

PRIMARY SOURCES FOR CHAPTER 30

AFTER THE COLD WAR, 1988–2000

SOURCE 30.1

Apple Computer Company and Computerworld, “Introducing Macintosh” Advertisement (1984) and Excerpts from “Steve Jobs: Oral History” (April 20, 1995)

In 1984 Apple Computer Company introduced the Macintosh, or Mac, a personal computer designed for easy use and graphic publication. The first document below is an advertisement for the Mac around the time of its release. In the second document from a decade later, Steve Jobs, one of the inventors of the Mac and founders of Apple, explains aspects of the innovative culture of Silicon Valley.

Sources: Personal Computing, April 1984, 196–97; Computerworld Honors Program International Archives, “Steve Jobs: Oral History,” interview with Daniel S. Morrow, April 20, 1995.

Introducing Macintosh. What Makes It Tick. And Talk

Well, to begin with, 110 volts of alternating current.

Secondly, some of the hottest hardware to come down the pike in the last 3 years.

Some hard facts may be in order at this point:

Macintosh’s brain is the same blindingly-fast 32-bit microprocessor we gave our other brainchild, the Lisa™ Personal Computer. Far more powerful than the 16-bit 8088 found in current generation computers.

Its heart is the same Lisa Technology of windows, pull-down menus, mouse commands and icons. All of which make that 32-bit power far more useful by making the Macintosh™ Personal Computer far easier to use than current generation computers. In fact, if you can point without hurting yourself, you can use it.

Now for Some Small Talk

Thanks to its size, if you can’t bring the problem to a Macintosh, you can always bring a Macintosh to the problem. (It weighs 9 pounds less than the most popular “portable.”)

Another miracle of miniaturization is Macintosh’s built-in 3½” drive. Its disks store 400K—more than conventional 5¼” floppies. So while they’re big enough to hold a desk full of work, they’re small enough to fit in a shirt pocket. And, they’re totally encased in a rigid plastic so they’re totally protected.

And Talk About Programming

There are already plenty of programs to keep a Macintosh busy. Like MacPaint™, a program that, for the first time, lets a personal computer produce virtually any image the human hand can create. There’s more software on the way from developers like Microsoft, Lotus,™ and Software Publishing Corp., to mention a few.

And with Macintosh BASIC, Macintosh Pascal and our Macintosh Toolbox for writing your own mouse-driven programs, you, too, could make big bucks in your spare time.

You can even program Macintosh to talk in other languages, like Yiddish or Serbo-Croatian, because it has a built-in polyphonic sound generator capable of producing high quality speech or music.

All the Right Connections

On the back of the machine, you'll find built-in RS232 and RS422 AppleBus serial communication ports. Which means you can connect printers, modems and other peripherals without adding \$150 cards. It also means that Macintosh is ready to hook in to a local area network. (With AppleBus, you will be able to interconnect up to 16 different Apple computers and peripherals.)

Should you wish to double Macintosh's storage with an external disk drive, you can do so without paying for a disk controller card—that connector's built-in, too.

There's also a built-in connector for Macintosh's mouse, a feature that costs up to \$300 on computers that can't even run mouse-controlled software.

One Last Pointer

Now that you've seen some of the logic, the technology, the engineering genius and the software wizardry that separates Macintosh from conventional computers, we'd like to point you in the direction of your nearest authorized Apple dealer.

Over 1500 of them are eagerly waiting to put a mouse in your hand. As one point-and-click makes perfectly clear, the real genius of Macintosh isn't its 32-bit Lisa Technology, or its 3½" floppy disks, or its serial ports, or its software, or its polyphonic sound generator.

The real genius is that you don't have to be a genius to use a Macintosh.

You just have to be smart enough to buy one.

Soon there'll be just two kinds of people. Those who use computers. And those who use Apples.

Steve Jobs: Oral History

SJ: Apple was this incredible journey. I mean we did some amazing things there. The thing that bound us together at Apple was the ability to make things that were going to change the world. That was very important. We were all pretty young. The average age in the company was mid-to-late twenties. Hardly anybody had families at the beginning and we all worked like maniacs and the greatest joy was that we felt we were fashioning collective works of art much like twentieth century physics.

Something important that would last, that people contributed to and then could give to more people; the amplification factor was very large. . . .

From almost the beginning at Apple we were, for some incredibly lucky reason, fortunate enough to be at the right place at the right time. The contributions we tried to make embodied values not only of technical excellence and innovation—which I think we did our share of—but innovation of a more humanistic kind.

The things I'm most proud about at Apple is where the technical and the humanistic came together, as it did in publishing for example. The Macintosh basically revolutionized publishing and printing. The typographic artistry coupled with the technical understanding and excellence to implement that electronically—those two things came together and empowered people to use the computer without having to understand arcane computer commands. . . .

DSM: You used an interesting word in describing what you were doing. You were talking about art, not engineering, not science. Tell me about that.

SJ: I actually think there's actually very little distinction between an artist and a scientist or engineer of the highest caliber. I've never had a distinction in my mind between those two types of people. They've just been to me people who pursue different paths but basically kind of headed to the same goal which is to express something of what they perceive to be the truth around them so that others can benefit by it.

DSM: And the artistry is in the elegance of the solution, like chess playing or mathematics?

SJ: . . . If you study these people a little bit more what you'll find is that in this particular time, in the 70's and the 80's the

best people in computers would have normally been poets and writers and musicians. Almost all of them were musicians. A lot of them were poets on the side. They went into computers because it was so compelling. It was fresh and new. It was a new medium of expression for their creative talents. The feelings and the passion that people put into it were completely indistinguishable from a poet or a painter. Many of the people were introspective, inward people who expressed how they felt about other people or the rest of humanity in general into their work, work that other people would use.

WORKING WITH SOURCES

1. What, to judge from the Macintosh ad, were the characteristics and values of someone who would buy and use a Mac?
2. What, according to Jobs, was the purpose of work for those who created the culture of innovation that led to Apple and Silicon Valley? Does the Macintosh ad reflect these individuals' concept of work's purpose? If so, how so? If not, why not?

SOURCE 30.2

Joseph Perkins, "Op-Ed" (October 21, 1994) and *The New York Times*, "Why Proposition 187 Won't Work" (November 20, 1994)

In 1994 California voters passed Proposition 187, a measure denying government services to undocumented immigrants. Although courts later invalidated Proposition 187, the initiative ignited a nationwide debate over immigration.

Sources: Joseph Perkins, "Op-ed," *San Diego Union Tribune*, October 21, 1994; *New York Times*, "Why Proposition 187 Won't Work" [editorial], November 20, 1994.

Joseph Perkins: Op-Ed

No one has been harder on California Gov. Pete Wilson than yours truly. But I have to give the devil his due for his principled stand on illegal immigration.

Specifically, I am referring to the governor's unequivocal support for a state ballot

measure that would deny California's 1.6 million illegal immigrants taxpayer-funded education, nonemergency health care, welfare benefits and other public social services.

Wilson has been accused of, among other things, "scapegoating," "xenophobia" and "racism." But this is a patently absurd charge.

Proposition 187, titled the "Save Our State" initiative, is favored by Californians across the board.

This was borne out by a recent Los Angeles Times survey, which showed that the ballot initiative is supported by a majority of Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, whites and, most telling of all, Hispanics.

California's legal residents recognize that the financially-strapped state no longer can afford to generously proffer government benefits to persons who steal across this country's border.

As it is, illegal immigrants are eligible for almost as many publicly-funded services as U.S. citizens. Indeed, they can cross the border and have babies at American hospitals at taxpayer expense. They can enroll their kids in American schools tuition-free. They can even get welfare benefits in their children's name.

As Wilson has repeatedly mentioned, illegal immigrants cost his state a net of \$5 billion annually. That works out to more than \$400 a year added to each California family's tax burden.

The illegal immigrants, themselves, are not to be faulted for taking advantage of Yankee largess. We have only ourselves to blame for devaluing U.S. citizenship, for conferring upon those who come here illegally the same rights and privileges as those who are either native-born Americans or who legally immigrated to this country.

Indeed, nothing is more ludicrous than the designation of so-called "citizen children." These are babies who become U.S. citizens through accident of birth; whose illegal-immigrant mothers happen to bring them into the world in an American maternity ward.

The babies are Americanized by virtue of the 14th Amendment's guarantee that any person born on U.S. soil is automatically a citizen. But when the amendment was ratified

in 1868, neither Congress nor the state legislatures were even remotely thinking about future illegal immigrants.

They were thinking about former slaves who were brought to this country against their will, on whose backs the South's agrarian economy was built. Black men and women who were third- and fourth-generation residents of this country, who had no first-hand memories of their native land, but who nonetheless were disenfranchised by their new homeland.

To equate the citizenship rights of emancipated slaves with those of babies born to illegal immigrants is to trivialize the history of slavery in this country.

The emancipated slaves earned their U.S. citizenship by virtue of their longevity in this country and their uncompensated labors. The babies of illegal immigrants have done nothing to merit citizenship, except be born at U.S. taxpayer expense.

The 14th Amendment needs to be rewritten by Congress. American citizenship no longer should be routinely bestowed upon a baby that happens to be born here, but whose parents are foreign citizens. Let the child apply for naturalization at the age of 18. If he or she becomes a U.S. citizen then, it will be by intent rather than by default, the way it is now. . . .

America continues to admit more foreign immigrants than all the other countries in the world combined. As most of these immigrants ultimately settle in California, at considerable expense to the state's taxpayers, it hardly is xenophobic or racist if California residents vote to deny publicly-funded benefits and services to immigrants who have entered the country illegally.

New York Times: Why Proposition 187 Won't Work

Proposition 187, the California ballot initiative that deprives illegal immigrants of state services, has quickly been revealed as the

inhumane headache its opponents promised it would be.

Already a host of examples of the new measure's inevitable consequences have shown how unlikely it is that its supporters really thought much before casting their votes.

Did they, for example, intend to deprive a child who is a legal resident of treatment for lead poisoning—because his illegal mother is too frightened to bring him to the clinic? One health worker has already encountered this situation, although the law has yet to go into effect.

Did Californians, when they voted to deny illegal immigrants non-emergency medical care, think about the consequences of having people go untreated for communicable diseases, thereby putting whole communities at risk? And did Californians really want the people who run child-welfare agencies to abandon children already abandoned by their parents, or to evict abused children now in foster care?

Health care workers, educators and other public servants are having to think about such issues now. That is one reason why the Los Angeles City Council and school district have vowed not to comply with 187; it is one reason why school principals around the state have rushed to reassure their pupils that they have no intention of playing enforcer for the Immigration and Naturalization Service; it is one reason why staffs at health clinics have vowed to give up state funding rather than turn away people in need. . . .

Californians are learning that getting tough with illegal immigrants may sound wonderful in the abstract but it is heartbreaking, and tortuously complicated, in practice. Both because of its inhumanity and its impracticality, Proposition 187 invites massive civil disobedience. It is a bad law, which, if the courts continue to rule wisely, will never have to be instituted.

WORKING WITH SOURCES

1. On what grounds did each side base its case for or against Proposition 187?
2. What, according to Perkins, should make someone a citizen of the United States? What might be the implications of his goal to rewrite the 14th Amendment?

SOURCE 30.3

President Clinton, Excerpts from "The Era of Big Government is Over" (January 23, 1996)

In the 1994 elections, Republicans gained control of both houses of Congress for the first time in 40 years. Democratic President Bill Clinton and the Republican congressional majority fought bitterly in 1995, leading to a shutdown of the federal government in the fall. In his 1996 State of the Union address, President Clinton agreed with Republicans that "the era of big government is over," but he also challenged Congress to balance the federal budget.

Source: John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, *The American Presidency Project*, Santa Barbara, CA, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=53091>.

The state of the Union is strong. Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We have completed—created nearly 8 million new jobs, over a million of them in basic industries like construction and automobiles. America is selling more cars than Japan for the first time since the 1970's. And for 3 years in a row, we have had a record number of new businesses started in our country.

Our leadership in the world is also strong, bringing hope for new peace. And perhaps most important, we are gaining ground in restoring our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. And as they go down, prospects for America's future go up.

We live in an age of possibility. A hundred years ago we moved from farm to factory. Now we move to an age of technology, information, and global competition. These changes have opened vast new opportunities for our people, but they have also presented them with stiff challenges. While more Americans are living better, too many of our fellow citizens are working harder just to keep up, and they are rightly concerned about the security of their families.

We must answer here three fundamental questions: First, how do we make the American dream of opportunity for all a reality for all Americans who are willing to work for it? Second, how do we preserve our old and enduring values as we move into the future? And third, how do we meet these challenges together, as one America?

We know big Government does not have all the answers. We know there's not a program for every problem. We know, and we have worked to give the American people a

smaller, less bureaucratic Government in Washington. And we have to give the American people one that lives within its means. The era of big Government is over. But we cannot go back to the time when our citizens were left to fend for themselves.

Instead, we must go forward as one America, one nation working together to meet the challenges we face together. Self-reliance and teamwork are not opposing virtues; we must have both. I believe our new, smaller Government must work in an old-fashioned American way, together with all of our citizens through State and local governments, in the workplace, in religious, charitable, and civic associations. Our goal must be to enable all our people to make the most of their own lives, with stronger families, more educational opportunity, economic security, safer streets, a cleaner environment in a safer world. . . .

Here, in this place, our responsibility begins with balancing the budget in a way that is fair to all Americans. There is now broad bipartisan agreement that permanent deficit spending must come to an end.

I compliment the Republican leadership and the membership for the energy and determination you have brought to this task of balancing the budget. And I thank the Democrats for passing the largest deficit reduction plan in history in 1993, which has already cut the deficit nearly in half in 3 years.

Since 1993, we have all begun to see the benefits of deficit reduction. Lower interest rates have made it easier for businesses to borrow and to invest and to create new jobs. Lower interest rates have brought down the cost of home mortgages, car payments, and credit card rates to ordinary citizens. Now, it is time to finish the job and balance the budget.

WORKING WITH SOURCES

1. What, according to Clinton, was the proper role of government now that the era of big government was over?
2. This was Clinton's last State of the Union speech before the presidential election of 1996. In what ways does this speech reflect that impending event?

SOURCE 30.4

The Economist, "The End?" (February 11, 1999)

President Bill Clinton's involvement with Monica Lewinsky, a 21-year-old White House intern, captured public attention at home and abroad for a year beginning in January 1998. Britain's *Economist* newspaper expressed both the widespread fascination with the subject and the ultimate judgment that Clinton's critics went too far in impeaching the president.

Source: *The Economist*, "The End," February 11, 1999.

As *The Economist* went to press, it was uncertain exactly how the Senate trial would be brought to its inevitably dismal end. But two things were clear. First, what has happened over the past year should never have happened at all; second, there is no guarantee that it will not happen again. The end of this awful tale still leaves in place the elements that spawned it: a diminished presidency, a bitterly divided Congress, an over-mighty prosecutor, and a media pack that is proud to seek out scandal wherever it can.

It was clear, if not from the start then soon after, that the president's impeachment should never have been undertaken. This huge, ponderous machine, whose workings paralyse normal government, should be activated only to remove a president who is agreed by both political parties and by the people to be a menace to the country. Bill Clinton's offences, perjury and obstruction of justice—not, it bears repeating, that he had a tawdry sexual fling—were in our view grave and shameful. Mr. Clinton disguised private lapses of behaviour with public lying, which

had the public consequence of destroying the people's trust in him. To this, the proper response of a man of honour would have been to resign his office. But that was never the view of most Americans; still less did most Americans feel that these crimes justified the president's removal by another branch of government.

Since Mr. Clinton would not go, his political enemies determined to root him out, using impeachment to try to overturn, by a sort of constitutional *coup d'état*, the result of two elections. This is not impeachment's purpose, and no one has emerged from the process untarnished: not the president, who refused even the courtesy of answering senators' questions, nor the Republican trial managers, who often exhibited pure vengeance, nor the Democrats, whose scramble to embrace their president suggests a wholesale abandonment of principle. It is expected (though nobody can be sure) that the Republicans will reap the whirlwind in the elections of 2000—that they, not the president or his Democrat apologists, will be blamed for

taking the country through this horror. Even so, impeachment once devalued may be used this way again, not least by those who feel that vengeance and partisanship are most neatly countered by more of the same.

Morning-after Washington also bears the scars of other excesses. The scandal saw a sort of Faustian pact between the special prosecutor, Ken Starr, and the press, whereby each seemed to feed and encourage the prurient appetites of the other. Mr. Starr's powers to investigate the president had long been condemned as too far-reaching. But when the inquiry turned to sex, rather than obscure tracts of scrubland in Arkansas, the press became insatiable, and Mr. Starr obliged them with an extraordinary flood of detail. Where the Internet dared, the old press followed. Rumour was published before it had been verified; the prosecutor's office sprang leaks for which no apology was offered; and Congress, when the time came, pushed titillating material immediately and unthinkingly into the public domain. This howling after sex stoked the fires of Republican moralists, obscured the valid reasons for condemning this president, and made the public think one thing: this prosecution was unfair.

Hungry Press, Hungry Prosecutor

There is a grain of truth in that. No other president has faced a man of Mr. Starr's resources and persistence (a persistence that is still unsated); and none has had to deal with such a torrent of explicit revelations. Perhaps Mr. Clinton's successors will not have to. In

the present mood of national regret, the overwhelming wish never to go through *that* again, the office of the special prosecutor may well be eliminated before the year is out. Yet something will have to replace it; the executive cannot go unwatched. The press will be restrained for a while, no doubt. Yet the modern trend to keep close tabs on the powerful, to comb through their private lives, to expose them and pull them down, is not about to disappear. Every would-be presidential contender now working the malls of New Hampshire must expect to have to defend himself.

The fact is that during the presidency of Bill Clinton, the perception of the office has changed and its authority has diminished. At this point in history, it is said, America does not require a leader to admire; prosperous and peaceful, it needs only a man who can steer straight, and Mr. Clinton can do that capably enough. Respect and special treatment are not necessary. This attitude was both confirmed and reflected during the Lewinsky affair, by the Supreme Court ruling that the Paula Jones civil suit could proceed against Mr. Clinton while he was in office. But this ruling was misguided; this, too, should not have happened. A president in office is not an ordinary man, but the head of state of the most powerful country on earth. He represents an entity to which, above all, the world looks for guidance. His accountability as a man before the law must always be balanced by a sense of the importance of the office he occupies.

WORKING WITH SOURCES

1. Did someone or something, in the view of the *Economist*, bear a disproportionate share of the blame for the impeachment of Clinton? If so, who or what? If not, why not?
2. What did the *Economist* see as the likely future of American politics?