

Excerpts from two interviews with Richard Scharick, April 18, 2007 and May 19, 2007, in Olympia Washington. Interviewed by Kevin Wallace.

[Were you born here in Washington?]

No, I was in Europe, in Great Britain in 45, towards the end of the war. My folks had met there when my dad was stationed there...[inaudible].

[When your dad was in World War Two where was he stationed?]

Well during the war he was sent over there after the Normandy landings in June, cause he had already been a career guy, joining at Fort Lincoln North Dakota 1937. And he was in the Battle of the Bulge whereupon Christmas Day 1944, had to experience that in a freezing winter of Belgium, one of the worst winters in recorded history in that area.

[H]e grew up in North Dakota where most people, you know that turn of the century immigration because of the homesteading in the Midwest the Dakotas, Montana, the acreage, a lot of Europeans went through that Ellis Island, they came there. And there was a lot of Central Eastern Europeans, German speakers, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles, primarily and a reasonable amount of the Scandinavians too, particularly Norwegians there. And so he grew up speaking kind of an Eastern odd dialect of the German language, from Romania and that area and Hungary. Actually was Hungary, today the political borders de jure change but it was Transylvania and the _____. Transylvania [(spoken like Dracula) chuckles].

[And your mom?]

She was from Britain she's passed away now, she had rheumatic fever so she died at seventy one rather than getting another decade or so. So it is, but, she was born in

Britain, her name was Rhynnon [spelled it out], Welch. And her brother's Rhys Myrddin [spelled it out]. The Welch language is Celtic and very different than the English or "Sasson" as the Welch call the English, Saxons.

[You went to school here in Washington?]

Oh yes, I graduated from High School at North Thurston in Lacey before it was incorporated into a city, in sixty three, it incorporated in sixty seven, when I was away in the service myself, the summer of love. [chuckles] Then I went to Centralia College for a couple years, did do a semester at St. Martins and then went in the service and after that I finished at the University of Puget Sound, December of sixty nine I got the degree. Whereas straight through without the interruption it would have been spring of sixty seven for a four year degree. I got two of them at U.P.S., polisci/public administration and a history degree.

I'd used a public administration internship, before it became the super agency DSHS it was Public Assistance. And I had a couple of summer projects so I got paid for it and used it also as credits in my political science degree. And, high water mark was I drafted the state's first food stamp program under the federal guidelines. After that I worked in Tacoma in the DSHS or uh Public Assistance office at the time. Then I came back to Olympia and worked for Employment Security Department whose job is dual fold, employment services and unemployment compensation. And so I worked there. Then a friend and I got into producing jazz concerts here in the greater Northwest and I did that for several years. So it was a great experience, a financial disaster but man does not live by bread alone. [chuckles] And so therefore I have no checkered resume. And then I went back to the legislature in 1981, I had worked there once in 67 in the bill room

before I had to go in the service, U.S. Army.

[When did you go back?]

I think it was a special session, October of 81, and then pretty well from 82. I was full time there from about 85 to 93, under staff cuts there. Oh actually about 81 to 93, yeah, full time most of it.

[And you moved your way to the house security?]

Yeah, the Sergeant at Arms office. Sergeant at Arms was a great guy, Ross Young, Sergeant at Arms for twenty years. He knew how to make it work, he was like the oilier, on equipment, the oilier...[went on to talk about another state job opportunity]

[W]hen I did go to St. Martin's College, there was a great teacher named Father Meinrodd Gall, he made sure we all read a simple book by a guy named Nicholo Machiavelli, printed I believe in 1504 about real politics. Hence Machiavellism. Now I know why he wanted us to read that.

[T]here is the upfront situation when a guy worked at the legislature, the House floor or the Senate floor, the parliamentarianism in the format of democracy, the Representatives, when Machiavelli wrote that book it was just the powerful princes in the Northern Italian city states and pretty well monarchy everywhere...[went on to talk about the history of democracy].

[T]he demos, the democracy of representation. But democracy is there to be used and employed for the greater good like Jeremy Benson's philosophy or it's there to be used or abused. For example, out of Hitler and the National Socialists stumbled in, a fluke like Napoleon, probably those are the two major important impacts in recent history that gone down to a group, *i.e.* a one guy deal, Napoleon and Hitler, almost upset the

apple cart and militarily it was so uncanny, the loss in Russia and on and on, that part's amazing. But, he got in through the democratic process. A bunch of thugs didn't just walk into the heart of Europe, Germany and take it over, but when they did, it was subtle and fast and people don't think about it but they were only there twelve years, four months, and eight days, half of it in warfare.

That experience was impacting obviously on history, on modern history. But, it was a brief moment. What's twelve years now that I'm sixty one? Seems like it would be yesterday. Where when you were a kid a summer was an eternity. But that happened there so this is why we have to watch it here, now, in our country, what's coming down under the latest things of foreign policy. Perhaps some hypocrisy when dealing with Palestine and Israel and the actuality of that, the reality of that. The questionable elections.

So sometimes there's a coup d'état and sometimes there's a creeping coup. This is what we got to watch for, with our rights and so forth. In fact, not to get too radical on anything but the homeland guard creation, in a way if you translate that into German it would be the Geheime staat polizei (*German--secret state police*), Gestapo, Homeland Security or police. I'm surprised they had the nerve to use a darn near direct translation into German. But sometimes truth can be stranger than fiction, it appears, the older I get.

The greatest duality is in a democracy, the idea is to steward the nation for the betterment of most people. In fact, let's start with the United States Constitution, of, for and by the people. Now today we know that isn't flying the way it should. There's a duality right there of that, it has fallen into special hands, usually big money, in other words, corporate America. And so the people suffer, for example, of the democracies on

this earth, the great industrial democracies, we're the only one that doesn't have a national health care program, as opposed to most of Western Central Europe, Japan, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, so forth. It's obvious there that we have a duality that politics is basically, nationally and state wise, failing the of, for, and by the people. And, to say one thing's another and then duality we actually have two parties. There should be more. But we do have a two basic party system and you have people there that try to represent the great picture, the constitution, and you have others mouthing at the duality that really are there for special interests, whether its big money, or some specific religious fervor, something like that.

So the duality there is which mode of "for the people" or for special interest. Then again there's the actual look at the parliamentary procedure, the voting, the process, the bill amendments so forth, floor action. And then there's the back room compromises and so forth. And there's the people that are progressive and the people that are regressive, in the great picture.

The problem is, good, bad or ugly, the sharper ones at the top, taking either stand are hip, but the great bulk don't really get the picture it appears. And I prefer the Democratic Party but it isn't cutting the jam either as far as representing the people.

[Who would you say was your favorite legislator of all time?]

This would be mostly guys in the House. Although one of them did serve in the Senate as well, that would be a tough call. I would say first of all, a guy named Eugene V. Lux, Gene Lux, named after Eugene V. Debs, a union leader imprisoned by Wilson and paroled by Harding in the early twenties. Eugene Lux, a real progressive guy, probably one of the sharpest.

The other was an old veterinarian from a small town in Pierce County, Charlie Moon. Those two guys are progressives, that's what I call it. One time in the thirties and twenties, liberal meant progressive but it's been turned into a wimpy wimpy or some so called. That's part of the game, to confuse us rather than fuse us, and there's part of the duality of politics in another mode for example. But Charlie Moon, Gene Lux, Mike Lowry, Governor, former congressmen federally, there's a handful of others in my days, the past, certain others. Occasionally a Republican, like Katie Allen from up by Everett, she was a good person too. Probably a couple others but those three guys stand at the top, Lux, Lowery, and Charlie Moon, in my experience.

[Gene Lux] was a progressive like in the thirties and twenties when we had progressive parties, he knew what it was all about. For example, some of his one-liners on the House floor, when Mercer Island failed to win a state basketball championship one year he yells over to the majority leader at the time, a Republican, guy named Gary Nelson, he says "hey Gary, you see if you'd have voted with us on the bussing bill, you guys would have had a championship basketball team here in Mercer Island." [chuckles]

Another time he mentioned the corporate lobbyists, "how you come down here with your corporate concubine like a gaggle of goose. And then, of course the speaker, Democrat Joe King gavels him down laughingly and says "this is not a social issue Representative Lux." But he had the one-liners. Heck of a guy, always had a sense of humor and never had a stiff neck and got POed, like I or a lot of other people can. He had that charisma like a good comedian who deals with politics or something...[went on comparing Lux to comedians.]

[W]hen I was there [House of Representatives] the first time for only a session in

the bill room, I actually had to go in the service after that spring of 67, he [Charlie Moon] was a member. When I came back after years, finishing college, army, couple other jobs in between, he came back in after years later. Sometimes a person did serve many years later. One thing I liked about Charlie Moon, one night it was about eighty one or two, I had just been back there, I recognized him, I was down in the members kitchen doing something on security and he was going down there and we recognized each other and talked and I says "yeah, I haven't seen you since I was here many ____" he says "Yeah, when I wanted more aid for the blind instead of tax breaks for Boeing, they didn't like that and I didn't get reelected." So there was a statement right there about that progressive old veterinarian.

And these are rare birds, they were usually Democrats but I've seen a couple of Republicans worth their salt. But the great majority are just kind of follow the leader, so to speak. Again, democracies^{y's} either to be used or abused.

Sometimes issues can be made into something. Like one of the worst things I've felt as an injustice was the omnibus drug bill, which chipped away at those bill of rights like certain other things recently, the homeland guard idea, so again it's a double edged sword. This is why when the Seattle Police made a mistake with a cannabis growing warrant at an address, they got the wrong address and got a prominent Seattle man's home, the guy that owns the Dynasties Restaurants... Warren Chin I think. But the point is they made a mistake on the address and it was for cannabis growing, not hard drugs or no violent crime. And raided his house and his wife and mother-in-law were treated pretty roughly. They got the wrong address. But he happened to be somebody known and famous in Seattle. You know, I think he was in the Horse Racing Commission,

maybe the City Council, well known as the Dynasties Restaurants. But they got somebody who could say something rather than another person. But this man could say something and that's why when it was in the paper, couple days later, "this is why I left China," you know, in the early fifties and stuff. And so I got a kick out of that and I showed it to a Representative, Gary Locke who was later Governor. One night alone, just him and I, I said "you see this, that's what the omnibus drug bill made."

I mean there's ways to fight. They tried to outlaw alcohol here, remember? Between 1919 and 33. All it did was make some people wealthy like President Kennedy's father, and some people despised like Al Capone. And some people made ends meet, like my grandfather in North Dakota, making their own schnapps, trading for the coffee the sugar, things that, gasoline, that they couldn't produce. And on the other hand there became bad alcohol, Jamaica Ginger, from the stuff that'd blind you. And that's what we're dealing with today with certain other things like where did crank come from? What crack is compared to the real molecular structure of cocaine of years ago. Illegality brings out people making money and dangerous products. You can't really fight anything that way and they didn't learn from that one so we're that way now. All it's done is made it a bigger problem.

And then there's certain things like cannabis. Probably shouldn't even ^[be] on there if we're smoking cigarettes and drinking alcohol but that's a social issue and a scientific issue that one could delve into. Nothing new under the sun over the years. One guy despised garlic so badly, King Alfonso the thirteenth of Spain, that he outlawed it. And when coffee came in originally in, probably Mecca and Medina, young Muslim clerics were drinking it late at night studying scripture and certain guys thought it was the devil's

drink. Nothing new under the sun, a century or two later when it was being done in Europe by monks in the Catholic Church, probably before it split into the Roman and the Byzantine, Eastern and Western, they got attacked by certain guys for staying up late drinking that java and reading our scripture, so nothing new under the sun. [chuckles]
[So as far as the greatest political injustice that you've ever witnessed you'd say it's that omnibus]

Was probably the omnibus drug bill which chipped away at the constitutional rights...

[That was a state bill?]

Yeah, a state, but we have fifty states and a lot of them carry, like the three strikes scene. See our political process and our justice process, Kevin, seems to not make a distinction between violent and nonviolent crimes. Nonviolent crimes within reason, drugs, things, a paper hanger, a guy--bad checks, other stuff, they could do some penance fine and public hours but only the real violent should be imprisoned. There's a distinction there, believe me, this county's got more people incarcerated than anybody else in the world other than China simply because they're the largest country on earth, population wise... These people, the public expenditures to incarcerate guys, they could be going back, they got to pay their penance on certain things under the law, whether that law's good bad or ugly. It should be a good law, guys that write bad checks or bamboozle old people out of their savings on a roof punk job or something. That's getting pretty low but they ought to pay with penance, fines, whatever. But the violent are the ones that should be behind them bars...[went on to talk about the different types of violent crimes and the appropriate sentences]

Mike Lowry¹ was a pretty good guy, a progressive guy, he was hip and had a standard. Now the right wing likes character assassination so, and that's why part of the word liberal became that. They tried to discredit him, one with some touchy feely charges with a gal or something.² I wasn't there but nevertheless he was under attack after the Regan mentality of the eighties, coming over the, down the pike in that last twenty, twenty five years. That, he did run for governor _____ he was in the Federal Congress in D.C. and he won it. But that came down then and I remember a couple of people I worked with at the legislature deputy chief clerk and a couple of other people there, when that thing came in they said "he's going to be a one-term Governor," and I said, "probably so." And he didn't run again or he would've again. But when he did come back he tried to run for that DNR and that's when you and I were talking about [a bumper sticker that asked "do you trust Mike Lowry with your trees?"]. Yeah, cause in this state we have Department of Natural Resources, we have Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, and Superintendent of Public Instruction that run for office.

[How about this Republican that was worth her salt, Katie Allen?]

I say that because she was pretty good. Again Gene Lux, mister one liner on the House floor. One time the majority leader, at that time, no they were the minority leader, Gary Nelson, he was trying to intimidate her to go their way on a bill and Gene Lux yells across the floor to Gary Nelson, he says "okay, Gary I'll tell you what, we'll trade you for Katie Allen we'll trade you Louie Edgar and two future draft choices." Louie Edgar was

¹ Mike Lowry - 20th Governor of Washington, in office 1993-1997, preceded by Booth Gardner, succeeded by Gary Locke.

² Allegations arose that Gov. Mike Lowry made sexual comments about his aid's "nice legs," that he touched her legs, neck and waist, she insisted that she "felt stalked." (Seattle PI) Senator James West called for his impeachment March 29, 1995. (Calling for the Process of Impeachment of the Governor) Ultimately "a two-month investigation did not sustain allegations of sexual harassment against Gov. Mike

a Democrat from the seventh district which is way up in the North East. A big district mile wise because it's a low population. But he was more reactionary than a lot of reactionary Rs. So that's why Lux "we'll trade you" [chuckles] I forgot that one-liner. He was an ace to ace.

[Katie Allen] had a heart. And had a standard. And voted for the people. And there's a lot of Democrats that weren't as sharp as her but I looked at the great picture. And the better Republicans are worth their weight in platinum nowadays. And the Democrats were always, in the great picture, the better end but there's something lacking there now too, overall. And so that's part of the duality of politics. It really isn't managing the constitution of, for and by the people and if you talk about being conservative or liberal you're either progressive or regressive. I'm conservative on the constitution, on mother nature. I would be liberal on people's rights to whatever religion they want to be. [Civil Liberties?] Yes, or race, culture, even certain things like what's become a problem with the illegality of drugs. Even if it's bad stuff like crack or crank there's a better way to fight it and certain other things like cannabis shouldn't even have been outlawed in the first place if we have tobacco and alcohol. Tobacco is always constant abuse, the hypocrite that I am still smoking now and then. Of course alcohol can go either way, beneficial, okay or burn out that liver. Or take out the school bus full of kids goofy.

[On Friday March second 1989, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved the sweeping drug bill, House bill 1793. What do you recall when that bill passed?]

Well, I was there and myself and several friends who were aware of this we

thought this was another further breaking down of the checks and balances of which a democracy, a fragile one...would be under challenge. And up to today with all the other happenings such as the foreign policy in the Middle East, it just shows in one way or another this is a planned and manifestation of a continual creeping coup d'état. The irony is seventeen ninety three was also the date of the reign of terror during the French Revolution. Amazing huh?

[During the overwhelming approval of House Bill 1793, Speaker Joe King had abandoned his previous stand on requiring judicial permission for police electronic surveillance. The two years prior he voted against any bills expanding the police powers as far as electronic surveillance goes.³ What do you suppose made him change his position?]

Well, I feel only he would know personally inside his own mind but it appears to me that he saw the writing on the wall in that reactionary movement. And he was thinking of his own political future's continuation, especially as he was Speaker of the House not just a member. And I felt that that's what was done. There were only eight that didn't go for it and one of the best comments was by Jennifer Belcher, a really good politician, a Representative, who later became Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources, she put it this way, she "didn't want to be party to a witch hunt." And in history a witch hunt is a diversion from the real problems. In other words, it's attacking symptoms not the cause of the problems. And that's what these witch hunts were. And she saw that and so did Jesse Weinberry. But also depending on the district you represent you may be safe in office for reelection taking the right stand for freedom

³ Wilson, Scott. "House OKs bill allowing secret police surveillance." Tacoma News Tribune. 3 March 1989, sec. B: 1+

and the great, say overall black and white picture here. In other districts you're dead meat if you vote the right way, because there's a lot of reactionary constituents there. But I felt that he saw the writing on the wall and just kind of turned his head on it just like recently when the Bush administration, with its weapons of mass destruction bologna and all that, misleading the House and the Senate, got a lot of people to sign on there and now they're looking backwards and seeing that they were slipped the bologna but went with it anyway. This is similar to that I feel, and that's what happened.

[Why was the Senate approving police powers in the past but the House was more reluctant? Prior to the passing of 1793. Why was the House more reluctant than the Senate or why was the Senate so willing to expand the police powers?]

It looks like this, in general the House has twice as many members, ninety eight and the other has half that, the Lieutenant Governor votes as a Senator in case of a tie. And so what happens there is the more senior and experienced politicians usually go to the Senate from the House. And it appears to me that, so the seasoned ones move over. Not always, people have stayed in the House their whole career others have been elected as a freshman to the Senate but is by and large the more conservative body and when you become institutionalized as a Representative or a Senator for years. As I've seen with many, there's a certain change into the system and they tend to get a little more conservative in things and the other corker here is which party has a majority at the time in which House. Republicans are generally the more conservative, reactionary party and the Democrats, not so much so but they certainly aren't the progressive party that they should be.

[Why would it be harmful to let police decide for themselves when to conduct

electronic surveillance?]

Well, the harm there would be again relating to keeping it honest, a democracy, the checks and balances. Their job is to seek convictions and it maybe that fouling a guy on a basketball game sends him to the line or whatnot. They will, it's like you foul a guy if you can get away with it, to win the game. And their thing is to win the game by their nature. There's other fields where police are needed but on civil rights, their not the ones. Because we've thwarted the checks and balances they want their points on the board and you're putting the whole thing, the whole constitutional thing in the hands of individuals who have their job to do, god, bad or ugly in that manner.

[The members of the House began writing the bill "after the legislative leaders decided new weapons for the drug war should not be a partisan issue."⁴ Why did they decide, in your opinion, or in your experience, that this shouldn't be a partisan issue? Why would they agree to agree on this issue?]

Most of it gets down to any way you slice it, it is a partisan issue, but in this case it's like coming up with a common enemy, like U.S. foreign policy tends to do, perhaps after the fall of the so-called "Iron Curtain" and Soviet Union they needed another enemy and looks like they were looking towards the Middle East on that one but take that as it is. [chuckles] But yeah it was sort of like looking for a common denominator of an enemy. And basically the very few that didn't go along with it were Democrats because of the Constitution and our rights to keep a democracy being chipped away with day after day, alive and it was a reaction for everybody to band together for the common enemy.

I suppose like today when you see the "support our troops" stickers, well it

⁴ Wilson, Scott. "House OKs bill allowing secret police surveillance." Tacoma News Tribune. 3 March 1989, sec. B: 1+

insinuates supporting the White House's policies. Most people don't want our troops hurt any more than anybody else, I was one. But again it's that common denominator to find an element elsewhere for the common bond and that's where they were coming from.

["The great majority of the House of Representatives agreed with Representative Marilyn Rasmussen, a democrat from Eatonville, who said that she was ready to give up privacy rights in order to help the assault against drugs."⁵ She's quoted as saying "I'm willing to sacrifice those rights for the future of our children." Any comment on that?]

Well, yes, her comment first of all, Marilyn is now in the Senate, this was in that session and she's been there for years. Marilyn is a dairy farmer out of Eatonville, and the question is, her statement of sacrificing certain rights for the future of her children, well the majority of people with intelligence would see that that's not a good thing. To allow, let's say, for example in history the National Socialist Party decides something, to make sure every mouth is fed. Now you can't, you don't. This statement in itself by her cancels itself out, because she's not going to help her children by giving up their rights. She is completely not aware of most of this and I hate to say this but that's a good, well over fifty percent at least of your legislators. Again, I'll repeat that her various statement on giving up rights for her children's future protection is based on things that she doesn't know deeply. I'm afraid that most laws are made in emotive reaction rather than progress. Here's living proof, in Marilyn Rasmussen's statement. Because she doesn't get the picture, I see it. And that's enough said about her and the following of suit there.

⁵ Wilson, Scott. "House OKs bill allowing secret police surveillance." Tacoma News Tribune. 3 March 1989, sec. B: 1+

[At the time the two foremost proponents, that made the most powerful statements I should say, were Representative Shirley Winsley and Representative Mike Patrick. Winsley, a Republican from Lakewood, described how her house had been riddled with bullets from an alleged Tacoma gang leader, who mistook the residence for that of someone who was not paying for his drugs. And Representative Mike Patrick, the Republican from Renton, delivered what's been called the most forceful speech. He's a Seattle Police officer who described the ravages of the drug trade on young people he had known while he was a cop on the beat.⁶ What are your feelings on the statements of those two Representatives?]

Well, first of all, Shirley Winsley is in that particular district, where Republicans get elected. Her mindset is more as a Democrat but she'd never get elected in that district as a Democrat. And by in large she went mainly with the Ds for social issues, the poor, children, things like that. But, however, her statement here alleged drug dealer, that's all this whole thing is, it's hearsay. We don't want to pass laws on hearsay and that's what it was on Shirley's end.

And on Mike Patrick's end you can call it hearsay too. Because he was a police officer with a job to do. He wants that right to bug someone without going to the Judiciary.

We do have drug problems, hard drugs are a problem. The problem with that drug law is everything's lumped in there including cannabis which is obviously medicinal to a lot of people and that has become fact. So I guess my point in this is these two were simply reactionary pep talks based on the mode of hearsay and hearsay only. Therein lies

⁶ Wilson, Scott. "House OKs bill allowing secret police surveillance." Tacoma News Tribune. 3 March 1989, sec. B: 1+

that problem.

[Representative Mike Patrick, the Republican from Renton, had made the statement “I’m angrier that we don’t treat the drug thugs as an invading army that should driven from our shores. If we did treat them as an invading army, killing our children and loved ones, we’d fight back with every tool available to us. When I say we should declare war, I mean an offensive war. We should drive them from our shores.”⁷ How do you feel about this statement?]

Well, that’s dual fold, there’s two parts to that one. First of all there’s always a need to have a war on something, you see. Now it’s a war on terrorism, a war on drugs, hell there was a war on poverty. But if we’re going to have a war, let’s have a war on the corporate state keeping all the money in one corner and making this an unjust socioeconomic system that we live in.

The second part of that is, driving people from our shores. I think most of these so-called “drug dealers,” whether it’s the guy selling the most hideous crack or crank combo or a simple marijuana cocktail for a medicinal patient. These are citizens, so I don’t know where he comes from in the Constitution where they want to drive nice citizens of the United States from their own shores. But this is the type of mentality we’re dealing with, with a lot of legislators. Both those aspects right there negate anything he says as far as American’s rights go.

[In addition to the secret surveillance section of the bill, the bill also allows for the police to seize the real property of drug dealers. Do you have any comment on that?]

⁷ Wilson, Scott. “House OKs bill allowing secret police surveillance.” Tacoma News Tribune. 3 March 1989, sec. B: 1+

Well, of course this is a way of trying to obtain more capital in their continuing, this is another example of trying to secure moneys on the side to continue the spending of the public tax payer's money on these particular issues. Also if people were growing primarily I'd say cannabis, or probably mushrooms or something, they'd want to take your property. An old couple down in Lewis County years ago were using cannabis medicinally and they took that old people's property. And that's way off too. Just another statement, the chipping away of this fragile Constitution, to try to gain money, for their operations. They've got their own agenda and the Constitution apparently doesn't measure up to it.

[The law would also expand the community and school programs for anti-drug education and treatment. What do you have to say about that?]

Well, I don't know how many school aged kids need treatment for hard drugs or anything. But I do know that we've had the DARE program and all these others in there, more or less with a political agenda and I have seen where in many of these Northwest schools the police go in there and handcuff kids. Kids that are twelve, thirteen years old, so I don't know how they're treating and educating people with this type of a reaction. That's a tough one because you're not really getting any progressive statements and facts of the matter concerning this. And that's kind of a funny point. We'll see where that goes.

[What was originally House Bill 1197, advanced through the Senate at the same time that the omnibus drug bill was passing. This bill would force mentally ill patients to take antipsychotic medication without a court order. Do you see this as being related in any way to the omnibus drug bill?]

Yes, it's kind of an irony that the omnibus drug bill is doing what it can in all measures to prevent people from using certain drugs. [W]hat it boils down to was under the involuntary treatment act that people in, inmates at mental institutions, that they want to make sure that these people are forced to take the drugs. In other words, in cases where such emergency conditions do not exist, the patient has the right to refuse medication or shock treatments. Yes, shock treatments too. However a court could order such treatment if it found a compelling state interest in giving such treatment. State interest again. Senator Kent Pullen, he was a Republican from Kent, he was among the only five who voted against that bill, saying he "considered forcing mental patients to take drugs would be a fundamental violation of civil rights." On the other hand, the same thing goes on the other end so this is a good irony to see where they're trying to put one on people whereas on the other end of it to do all they can to stop it. That's an irony. **[What are the positive aspects of it that would entice a law maker into voting for this?]**

Well, if they're already incarcerated in a mental institution it's slightly different than a prison. But, I don't know what it would do because if they're that way they'd be in individual confinement anyway. But on the bad end of it, it could have them use it for the wrong ways politically. Such as can be done. Remember the old saying in the Soviet Union, "they put them in the mental institutions to shut them up?" Well, there's nothing new under the sun. We've all read Machiavelli, it can be employed here as well. For example, Francis Farmer was lobotomized in Western State many moons ago after the end of the first world war and she was kind of a political rabble rouser. In a way, you could see that they could dummy someone up here under that mode that they've done in

the Soviet Union and has been done here. Whether it's with lobotomy, shock, or forcing drugs on them that make them a vegetable. So again it's a double edged sword.

[At this point, I'll turn to the Twelve Labors of Hercules, the paintings by Michael Spafford, which represent the twelve tasks performed by Hercules, the mythological figure to obtain immortality. The paintings were criticized as inappropriate for the building as offensive and even pornographic. Since you were there for the original hanging up of the pictures, you were there through the controversy, the attacks on the paintings, the covering up with the curtains, the uncovering, and the final taking down of the paintings. You were there through that whole era correct?]

Yes.

[And what do you have to say about the whole controversy and how things went with that?]

Well, that was an interesting one too. First of all, my own feelings is that it was inappropriate for the décor of an old classic institution. That is the great marble, the wooden pews, the brass, the curtains. Now kind of a black and white modern work just didn't fit that décor and that's the only thing that I would say but the most reactionary elements always have to bring it into something like pornography. As the more reactionary elements did on the drug bills, "to protect the youth," it's always protecting the youth in their eyes. Well, the situation turned out that when they decided to cover it and it was covered with gold curtains for a few years and then decided to take it down. But a couple of the statements that were kind of interesting here and I'd like to quote a couple from people that actually visited the legislature during this time when they were allowed to be viewed before taken down. Here's a statement from someone Bill Mcaslin

from Beaverton Oregon, "No I didn't like it, but I didn't find it pornographic either."

Here's another one, from a lady from, Jan Owens of Tumwater Washington, "I guess people who see porn in this are reflecting their own pent-up sexualities," says Jan Owens of Tumwater. Well I think she's hit a nail on the head there and, for example, allow me to quote another person, Mike Patrick, who was in the Legislature at that time, the one that I'd quoted earlier as wanting to drive drug dealers and users out of this country as foreign invaders, even if they're American citizens. Now that same mentality that way, according to him, Seattle Representative Mike Patrick said during floor debate, he'd "been a vice cop for two years and that the panels met the test of pornography." And here's another one like him, and that was Representative Mike Padden, "I was involved in the debate back in ninety two, in that time we had numerous complaints from school aged children." Now you tell me when school aged children are going to complain about something like that. The more reactionary, the more "for the children." [went on to talk about the marble in the capital and the cost to remove the paintings.] Pornography? No. Foolish attire? Yes. And that's that.