99-07-09/MovieReview.asp>

A Philistine's Guide to Italy
<http://www.slate.com/Features/italy/italy.asp>

Harvard Law School Sees a Shrink

book club

Monumental Memories

By Philip Gourevitch and James Young

Philip Gourevitch writes for The New Yorker and is the author of *We Wish To Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families: Stories From Rwanda*. James Young is a professor of English and Judaic studies at the University of Massachusetts. He is the author of *The Texture of Memory*.

This week they discuss *The Holocaust in American Life*, by Peter Novick.

To read this exchange from the beginning, go to
<http://www.slate.com/code/bookclub/bookclub.asp?Show=7/6/99>

From: Philip Gourevitch
To: James Young
Subject: The Past Is Inaccurate

Dear James,

You're right that "not every institutional memory of the Holocaust is a deliberate instrumentalization of it toward cheap and self-interested ends," and that in focusing almost exclusively on abuses and exploitations of Holocaust memory, Novick himself distorts the history of that memory. Tony Judt makes a related point in his sharply negative review of Novick's book in the *New Republic*, where he observes that Novick "has spent a lot of time thinking about the uses and the abuses to which the Holocaust has been put in modern America; but he has devoted curiously little effort to thinking about the Holocaust itself." True, and the Holocaust remains almost relentlessly interesting to think about--in large part because one can do so while drawing on many deeply thoughtful works (as opposed to questionable popularizing) that already exist on the subject. But then Judt (with a tip of his hat to you, James) counters Novick's complaint that there is too much Holocaust obsession around us by saying effectively that there cannot be too much. He writes: "I still share James Young's preference for inadequate and even abused memory over comfortable forgetting."

Is that really the choice? Can't we ask for a higher critical standard, in which the measure of Holocaust representation is not its quantity or pervasiveness in the culture, but its quality--without advocating (or being accused of advocating)

forgetting? Anyway--how can dumbing down of memory be a safeguard against the worry that the Holocaust is at risk of being forgotten?

These questions bring us back to our common concern with the problem of what it means to remember the memories of others. I hadn't read your essay in *Critical Inquiry*, which you quoted from, but yes--the echoes of my own thinking on this question are uncanny. Since we're quoting ourselves: After a visit to the Holocaust Museum in Washington five years ago, I wrote in the *New York Times Magazine*:

"The Holocaust maxim, 'Remember,' may be acquiring a new meaning with the passage of time. What we cannot remember directly, we must imagine through representation, and our response is less immediately to the event than to the medium that has conveyed it to us. It is not the Holocaust that is suddenly such a huge popular draw, but the Holocaust Museum and the Holocaust movie, *Schindler's List*. The creators of these artifacts, and many who celebrate them, tend to indulge in vainglorious rhetoric, claiming that an affirmative public response to representations of the Holocaust places today's secondhand witnesses on the right side in the struggle of good against evil."

But does it really? Doesn't the fact that "memory" is now not so much a matter of absorbing the event as such, but of absorbing intermediary representations of the event mean that we should hold those representations to the highest critical standards?

So we're back to the question of whether Holocaust memory offers us useful lessons for understanding our world in our own times. I'm intrigued by your suggestion that "the lessons of Kosovo may actually be more pertinent to understanding Holocaust memory, or at least its possible consequences, than vice versa." Leaving aside the question of what exactly the lessons of Kosovo might be, I take it that you're saying we could learn a lot about how we really (rather than ideally) respond to the legacy of the Holocaust by recognizing the groping, often less than heroic fashion in which we respond or fail to respond to contemporary episodes of mass political violence. Again, as you say, we're pretty much on the same wavelength. I ended the above-mentioned article on the museum by saying,

"As Americans observe the bloody unravelings of the post-cold-war world, the Holocaust Museum provides a rhetorical exercise in bearing witness to dehumanization and mass murder from a seemingly safe distance."

Of course, I was only talking about the way that museum seemed to function at that moment, and I happened to be visiting in May of 1994, as the genocide in Rwanda was at its peak and photographs of dead bodies there were on the front pages of the newspapers. I was not talking about "the memory of the Holocaust" as a whole--if there is such a thing--and I've felt frustrated in our correspondence here over the past few days that the immensity of

our subject and the limitations of space have inclined us to speak rather broadly and generally, when it seems to me that we both have formed our ideas and responses to Holocaust commemoration in terms of very specific artifacts: images, texts, testimonies, etc.

So I wonder: Must we really seek to be able to name the exact lesson we learn from our encounters with the artifacts that excite our imaginations? Is "lessons" the best way to describe what we come away with? We tend to speak of lessons as if what we learn from the Holocaust will be in some way positive, affirmative or affirming of what we hope will be best in and for humanity. But that isn't my experience; the truths that are yielded are mostly quite terrible. So isn't it more honest, and probably more productive, to say that what we are really left with when we contemplate the Holocaust are questions about all that is essential in the fabric of human experience? I'll leave you with that question about questions, James. Or--no--I'll leave with this prose poem, "The Past," which I recently came across in Czeslaw Milosz's new collection, Road-side Dog:

"The past is inaccurate . Whoever lives long enough knows how much what he had seen with his own eyes becomes overgrown with rumor, legend, a magnifying or belittling hearsay. 'It was not like that at all'--he would like to exclaim, but will not, for they would have seen only his moving lips without hearing his voice."

Thanks for the discussion.

Philip

From: James Young
To: Philip Gourevitch
Subject: The Meanings of Monuments

Dear Philip,

Great question: Is the choice really between any memory and comfortable forgetting? Or can there also be a higher critical standard to which we hold kinds of Holocaust memory accountable? My preference, cited by Tony Judt, actually comes from my first book's discussion of Sylvia Plath's seeming appropriations of Holocaust memory to describe her own inner pain and torment. Rather than legislating such memory, what is permitted and what is forbidden, I suggested that we look to see how it has been done, to what ends, and judge it accordingly. This is really to advocate a case-by-case approach, I suppose. We can agree on the standard provided by great works like Paul Celan's "Todesfuge," or Primo Levi's *If This Is a Man* . But what about everything else? The pope and Willy Brandt both kneel at the foot of the Warsaw Ghetto Monument, while art historians recoil from even looking at it. Israelis and Hollywood loved *Life Is Beautiful*, while Art Spiegelman and David Denby (among others) hated it. *Schindler's List* seems to be most politicians' choice for the greatest of all Holocaust films, but

not if you ask Claude Lanzmann, the director of Shoah or, again, Art Spiegelman.

Here you might rightly argue, again, that aesthetic judgment is one thing, historical judgment another, that there must be some standard for arbitrating between sound and unsound history, between scrupulous and unscrupulous memory. And here I would agree, to some extent, that as critics and historians, we are still arbiters of good and bad history, trivial and profound memory. But only to a point, after which it becomes our jobs not to ask whether or not something is merely great or terrible, but to explore the kinds of historical understanding being created and to what ends such history is being remembered.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I enjoyed, somewhat perversely, your other New York Times Magazine article from a few years back on what it was exactly that school groups were "learning" from their visits to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. If I recall correctly, you found that they basically had confirmed for them what they already knew, or in the case of young students, what their teachers told them it all meant. In some of these young minds, therefore, the Holocaust Museum merely illustrated the terrible wrath of God toward Jewish unbelievers in Christ. With this "lesson" in mind, I have to agree that the whole notion of taking "lessons" from the Holocaust is problematic--even as we continue, for better and worse, to "learn" from such history.

And finally on a further "lesson of the Holocaust": In an explicit reference to the mass murder of Jews, a Nazi leader once proclaimed to his officers that "this would remain a glorious but unwritten page of German history." That is, the Holocaust, like any genocide, was being designed and planned as a self-consuming Holocaust. It was to destroy both a people and memory of itself as an event, leaving behind as few traces as possible. In so doing, the Germans hoped to build deniability into the very crime they were perpetrating. It's clear that Serb President Slobodan Milosevic has drawn this lesson from his Nazi forebears. Not only did his army and police units work furiously in the last days of the bombing to hide and destroy evidence of their crimes against ethnic Albanian Kosovars, but his propaganda machine sought no less assiduously to deny the crimes altogether. The denial of genocide and the refusal of its memory are two fundamental characteristics of genocide, it seems.

For a moment, I'd like to go back to the end of your first installment on Novick's book. You ask whether we should just say "Whatever" to the fact that millions of Americans a year now visit the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum on the Mall in Washington, D.C.--while there still isn't a memorial there to American slavery. This question goes right to the heart of a nation's reasons for making a particular past part of its official landscape. When the German government asked me to serve on a five-member Findungskommission for its proposed national "Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe," it was largely because I had explained in

several lectures there and op-ed pieces that I was reassured by its national memorial paralysis. When has any nation ever made its own crimes against humanity part of its national reason for being, part of its national memorial landscape? Here I had asked in front of a German audience, "Where, for example, is America's national memorial to millions of Africans enslaved and murdered? How can it be that on our national Mall, the actual site of slave auctions for many years, there is no sign of our national shame? Where is Japan's national memorial to the victims of Nanking? Where was the Soviet Union's national memorial to the millions who died during Stalin's purges? That the German Bundestag has actually voted to build a gigantic national memorial to the murdered Jews of Europe in the center of its reunited capital is an amazing and unprecedented turn of events."

But in so doing, the German government is also marking an absolute distinction between itself and the murderous regime it succeeds, which is partly why it has taken more than 50 years for such a memorial to come into being. Similarly, the American government's decision to build a U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum just off the Mall was also taken at least partly to define what it means to be American by graphically illustrating what it means not to be American, enshrining American ideals as they counterpoint those of the Nazi regime. In fact, I believe a national museum of African-American history is now being planned for a site just off the Mall. And while such a museum is clearly justified, it will ultimately celebrate the contribution of African-Americans to American culture and history, thereby celebrating America as a land of opportunity--even for former slaves. But will there be a memorial to the shame of slavery itself, to the millions of lives lost and nearly unrecorded? Because there is no place in America's idealized story of itself for such a crime, I doubt it.

To the brilliant lines you quote from Czeslaw Milosz's poem, I would like to close with two lines from Agha Shahid Ali's poem, "Farewell": "Your history gets in the way of my memory," and later, "My memory keeps getting in the way of your history."

Thanks, Philip, for all your thoughts.

James

The Internet's informed look at politics and culture -- SLATE. What Matters. (<http://www.slate.com>)

E-mail delivery is for SLATE subscribers only. To receive SLATE e-mail deliveries, sign up for an annual subscription and get four weeks free. Cancel at the end of the four weeks and pay nothing. Or, continue with SLATE and we'll charge you \$19.95 and send you a thank-you gift. To subscribe to SLATE now, go to <http://www.slate.com/subscribe/evening.asp> or call (800)706-3330.

SLATE subscribers can add or remove themselves from any SLATE delivery by going to our "E-mail Delivery Services" page at <http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/emailservices.asp> and checking or unchecking the appropriate boxes. See SLATE Member Services at <http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for additional information about SLATE.

This delivery powered by Exactis.com <http://www.exactis.com>

Copyright (c) 1999 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.