

INSTEAD OF JUST THE EUROPEAN CUP soccer finals, 400 million people watched the spectacle of Europe sinking into barbarism telecast direct from Brussels stadium the evening of May 29. The drunken British soccer fans who armed themselves with pieces of the stadium as they tore it apart to assault rival Italian fans were everywhere described as a "barbarian horde." These were not the Huns or the Mongols sweeping into Europe from the steppes of Asia but the barbarians within a disintegrating society.

Margaret Thatcher expressed her "profound horror" and sternly condemned those responsible for the murderous violence that disgraced soccer and England. However, very many Europeans consider that "Thatcherism," the resolute destruction of the welfare state in order to return to the legendary golden age of free market capitalism, is indirectly responsible for the increasingly savage behavior of British soccer fans. In cities like Liverpool, whose team was playing the Juventus team from Turin in the Brussels final match, soccer is the main community activity left in the wasteland of a dismantled economy. Commentators stressed the destructive nihilism of working-class youth with no future prospects.

Sociologists will no doubt study the facts in detail, but initially it is evident that Britain's rampaging soccer fans who periodically assault the continent are not the poorest members of society, in an economic sense, since they can afford to travel and fill themselves with duty-free liquor all the way across the Channel. The poorest of the "new poor" are women and old people. Young males manage rather better for themselves. Their group behavior is as old as barbarism. In pre-historic Celtic Britain, young males ran in marauding packs apart from productive society, boozing and killing in joyful abandon. The scenes of mayhem at Brussels suggest that the mass unemployment of the '80s is bringing, not the pathetic poverty of the Great Depression whose victims awakened sympathy, but a return to the ancient barbaric detachment of male youth from productive activity in search of fun and adventure.

Competitive sports are frequently exalted for their civilizing role in sublimating the instinct for violence. Recent stadium behavior suggests the games are not sublimating but stimulating violence in a society based more and more purely on competition. The soccer team provides the only way for the mass of losers to count themselves among the winners. Both the sublimating and stimulating effects were evident in Brussels. Before the game began, the symbolic war between the Liverpool and Turin teams spread into the bleachers in the form of a real war. The British hooligans showed no quarter and no remorse, continuing to attack the Italian fans even after it was obvious that many were lying dead and wounded.

The callous indifference of the fans to everything but football was the most barbaric aspect. While the dead and wounded were still being cleared away, and rowdies continued to look for a fight, the match had to be played. Otherwise it was feared the rival hordes of fans would surge out of the stadium and destroy Brussels. So the players came out and soccer sublimated the violence, so transparently this time that the game itself emerged tainted. The Swiss referee saw to it that the Liverpool team lost: a British victory would have been unbearable. After Michel Platini scored on a penalty, there was the ritual celebration of the goal (the male egg fertilization) with the ritual ecstatic homophilic embraces.

The Italian tifosi are about as fanatic as fans can be, but the violence was indisputably the fault of the British. This seems to reflect a traditional violence in England where industrial capitalism never brought the degree of social and cultural equality that prevails on the continent of Europe. The urban sub-class of England has never been fully integrated into a society whose

class divisions are the most pronounced in the West. In the '60s, the decade of the Beatles, the integration seemed finally to be taking place. That was the heyday of the welfare state. But Liverpool has regressed from the gentle days when John Lennon was "more popular than Jesus Christ."

For centuries, colonization and imperialism have provided safety valves and outlets for the lower and upper-class violence of British society. Watching the pitiless aggressiveness of the British hooligans toward foreign enemies in the football stadium, it was clear what a fine source of mercenaries lies in the depths of British society. Only a few days earlier, it was reported that British mercenaries were among Reagan's "freedom fighters" killing Nicaraguans.

Survival of the fittest economics as practiced by Margaret Thatcher virtually re-

lions of people watching over television in Europe and Africa. The spectacle of brutality gave Europe an image of itself as sinking into a sort of chaos associated with the Third World. Civility was gone. The shock was very great.

The political repercussions will be hard to trace, but surely go beyond banning British teams and fans from European matches. The events in Brussels' Heysel stadium will reinforce Europeans' feeling that the social cost of Thatcher economic policies is too great for civilization to bear. At the same time, the spectacle contributes to the prevailing pessimism about the ability of mass movements to assure social progress. Soccer fanaticism is, after all, the largest mass movement today.

II

For the last decade or so, leftist hopes have been largely pinned on loose social

IN THESE TIMES JUNE 12-25, 1985 11
in favor of centrist five-party coalitions identical to the one governing the country in Rome.

The PCI is back in the wilderness, barred more firmly than ever from national office (thanks largely to Reagan and the Pope) and now swept from office in the cities, provinces and regions. Only in Bologna and Florence did the PCI retain a chance of governing, in coalition with the lone new representative of Democrazia Proletaria (in Florence) and the Greens (in Bologna). These two between them picked up roughly the 3.5 percent that used to go to the Radicals, who ran no candidates. Backed by the German *Grünen*, the new *Verdi* got a national total of 1.8 percent and 11 seats in regional governments: a fairly modest achievement.

While the Christian Democrats held their own as top party (35 percent in the regions), Craxi's PSI made its best showing to date, going from 11.3 percent in European parliamentary elections last year to over 13 percent in the regions and provinces and nearly 15 percent in the municipals.

Italian Communists called the results "catastrophic" and "the end of the decade of hope." Dissatisfaction was general with Berlinguer's successor as general secretary, Alessandro Natta. The election results seem to have discredited his approach, inherited from Berlinguer, of seeking to achieve the

SUMMER LETTER

Soccer and modern European barbarism



"Tell me the truth, Daddy... You're voting PCI because Berlinguer is dead..." "No. I'm voting PCI because Craxi is alive..."

quires colonial or imperialist wars of some sort abroad to channel the violence of the most brutish losers toward foreigners for the safety of respectable citizens at home. Margaret Thatcher was certainly sincerely horrified by the behavior of her fellow countrymen. The traditional way of dealing with such domestic savagery has been to export it. It may be that the current government of Britain will attempt somehow to channel young male violence in the traditional way, through military discipline toward foreign crusades and conquest. International football matches, like the Los Angeles Olympics, show how spectator sports can be a training ground for delirious chauvinism and arrogant xenophobia.

British fans have shown themselves to be the most savage in Europe, but those of other countries, if less wild and reckless, are also disturbing. The sight of Juventus fans jubilantly celebrating their victory a few hours after the carnage was one of the most disquieting visions of the whole barbarous evening. In West Germany as well as in Britain, neo-fascists have infiltrated some football fan clubs. Of course, sports fans come in all political persuasions, but mass cheering for "our team" can be a dress rehearsal for nationalist hysteria.

There have been even worse tolls from soccer stadium violence some 20 years ago, in Peru and Turkey. But this was a Cup match played in the very center of Western Europe, Brussels, with hundreds of mil-

movements (women, peace, gays, ecology) rather than disciplined political parties. But the decline in left parties has been followed by a certain decline in left movements, while rightist activity has been mounting first in the U.S., with the Moral Majority, and more recently in France and even Italy.

In both Italy and Germany, regional elections last May 12 dealt a serious blow to leftist hopes of translating disparate movements into electoral success.

In Italy, The Communist Party (PCI) failed in its bid to become the number one vote-getter through appeals to social movements (most notably by running a number of gay candidates on its lists). The "sorpasso" (surpassing the Christian Democrats) achieved for the first time in last year's relatively unimportant European Parliamentary elections was not repeated, and the declared effort boomeranged. Growing conservative Catholic movements, galvanized by the Communist threat and Papal encouragement, brought out the Christian Democratic vote. Despite its reputation as the most honest of parties in local government, the PCI score dropped from its 1984 high of 34 percent to 30.2 percent in the regional elections to only 28.7 percent in the municipals. This was disastrous for the PCI as only a very strong showing could have stopped Prime Minister Bettino Craxi's Socialist Party (PSI) from going ahead with its intention to drop the left coalitions that have governed Italy's major cities for years

official party goal of a "democratic alternative" by allying with social movements rather than with the PSI so long as the Socialists, led by Craxi, are deemed hopeless. Without Berlinguer's peculiar moralistic charisma, this approach shows up as merely sectarian. Those in the PCI, notably its parliamentary and CGIL (general confederation of Italian labor) leaders, who insist on a political rather than a sociological approach to alliances, that is, on the definition of a precise program as a basis for working out a compromise with the Socialists, should now carry more weight. But meanwhile, the June 9 referendum on the sliding wage scale (*scala mobile*) is further pitting Communists against Socialists, with the risk of splitting the CGIL to create a fourth labor confederation linked to the PSI (after the CISL, Christian Democrat and the UIL, linked to the weakened Social Democratic PSDI).

The labor movement continues to be on the defensive, and the new social movements have been weakened by the widespread "return to private life" of leftists after the turmoil of the '70s. Now along come conservative Catholics saying that exclusive concentration on private life is irresponsible, that Catholic morality must be injected into political life.

The May 12 elections were a triumph for the *Movimento Popolare*, a conservative Catholic grassroots organization founded in

Continued on page 22

By Joan Walsh

SANTA MONICA, CA

BILL ZIMMERMAN MIGHT best be described as the left's electronic preacher, except people might confuse the Santa Monica-based media consultant with the TV evangelicals that abound here in Southern California. And then, Zimmerman doesn't preach to the left on TV, he preaches about it, to an audience that seems increasingly receptive to his pitch.

Zimmerman wins converts by helping win elections. His consulting firm, Zimmerman, Galanty and Fiman, has participated in 26 races, 20 of them successful, since incorporating in 1981. His firm has created advertising for Chicago Mayor Harold Washington, New Mexico Gov. Toney Anaya and Rep. Lane Evans (D-IL). He's done media for many California propositions, including the successful Nuclear Freeze Initiative in November 1982. Nationally he's produced freeze TV spots to target opponents of the measure.

He also has a track record on Central America, most recently doing *pro bono* TV and radio ads for SANE opposing *contra* funding. The campaign was vintage Zimmerman: the ads got network TV coverage when one radio station, Washington, D.C.'s WTOP, refused to air them because they were too "gruesome."

Zimmerman's success has helped sell a lot of skeptics on television's uses—he ticks off a roster of public interest groups currently using or investigating using television to push their message and candidates. It has also attracted a more mainstream clientele. He did media for Gary Hart's successful California primary bid—he wouldn't work for Mondale and got no response from Jesse Jackson when he queried the campaign. And he's currently working on New York City Council President Carol Bellamy's challenge to Mayor Ed Koch.

But Zimmerman's biggest challenge to date may be the campaign to win California Supreme Court Justice Rose Bird voter confirmation in November 1986. The campaign is already off the ground, 18 months before the election, and ZGF is running it all, not just the media effort. It's a campaign pundits predict will be cloaked in judicial dignity, in contrast with the frenzied conservative campaign to recall Bird, to make the argument that the Supreme Court should be above politics. But Zimmerman says, "Don't believe anything you've read about it. Everything's up for grabs in this campaign. Our style

has never been to meet emotion with abstraction, but with emotion."

Zimmerman became a TV convert when he managed Tom Hayden's 1976 campaign for the Democratic Senate nomination against incumbent John Tunney. It's a story he's told many times: the campaign traversed the state for nine months organizing chapters, sponsoring Hayden speeches and appearances, getting lots of surprisingly favorable press. In that time Hayden's poll standing went from 13 to 14 percent. Then the campaign went on TV with spots that Zimmerman himself wasn't particularly sold on. Hayden's share of the vote jumped 19 points in three weeks. Zimmerman credits it all to television.

With a Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Chicago, Zimmerman held various academic posts in the late '60s and early '70s while involved in the civil rights and anti-war movements. He lost a job at Brooklyn College for refusing to do research that had military applications, then worked at Science for the People and Medical Aid to Indochina. He gained national attention during the 1973 Wounded Knee occupation, when he flew in a plane full of supplies for the American Indian Movement members under FBI siege there.

But the Hayden campaign turned him into an

electoral junkie, with a particular weakness for television. He worked that campaign with now-partners Sid Galanty, a CBS veteran who wrote TV ads for Hubert Humphrey in 1968, and Jack Fiman, an expert in targeted media buying. After Hayden's strong but unsuccessful primary showing, Zimmerman and Galanty toured the state, proselytizing community groups to political television. Even today Zimmerman occasionally finds time to pack up the video equipment and give his pitch to local political leaders and campaign activists, walking them through a cassette of ZGF commercials explaining why they work.

They didn't work as well in the early campaigns, when ZGF did media for city and county politicians and some statewide initiatives. Two June 1980 initiative campaigns—one successful, the other not—were ZGF jobs. They provide an illuminating contrast.

The losing effort was a Tax Big Oil initiative, to tax oil drilled in California at the well-head. To this day it's the only campaign Zimmerman mentions as a sure loser that was worth doing anyway. The commercials were pretty crude—pigs feeding at a trough while oil industry profit statistics roll down the screen. "Tax Big Oil" turned into "Tax Pig Oil." Outspent by the oil companies more than 20-to-one, the initiative's backers lost, 56-44 percent.

The victorious ZGF initiative campaign that year, to defeat an anti-rent control proposition, faced the same financial disparity. But rent control backers had one advantage—they were on the "No" side of the initiative, which usually means just raising reasonable doubts about a measure is enough to defeat it. Zimmerman's ads went on the attack, accusing the initiative's sponsors of fraud because they tried to present the measure as a "fair rent" initiative that would help tenants. One commercial featured the other side making a commercial, with an actor posing as a tenant advocate supporting the measure. In walks Jack Lemmon to expose the charade, pointing out that "big landlords and speculators" were actually behind the proposition.

"A lot of people in the campaign wanted to educate the voters about the virtues of rent control, about power relationships between tenants and

landlords," Zimmerman recalls. "But we didn't want to do that. We developed a strategy accusing the landlords of fraud. We didn't want to raise the rent control issue at all." He believes the decisive margin to defeat the measure came from voters exercised about fraud, not the attack on rent control.

"Guerrilla warfare."

As Zimmerman crusades for a wider left use of TV, he's equally adamant about the way it should be used. "Television is basically manipulative," he says. "The left wants to use TV to communicate rational, logical arguments and information. But people use TV for entertainment and diversion, not ennoblement and education. So making effective political advertising is like making a movie, you use drama and emotion.

"It's also like guerrilla warfare. I'm usually with



Bill Zimmerman, Sid C. Fiman have been working since 1981.

the candidate that has fewer resources. So I think you focus your limited strength on your opponent's weakest point. And you place education of the electorate in second place to getting votes—if you're in it to win. The left is ambivalent about electoral politics, they enter the arena but aren't sure they want to play by the rules. The bottom line is winning, getting all the votes you can. The way to win isn't always by taking the high road. Sometimes it's by taking the low road."

No one who has seen Zimmerman's commercials would be surprised by those statements. His ads are not for the squeamish, or the cynically

The Bird and Bellamy campaigns

The Rose Bird campaign is unique. From what little has been written about strategy so far, it seems the attempt will be to de-emotionalize this issue that conservatives have succeeded in getting people frenzied about. But your own media style is to go for the gut.

Everything's up for grabs in this campaign. Our research isn't through yet, but it may turn out we can tap into emotions as powerful as the other side. And we may have to undercut their arguments emotionally before we can deal on an intellectual level. Our style has never been to meet emotion with abstraction, but with emotion.

This is the most complex campaign I've ever been involved in, and one of the most complex that has ever been waged anywhere. There has never been an election involving millions of dollars on both sides when the office at stake was chief justice, and voters were being asked to confirm or deny. This is a situation in which a candidate cannot address the issues because the canons of judicial ethics prevent her from speaking about any decision she's been involved

in. She has to put her opinion in writing, and that's it. There's no opponent. It's an intense campaign 18 months before the election. This is a woman whose name is known to approximately 60 percent of the voters in California, but whose person and personality are unknown.

Will you use her in commercials? Is it important to humanize her?

I don't know. This is a candidate who occupies an office that most people feel would be demeaned by campaigning to retain that office. So we may not have use of the candidate. It may all have to be done with surrogates and third parties. Our major advantage is truth, and our second advantage is time. The opposition has gained the public's attention so far in advance of the election that we have time to communicate the truth.

Can this election help but be partisan? You say that there's no opponent, but there is—the Deukmejian appointees who fill the vacuum a no-confirmation vote would create.

The opponent is also the four campaign

committees against her. The opponent is the governor, the opponents are scattered all over the place. But we've got to turn that into an advantage by dividing the opposition, so that their campaign isn't speaking with one voice but with many voices. There are divisions on the other side we can exploit. For example, Bob Dannemeyer's committee has engaged in more virulent attacks than other committees. He's a potential candidate in the crowded Republican Senate primary in 1986. He set up the California Bird Watchers to further his own Senate ambitions. Well, one of his likely opponents in the primary is State Sen. Ed Davis, who is affiliated with Jarvis and Gann and the Committee to Defeat Rose Bird. So Davis and Dannemeyer have to work together on the Bird campaign, but they're working against each other in the Senate primary. I think we can do something with that.

What are you trying to do with Carol Bellamy—is Denny Farrell being taken seriously?

No. We're trying to have people understand this as a two-candidate situation. Farrell comes in a distant third with no chance of winning any serious segment of the vote. And he seems to have no campaign, no campaign budget. We

don't know exactly why he's in there but we're hopeful that before the deadline in July he'll find something to do, and there are some indications that might happen.

What we're trying to do in terms of Bellamy vs. Koch is complicated. We don't allow this race to be decided on the personalities, Koch wins. He's more entertaining, tells better jokes. So we want to avoid the personality dimension. We'd like to ask voters to decide between two visions of government in New York.

In a city as stratified as New York, is there some comparison with Chicago? Can the "liberal guilt" approach be used?

No. But eventually we'll talk about the fact that Ed Koch has been a good force for midtown Manhattan and the municipal corporations that live there not for the outer burroughs or the rest of Manhattan. And that has very little to do with New York deteriorating.

You have the very rich and even the very rich. I don't think that in Chicago is it like Chicago, where liberal played a role. I think this is economic self-interest. The middle-class, educated liberal types are on the other side of the line that Koch draws. T