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FOREWORD

The Ten-Year Report, issued in the Spring of 1977, was a handy—even heroic—record of the programs and individuals of the Institute of Politics' first decade. Shortly thereafter, plans were made for publication of an annual retrospective, promising a more regular and expressive review of Institute life. Rather than just listing names and events, the new publication would also include selected excerpts from Institute speeches and panels, articles and books, formal reports and personal evaluations—the various stirrings of mind and spirit which a simple inventory of activity inadequately represents.

Here is the first edition of Proceedings of the Institute of Politics, which covers the two academic years since its ten-year anniversary (the second of which signalled the Institute's relocation into the new John F. Kennedy School of Government building). Part One, Readings, is a sampling of analytical and personal statement, with zesty accounts of the workings of politics, impassioned or studied plans for political action, hearty exchanges over the role of the press, anxious searches for political direction—concluding with somewhat more intimate insights into Institute life. All pieces appear in excerpted form. Part Two, Programs, is a detailed listing of the various activities, people, and products which comprise the past two years of Institute effort.

Taken with the preceding Ten-Year Report and the annual editions to follow, Proceedings presents an ongoing portrait of the Institute of Politics. We hope its readers find it informative and enjoyable.

Jonathan Moore, Director of the Institute of Politics

Dan Paller, Editor of Proceedings
I. Readings
Readings
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Getting Into Politics
by Jack Walsh

This article appeared in the Harvard Political Review, Fall 1978. Jack Walsh, currently political director of the 1980 Carter-Mondale campaign, was an Institute Fellow in Spring 1978.

It seems that people who have never participated in the political system view it just as they do other institutions they don't understand. There is the same kind of uncertainty in approaching the political system as there is in approaching a bank for a mortgage, military service for induction, a university for enrollment, a city department to straighten out a water bill, an insurance company to make a claim, or any other institution which is large, confusing and threatening to the lonely individual.

And how does the uncertainty manifest itself? Usually, the individual develops a negative attitude towards the institution and starts to pit himself or herself against it. It is not often that a person about to enter a hospital speaks glowingly of hospitals; nor does someone having an insurance claim praise insurance companies. The same kind of uncertainty and trepidation gripping people in their social negotiations with other institutions grips them during their first serious contact with the political system.

People usually enter the political system through a political party, a candidacy, or an issue movement. What attitudes do they bring with them? Unfortunately (or fortunately, depending on your perspective), they usually bring negative ones: the new candidate talks about changing the system; the candidates for local party office talk about elevating the quality of people in the party; and some people talk about stopping some public policy decision which has been made by the government. In all of the above examples, the individual has focused on something he or she has found wrong with a political institution and attacks the institution with the ultimate goal of improving it.
And what are the possibilities? The two most prominent ones are: [a] the individual wins, and the institution is proven a bad one, or [b] the individual loses, and the institution is proven a bad one.

Every time I start to think seriously about this problem I am reminded of a meeting I had with a group of young political activists years ago. I had asked them, "How many of you think that our major role in the political system is to throw the 'rascals' out of the government?" and every hand went up. Then I asked, "With whom do you think we should replace them?" There was complete silence.

The problem is not that people are negatively motivated. Rather, they don't see our political institutions as potentially positive forces through which they can move the government to be more compatible with their perceptions of its role. That happens because people, at a stage in their life when they are about to enter the political system, have not given that major step enough thought. They don't see it as a rational process, but as an emotional or social one. They enter because it serves their own ambitions or social needs. And consequently, they rationalize their own motivations. They say, "I entered politics to make the government better." What government? Government to do what? For whom? And what does "better" mean? Is "better" more efficient? More compassionate? More protective? More equitable? More positive? Or what?

Because these goals are badly defined, they are never achieved. When people fail to achieve their goals they tend not to blame themselves but to blame the political institution. The worst part of this phenomenon is that people leave the political system with negative attitudes toward it. Because of their experience they have credibility. They proselytize against the political system, and they are winning their argument. The American people are becoming more and more anti-political, and it scares me because political institutions are potentially constructive forces in our society. After all, if we give up on democratic political institutions, what do we replace them with?

Upon making the decision to enter the political system, one must know what he or she wants to accomplish and then go to the political institution which best can affect the level of government which can help achieve these goals. If none of the existing institutions fulfill that need, then one should start a new one. If one wants to get involved in developing a strong defense for our nation, or if one thinks it is important to distribute wealth more equitably, then involvement with a national political institution is in order. To get a new high school built one should get involved in local institutions; to amend the Constitution of the United States through the ratification process.
one should find the other people who agree with that goal, organize them, and then create a new political institution.

To enter public service as a career one should enter at the level at which one can learn the most. I recommend that people who want a career in politics enter at a level at which they meet and interact with voters because this is the most fundamental political relationship. And if it is not understood, the new politician will be doomed to frustration and failure (not necessarily to losing elections). One can win elections and still fail if one doesn't achieve one's other goals. Having gained that understanding, one can more rationally and realistically shift political goals as career developments occur.

On entering the political system: think about it; know why you're doing it; then do it. It is very enjoyable, if unrealistic expectations aren't developed.

Introduction to *Campaign for President: The Managers Look at '76*

by Jonathan Moore

*This piece introduced a volume, published in Fall 1978, which was based on transcripts of a 1977 Institute conference of campaign managers. Jonathan Moore has served as director of the Institute since 1974.*

The 1976 Presidential campaign was as confusing as it was exciting. Several factors, particularly when taken in combination, made it dramatically different and complex. There were major changes in party rules for selection of delegates in states, although mainly on the Democratic side—notably, the requirements for adequate participation of women and minorities and for proportional representation in place of the "winner take all" system. There was a proliferation of state primaries up to thirty, seven more than in 1972 and almost a doubling of the number in 1968. For the first time, money was available from the federal treasury to pay for campaign costs—partial and
matching in the nomination period and fully funded in the general election period following the national conventions. There were also new restrictions on financial contributions and expenditures and a new regulatory agency—the Federal Election Commission—on its shakedown cruise. There was even an incumbent President who had never run for national election before, challenged tenaciously from within his own party. And at one time there were ten serious Democratic candidates in the race, with a former Presidential candidate waiting in the wings.

---

Substantive issues were of marginal significance in the 1976 campaign—even though their importance compared to candidate and party traits had risen during 1960-1972. The relative insignificance of substantive policy issues can be attributed to several factors. The voters don’t place a high premium on them, perhaps because they don’t entirely trust what they hear candidates say about them and have greater confidence in their ability to get some feeling for how generally capable and reliable a given candidate is. There are some hard core issues pursued by hard core groups, but they tend to cancel out. Voters tend naturally to be confused by intricate and intransigent governmental problems, and once they get a general idea of where a candidate stands—how moderate, how extreme—that’s likely to be enough. Indeed, the inherent complexity of most public policy issues inhibits their role in political campaigns. Candidates are very wary of getting in over their heads or getting hit over the head on complicated, controversial substance. Jimmy Carter chose “fuzziness” over “specificity” and apparently was right. Ronald Reagan took an ambitious shot at substantive policy innovation, trying to save ninety billion federal dollars on social programs by pushing them off on the states, and he was wrong. Governor Jerry Brown admitted, “A little vagueness goes a long way in this business.” Finally, the media, particularly television, is not equipped to handle serious issues competently. One of the great ironies of the campaign was media response on several occasions when they had been successful in goading a candidate into detailed policy positions: they were the first to zap him, or they didn’t accurately or adequately cover him.

Ideology also appears to have played a secondary role in the 1976 campaigns. The middle—or everywhere—was the place to be. A CBS-New York Times poll in early September 1976 found that the electorate, when asked, divided itself along conventional ideological lines into 25 percent liberal, 41 percent moderate, 34 percent conservative. Americans, however, were not inclined to apply doctrinal measures to candidacies. The candidates returned
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the favor by avoiding undue typing of themselves. There were exceptions, of course, but Wallace described himself as a "populist," and Udall stopped describing himself as a "liberal." Ronald Reagan's campaign took on more of an ideological bent when he went on national television and badly needed money, but earlier he was criticizing Ford for not being nicer to the Communist Chinese. I can remember a telephone call from pollster and political analyst Walter DeVries, shortly before the North Carolina primary, to report that the self-identified Carter supporters he had just interviewed there split into thirds when asked whether they planned to vote for him because he was liberal, moderate, or conservative; Carter's candidacy never lost this characteristic. A CBS-New York Times election day poll reported the voters' perceptions of Carter along ideological lines as liberal 32 percent, moderate 30 percent, conservative 19 percent. The problems the nation faces are sufficiently complex as not to bend easily to ideological characterizations or prescriptions, and individual voters take different positions on different sets of issues that, taken together, are not congenial according to traditional ideological measures.

The greatest interest seems to be in efforts to project and market (on the delivery side) and to observe and intuit (on the consumer side) who the candidate is, what he's worth, and what skills he has. How decent, intelligent, tough is he? Is he an egomaniac, seduced by power, or secure in his own identity? What kind of judgment does he have, what managerial talent? What capacity for recognizing and attracting able people, sorting out priorities, applying grace under pressure? And so forth. Carter beat out Ford on perceptions of competence, intelligence, and concern for the average citizen. He was preferred on strong ability, seen as being more colorful, interesting, and imaginative, and as having leadership qualities. He deliberately tried to contrast himself to Ford's dullness, questionable competence, and complacency with the way things were. Ford was regarded as stronger on experience, more moderate, more predictable, and "non-waffling." Carter was regarded by some as weird and Ford by some as boring. These kinds of perceptions, opinions, and hunches are what a great deal of the time, energy, money, words, and pictures were all about in 1976. We can expect more of the same.

* * *

The current system is so complex and demanding that it may be discouraging potential qualified candidates for the Presidency far in advance. Added to the deterrent posed by the prodigious difficulty and personal risk of the job
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are the intensified demands of seeking it. We may be in danger of losing more competent, balanced leaders in preference to a compulsively ambitious and hyperactive breed—electing campaigners rather than governors, speculators rather than managers. People may be not voting because they are turned off by the seemingly chaotic and confusing nature of the process or are just plain unimpressed by the choices available. The electorate does get a chance to see the toughness, judgment, and stamina of the candidates tested by the rigors of extended campaigning throughout the nation. But attributes required in the Presidency include the serious reflection, strategic planning, and managerial acumen needed to grasp and anticipate the manifold problems of our society and to conduct policies to resolve them. These qualities are not tested by the frenetic, reactive, manipulative character of campaigns...

But there is no perfection to be wrought, no grand design or ultimate rationalization, and credible prescriptions are elusive. The American people can't be coddled into greater or more serious political participation, and the viability of the overall process will depend more on our cultural and spiritual dimensions, more on the quality of leadership of both the leaders and the led in the peculiarly reciprocating dynamic of American democracy, than on rules and regulations negotiated by experts and lawmakers. What is needed includes careful research and analysis by independent authorities of the experience we've had and the evidence collected; consideration of improvements by public interest groups with a detachment that belies an overly protective attitude toward reform already pressed; and further legislation by a Congress unhindered by its unhappily preceded interest in saving its individual skins. Such further effort can achieve a modestly more rational and workable process, still pluralistic and flexible, if it is cautious rather than impetuous in its approach, and if it deals with all the pieces together that make up the whole.
Congress Doesn't Live Here Anymore

by Linda Bilmes

This article appeared in the Harvard Political Review, Spring 1979. Linda Bilmes '80 was the California state lobbyist and an assistant in the California Department of Education Congressional liaison office.

Lobbyists are a frustratingly elusive part of the American system. Any third-rate novel portrays them as slimy scoundrels, yet academic explanations ignore the seamy evidence and present legislative advocates to be merely carriers of information in a pluralistic system. Neither stereotype much resembles the truth. In fact, today's lobbyists are polished professionals who have made the politics of pressure a sophisticated art. It's hard to put a finger on them, though. While there are 15,000 professional lobbyists in Congress and several thousand more in state legislatures, lobbying is the only legal profession the Department of Labor has persistently refused to list on its annual publication of career opportunities. Moreover, fewer than 2,000 of the national lobbyists register under the largely ignored 1946 Lobbyist Registration Act. Consequently, the most powerful lobbies in Congress are not registered, so little is known about how much they spend and on whom.

The number of interest groups represented has proliferated at an astonishing pace, and along with this increase, the percentage of time, energy, and money organizations devote to lobbying has also shot upward. Undoubtedly, there are many benign aspects to the growth of lobbies in the nation. But there are also other dimensions which warrant concern. Three questions require explanation in order to evaluate the situation: why has the number of lobbyists proliferated so greatly? how much influence do lobbyists actually possess? and what have been the consequences of the expanding role of lobbyists in the system?

The first question is not so difficult to explain. The mushrooming lobbies are a result of major changes in Congress and in the nation. In a country that upholds the "right to petition the government," interests have always vied for attention. The word "lobby-agent" was first applied to representatives of organized interests who lingered around chamber lobbies in Albany in 1829 for a chance to snare the lawmakers' favor. At that time, most lobbying focused on state and local governments, which financed the bulk of government programs. Since then, the Federal government has gained control of
most existing programs and vastly enlarged their scope; moreover, hundreds of new programs have sprung up over the past fifty years. So today, Congress faces thousands of pieces of legislation each session, concerning every conceivable subject from nuclear disarmament to endangered grasshoppers.

Not only has the number of bills exploded, but reforms have drastically transformed the relationship between Congress and its lobbyists. Previously, clever lobbyists provided data to key members of Congress who controlled committees relevant to the advocate’s group. Their goal was to lure the legislators into relying upon them for useful information, and eventually to secure the lawmakers’ favor for certain causes. There were few persons involved, and they usually had predictable personal backgrounds and tastes. The average politician of today, however, is not so burdened with directives from above, nor does he wish to be. Rather, Congressmen value their ability to make individual choices and hesitate before they obey party or committee decisions. Thus, their need for information is tremendous, and lobbyists have spilled into the vacuum. Although Congressional staff members research many issues, interest groups are often the best source of experts and specialists. The lobbyist’s job has always been to provide Congressmen with his organization’s expert advice, but now every Congressman needs the data. Hence, the lobbyist’s job has multiplied many times.

The advocates have deftly risen to their new challenge. Not only have their numbers swelled, but lobbyists have become skilled and inventive professionals. Sophisticated lobbies can usually generate mail almost instantly. Lobbyists also use Congressional staffers very effectively. They try to maintain warm relationships with committee staff members and, for their pains, can then rely on the committee staffs to inform them of any proposals that could affect the lobbyists’ interests before they reach bill form. Lobbyists frequently select people to speak on behalf of their organization at committee hearings, forge coalitions, and research Congressional alignment. And political contributions have always comprised yet another avenue of influence.

But no amount of organizing and contributing replaces the actual face-to-face lobby encounter. The master lobbyist seizes the opportunity to figure out the Congressman’s point of view and feeds him exactly the kind of data the lawmaker desires to hear. Lobbyists perceive five mental response patterns that a politician may choose on an issue. First is the legislator whose
primary concern is his or her district and will want to know its predominant public opinion. A second response is primarily political: politicians in this case want to know how major organizations are lining up on the bill, how their colleagues are intending to vote, and how local party organs see the issue. The third group of lawmakers only needs to fathom whether the bill is controversial, as this group (the "nulls") will vote against any controversial legislation. A fourth response is bargaining: "What good things can I expect if I vote for your bill?" Such legislators often will vote for the position that promises more money, more votes for their legislation, or other tangible benefits. Finally, a legislator may have scarcely any interest in the lobbyist's bill (such as the chairman of the Transportation Committee regarding preschool programs) in which case the lobbyist should assume the Congressman will forget the plea and should therefore invite a staff member to participate in the meeting.

Lobbyists must assess this correctly, for if a Congressman desires political information and a lobbyist provides him with bargaining data, the Congressman will believe he is being "lobbied"—not simply given information. The only method by which a lobbyist can persuade a lawmaker without his knowledge is if the advocate provides him with the material the Congressman wants to know. Thus the face-to-face contact bears not only the opportunity for the perfect lobby encounter but also high risk.

Undoubtedly, lobbyists perform an important function by providing information to lawmakers. But today, there are so many organized interests that it is difficult to imagine a fair hearing for any position that does not possess a knowledgeable lobbyist. Moreover, lobbyists have largely usurped the role of legislative staff. Staffers do not undertake enough unbiased research to counter tilted studies provided by interest groups. Finally, in spite of the proliferation of various kinds of lobbies, the entrenched interests—such as business, agri-business, and labor associations—have trounced the little ones and kept their own power. They have done so by erecting barriers to entry in the lobby game—such as money, skill, political savvy, and problems of access.

Certain lobbying groups, then, have accumulated too much power, and their might has doomed lobby reform bills. Any effort to modify the system must be a full-fledged commitment by the President and the Congress; however, the public's ignorance of the problem's dimensions pre-empts any
support for such a movement to curtail lobbyists' influence. Nevertheless, several states, notably California, have managed to enact stringent lobbyist reform laws. The California Act limits the amount a lobbyist may spend to influence legislators, requires that all advocates register and file monthly expense reports, and provides stiff penalties for failure to comply with the law. Squeezed through the legislature by Governor Jerry Brown when he was California Secretary of State, some say the act has been merely a "cosmetic device." Yet, most analysts believe that it has curtailed major abuses of power by powerful interest groups.

Such an act could not wrestle through the current Congress. But perhaps a modified version could succeed. In order to procure any such legislation, the nation has to awaken to the dangers of the lobby, as it threatens to become a fourth branch of government with few checks and no balances. The rising tide of interest groups should not be quelled but must be regulated.

Staying Informed: A Mayor's Right — and Need — to Know

by Barry Gottehrer

This address was presented at an Institute seminar for newly-elected mayors, November 1977. Barry Gottehrer is former Executive Assistant to New York Mayor John Lindsay.

So you chose to be a mayor. No matter what the size of your city, no matter the powers of your office, your situation as mayor will periodically become one of government by crisis. Let me illustrate the point.

A grassy area alongside your main highway has become a dumping ground for garbage. Within a short time, it is an eyesore and, because of vermin, a health hazard. Your local paper asks your Sanitation Commissioner to clean it, but he says he can't because it is park land. The reporter then asks the Parks Commissioner who says the Health Department must first clear the grass of vermin before his department
will cut the grass and clean up the other debris. The reporter goes to the Health Commissioner who says both the Parks Commissioner and Sanitation Commissioner are crazy and that his department has nothing to do with cleaning up grass along a highway. The reporter gives up, does a scathing page-one story, and blames it all on the mayor who first learns of any of this when he reads the paper.

A young policeman tells one of your assistants that there is sweeping corruption in your police department. You direct that the matter be turned over to your Police Commissioner for priority investigation. The Commissioner later reports back to you that the allegations, though they could be true, cannot be substantiated. The young policeman, convinced that a cover-up is taking place, goes to the local paper, which prints the allegations and blames you for failing to act more forcefully on the matter.

After many months of preparation by various city agencies, many not under the mayor's direct control, the mayor is given a five-inch thick application for a $2.5 million HUD grant. Everyone tells the mayor the proposal is complete, and so the mayor signs it and forwards it to Washington. Unfortunately, one page, recording the state's required approval of the project, is missing. The grant is rejected, and the press and the mayor's political opponents have a field day attacking him.

Electric power unexpectedly goes out all over the city. Wide-spread looting occurs in several neighborhoods over the next few hours. Store owners and the press blame the mayor for not preventing the looting.

The Police Commissioner is concerned that a demonstration, because of its potential size, might get out of hand and feels it would be better to let it be held in a city park than on the streets. The Parks Commissioner refuses the permit because he does not want the demonstrators destroying his grass and flowers. The demonstration is held in the street and, as the Police Commissioner feared, turns into a riot. He blames it all on the Parks Commissioner and the press blames it all on you.

What do these horror stories have in common?

- They are all true.
- They all reached a critical point before the mayor knew about them.
- They all had someone—be it the community or the press—placing the blame on the mayor, regardless of the facts.
- They all required a mayoral response—in most cases based on poor or biased information.
- They demonstrate the fact that your commissioners, who either are appointed by you to work together for the greater good of the city and your administration or are civil servants, frequently are in conflict with each other.
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and do things that are not in the best interests of either the city or your administration.

• And, most of all, these examples should clearly demonstrate that you, as new mayors, may be able to run, but you really can't hide.

* * *

From everything we have seen, it is evident that to run a city effectively, a mayor must know what is going on—within his staff, in his departments, in the neighborhoods, on the streets. Yet, just because you have just won the key to the executive washroom, it does not automatically follow that you are going to be told where the bathroom is or, for that matter, how the plumbing works. You know what the electorate wants you to accomplish, you may even know what you hope to accomplish, but changing departmental behavior, or even getting the garbage picked up on block X, is not always as easy as making a phone call to the appropriate agency. In short, you need some arrangement which draws information from the streets to your desk and transmits responses from your desk back to the streets. This "system" (I use the term loosely) might provide you with information in the following ways:

I. From staff and department heads
   1. Regular cabinet meetings to consider future potential problems
   2. Regular memos
      (In New York, a crisis calendar was extremely effective; in Fort Wayne, a daily one-page log sheet from every department head detailing his activities and agency problems has proven equally effective; in Nashville, key staff people utilize portable tape recorders to transmit daily reports to the mayor. The latter is also used to give citizens the ability to send messages to the mayor, who listens to the tapes at certain times during the day.)

II. From Citizens
   1. Creation of special offices to handle citizen complaints, monitor governmental responses, and keep the mayor informed
      (Cities often establish an Ombudsperson or a Citizen Complaint Bureau to coordinate the citizen response mechanism. In Birmingham, the mayor also sends out a postage-free return postcard requesting the citizen's response to the government's handling of a problem. The politics of this should be obvious. It provides the mayor with a check to make sure his departments are really respond-
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1. Recognition and response to citizen problems, and, if his administration is responding positively to only 250 complaints a week, he will be building up a card file of 13,000 satisfied customers a year.

2. Creation of more formal Neighborhood City Hall structures as in the city of Boston.

3. Utilization of citizen hours either in City Hall or in communities.

4. Scheduled community meetings.

5. Unscheduled community visits.
   (Unannounced neighborhood visits by a mayor can be extremely beneficial. But I must caution you that you can't have it both ways: once you start being a visible mayor who wants people to know you run the city, you cannot expect people to believe that eventual failures are the responsibility of others.)


7. Listing of mayor's home telephone number.

III. The Press
IV. Others (Political Leaders, Business Leaders, etc.)

* * *

Given time, you will have your first crisis to manage, and you will find that you can handle it more effectively if you are ready in advance. If you have systems of communication that extend out into the community, if you have a means to pass along important information to decision makers, if you have clearly designated someone close to you who can take immediate action in crisis situations, if you have carefully thought out the circumstances under which you will personally intervene—if you have done all these things, then you have built a framework for successful crisis management.
Strategies for Change

The Chiquita Banana Boycott and California Strike

by Cesar Chavez

This address was delivered in the Forum in April 1979. Cesar Chavez is president of the United Farm Workers.

Muchissimas gracias, all of you, for being here tonight. We want to thank you for the opportunity to be here at the Kennedy Institute of Politics and share with you a few moments about the farm workers' continuing struggle in California. We bring you greetings from the men and women who are now in their eleventh week of a strike that we thought was not possible in this day and age in California.

I say a strike that we thought was not possible because in California for the last seventeen years we've been struggling for the right to have a union. And not until 1975, when the Agricultural Labor Relations Act of California was passed, did we get that right to be able to establish a union—not a right given by the employers but a right given by the state, a right that workers could decide if they wanted a union and which union they wanted by a secret ballot election. All of the struggle of these many years has been really based on the strategy to have workers be able to have an instrument, be able to have an association to be able to struggle with and by. Now, this strike that we're in now is a different strike. After these many years of striking we wanted to consolidate the gains and make this an economic strike, where workers would really be asking for money, for substantial benefits and wages, so that they could meet with the needs that they have and meet the devastating impact of inflation.

***
So when we met for negotiations with the employers, we asked for a 32% wage increase, and the employers thought we were kidding. In fact, it was so funny to them when we presented the proposal, the economic demands, they actually took a break, and they came back laughing and smiling and said, "You're not serious," and we said, "Yes, we are." Immediately, it became a deadlock.

On January the 19th the workers said, "Enough, basta" and went out on strike. Eleven companies were struck, representing about 30% of the lettuce grown and harvested and packed and shipped in Imperial Valley. The biggest company is Sun Harvest, which is a subsidiary of United Brands, formerly United Fruit Company of Central American—I'm sure that you know about that company, and if you don't, it's time to find out who they are. What happened was that because we had now California collective bargaining legislation, the workers had some protection. Not in our wildest dreams did we think that this would be a fight to save the union. We thought it was a good old economic fight, but, as it turned out, Sun Harvest began to take the opportunity of this strike to sort of bust the union. We began to see signs of that, but we didn't really believe that this company—we've had a contract with them for eight years—would go to that extreme. Especially now that we have some good legislation in California and we've had some relations with them, we thought we were getting along well.

On February the 17th Sun Harvest broke away from the other growers to negotiate by themselves. And we thought: that's what we want; we want a break; we'll get this company; we'll negotiate and then that will set a standard. It didn't work that way. After four or five days of negotiating, we didn't reach an agreement. We didn't learn the truth until last week, when a foreman who is one of the major recruiters of strike-breakers in California defected and came to our site and gave us a story of what had happened. On the same day that we were negotiating in Los Angeles, sitting there in good faith, the company was behind our backs negotiating to bring in strike-breakers from Mexico, negotiating wages with them, and negotiating as if we didn't exist.

Even more importantly, Sun Harvest began to bring in excessive amounts of armed guards. There's an outfit in California called the Alpha Agency; they specialize in breaking strikes. They're the ones that hook up with the posse comatadas, hire KKK people off the street. It's put-together of the worst elements in society. They're all anti-farm workers, anti-minority, anti-anything, or everything. And so when we saw the employers doing that, we began to wonder: really, are these people trying to take us on?
And then five police agencies, sent there by the governor, came in—what they call a mutual aid pact. They got money, I understand, from the Federal government, from the FBI, to control riots, so right off the bat they classify our strike as a riot instead of a labor dispute. We needed to have the Department of Labor certify the strike; you'd think it was an international treaty we were trying to get. Back and forth. Finally, they gave us a rinky-dink sort of labor certification, but not good enough, doesn't meet the requirements. And so we get kicked around by the Immigration Department, go back to the Labor Department, go back to the court. We've got a stack of injunctions about that high. We now got injunctions against picketing in excessive numbers, against loud noise, against too many cars. Against noisy mufflers we've got injunctions. You name 'em, we got 'em.

So the situation was really like old times. Will they have the total control of the community and the power that lies within? You're not striking the grower; you're striking the whole shebang. For instance, the very first week of the strike, the principal of three high schools in the county went class to class recruiting kids to break the strike on Saturdays. When the Chicano kids said, "Well, I'm not going to break my dad's strike or my mother's strike," there was a kind of a riot. So we came and we sued. We got an injunction against the high school for recruiting labor without labor contractors' licenses.

Never in our lives would we have imagined that the employers would respond with the kind of attack that they now coordinated against our people. On February 20th, about 10:30 in the morning at a lettuce field in central California, about forty strike-breakers were working in the field. There were twenty or twenty-five strikers about 150 yards from where they were in a public road. They got together and selected three men, unarmed, to go into the field to try and talk to the strike-breakers. See, if we can talk to them, in most cases we can convince them either to join us or, in many cases, to leave and not break the strike. And as Rufino Contreras and two of his friends went into the field, after they'd traveled about maybe thirty or forty yards, someone opened fire with a rifle from a pump house, cutting their retreat. They went forward then, and from the front, from where the crews were, from where the trucks and the tractors were, two more men opened fire on them. They fired 284 rounds, hitting Rufino in the face, and Rufino lay in that field for an hour and a half. After he was hit and lay there, the strikers
wanted to come in. His father and his brother were among the strikers to come in with a makeshift stretcher to take him to the hospital. The three foremen firing kept them at bay. Now, it was almost two hours from the time they went in and Rufino was shot and wounded, but not one single police car was in sight. Why was that? They have so many patrol cars, almost one-to-one. This was the only time since and the only time after that there were these twenty-five or thirty strikers with not one police car in sight. Coincidence? Maybe.

Later, some frustrated workers—even though they believe in non-violence, to a point—were throwing dirt clods at a police car. Whether they hit or not, $10,000 bail. $10,000 bail. The three foremen that shot and killed one of our strikers and nearly killed two others, $5,000 bail. The judge that lowered the bail from $25,000 to $5,000? The judge’s son represents the grower and the foreman involved in the shooting. That’s the kind of justice that you get in those counties. That’s why the boycott. That’s why we need to then come out of those areas, get out of those hell-holes and come to you to ask for help, because of what we learned many years ago—that all strikes were lost until we came on the scene. They were lost because in those areas where the growers control everything, everything that lives there, grows there, works there, anything and everything, you just cannot win. It has nothing to do with how much support you have from the workers. It has to do with how vicious they can enforce the law and how much strike-breaking those sheriffs can get into. They’ve got all the tricks in the world.

And so Rufino was taken to the hospital, pronounced dead when he arrived there, a young man, 28 years old with a wife and two kids, just an ordinary farm worker, very loved in the union, born in Mexico, been working there about eight years . . .
According to a just-published study by Dr. Faustine Childress Jones, a senior fellow at Howard University's Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, blacks now believe that national attitudes have turned against them. They sense there has been a systematic retreat by government, white intellectuals, liberals and the academic world from a previous commitment to provide affirmative action for blacks and other minorities. No longer does the strong black and white coalition for civil rights exist. We have entered a changing national mood, the Bakke-Burger Era.

I am blessed—some might suggest bludgeoned—by a unique perspective from which to watch this changing mood. I write a column for a major daily newspaper, the Philadelphia Daily News, in the fourth largest city in America. With a 70 percent white readership which nightly prays for my deliverance, I carry on a dialogue, mostly rancorous. But it's a kind of primordial communication that must have existed when man lived in the trees and roamed the earth in bearskins.

This past June, I received a letter from a white reader, Joseph C. McTannney, which concisely capsuled white America's attitude today toward black America. I had written a column lamenting the U.S. Supreme Court's refusal to overturn seniority lists, even though, as the Court admitted, they perpetuated racial discrimination. Following the Nixon-Burger Court's reasoning, I concluded that the court felt "it was okay to amputate Kunta Kinte's foot as long as it was unintentional and he was given anesthesia and good hospital care." The reader, Mr. McTannney, responded thusly, and I read the letter because, in the words of Walt Whitman, I hear America singing:
Dear Mr. Stone,
Your article in today’s Daily News concerning the Supreme Court’s refusal to overturn seniority lists through the nation was a brilliant piece of tongue-in-cheek writing. I never cease to be amused by your subtle and intricate satire on the black condition in America today. Admit it. You are really a white Klanner seeking to present the black man’s position in the most irritating and ridiculous light possible.

Imagine any man of reason and a sense of justice and fair play suggesting that I, a descendant of immigrants who never owned a plantation or a factory, or wrote the laws, or, to my knowledge, ever did anything to harm a black man, should be asked to move to the recently vacated back-of-the-bus to redress wrongs for which I bear no responsibility. Of course, you can’t.

We all know you cannot fight injustice with injustice. If the wrongs of the past are to be righted that way, then someone in Great Britain owes my family and me a tremendous debt for the dislocation, suffering, and death which the Irish people suffered under centuries of British misrule. Well, maybe they do. But I don’t think so. To suggest that white workers must step aside for black ones is the kind of arrogant chauvinism that reinforces the Archie Bunker stereotype. The resentment that would result from the breaking of the seniority rule which unions fought so hard to get would set back black-white relations fifty years.

I realize that your only qualification for the job you hold is your color and that you are exploiting a need for professional niggers—one to cry wolf, stir up controversy, and help the Daily News in circulation. Okay, it’s the way you make your living. But it doesn’t give you the right to take away the way I make mine. Nor does it put you in a position to make moral judgments about the actions of men far more learned, far-sighted, and fair-minded than yourself.

Sincerely yours,
Joseph C. McTanney

As well as anything I have ever read, that letter captures the perfumed racism of the Bakke-Burger era. Nothing coarse or violent, but sophisticated and genteel, almost plaintive in tone, with the fragrance of an apology for having lynched you without having first read you your rights.

America in 1977 hovers on the brink of a mood eloquently defined back in 1889 by the distinguished Georgia editor, Henry W. Grady, who told the Boston Merchants Association in a speech: “It is on this, sir, that we rely in the South: not the cowardly menace of mask or shotgun, but the peaceful majesty of intelligence and responsibility, massed and unified for the protection of our homes and the preservation of our liberties.” Today’s fight against “forced busing,” “reverse discrimination,” and “quotas” epitomizes the suc-
cess of the peaceful majesty of intelligence. It is constitutional. It is acceptable. And it is exquisitely imaginative, a product of cognitive flexibility.

* * *

It is an era in which blacks are suffering an awesome economic and educational disproportionality. How does America disdain thee? Let me count the ways.

- The median family income for blacks—$8,779—is still only 58% of the median family income for whites, $14,268.
- 31% of all blacks live below the poverty level compared to only 9% of all whites.
- 45% of all black teenagers are unemployed, and in many cities, the figure is as high as 60%.
- The infant mortality rate for black babies is twice that for white babies.
- In the professions, blacks represent only 2% of the nation’s doctors, 2.5% of its dentists, 1.5% of its lawyers, and 2% of its Ph.D.’s.
- 23 times more whites earn $15,000 or more than blacks, and that’s important since that’s the average income of families sending their kids to college.
- In the criminal injustice system, 74% of all blacks convicted of larceny in state courts received penal sentences compared to only 49% of convicted whites. On death row, 62% of the inmates are black. These figures are not static. They continue to worsen, not improve.

Economically and educationally, blacks live in the worst of times. But, to paraphrase Dickens, we live, politically, in the best of times. And perhaps blacks have been mesmerized by the glamour of spectacular political breakthroughs:

- Black mayors in three of America’s largest cities—Los Angeles, Detroit and the nation’s capital, Washington, D.C.—and in Newark, Atlanta, Gary, and, on the threshold, New Orleans and white-ethnicized Buffalo.
- Two black lieutenant governors of California and Colorado.
- The highest number of blacks in Congress in history, sixteen, with two of them holding committee chairmanships.
- And, if Jimmy Carter hasn’t been born again enough to get passed the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment bill, he has broken new ground for black women in the federal government: the first black woman cabinet
member, the first black woman assistant in the White House, the first black woman on the U.S. Civil Service Commission, the first black woman to head up the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and black women head up the Office of Federal Revenue Sharing and the Peace Corps.

If blacks have been overwhelmed by what seems like enormous political strides, so are whites. As we have boasted of our newly won gains of political paucity, whites have concurred. This proves we're not racist, white America chuckles. Now when we attack you, investigate you, defeat you, fire you, refuse you, and ignore you, how can you call us racist?

* * *

In this changing mood, this hostile white environment, what options are available to blacks to preserve their status and increase their political, economic, and educational growth? Are blacks capable of forging a diversified strategy for both national and local politics? In some curiously unexplainable quirk of mental association, my mind turns to Dostoevsky and a quotation from the Brothers Karamazov. In the chapter “The Grand Inquisitor,” Dostoevsky writes: “So long as man remains free, he strives for nothing so incessantly and so painfully as to find someone to worship. . . . This craving for community of worship is the chief misery of every man individually and of all humanity from the beginning of time.”

What Dostoevsky was talking about, of course, was monotheism. Blacks suffer from a political variation of that craving. Blacks struggle incessantly and painfully to worship the Democratic Party. It’s called monomania. Monomania simply guarantees that your vote is safe and need not be courted. Nothing is more counterproductive for any organized segment of society than a predictable vote. Once a political party determines that you have nowhere to go, then they will give you no reward to stay.

We must collectively adopt a new mood, a daring willingness to experiment. This we can do by utilizing what I call (for want of a better term) the five-tier strategy.

The first tier consists of working within the Democratic Party on specifically isolated instances that accrue to the best advantage of black people. If General Motors President Charlie Wilson can say “What’s good for General Motors is good for America,” then certainly blacks ought to act in the conviction that what’s good for black people is good for the Democratic Party. This first-tier strategy demands getting legislation passed, such as the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment bill, and trying to prevent, where possible, the further emasculation of black economic and educational power.
Strategies for Change

The second-tier strategy consists of working within the Republican Party. This means supporting black candidates who are Republicans against white Democrats. Every ethnic group in America, especially the Jews, does this—supports its own first. For example, blacks betrayed their roots, their heritage, their morality, and their mommas when they voted for Daniel Patrick Moynihan for the U.S. Senate last year. Moynihan boasted about his 89% black vote. Had blacks deserted the architect of their benign neglect, Moynihan would have lost. A shift of just a quarter of a million black voters and Moynihan would have lost. Now he owes black people nothing. The second-tier strategy demands that blacks encourage the Republican Party to slate more blacks and, when they do so, loyally support this new effort.

The third-tier strategy represents the third party. There are times when neither party will be responsive to black interests or needs. Certainly at the state or local level, a third party must provide a safety valve for black discontent. For example, in the 1975 race of mayor of Philadelphia, Charles W. Bowser formed the Philadelphia Party and ran as an independent. He actually polled more votes for mayor than did the Republican Party, and it established Bowser as a force with which to be reckoned. Still, this third-tier strategy is the most difficult of all. It takes an awful lot of explaining and an inordinate amount of education. The only alternative to this strategy is staying home. And blacks must be educated to the fact that a stay-at-home vote is a wasted vote.

The fourth-tier strategy is one of the most serious deficiencies within the national black community. Who speaks for us with the same national authority as the Conference of Major American Jewish Organizations speaks for the national Jewish community? The Congressional Black Caucus should not be expected to speak for all blacks. It should have the luxury of a major national black organization fulfilling this role and freeing the Caucus to work on legislative strategies, not pressure tactics. The fourth-tier strategy was incubated last month when a meeting of heads of national black organizations resulted in the formation of the National Black Leadership Roundtable.

The fifth-tier strategy is community control of the black agenda. In this Bakke-Burger era of retrenchment, quiescence, and de-emphasis on economic justice for blacks and educational excellence for ghetto schools, blacks must make a joyful noise unto the Lord, rise up, and kick tail.

Let all of us leave here today with a sense of commitment to some form of specific strategy—if not to the five tiers, then to some political tactic that will end the disproportionality from which blacks suffer. Black parity is an imperative we must bring about in the 1980's.
Findings and Recommendations from "An Analysis of the Impact of the Federal Election Campaign Act, 1972-78"

by the Campaign Finance Faculty Study Group

This analysis was submitted to the Committee on House Administration of the U.S. House of Representatives, July 1979. The report was based on research conducted by F. Christopher Arterton, Gary Jacobsen, Xandra Kayden, and Gary Orren.

The campaign finance reforms enacted into law in the Federal Election Campaign Act and its amendments have brought about major changes in the funding of Congressional election campaigns. Most of these changes were long overdue; the overall impact of the Act has added to the honesty and efficiency of the political system. In sweeping terms, the Act must be considered successful in alleviating many of the perceived problems which stimulated Congressional action.

Like any major, innovative law, however, the Campaign Act has had consequences unanticipated and unintended by its authors and supporters. Fortunately, these consequences are highlighted by the success of the Act in producing reliable information on how campaigns are financed. Given the Act’s provisions for public disclosure and the resulting data compiled by the Federal Election Commission (FEC), many of the vexing questions about money in elections can now be addressed from a solid factual base.

Much of the discussion which framed the enactment of the Act was animated by the belief that money in politics was somehow an evil force, at best a necessary evil. Quite to the contrary, the Study Group cannot emphasize strongly enough that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with campaign contributions and expenditures. Adequate campaign funds are essential to competitive Congressional elections. The essence of an election campaign is to provide voters with a choice among alternative candidates. That process requires the communication to voters of some minimum quantity of information about the contestants. In contemporary America, providing that information to the voters costs substantial amounts of money.
Every study based on the information available since 1972 has shown that most campaigns have too little, not too much, money. The most competitive elections, where the voters have the most information about candidates, are those in which the most money is spent. Election contests in which spending is comparatively high are also those in which voter participation tends to be highest. While campaign finance laws must certainly guard against the undue influence of wealthy interests of individuals in the political process, they should at the same time be designed to enhance rather than hinder the raising and spending of campaign funds deemed appropriate.

Our data analysis permits us to identify the key source of the problem currently confronting candidates for federal office: the individual contribution limits are too low. Unable to raise enough money from individuals, candidates have been forced to turn to other sources to fill their campaign treasuries. The unfortunate consequences that flow from the loan limits are, first, non-party political action committees (PAC's) have increasingly supplanted other sources of money available to candidates, and, second, wealthy candidates now hold an unfair advantage over poorer candidates who must raise money in small chunks from many sources. In addressing these changed circumstances, it is important for the Congress to recognize that the major stimulus for growth of campaign money from these sources has been the difficulties of raising adequate funds through contributions from private individuals.

A second emerging consequence of the Campaign Act has been a further deterioration of our political parties in the services and resources they can provide to their candidates. Financially, the amount of money given to Congressional candidates by party committees has declined in absolute amounts and, consequently, as a percentage of the resources available. Complicated regulations and burdensome reporting requirements have had the effective consequence of discouraging local party leaders from becoming involved in the campaigns of federal candidates. Again and again, those party workers interviewed stressed that the effect of the Act had been for local party committees to either opt out of Congressional and Senatorial campaigns or to delegate their financial capabilities upward to the national campaign committees. Noting that these problems will be exacerbated during Presidential campaigns by the limitations placed upon expenditures, the Study Group believes that the Congress should amend the Act with the explicit intention of aiding party committees.

A third and related problem, which has developed during the implementation of the Act, is the burdensome effect of reporting requirements upon
campaigns themselves. The pitfalls of over-regulation—a special danger in an area so close to the heart of the democratic process—have not been completely avoided. While the Study Group strongly supports the necessity of public disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures, in practice the most onerous requirements of reporting to the FEC have not provided compensating benefits to the public. Simply put, the rather low threshold above which both contributions and expenditures must be disclosed has increased the costs of conducting an effective campaign without adding substantially to the public enlightenment.

The problems identified here are severe. They are occurring at the same time that much of the public discussion of needed changes in campaign finance is focused on the question of providing Congressional and Senatorial candidates with a source of public funds. We believe that, irrespective of the resolution of that controversial question, the legislative changes proposed here deserve to be addressed separately. Given that advantages in fund-raising soon become translated through electoral success into effective constraints upon Congressional action, the opportunity for rectifying these adverse changes may rapidly be lost. We, therefore, urge the Committee on House Administration and the Congress as a whole to focus separately upon the following needed changes in the present law:

1) The individual contribution limit ought to be raised from $1,000 to $3,000.
2) The income tax credit for contributions to candidates for public office ought to be expanded, permitting each taxpayer a “dollar-for-dollar” tax credit for the first $50 contributed to political candidates. An additional tax credit of $50 per taxpayer for contributions to political parties should be established on a separate but similar basis. Tax credits for contributions to non-party committees should be eliminated.
3) Individual contribution limits should be higher for Presidential and Senatorial contests than for House races.
4) In all elections, including primary races, the national and state party committees ought to be allowed to contribute more to Congressional and Senatorial candidates than non-party committees.
5) Local party committees should be allowed to raise and spend up to $2,000 on behalf of federal candidates within their jurisdictions without being required to file detailed reports with the FEC.
6) State party committees should be allowed to spend up to $5,000 on behalf of their candidates for federal offices without having to file detailed reports with the FEC.
7) Only contributions and expenditures of $500 and over should be "fully disclosed" to the FEC.
8) Candidates raising and spending below $5,000 in an election ought to be exempted from the detailed reporting requirements of the FEC.
9) Additional funds should be appropriated in the FEC budget to implement an optional system for report filing by data transmission between computers.
10) Candidates should be allowed to designate accounting firms or banking institutions to act as their agents in filing reports to the FEC.
11) The Chairman of the FEC should be appointed for a term of four years, while all policy matters should be explicitly reserved for the full Commission in order to insure the partisan balance on these matters.
The Media

Reporting on State Government: How Can We Improve?

This panel discussion constituted the final session of the Institute's conference for Massachusetts journalists, June 1979. Appearing in the excerpt are: Lewis Wolfson, Professor at American University and former Washington Bureau Chief, Providence Journal-Bulletin; Robert Turner, columnist, Boston Globe; Martin Linsky, editor, Real Paper and former member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives; and Brian McNiff, reporter, Worcester Gazette.

WOLFSON: There are three barriers to more probing reporting on government. First, you're really in an adversary situation with officials. You want access; they want to hide. You want information; they want to conceal it. You want news; they want PR. They talk about openness in government; you look for it, and you find instead self-protection, defensiveness, suspiciousness, lying. Secondly, there are editors and publishers. They don't give you the time, the space, the manpower, the money—not the understanding. They want production, right? They don't care what it is; just get that copy in. And they want certain stories covered by your paper, so that all of you often wind up chasing the same story. People are stepping on other people, while other stories are going uncovered. Thirdly, there's the subject matter. If you are going to go in and do a story about an agency, it takes time—and it's complicated—to get all the people you need to get, to get all the lobbyists and other interest groups that are on the outside and that effect the story you're writing. They are sprawling stories, and they're also boring. Readers aren't interested, and it's tough to make the story interesting.

But one reason why we've got so much trouble is that the press has not thought out its priorities. We're too timid with government reporting. We love the personalities, love the muckraking, love the legislative fights, love the exposure of state secrets. And why not? Those are the kind of stories that win you awards. But people need something else. They need to know how
government really works, what's really gone wrong, and how that affects them. We oversimplify officials' operations, and we gloss over their real failures. We simply will not win people's respect and attention unless we tell them what government is doing to them and help them cope with the waste, the stupidity, the injustices . . .

What we need to do, I think, is to push the officials to think more about dealing with issues, to rethink their own shop-worn theories of government. We need to dig ourselves for ideas about state government, ideas that may seem wild and off-beat now but may be tomorrow's accepted practices. Go outside, go to the "think tank," and talk to these people. They're sitting there with ideas—there are some left—but they don't get the attention. What we need to do is show who is being hurt and who is being helped by government, what works and what doesn't work and what may work given a chance. And if that isn't the press' job, I don't know what is.

TURNER: We spent three days studying how to write better stories about government and, to some extent, what stories can be written. But there has been very little assessment of exactly how situations would have changed if the coverage would have been better or different. It seems, in fact, that the better government is covered, the less likely it is to do anything. That may be an oversimplification, but I think that it is not entirely without justification. Our coverage, to the extent that it has any power at all, has the power to slow things down rather than encourage them to proceed. But this is a whole area that really wasn't dealt with very specifically. I've come to think that that was a conscious decision and probably a correct one, for that's a subject for another seminar.

I think the overall direction of the seminar contains a presumption that I would like to question—that there are dozens of stories out there in state government and bureaucracy that ought to be covered and reported, even though they're dull as hell, because they are important. The contention I would like to make is that the stories we have been talking and learning about these three days should not be reported "even though they're dull, because they are important." They should be reported because they are good stories and they are not dull. If they're important, their impact makes them good stories.

Good stories frequently do have winners and losers, and I don't think that's wrong. That makes for good stories, but I don't think the winners and losers always have to be Jimmy and Teddy. They can be a policy that affects welfare recipients vs. a policy that affects mental health recipients. I don't
think that we are covering too many winners and losers; I just don’t think we are covering enough of the game. In competitive politics, we can usually depend on the competing sides to develop the issues for us. It does not work that way in the bureaucracy. Our ignorance is their power. The policies and the arguments are going to have to be analyzed by us, on our own. It is a major responsibility.

McNiff: We don’t ever have to worry about lacking winners and losers. In our summary of winners and losers we have described the process. Yet, the politics and the process, the civil service, the boring stuff, is hidden in our stories; we write about it only as it bubbles in a conflict. Perhaps we should cover the conflicts and intersperse it—like marbling a steak—with a little background description of what the process is that provoked somebody to get into this fight. If we cover the process as a process story, nobody is going to read it. It is dull. Perhaps we need to relabel things. For instance, civil service reform is a genuine eye-glazer. But there is a reason for the civil service being there, and there are reasons for changing it. Very often, the reason for changing it is that somebody wants to put his own people into jobs, and the civil service restricts them. If we covered that, if we described that as a “patronage power play”—which in fact is what it is—instead of “civil service reform,” more attention might be paid to it, and we might be a little more accurate in describing what’s going on. What is more, there might be a little more interest in changing the system if we force the civil service to defend itself and force those who would change it to justify why there has to be change (beyond putting campaign workers or academic technicians into jobs).

Of course, sometimes we can be excessively rational in talking about process. John Hughes, a speech writer for Eisenhower, said that he’d pick up the paper the next morning and be totally baffled at the order and logic and reason that had been ascribed to actions that he knew were utterly chaotic. We do that because we have to have a beginning, a middle, and an end to our stories. We give the illusion that it’s neat and cut and dried. We ought to keep a little something aside for the irrational, the human.

Linsky: The one thing I don’t understand which Turner mentioned—and which is something which I’ve noticed in the course of talking to reporters, not only here, but over the past couple of years—is the suspension of belief the press has about its impact and power. It is a kind of curious and
comforting modesty that I really can't figure out, except that by denying to themselves the importance of what they're doing, journalists can also deny the responsibility for it. It's not what the politicians believe to be the case. Politicians live and die by what people who cover them write. I remember thinking about the phenomenon when I was in the statehouse. I'd go in in the morning, and by ten o'clock I'd not only be able to talk to anybody in the statehouse about the Political Circuit column in the Globe, but be able to talk about the contradiction between the third and fourth paragraphs. And then at night I'd talk to my father, who is a lawyer, who makes his living by reading and by understanding what he reads. I'd ask him about that column which he had read on the way into town in the morning, and he wouldn't quite be sure which way it came down, or even quite sure what it was focusing on. The difference in the detail and the attention that's given to everything that is written about the statehouse by people inside and the detail and attention that's given to it by people on the outside is extraordinary. The idea that you people don't have a tremendous impact on everything that is done inside is foolish.

To me the adversary relationship that exists in state government exists between the statehouse press corps, the legislature, the other elected officials on the one hand and the citizens on the other hand. We look at citizens as if they don't understand what really goes on, as if things would be worse if we told them what really goes on, as if they can't take heavy, thoughtful stories because all they want is sexy stories. There was, in my experience in the statehouse, only one reporter who really saw every elected official as an adversary and not as a friend and a crony, and I think he was a terrific reporter. I did everything I could to break down that wall that he put between us, but I couldn't do it. As a result there was none of that give-and-take that friendship that compromises what I think is a really important sense of distance between reporters and the people they ought to cover.

I think you can cover campaigns and cover bills as sports stories with "winners" and "losers." But there is one major difference between sports and government, and that is that in sports you can look at the standings at the end of the season and you can see how the teams came out. That is true in an election, too, where you can look at the election returns and you can see who won and who lost. But if anything has come out of this conference, it is like the lesson we were taught in the first year of law school—that the law is a "seamless web." Well, government is a seamless web. There are intricacies in the relationships between government and politics, between legislators. A liberal Republican and a conservative Democrat who drive to the statehouse
in the morning have more going between them than anything else would indicate because they share a car in the morning. All the things that make up life at the statehouse determine what’s going to happen—including the worth of legislation.

One of the things that bothers me the most is the unwillingness of people covering the state government to make honest, open (at least to themselves, if not to the readers) value judgments about who the good guys are and who the bad guys are, what the good issues are and what the bad issues are, what is important and what isn’t important, who is cynical and who is serious. I think the only way you can understand that zoo is by putting value judgments on it. But everything that you are told in the daily paper acts to eliminate those value judgments from your head. Well, you don’t eliminate them from your heart, and the process of trying to report straight from your head onto the typewriter in a sterile kind of way distorts reality for your readers. I think allowing yourselves to loosen up a little more, to write a little bit more about what you really believe to be the truth—even though it takes some risks and it’s not perfectly consistent with the lessons that have been driven into you—would be a much more honest way to report on state government and would in the long run make for a much more informed electorate.

Separating the Facts from the News
by Raymond Price

This article appeared in the Harvard Political Review, Spring 1978. Raymond Price, former editor of the New York Herald Tribune and chief speechwriter for President Nixon, was an Institute Fellow in Fall 1977.

Perhaps the least-appreciated political truth in America today is how little we actually know about what goes on in the nation and the world. A person who assiduously follows the news is commonly described as “well-informed.” But that usually means that he has read or heard a great many
things which may or may not be true. As Henry Fairlie, an exceptionally thoughtful British journalist working in the United States, has written:

The flattest and most flatulent lie that is told every night in the world today is when Walter Cronkite says: "That's the way it is. . . ." It is not the way it is. How can Walter Cronkite ever know that "That's the way it is. . . ." in the world? All he knows is what he is told; and all we know is what he and the staff of CBS News choose to tell us. . . .

News is not what has happened—it is not "the way it is"—it is an account of what a few people, journalists like myself, think has happened. Out of what we think has happened, we select and elaborate, and we provide what each day is called the news.

This is our job: to make the news up. That may sound like a shocking confession; it is, in fact, the only honorable description of journalism. We are engaged in "making up" stories about the little we know of what has gone on in the world in the near past.

At Harvard University last fall, I led an Institute of Politics study group that I called "The Media and the Political Process." But so central is the role of the news media in politics today that I might better have called it "Politics and the Media Process." Political causes triumph or fail, politicians survive or disappear, on the basis of their access to and treatment by the media. Thus, media techniques, media values, and media standards largely define the ways in which our political institutions are able to function.

And our perceptions of the world are the perceptions we receive through the prism of the media. Particularly, they are those we receive through an increasingly concentrated handful of "national media" headquartered entirely in New York City and Washington, D.C.: CBS, NBC and ABC, AP and UP, Time and Newsweek, and The New York Times and The Washington Post. The Times and the Post also derive much of their national influence from the fact that each has a nationwide news service, distributing its stories to hundreds of client papers across the country—just as most of the newsfilm of national events carried on newscasts is provided by the networks. What sort of prism is it? Is the refracted light that comes out the light of truth, or a highly colored version of the truth? And, to the extent that it does color the truth, what can or should we do about it?

Having spent roughly half of my own working life on each side of the fence that separates press and politics, I know that it looks very different from each of the two sides. Basically, the official cares about results. The newsman cares about a story. Truths, or facts (and these are not necessarily the same: facts can be arranged in ways that seriously distort the truth), are
useful ingredients of a story. But they only make a story when mixed with other elements that give it excitement, interest, or immediacy, elements such as drama, titillation, mystery, confrontation, suspicion, danger. And these can make just as good a story when mixed with half-truths or suspected truths, with allegations or innuendo. Indeed, sometimes these make a better story. In the humdrum everyday world, half-truths tend to be more dramatic than whole truths.

As we consider the problem of how little we actually know about what goes on in the nation and the world (the problems I cited at the outset), we really are dealing with two separate aspects: lack of information and misinformation. When looking for solutions, newsmen usually focus on lack of information, arguing that they should be given more about which to write. Officials focus on misinformation, saying the media should write more accurately. The familiar shibboleth that attacks on the press are merely attacks on the messenger bearing bad news is only a shibboleth; what officials complain about is not the reporting of bad news but, rather, the bad reporting of news.

* * *

As a purely practical matter, however, we confront the basic fact that the audience's attention span is limited and probably not very expansible. If we are truly to expand what we know about the world around us, therefore, our first need is not for more information but for better information. Crucial to this aim is developing a more sophisticated means of evaluating the information we get. As a starter, this requires three things:

1) a livelier, more active public awareness of how techniques of news presentation shape the news product consumed;
2) a greater readiness on the reporter's part to stress the degrees of probability in their stories, rather than pretending that every word is gospel;
3) a concerted, persistent demand on the part of news consumers for a product that is in some way "graded"—not government-certified as U.S. Prime or U.S. Choice, but presented by the news organizations themselves with a greater openness concerning levels of accuracy, degrees of probability, bias of sources, and the point where ascertainable fact leaves off and speculation begins.

As long as news consumers continue to fall for the con that words set in type are somehow magically rendered true, standards of accuracy are going
to continue being abysmally inadequate. News consumers must start challenging news producers, demanding to know why they should believe what they are being told, pressuring producers to be open about their techniques, asking for more emphasis on fact and less on drama, insisting on a disentangling of news and opinion. If product labeling is important on the foods we put into our bodies, its equivalent is no less important on what we feed into our minds.

This mislabeling is particularly important because one of the most egregiously distorting aspects of media coverage is the false air of authority reporters and commentators commonly bring to it, offering their reports as the "real truth," the "inside story," or whatever—including such familiar formulations as "NBC has learned...." Even participants in events seldom can be certain of the full truth, except about their own small parts in those events. The best any of us can really do is guess, trying to approximate the probable truth—with our own biases and preconceptions leading us to select one "probable" truth out of a variety of possible truths. The mass media presence is so intimidating that its pretense of truth is taken as gospel by much of the public, and its patchwork of speculation, guesswork and inference is accepted as instant history.

Viewing the growing power of the national media, and the increasing concentration of that power, anxious voices are asking whether we ought not to devise some curbs on its excesses, some limits on the First Amendment. However, the awesome power of the media today makes even more frightening the specter of anything that would join that power with the government's power.

What we need is not government curbs; rather, those who select and present the news should be more acutely aware of the self-restraints that the possession of great power places on the exercise of great power in a free society. And coupled with this realization should be a more vigorous, concerted demand by news consumers for truth rather than drama, for they must recognize that the "right to know" applies not only to the government that shapes their laws but also to the news media that shape their perceptions. Ultimately, the news consumer is going to get either what he wants and demands or what he is willing to settle for in his complacency.
Should Journalists Have the Right to Protect Their Sources?

This examination and cross-examination is taken from an Advocates show, filmed in the Forum in February 1979. The witness is Daniel Shorr, columnist; the Pro Advocate is Charles Nesson, professor at Harvard Law School; the Con Advocate is Avi Nelson, radio and television commentator; the moderator is Michael Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts.

NESSON: I call Mr. Daniel Schorr. Mr. Schorr, would you give us a brief thumbnail sketch of your background as a journalist?

SCHORR: Well, in a career of some forty years, I was a newspaper correspondent in Europe reporting for the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor. For a quarter of a century I was a correspondent for CBS News abroad and at home in Washington, and since then a syndicated columnist and an independent television commentator.

NESSON: Tell us, what is a confidential source?

SCHORR: A confidential source is a source that will tell you something you need to know on your promise to protect the confidentiality of the identity of the person because he or she might otherwise get into trouble.

NESSON: And have you had occasion to use confidential sources in the course of your work as a journalist?

SCHORR: On certain occasions, yes. In sensitive information obviously involved with Watergate and investigations of the intelligence community there was a constant use. Even in more routine ways Congressmen and others frequently want to be kept confidential. Those in government who feel they are maybe in trouble frequently can only let you know what's going on if you respect their confidentiality.

NESSON: Could you give us an example, Mr. Schorr?

SCHORR: Well, some of the examples are quite famous. All of Watergate is in a sense an example. Watergate was a case where there was a gigantic cover-up perpetrated by the Nixon administration that could only be
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penetrated by sources such as the one called "Deep Throat." But there have been others. There have been examples of CIA conducting domestic surveillance against its charter, which would not have been known had it not been revealed through confidential sources to Seymour Hersh of the New York Times, resulting in a large investigation. There was a war that was being conducted illegally (in the sense that Congress hadn't authorized it) in Cambodia—again, revealed because of confidential sources who knew it was happening and could only tell about it if they were kept secret.

NESSON: Mr. Schorr, you yourself were responsible for reporting some of the activities of Gordon Liddy in the course of the Watergate experience?

SCHORR: That's right. To give a case of my own, in the course of the early Watergate investigation, before it was known that there were more than five persons involved, I happened to learn that Howard Hunt, in a proceeding which was supposedly confidential, had taken the Fifth Amendment when asked about his whereabouts of the night of the Watergate break-in. That was one of the clues that led, along with other information, to my being able to discover and report for the first time that Gordon Liddy and Howard Hunt had been present at the Watergate that night. The fact of the matter was that I was even warned by my superiors at CBS News that, in view of Supreme Court decisions, it was possible that I might be called by a judge investigating the leak and might be asked for the source. It might not be possible to protect me, and I might have to go to jail. I accepted the warning and reported it nonetheless, and I was happy to make that small contribution to Watergate history.

NESSON: Mr. Schorr, if the public has a right to know, why doesn't it have a right to your source?

SCHORR: It's a good question. I think it would be of great interest for the press to have to disclose sources because it's often a legitimate item of news in itself, as in who has an interest in telling something. Unfortunately, however, it is the one kind of information that would make it impossible to gather the rest of the information. Or if I can put it to you anecdotally, I was involved, as you may know, in being threatened with a contempt citation because of a House intelligence report that, against the wishes of the House of Representatives, I caused to have published. I ended up in confrontation with the House Ethics Committee, which my two small children tried to explain to
playmates of theirs. My young daughter, who was then about five years old, explained to her playmates, "Daddy had a secret and he told everybody the secret, so they wanted to send him to jail." And her older brother said, "You dumb-dumb, that wasn't the way it was. He had a secret and he wouldn't tell anybody, and that's why they wanted to send him to jail." And I said, "Children, you both have half the truth. There was a secret which was something the public had to know. Then there was a secret which is a secret of how you get secrets, without which you don't get them, and that I couldn't tell."

NESSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Schorr.

***

NELSON: Can you imagine a situation where a defendant would be on trial and he would need the sources of a journalist in order to prove his innocence?

SCHORR: I have a vivid imagination; it just has never happened, to my knowledge.

NELSON: I'm disappointed in your imagination, as vivid as you may have it. The fact is that there are certain judges in this country who have said that they disagree with you, that under certain circumstances the sources of the reporter should be revealed. Is that not so?

SCHORR: It is so, up to the Supreme Court.

NELSON: Why do you think then that the reporter should be the final arbiter and be able to overrule the judge? Shouldn't the judge? Don't we work that way in this country, that the judge should have the final say?

SCHORR: Well, dismissing the contentious way in which you put it, I don't think the judge is overruled by the reporter. The judge does his thing and the reporter does his thing.

NELSON: What I'm trying to drive at, Mr. Schorr, is that when you do your thing and do it in contradiction to the judicial system in the United States, are you not putting yourself above the judiciary? And is this not a privilege that you ought not to claim merely because you are a reporter?
SCHORR: I claim the privilege when the judge doesn't recognize the privilege. Since I'm forced to do what my professional duty tells me to do, I'm willing to risk going to jail.

NELSON: And are you willing to risk that the defendant will go to jail because of this?

SCHORR: I don't think that defendants necessarily have to go to jail. The defendant can be dismissed if the information appears to be so essential to his defense.

NELSON: You mean a mistrial declared?

SCHORR: A mistrial declared or an acquittal even, because I think public information at some times is more important than any trial.

NELSON: Well, what would probably happen is the charges would be dismissed, and then we'd have the risk of a stigma that the defendant would have. Let me get to another area. You talk about the responsibility of the press. Take an example of a bombing, where a student was killed, and a reporter knew who did it and what the next bombing was going to be. Would you say that he should come forward?

SCHORR: Of course.

NELSON: If he does not come forward and he is commanded to do so by a grand jury or by an authorized agency of the United States, should he be forced to come forward?

SCHORR: Ah, most reporters in those cases wouldn't have to be forced to come forward.

NELSON: Oh, but we know of a case, don't we—because what I've described is not hypothetical—where such a situation existed and the reporter did not come forward . . .

SCHORR: What case do you have in mind?

NELSON: The Knopps case in Wisconsin in 1971. Granting this case, don't
you think the reporter should have been compelled to save another life, to tell his information before the next bombing?

SCHORR: I can speak only for this reporter. If somebody comes to me with information where lives are at stake, I don’t accept the confidentiality of the source, and I simply tell the police. I only can give confidentiality where I’ve promised it, and in cases where crimes of that sort have been committed, I would not promise confidentiality.

NELSON: Well, I wish every reporter were as honorable as you.

SCHORR: Most are, most are.

NELSON: But the fact is that some are not, and that’s why we need it. Let me take one more example. Supposing we have a situation where an innocent person has been maligned by a vicious, inaccurate story published in a major paper. What should be his course of action?

SCHORR: Libel suit.

NELSON: You say libel. If he now takes his action along a libel path, should he be able then to command the journalist to reveal his sources?

SCHORR: No.

NELSON: I don’t understand your point then. Here is an innocent, small person maligned by a large corporation. You tell me his redress of grievance is through the action of libel, and yet, when he wants to get this information, you tell me he can’t get it. How is he supposed to defend himself against the multimillion-dollar corporation?

SCHORR: I would say he’s not defending himself, he’s suing, right?

NELSON: Yes, because he has been defamed and because the story was indeed inaccurate. I’ve stipulated that.

SCHORR: The story is inaccurate. In that case, the judge would simply have to take into consideration that the source isn’t being revealed and draw whatever conclusion he was going to draw from it.
DUKAKIS: Gentlemen, I'll have to break in at this point. Mr. Schorr, we have a few more questions from Mr. Nesson before you end your testimony.

NESSON: Mr. Schorr, in the case that Mr. Nelson was just pursuing with you, the clear result would be that the newspaper would wind up paying, would they not?

SCHORR: That's right. That's the risk of doing business, both for the reporter and for the newspaper. When you withhold a source, the reporter may go to jail, the newspaper may have to pay money. We are forced to take that risk to provide public information.

NESSON: Mr. Schorr, do you believe that reporters need an absolute privilege?

SCHORR: Mr. Nesson, the word absolute is not in my lexicon. I only know that in forty years of reporting I have never known a case when I thought it was necessary to have that privilege violated.

* * *

DUKAKIS: Gentlemen, I'm afraid I have to break in at this point. We've reached that point in our debate this evening when it's time for our advocates to sum up. Mr. Nesson, you have one minute for closing.

NESSON: Thank you. You don't find real cases in which revealing a reporter's confidential source would provide evidence crucial to a defendant. Mr. Nelson has to make them up. What you do find increasingly are cases in which a defense lawyer, in search of a diversion, confusion, an issue for appeal, goes after a reporter on the theory, "Maybe he's got something. How can we tell unless we look?" That's a fishing expedition, and the resulting fight between judge and reporter is just what the lawyer wants. It's a fight we can only lose. If the press holds out, goes to jail, pays its fine, then the authority of our judges is flaunted and the rule of law is weakened. If the press caves in, an instrument of news-gathering essential to reporting on government corruption and incompetence is damaged. Far better to recognize that reporters should have a right to protect their sources.

DUKAKIS: Thank you, Mr. Nesson. Mr. Nelson, one minute for closing.
NELSON: These are not figments of imagination; these are cases where the judges have decided that sources should be revealed. We come back again to the unanswerable argument that if there is absolute privilege granted, then there may be defendants who cannot prove their innocence and guilty people who are free to go back into society. The question here is whether we should grant to the journalist a privilege so absolute and so broad that it is not offered to lawyers and clients, to doctors and patients, even to priests and penitents. I contend that there are individual rights that are important if we are defendants, and they cannot be sacrificed on the altar of journalistic privilege. It is important to keep in mind that even for the press itself this may be a dangerous policy to follow. We may indeed get into the situation where the judge and the legislature shall define who is a member of the press, and that would subvert the freedom of the press to a much greater extent than the occasional mandatory revelation of sources. We live in a constitutional democracy, and we should recognize that the final arbiter ought not to be the reporter upon his discretion but the court of law. That is the best way to protect the rights of all of us, journalists and individual citizens alike. Thank you.
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Is Anyone in Washington Thinking?

by Bruce Adams

This piece was written by Bruce Adams, Director of Issue Development at Common Cause, during his term as Institute Fellow, Spring 1979. The full article will appear in the Public Administration Review.

Washington has become much like the world of the Red Queen in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass*. As the Queen explained to Alice: "Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!" Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, assistant secretaries, White House staff, and special assistants spend most of their days racing from one meeting to the next as their in-boxes and phone messages pile up. There is usually one thing missing from the three-by-five schedule cards that rule the lives of these busy people. There is no time to think very deeply or broadly about anything.

In Washington, the urgent drives out the important. The short-term demands on the top policy-maker are staggering. It is tempting to believe that most of this is merely people acting self-important, but most of the busyness is genuine. The large majority of the claims on the top official's time are at least somewhat legitimate when looked at on a case-by-case basis. All of them are important to somebody. And there is usually a political price to pay for each request that is denied. The tyranny of the clock is real, and the cumulative impact of the demands is intolerable.

While the legitimate work demands are large, there is a significant degree of foolishness involved as well. Unfortunately, because power in Washington often has as much to do with symbols and appearance as with substance and reality, much of the foolishness is necessary as a means of enhancing or maintaining power. Protocol often prefers a high-ranking official to an informed one. Washington is a town where assistant secretaries have been known to cancel meetings when a peer has the audacity to send a
deputy, a town where people usually do not sign what they write and do not write what they sign. Congressional committee chairmen want Cabinet secretaries to testify even when assistant secretaries may be better informed on the subject of the hearing. Why? The Cabinet secretaries tend to attract media attention and they satisfy the chairmen's feelings of being part of a co-equal branch of government. The Congressional demand might not always be reasonable, but the price of refusing is often too high.

But these top officials are not just the prisoners of others. Many of them are also prisoners of their own egos and senses of responsibility. Staying on the move and working long hours give the official a sense of self-importance and often a sense of indispensability. Getting VIP treatment for giving a speech in Las Vegas or holding a press conference in Washington provides ego gratifications that serious reflection cannot match for many. Solving short-term crises can be exhilarating, fulfilling the childhood desire to play fireman. A large part of the problem relates, too, to what Joseph Bower of the Harvard Business School calls the "myth of the good manager," the person who knows everything and does everything. The conscientious government official is reluctant to delegate, to let go of anything that might be of some importance. This is especially true because of the initial lack of familiarity that political appointees have with most of their colleagues and the career civil servants. Just about the time a comfortable relationship has developed, the political executive is often getting ready to return to private life.

* * *

As long as our ablest public officials are tied up with bureaucratic red tape and overwhelmed by their in-boxes and their three-by-five schedule cards, there is little hope that government will provide the visionary and creative leadership that our nation so desperately needs.

The present system draws all of the best people, even those in policy and planning jobs, into matters of day-to-day strategy and tactics. The question before them is not "What is the best policy for the nation?" but, rather, "What is the best policy I can come up with by Tuesday that Congress would take seriously?" When pressed for time, they seek out the easiest information available, the first historical analogy that comes to mind, the most obvious alternatives. There is little time for hard critical analysis and little opportunity to think about the long-term consequences and the potential for implementation of the ideas they do come up with. The price we pay is large.
Government’s failure to anticipate problems—the energy and inflation issues are the most obvious—and its seemingly endless reactive and inadequate crisis management have helped to fuel the growing lack of public confidence in government and the growing belief that government cannot deal with our problems.

* * *

The problem will not be solved until the officials take a step back from the frantic pace of everyday life to look at the whole of their lives and think through a few basic questions:
- What is this doing to me as a human being?
- What are my relevant goals and values?
- What three things do I really want to accomplish?
- Where could government be in this area in five years?

This does not mean that the top one hundred government officials should be detailed to Walden Pond to commune with the ghost of Thoreau. It does not even mean that they should block out periods of time during the week just for “thinking great thoughts.” Pity the poor secretary who would have to answer the phone with: “I am sorry, Mr. President, he is thinking today.” Admittedly, inspirations and insights often come in flashes, and one can get them as easily in the shower or while jogging as in meditation.

But public officials can and must build into their lives time to think through their goals, time to work on their priorities, and time for themselves and their families. Compared to these higher needs, much of what top officials do is trivial. Without a system of fairly rigid rules built into their everyday life, however, officials will have a difficult time saying “no” to even the most marginal demands on their time. Officials need rules and incentives that force priority issues and long range thought into their in-boxes and onto their three-by-five schedule cards. This will force them to make harder choices among the day-to-day routine requests that now dominate their lives.

This, of course, is exactly the ground on which James Fallows, in his *Atlantic* articles, criticizes President Carter, the ultimate “clean desk man.” “Carter’s problem is not that he doesn’t think,” according to another Carter appointee. “His problem is that he doesn’t choose.” In a town where the in-box rules, the trick is to get out ahead of issues so that the in-box is filled with issues the official cares about. Former HEW Secretary John Gardner consciously used “a policy of self-entrapment.” When he wanted to think deeply and broadly about a subject, he would make a commitment to give a speech or write an article on the topic. As the due date would draw near, with his
Elliot Richardson established a new management system at HEW in the early 1970's designed to allow him to focus his time on policy-making in priority issues rather than in reacting to a series of small issues raised by others. The heart of the process was a master calendar that coordinated planning and program activities with the budget process, a refinement of management techniques that had been tried before in Washington. Richardson conveyed his priorities at the beginning of the process and received an orderly flow of information that reflected those priorities. Other officials would be well served by adopting strict decision rules that scheduled periodic retreats well staffed in advance, monthly long-range staff planning sessions, or lunches with creative people they do not have to talk with. These sessions should be made priorities over all other than genuine emergencies.

Congress's own use of time could be much improved. At present, as former Representative Michael Harrington (D-Mass.) has pointed out, "the rewards all run to the reactive." Creativity and thought are undertaken at one's political peril. By ridding themselves of much of what Harrington calls the "non-essential garbage" that clutters the Congressional calendar—the routine annual authorizations and frequent quorum calls—members of Congress could free time for serious attention to long-term, high priority issues.

Former Representative Ned Pattison (D-N.Y.) proposed a three month moratorium on legislative activity at the end of the first year of each Congress. Pattison proposed that the period be used for concentrated oversight and foresight to educate members in areas of fundamental national concern. Undoubtedly, media cynics would play it as a three month holiday, political cartoonists would have a field day, and members in marginal districts would rush home to campaign. But the need for something like this is clear. A less dramatic approach proposed by Pattison would be to devote one Wednesday each month to the effort, banning legislative activity on the floor and in committees. In recent years, Harvard's Institute of Politics has hosted newly-elected members of Congress for a series of seminars. There is no reason to believe that more senior members would not profit from some of the same.

People must also block out time to preserve their human dignity and their relations with their families. Time out of the office and out of Washington doing things unrelated to work is the key to avoid being ruined by the system. The problem with taking time for one's self and family is, of course, that one might have to forego a measure of short-term influence or effectiveness. To his or her peers, the person might appear to be lazy or,
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perhaps worse, a dilettante. But the cost of being a follower, of going along with the peer pressure to grind one’s self into the ground is ultimately much greater. The truly self-confident, creative person does not need to be at every meeting and involved in every issue. A modicum of non-conformity in this regard would pay large dividends.

* * *

We have come a long way since the time when President Coolidge napped afternoons in the White House and Senator Borah rode horseback in Rock Creek Park. The complexity of public problems has increased exponentially. Life in the top positions of government is going to be rough for any conscientious public servant. At a minimum, it is going to be a long string of ten and twelve hour days. There is no way to change that. But it is demonstrably true that too many of our best public officials are chewing up their lives and those of their families on matters that will seem trivial just weeks or months or years from now. By running themselves ragged on a series of marginal, short-run issues and problems, they are failing to anticipate potential problems, design creative approaches, and help define a new vision for America.

The Role of the American Intellectual Community in Redefining Our National Purpose

by Patricia Harris

This address was the 1979 Pollak Lecture, delivered in May in the Forum. Patricia Harris was then U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

My purpose tonight is to explore with you what ought to be done to begin again the debate which can help to restore a sense of national purpose
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and commitment to American public life. It is a confusing period to analyze
and a difficult one to forecast. The general public appears simultaneously to
be apathetic and demanding; bored and rebellious; free spending and par­
simonious. To compound the problem, those to whom we would look to find
a better understanding of what is going on around us seem not so much
disillusioned by recent events as shell-shocked by them. As a result, there is
no one urging the setting of standards, carrying arguments forward, criticiz­
ing conclusions, and formulating principles for national action.

During previous periods of dynamic and sweeping innovation in public
policy, it was not the political leadership which developed the new ideas and
new approaches. The theories and the concepts on which innovative political
action was based first came to life in the academic and intellectual communi­
ty. There is no escaping the conclusion that the intellectual must be the idea
initiator in any society. Politicians and the press may give the ideas currency,
but today’s public life makes it clear that neither creates new ideas or new
relationships between ideas. Politicians, like academic and intellectual
generals, tend to fight the battles of today with strategies and tactics of
yesterday’s war. The pressures of political life leave little time for study,
reflection, research. Public officials must be able to turn to those in the in­
tellectual community to replenish their reservoir of ideas, strategies, and con­
cepts. If they cannot, then a critical part of the system has failed. Deprived
of intellectual fertilization, the political community and political leadership
become weak, anemic, and ineffectual.

Hofstadter in Anti-Intellectualism in American Life describes the in­
tellectual role as one of “piety.” He goes on to say, “the intellectual is
engaged—he is pledged, committed, enlisted. What everyone else is willing to
admit, namely that ideas and abstractions are of signal importance in human
life, he imperatively feels.” How different is the intellectual role today. In­
tellectuals, first of all, found out that Harold Lasswell was right and that
politics is a matter of who gets what, when, and how. The result was that
many intellectuals used that knowledge to rush to the fonts of power, belly­
ing up to the bar so that every President, every Governor and now every
mayor is very likely to have his or her choice of academicians for positions
once reserved for the hard-bitten party faithful. In fact, many of us quickly
became the party faithful out of a belief that we could change the system.
What alarms me now is that sector of the intellectual community that has stayed in the political forum to urge the dismantling of the programs for the disadvantaged because of alleged failures, without assuming responsibility for developing alternative policies. Furthermore, the positive vision of public authority carrying out its essential role in improving the lives of all our citizens has been seriously eroded by the notion, so popular today, that all government is an evil force that must be reduced to the smallest possible proportions if American citizens are to secure the well-being they seek. This position is as dangerous and as simple-minded as that which could commend all control to government. There are twenty-seven million Americans who live in poverty and need help from someone. There are millions of brown and black Americans who cannot live or work where they choose because of the continuing barriers of racism. The only source of aid is that collective source by which we pool our resources and maximize our aid—government.

* * *

Considering the events of the past fifteen years—the assassinations of charismatic leaders, violent urban unrest, and involvement in Southeast Asia and the abominations of Watergate—it is no surprise that the American public is angry, confused, and without a sense of vital purpose. The American sense of place in the world has been altered by these events, and we sorely need a thoughtful analysis of whether we do have basic values and goals. As a nation it is the role of the intellectual to begin the analysis and to lead the debate that must take place.

Once the debate begins, the intellectual community must stay in the debate for the long haul. Intellectual engagement has to be more than episodic. Boredom is a luxury that must be foregone. The best example of episodic involvement and intellectual boredom with an important public policy issue is perhaps manifested by the War on Poverty experience. In no small way, the American intellectual community contributed to the initiatives that became the War on Poverty, and President Johnson eagerly assumed the challenge offered by the intellectual opinion makers of his time to eliminate poverty in his lifetime. But the modest efforts were judged a failure in a distressingly short period of time. We are all aware of the ubiquitous TV commercial that reminds us that it took Beethoven four years to write his fifth symphony. For that matter, it took Brahms twenty to write his first. I have often wondered why the many who accept the reality that artistic endeavors may take years or decades to evolve manage to find it possible to
condemn and reject a social program if it fails to accomplish the impossible within the term of one Administration. Quite frankly, I am appalled by those who demand so much and retreat so quickly to boredom or hostility when results are not immediately apparent. The plain facts are that the most troubling problems facing this society will take more than a quick fix or a four-year plan to turn around. What we must prepare ourselves for is a much longer and more constant struggle for change.

The long haul approach also carries with it a certain caution about raising expectations for social change. It requires us to understand that society's victims may not love us for caring, or trying, or even for succeeding. If gratitude of the victims is required for satisfaction, then we will be disappointed. But in the past, the lack of a requirement for gratitude distinguished the committed intellectual from Lady Bountiful. I am not saying think small. I am saying don't oversell and don't expect the reward of gratitude . . .

Someone once asked Gandhi what he feared the most. He replied, "The hardness of heart of the educated." If anything frightens me, it is the faintness of heart of the educated. I am not saying that our teachers, scholars and researchers, our writers of essays, novels and editorials, and the members of the learned professions have no heart in the sense of lacking sympathy for this suffering world, but that America's intellectuals lack mettle and are refusing to assume their proper role in the unfinished struggle to make this a truly just society. American intellectuals must resume their historic role of not only describing objective phenomena, but also of defining aspirations which may be legitimately embraced by the American people.
The Personal Side of the Institute

A dedication address
by Edward Kennedy

*Senator Edward Kennedy, Senior Advisory Committee member, spoke at the dedication of the John F. Kennedy School of Government building, October 20, 1978.*

The Institute of Politics will be a magnet between the University and elective office. In its eleven years of life, the Institute has gone well beyond its original purpose of linking the world of ideas and practical political action. It has become one of the most active, vital, and exciting parts of Harvard, and its presence is felt around the country. Of all the programs of the Institute, its student program would have been especially close to President Kennedy's heart. May it have as lasting an impact on those who take part in it as it has had on those who have watched it grow.

In all its exciting programs and new surroundings, we have confidence that the School of Government will prosper. But to live up to both its name and mission, it need not try to rival the other schools of the university in size. The Kennedy School is part of a great university whose historic motto and purpose is the objective search for truth, *Veritas*, truth not beholden to any political viewpoint, economic interest, or segment of society. Its independence is the most precious asset of the School. The quest for excellence in government or any other human endeavor will tolerate no compromise of this principle.

For all the Kennedys here, it is an honor to be part of this beginning. We were proud of him. And the four Kennedys no longer with us—our father and Joe and Kathleen and Bob—would have shared our pride on this very happy day. On that other beginning, in 1961, my brother said, in words applicable as well today:

*All this will not be finished in the first one hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first one thousand days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet.*

Now at last Jack has come back to Harvard. The work goes on. The dream still lives. The flame may flicker, but it shall never die.
An evaluation of summer research
by Jean Koh

Jean Koh received a Summer Research Award in 1977 to explore the U.S. security commitment to the Republic of Korea.

In general, what could have been the program's greatest disadvantage seemed to me its greatest asset: the independence I felt at every stage of the preparation and execution of the research this summer and which I still feel as I attempt to write the "synthesis" of the research this fall. Part of this independence was imposed by the program—the application which requested only a "description of summer work," the absence of summertime reports or check-ins, the request only for a copy of the finished paper at the end. And the most immediate consequence of such independence was frustration—at groping in the dark, at wondering what was "expected," at not knowing what I in fact wanted or intended. I'll never forget the despair of one night last February as I tossed draft after draft into the wastebasket, finally concluding that not even I was convinced by the projected vague and undirected research on "something related to Korea." Nor, then again, will I ever forget the peaceful feeling with which I submitted the proposal some weeks later, thirteen pages which, I felt, sketched more of a part of myself that I had never seen or described before.

In Washington, the sense of being left alone produced both exhilaration at the constant barrage of new experiences and the nagging awareness of precious time racing away. I appreciated most the flexibility of my work hours and the freedom of direction and focus, though more than a few times I longed for a 9-to-5 job and the chance to feel part of something greater than this dubious plan of my own making. The other independence, not specifically imposed by the program itself, was of a more precious and undefinable nature: the sense of impressions absorbed, ideas incubated and refined or rejected. It is about this independence of impressions that I have the most extreme feelings. As they are inarticulable, they are almost universally useless, but as they have affected my way of thinking and perceiving in a basic and intangible way, they are, to me, infinitely valuable.

As I wrote in my proposal last February, I hope to follow up my Washington research next summer with similar interviews in Seoul and Tokyo. I hope eventually to continue to write about U.S.-East Asian relations and pursue our family dream of promoting greater understanding between the East and West. Whatever course my future work may take, this
summer's experience will shine in my memory as an outstanding personal education. For the support, the opportunity, the revelations, the unanswered questions, the frustration and the sheer joy, I am to the Institute most truly grateful.

A resignation speech
by Nina Dayton

Nina Dayton '79 served as chairperson of the Student Advisory Committee in Spring 1978.

I am asking for your time this evening because I wanted the chance to explain to you why I resigned this week from the Student Advisory Committee. You should not think of my resignation as an unfortunate or impetuous action; I apologize that my speaking to you about it coincides with an evening of elections when there is inevitably some tension in the air.

I am not one to give up when discouraged. I resigned because I saw both small and deep, both specific and intangible problems that students at the Institute must tackle in the coming months, and I realized that I could not with fairness to either you or myself expect to continue serving on this committee and exerting the energy required to construct remedies.

I see one of the general problems as the prevalent situation that we are simply going through the motions of putting on programs. The staff could put on our existing programs, and in many ways they do: they certainly clean up and catch our mistakes and gaps. There are some clear indications that we recently have failed to act on the visible and invisible obligations and opportunities of SAC membership. Resident Fellows: we chide ourselves at the end of each semester that we did not get to know the individual Fellows well enough, that we gave them very little of our individual time, that we failed to connect them with personal friends and other students interested in their fields. We always say that it was a "good group," yet we cringe from acknowledging Dick Sneider's point that the Fellows earnestly deliver their "side of the bargain" while the students fail to give back. Study Groups: A most striking example of our failure to respond in programs to political issues hot on the campus was our emergence from the Fall study group selection process without a group on South Africa. We stress our (potentially) educative role regarding U.S. involvement in South Africa, but we ignore
how we might with ease implement that role through our strongest program, the one with the greatest immediate impact. Relationship with the Student Community: Do we as an everyday part of our SAC membership seek out ideas of friends, classmates, roommates for Institute programs, topics, or innovations? Do we judiciously seek their involvement and comment on our programs? In other words, do we establish, and feel the natural obligation to establish, a continuous feedback with the students we are part of and seek to serve?

The SAC does not exist separately from the Institute. I will not make the technical criticism that this committee is a self-perpetuating body, but I would venture to say that it seems to have great trouble avoiding being a self-justifying body. That state is difficult to ward off once existing procedures and bureaucracy accumulate. If we are merely going through the motions, if we are mouthing old SAC principles, if we are lacking in creative use of the community’s resources, if we are failing to bring ideas into play to tackle the contemporary tasks before the Committee and the Institute, then it is because something fundamental is lacking in our approach to our membership on the SAC and our commitment to this special institution—a sense of service perhaps, a sense of mutuality and respect, a conviction that we are here to serve others than ourselves.

A report to the Senior Advisory Committee
by Tamera Stanton

Tamera Stanton ’79 served as chairperson for the New Projects Subcommittee in Spring 1978.

When I was talking to a few members of the Student Advisory Committee about my summer job in Washington, I joked about how my three years of countless hours at the Institute had finally paid off. As a student blessed with her normal tenure of term papers and tutorials, I was certainly prepared like all other interns in Washington to do research and provide other basic “services” for my employers. But unlike most of the students with summer positions in Washington offices, I was endowed with a rather rich past of helping out in organizing conferences, coordinating volunteers, publicizing activities, and planning everything from “strategy” meetings to major public events.
The SAC's reports each year to the Senior Advisory Committee concentrate on telling you how our programs continue to be successful in responding to student interest on campus and in providing new opportunities for students to learn about the real world of politics and government. But what I think is also significant to portray to you, beyond the continuing growth of our audience and the quality of our activities, is how the Institute fills a gap at Harvard in providing a program that is constantly training students in a wide range of organizational and administrative skills. Of course, there are many student groups here at Harvard which involve its members in basic planning, coordination, and related tasks—but the Institute, as a program with a professional staff, a structure designed to respond to student interest and initiative, and its wide range of projects and wealth of resources, offers many students a unique, ongoing opportunity at Harvard to get some superior and rather enjoyable training in the kinds of skill so valuable outside of school.

I hope that our broadening horizons and growing attention will never result in transforming this informal, often creative process at the Institute into any sort of pre-career training ground for bureaucrats. After three years of observing the capacity of the SAC and the Institute to take on new ideas and approaches—and to attract the time and energy from students required to make all of these programs successful and worthwhile—I don't foresee any such risk.

A fellowship evaluation
by Edward Pattison

Edward Pattison, former U.S. Congressman, was an Institute Fellow in Spring 1979.

The last six months have been a time of great personal discontinuity for me. As could be predicted, it has been a time characterized by intense questioning, discomfort, and confusion. I think that I will look back at it as a time of personal and intellectual growth, but that is not totally clear at this moment.

Up to November 1978, my life had been almost one continuum of active involvement in a variety of enterprises that constantly absorbed all my energies. As I look back, it is clear that most of those activities were externally generated. Providing for a family, establishing a law practice, becoming a member of a community by involvement in civic, social, and political
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matters, and serving as a Congressman for the past four years have all made for an exciting, satisfying, and very full life. There were always tasks to perform. The "in" box was always well-stocked, and there was a good mix of demands, not dominated either by career, politics, home and family, or social activities. All had their place, and except for the four Congressional years when that position and its duties were almost all-consuming of my time, I never felt that any one aspect of my life dominated the others.

All at once, I found myself out of the job that had become the central focus and purpose of my life. At the same time, my four children were suddenly grown up and living their own lives away from home; my wife had established her own very significant role in the movement concerned with the treatment and care of the retarded (she is currently the president of the New York State Association for the Retarded); and I was forty-seven years old, with no debts, no obligations, and no pressing material needs.

My idea in accepting the fellowship was that I needed time to reflect on my life, to plan for my future, and to sort out and organize my own conflicting instincts and views as they related to various and confusing cross-currents in today's society. I probably could have done that at home in my second floor office. But it is unlikely that I would have. The fellowship gave an important legitimacy to my goals. It's one thing to sit around, read, and converse at an academic institution. That's what those types are supposed to do. It's quite another to sit around home doing the same thing; that would be considered unbalanced, not only by the public and friends, but also by your family and yourself.

My point is that the fellowship provides a very important, acceptable, and legitimate activity for the politician in transition, especially to one who has been discarded by the electorate. Whether that translates into a benefit for the Kennedy School, the students, or the society is both debatable and, in any event, probably not provable in any usual sense of that term. It is most assuredly a benefit and an opportunity to the Fellow, at least one in my circumstances.

* * *

My study group was a mixture of success and disappointment. The longer I was in the Congress, the more concerned I became about that body's inability to deal with issues other than those of immediate concern, usually triggered by some crisis. At the end of my first year, I became involved with a group of members in the creation of the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future. My study group subject was an attempt on my part to continue my own examinations into the future impact of developing and existing
technology on our society and culture. Preparation for the study group sessions required that I do a great deal of reading on the subject. That was very useful to me. But by its nature as an extra-curricular course, the students cannot be expected to do the same. Basically, study group members come to listen and to learn in a non-rigorous way. Thus the device of having a string of interesting guests is the most successful from the students' standpoint. It was not what I had in mind for my own purposes, so I only had three visitors. Although I maintained a steady audience of about fifteen students, I have the sense that at times the sessions were not up to either my or the students' expectations. On many occasions the sessions went extremely well, so it was a mixed picture.

The collegiality of the Fellows was excellent. We all seemed to get on well from the outset. Our discussions at odd moments during the day, at the Wednesday luncheons, and at various functions were as important a part of my fellowship as any other feature. There were many instances where other Fellows helped me out in my approach to my study group, in my sorting out my own thinking on issues, and in a number of other ways. I believe that we developed mutual respect and friendships with each other. The key factor in this respect is physical presence at the Institute. If a group sense is thought to be valuable (I suspect that it is), then the importance of a reasonably sustained presence at the Institute should be stressed to future Fellows.

A fellowship evaluation
by Martin Nolan

Martin Nolan, Washington Bureau Chief of the Boston Globe, was an Institute Fellow in Fall 1977 and Spring 1978.

I'm not sure how much the students got out of it, but my study group, "The Anthropology of the Washington Press Corps: A Dadaist View," was one of the most intellectually enriching experiences of my young and boyish life. I rather think the students did get something out of it. Several wrote papers for their real classes that drew upon the study group, papers I was able to help them with. One pre-med student told me that he had no career goals in mind, but that "your course will help me to read a newspaper better for the rest of my life." A subversive thought, perhaps, but I'll take it.
We started out with about forty students, "media" being a talismanically hot topic, and the numbers stayed fairly constant, rising or falling with the notoriety of the guests. Guests were easy to get. They can dine out for weeks by clearing their throat and saying "When I was lecturing up at Harvard recently . . ." Guests are sometimes too easy to get. I had to dust off a couple of putative Presidents of these United States who sought a crimson soapbox.

The students were a little intimidated at first, but that's OK. They should be. I tried to divide each two-hour session into thirds. I or the guest would talk, then the students would ask questions, then I or we would ask them questions, Socratically drawing out the less assertive study group members. It seemed to work, and I especially enjoyed seeing the quieter students stick to the end.

So it wasn't for credit. That's fine with me. I don't have the tools of tenure, and besides, this Institute's function is more intellectual than academic—a crucial distinction. Harvard can afford at least one place where undergraduates can painlessly pursue the life of the mind without boarding the treadmill of academic bureaucracies.

* * *

I read lots of books, stained much paper, and it still may not be any good, but if my book is lacking in erudition or relevance it won't be Harvard's fault. When I found myself in the catacombs of Widener, twice cursing my inability to read German, I figured I must be doing something right. That Widener pass was a magic key to a mid-career's candy store.

Harvard is a marvelously unfinished place. To know that at the beginning and to have it reinforced at the end is the beginning of some wisdom. For the hyper-motivated and even for the eagerly indolent, the opportunities are here.

I remember when my saloon buddies predicted that I would be corrupted by Harvard. "Don't worry about me," sez I, "for I won't be changed by Harvard." But I did hope—in however small or imperceptible measure—to "corrupt," i.e. change, Harvard. I expect a larger and more substantial change when the Institute moves on in its earnest and cheerful corruption of Harvard.
A public address
by Dan Rather

Dan Rather, CBS news correspondent, spoke in the Forum in April 1979.

I am indebted to you for not only not dwelling upon but not even mentioning the fact that I'm a graduate of Sam Houston State Teacher's College in Huntsville, Texas. While those of us who went there know it to be the Harvard of our part of the world, we're perfectly aware that an awful lot of people this far North never heard of the damn place. Let me say parenthetically that I came up in a time and place where, although it may sound strange to you, my father was not at all convinced it was a good idea that I go to college. Once he became convinced that I was determined to go, and was indeed going to go, among the last things he said to me was: "Listen, when you get up there, you don't go around telling people where you're from. If they're from Texas, they'll be quick to tell you, and if they aren't, don't embarrass them."

It might be of some value to me in my ability to keep my footing here this evening, and sort of get myself comfortable up here, that I went to Sam Houston State Teacher's College on a football scholarship. Now keep in mind, if you will, that every young, able-bodied man in Texas is raised with the idea that he absolutely must be a football hero; it's not a matter of choice. If you are able-bodied, it is assumed that you will aspire to be and that you indeed will be a Doak Walker, or Earl Campbell, or some other legendary football hero, and I came out of that environment. I played football in high school, as everyone able-bodied did, and I wound up with this scholarship to Sam Houston State Teacher's College. Now as I go through this yarn, it would help some if you would understand that I played in the first college football game I ever saw—this was in pre-television days—and that a scholarship to Sam Houston State Teacher's College then and now is not exactly what you perceive a scholarship to be at one of our larger football factories (the University of Texas or Texas A&M).

The afternoon came in which it was to be decided whether or not I kept this "scholarship," and I thought it would determine whether or not I stayed in college for the rest of my days. The coach's acid test—what coaches call the "gut check," to see whether you're going to make this scholarship or not—was to stick you out there an entire afternoon running one power sweep after another in your direction. Basically, they'd give the ball to one of their people and run all their other people at you to try to knock you out of the
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way. When my afternoon of testing came, I was determined to play good defense, though I never had played much defense at all before. On the first couple of plays I did fairly well, but after about three plays I found myself being knocked off the field, and pretty soon I was retreating past the cinder track that ran around the field. After about twenty plays I was retreating over the coxwire fence and into the next county. It was pretty obvious that I had not done well, and when it was over, I had my head down, and the coach came up to me and said, “Young fellow, we watched you out there this afternoon. It must be as obvious to you as it is to us that you’re not going to make our ball club and that you’ll be off scholarship as of this evening. You can turn in your stuff, but I want to tell you something that I hope will stick with you the rest of your life, because if it does, it will be of no small value to you—and that is, you’re little, and damn it, boy, you’re yellow.” Which you have to know is about the way I feel coming to an institution as this before a group such as this and being introduced with those lovely remarks about being an outstanding analyst of the American political scene and all of those other heavy things.
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Paul Leiby, "Balancing Domestic and Foreign Affairs Considerations When Formulating Nuclear Energy Policy: Focus on Issue of Plutonium"
Edward Mansfield, "Congressional Committee Influence on Goal-Setting in the Federal Regulatory Agency"
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Stephen Herzenberg and William Schwartz, "Political Factors Leading to the Success or Failure of QWL (Quality of Work Life) Experiments"
Kevin McFarren, "Third and Fourth Political Parties in Stark County, Ohio, 1900-1924"
Dorien Nunez, "Redlining: Causes, Effects, Solutions"
David Otto, "Researching the Washington State Juvenile Criminal Code"
Eva Plaza, "Institutionalized Groups in the Mexican Illegal Immigration Problem"
Nancy Rose, "Deregulation: A Political Case Study"
Holly Sargent, "Developing Corrections Policy for Women in the Maine Criminal Justice System"
Corey Stone, "Control of Capital by Community Development Corporations"
Nina Vogelfanger, "Federal Desegregation Policy, Local Politics and the Fate of Restricted Admission in Academic Public High Schools"
Kathryn Zoglin, "Women and Power in American Politics"
Public Affairs Internships

Listings of summer jobs in the public sector are on file at the Institute and available to all Harvard University students.

Those students who received Institute grants in support of summer internships have included:

**Summer 1977**

Bruce Anderson, *Intergovernmental Liaison Officer, Mayor A.J. Cooper, Jr., Prichard, Alabama*

Gerald Birchette, *Research Assistant, Common Cause, Washington, D.C.*

Patricia Breault, *Legislative Research, State Representative John Cusack, Committee on Urban Affairs, Boston, Massachusetts*

Kathleen Bybee, *Legislative Aide, Congressman Dan Marriott, Washington, D.C.*

Adela Cepeda, *Citizen Advocate, Nassau County Law Service Committee, Inc., Hempstead, New York*


Andrew Demars, *Research Assistant, New Directions, Washington, D.C.*

Kathryn Edmundson, *Intern, Governmental Affairs Office of the National Association for Retarded Citizens, Washington, D.C.*

Elizabeth Goss, *Intern in Governor David Pryor’s Office, Little Rock, Arkansas*

Andre Guevorguian, *Assistant to the Director of Soviet Union Affairs, Bureau of European Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.*

Catherine James, *Research Assistant, Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.*

Steven Levine, *Research Assistant, Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs, Division of Social and Economic Opportunity, Boston, Massachusetts*

Eugene Matthews, *Legislative Assistant, Congressman Mark Marks, Washington, D.C.*

Charles McNew, *Administrative Aide, City Manager Wendell White, Hampton, Virginia*

G. Cameron Nixon, *Staff Researcher, The Governor’s Commission to Study the Election Process, Providence, Rhode Island*

Victoria Rideout, *Administrative Assistant, State Representative Mel King, Boston, Massachusetts*
Beth Rothbell, Intern, Bureau for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.
Steven Seidenberg, Assistant to Director of Licensing and Registration, Office of Secretary of State, Montpelier, Vermont
Hannah Shore, Member of Legislative Task Force, National Organization for Women, Cambridge, Massachusetts
James Smith, Jr., Staff Assistant, Mayor Steven Means, Gadsden, Alabama

Summer 1978
Michelle Brewer, Staff Assistant, National Urban League, New York City, New York
Michael Calabrese, Writer-Researcher, Congress Watch, Washington, D.C.
Susan Chira, Intern, Congressman Richard Ottinger, Washington, D.C.
Nicholas Christakes, Intern, Senator John Culver, Washington, D.C.
Patrick Fisher, Administrative Assistant, Kentucky Fiscal Court, Campbell County, Kentucky
Dennis Henderson, Administrative Assistant, Mayor's Commission on Fair Housing, Lima, Ohio
Paul Johnson, Intern, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.
Marcia Kadanoff, Administrative Assistant, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Washington, D.C.
Diane Kenny, Administrative Assistant, Town House Annex, Bedford Hills, New York
Alison Lueders, Intern, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.
Alice Miller, Assistant Researcher, Connecticut Department of Correction, Hartford, Connecticut
Anna Ochoa, Administrative Assistant, Mayor James Deyo, Yuma, Arizona
Eric Rakowski, Intern, Department of State, Washington, D.C.
David Schele, Intern, Representative Mel King/Boston Urban Gardeners, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts
Mark Smith, Legislative Assistant, Congressman Clarence Long, Washington, D.C.
Laurine Tuleja, Student Representative, Suffolk County Legislature, Suffolk County, New York
Winona Westigard, Investigative Intern, National Indian Youth Council, New York City, New York
Summer 1979

Debra Alligood, Research Intern, National Center on Voluntary Action, Washington, D.C.

Delma Bruussard, Intern for Prevention Planning, Health Planning Council, Boston, Massachusetts

Shana Chung, Legislative Assistant, State Representative Walter Bickford, Boston, Massachusetts

John Clark, Intern, Congressman Tom Harkin, Washington, D.C.

Susan Goodkin, Supervisor, Federal and State Legislative Coordinating Committee, Citizens for Participation in Political Action, Boston, Massachusetts

Lon Hatamiya, Intern, State Senator John Garumendi, Sacramento, California

Margaret Hoffman, Intern, Senator Jim Sasser, Washington, D.C.

Jeffrey Horwitz, Researcher, Chief of Housing, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, D.C.

Abraham Hutt, Criminal Investigator, Public Defender's Office, Denver, Colorado

Steven Irwin, Intern, Attorney General's Office, Tallahassee, Florida

Douglas Kruse, Researcher, State Senator Don Wesley, Lincoln, Nebraska

Andrew Low, Intern, Representative Michael Barrett, Boston, Massachusetts

Brian Mitchell, Eisenhower Research Intern, Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C.

Carlos Narvaez, Research Assistant, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.

John Nichols, Intern, Women's Equity Action League, Washington, D.C.


Alenia Sammy, Urban Renewal Coordinator Assistant, Department of Community Affairs, Boston, Massachusetts

Justo Sanchez, Intern, Congressman Claude Pepper, Washington, D.C.

James Scopa, Intern, Congressman Robert Drinan, Washington, D.C.

Eric Soto, Intern, Assemblyman Jose E. Serrano, Bronx, New York

Alan Wachman, Intern, Senator Paul Tsongas, Washington, D.C.

Michele Wheeler, Intern, Common Cause, Boston, Massachusetts
Seminars on job hunting in the public sector have included:

December 6, 1977
Lawrence DiCara, Boston City Councilman
Joseph Grandmaison, Federal Co-chairman, New England Regional Commission
Douglas Husid, Staff Assistant, Massachusetts House of Representatives

March 21, 1978
Barry Direnfeld, Chief Legislative Council, U.S. Senator Howard Metzenbaum
Terry Goggin, California Assemblyman
Jane Pierson McMichael, Executive Director, National Women's Political Caucus

December 5, 1978
Richard Howard, Public Sector Job Counselor, Harvard Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning
Gerald Mechling, Director of Management and Budget, City of Boston
Kim Skerritt, former Assistant Secretary of State of Oregon
Peter Zimmerman, Assistant Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government

March 13, 1979
Bruce Adams, Director of Issue Development, Common Cause
Richard Howard
Evelyn Murphy, former Secretary of Environmental Affairs of Massachusetts
Edward Pattison, former U.S. Congressman (D-New York)

The Summer-in-Washington Program, administered by Dan Paller (1977), Alice Randall (1978), and Ethan Burger (1979) for Harvard University students who hold summer jobs in Washington, D.C., has included—among others—the following activities:

- Discussions with:
  David Broder, Associate Editor, Washington Post
  Sam Brown, Director, ACTION
  Joan Claybrook, Assistant Secretary of Transportation
  Barbara Cohen, News Editor, Washington Star
  David Cohen, President, Common Cause
  Theodore Cron, Director of the Consumer Education Program, Federal Trade Commission
Thomas Dine, Director of National Security, Senate Budget Committee
Joseph Duffey, Director, National Endowment for the Humanities
Charles Ferris, General Counsel to Speaker O'Neill
Carol Forman, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture
Sandy Gottlieb, former Director, Citizens for a Sane Society
Meg Greenfield, Columnist, Washington Post
Max Kampelman, Attorney
Stanley Karnow, Syndicated columnist
Maurice Katz, Special Assistant, Energy Research and Development Agency
David Keene, former Southern States Campaign Coordinator in the Reagan Presidential campaign
Edward M. Kennedy, U.S. Senator (D-Massachusetts)
James King, former Special Assistant to the President for Personnel
Simon Lazuras, White House Domestic Staff
Alice Rivlin, Director of Congressional Budget Office
Donald Sole, South African Ambassador to the U.S.
Mark Talisman, former Administrative Assistant to Congressman Vanik
Jack Watson, former Director of the Presidential Transition Team and Presidential Assistant
Anne Wexler, Special Assistant to the President
Byron R. White, Supreme Court Justice
Lester Wolff, U.S. Congressman (D-New York)

and representatives from ABC, the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, the Committee on the Present Danger, the Department of State, the Equal Rights Amendment movement, the European Economic Community, the National Rifle Association, and the Egyptian, Rhodesian, and Soviet embassies.

• Career information sessions on consulting, the Foreign Service, journalism, lobbying, and Congressional staff work

• Special tours of the Capitol (with Elliot Carroll, Executive Assistant to the Architect), Dumbarton Oaks, the East Wing of the National Gallery, the Hirshorn Museum, the Library of Congress, and the Washington Post

• Receptions at the Capitol (sponsored by the Harvard Club of Washington) and at the home of Elliot Richardson, softball games, and other social and athletic programs
Harvard Political Review

Officers of the Harvard Political Review, a quarterly journal of political analysis sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, were:

Kathryn Abrams, Book Review Editor, Spring-Fall 1978; Managing Editor, Spring 1979
Linda Bilmes, General Manager, Spring-Fall 1978; President, Spring 1979
Marilyn Booth, Associate Editor, Fall 1977; Senior Editor, Spring 1978
Michael Cercone, President, Spring-Fall 1978; Senior Editor, Spring 1979
Elena Cohen, Associate Editor, Spring-Fall 1978; Senior Editor, Spring 1979
Bernadette Drankowski, General Manager, Spring 1979
Martha Gershun, President, Fall 1977; Senior Editor, Spring 1978
Alexander Kaplan, Book Review Editor, Spring 1979
Thomas Mangold, Business Manager, Spring 1979
Betsy Owens, Associate Editor, Spring 1979
Tony Perez, Associate Editor, Spring 1979
Daniel Poneman, Associate Editor, Fall 1977; Senior Editor, Spring 1978
Dani Rodrik, Senior Editor, Spring 1979
Federico Salas, Editor, Fall 1977
James Scopa, Associate Editor, Spring-Fall 1978; Editor-in-chief, Spring 1979
Scott Starbird, Book Review Editor, Fall 1977; Editor, Spring-Fall 1978; Senior Editor, Spring 1979
Lou Tripoli, Graphics Editor, Fall 1978 and Spring 1979
Bradford Westerfield, Business Manager, Fall 1977
Kathryn Zoglin, Business Manager, Spring-Fall 1978

The following is a list of the articles appearing in the HPR.

Volume VI Number 1
"Dissecting the Health Care Beast," Stanley Hwang
"The Draft Redrafted," Scott Starbird
"Election Reform: Two Views," Martha Gershun and Christopher Ball
"Genes in the Crossfire," Kathryn Abrams
"To Have, Have Not—and Have More," Federico Salas

Volume VI Number 2
"Equal Times for Equal Crimes," Elena Cohen
"Israel: Inequality Behind the Law," Marilyn Booth
“A Stormy Year for Labor,” Alan Albert
“Swine Flu: The Effect of Failure,” Xandra Kayden

Volume VI Number 3
“Fear and Loathing at U.S. Steel,” Terrence Danysh
“The King is Dead, Long Live the King,” William Mayer
“The Northeast Strikes Below the Belt,” Graham Gardner
“Peking’s Third World Connection,” Dani Rodrik
“Separating the Facts from the News,” Raymond Price
“Small Is Not So Beautiful Anymore,” Linda Bilmes
“Spanish Communism: Reform or Revolution?” Richard Valelly
“Supreme Court: Tilting the Balance,” Diana Shaw

Volume VI Number 4
“American Education in Distress: Where to Now?” David DeSimone
“Development, Military Style,” John Hedges
“Getting Into Politics: Some Experts Tell How and Why,” Jack Walsh, Genevieve Atwood, Anne Armstrong, and Midge Costanza
“The Great California Tax Revolt: Reform or Revolution?” Linda Bilmes
“New York, Decline, and Cosmopolitan Liberalism,” Bernard Gifford
“Primary Reform: Procedure or Power?” Christopher Ball
“Putting Up with Nazi Nausea,” Diana Shaw

Volume VII Number 1
“Franco’s Delinquent Heir Rebuilds Democracy,” Susan Rolfe
“Group Grope in Southeast Asia,” John Hedges
“Juvenile Injustice,” Diana Shaw
“Potomac Fever Hits the GOP,” Alan Albert, David Worlet, and William Mayer
“A Press for Unfettered Freedom,” Elena Cohen
“Separatism: Canada’s Contagion,” John Weston

Volume VII Number 2
“The Civil Service Is Born Again,” Linda Bilmes
“Crying Wolf: A Response to British Fascism,” Elisabeth Clemens
“Education on ‘Easy Monthly Payments’,” James Scopa
“Perspectives on Full Employment,” David DeSimone and Jeff Goodwin
“Tough Choices for Teheran,” Tony Perez

Volume VII Number 3
“Congress Doesn’t Live Here Anymore,” Linda Bilmes
“Freshmen in the House,” Freshman Congresspersons Vic Fazio,
Geraldine Ferraro, and William Dannemeyer
"Good Resources Make Good Neighbors," Federico Salas
"Imperfect Information and Arms Control," Steven Durlauf
"Warnke on U.S. Security Concerns" (an HPR interview with Paul Warnke)

New Projects

All New Projects events of Fall 1978 and Spring 1979 were held in the Forum of the new John F. Kennedy School of Government building.

A conference on "Blacks and the American Political Process: Perspectives for the 1970's and 1980's," October 29, 1977. Participants in the three panels were:

"Blacks and the Judicial Process"
Jane C. Edmonds, Chairperson, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination
C. Clyde Ferguson, Professor, Harvard Law School
George N. Leighton, U.S. District Court Judge, Northern District of Illinois
Constance Baker Motley, U.S. District Court Judge, New York
Edward W. Norton, Deputy General Counsel, HUD
Moderator: J. Anthony Lukas, Journalist; author of Nightmare

"Blacks and the Electoral Process"
Audrey Rowe Colom, Director of Women's Activities, Corporation for Public Broadcasting; formerly Chair, National Women's Political Caucus
Martin L. Kilson, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Basil A. Paterson, Director, Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution; formerly Vice Chairman, Democratic National Committee
William Schreiber, U.S. Commissioner of International Boundaries; formerly Marion County (Indiana) Democratic Chairman and member of the Board of Voter Registration
Robert L. Wright, City Councilman, Columbus, Georgia
Moderator: Badi G. Foster, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics

"Blacks and Public Policy"
Richard Freeman, Associate Professor of Economics, Harvard University
Kenneth A. Gibson, Mayor of Newark, New Jersey
Adam Herbert, Director of Research, Joint Center for Political Studies
Carl McCorden, Budget Analyst, U.S. Congressional Budget Office
Ronald W. Walters, Director, Institute for Urban Affairs and Research, Howard University
Moderator: Thomas C. Holt, Associate Professor of Afro-American Studies and History, Harvard University


The conference was co-sponsored by the Institute, the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard W.E.B. DuBois Institute for Afro-American Research, Harvard-Radcliffe Black Students Association, and Harvard Black Law Students Association.

A conference on "Planning for Alternative Futures: The Role of Government and Citizens," December 3, 1977. For the morning session, Craig Decker designed a "Public Technology Assessment Game." Alvin Toffier, author of Future Shock, delivered the keynote address. The afternoon panel was comprised of:

Clement Bezold, Director, Institute of Alternative Futures, Antioch College
Frank Keefe, Director of State Planning, Massachusetts
Paul Sarbanes, U.S. Senator (D-Maryland)
Peter Szanton, Associate Director for Organization Studies, Office of Management and Budget
Alvin Toffler
Moderator: Harrison Stevens, President, Participation Systems, Inc.

A debate between Massachusetts gubernatorial contestants Edward J. King and Francis W. Hatch, October 23, 1978

A speech by John Sears, candidate for Massachusetts Secretary of State, October 29, 1978.
The Student Program

An election night video display, November 7, 1978. Coverage was followed by commentary offered by:

Skinner Donahue, New England Regional Director, Democratic National Committee
Thomas Joyce, Political consultant
Paul Nace, Political consultant
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University

A panel discussion on "Campaign '78: Post-election Analysis," November 20, 1978. Participants were:

John Anderson, U.S. Representative (R-Illinois)
Evan Dobelle, Treasurer, Democratic National Committee
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University
Jules Witcover, Syndicated columnist, Washington Star

A panel discussion on "South Africa: The Economic Sanction Question," November 29, 1978. Participants were:

Leslie DeVilliers, South African investment banker
Roger Fisher, Professor, Harvard Law School
Kallu-Kalumiya, Doctoral researcher, Harvard Law School
Themba Villkazi, African National Council
Moderator: Luther Ragin, Student, Harvard Law School

A conference on "The Supreme Court of the '70s: The Contemporary Court on Trial," March 17, 1979. Participants in the two panels were:

"Fair Trial v. Free Press"
Jeanne Baker, Attorney, Cambridge
Robert Bonin, former Chief Justice, Massachusetts Superior Court
Myron Farber, Journalist, New York Times

"Bakke and the Future of Affirmative Action"
Thomas Atkins, President, Boston chapter of the NAACP
Kenneth Clark, Psychologist
Martin Kilson, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Robert Segal, Chief Counsel, Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO
The Student Program

A conference on "Perspectives on South Africa," April 14, 1979. Participants in the three panels were:

"Internal Political Dynamics"
Jeffrey Butler, Professor, Wesleyan University
John Chettle, South Africa Foundation
Bojie Jordon, Pan Africanist Congress
Mfundu Vundla, African National Congress
Moderator: John Harris, Professor, Brown University; Director, African Studies Center

"U.S. Foreign Policy Towards South Africa"
Clyde Ferguson, Professor, Harvard Law School
Sean Gervasi, Consultant, United Nations
Thomas Karis, Yale Research Project
Robert Keely, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs
Newell Stultz, Professor, Brown University
Moderator: Badi Foster, Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education

"Corporate Withdrawal"
Edward Feit, Professor, University of Massachusetts
David Liff, Investor Responsibility Research Center
Prexy Nesbit, former staff member of American Committee on Africa
John Purcell, Vice President, Goodyear
Moderator: Roger Fisher, Professor, Harvard Law School

A commemorative retrospective of the 1969 student strike at Harvard, April 20, 1979. Participants were:
James Anderson, Professor of Biology, Harvard University
Michael Ansara, SDS New Left Caucus
Thomas Berg, Activist
Kenneth Glazier, Activist
Skip Griffen, former member of the Afro-American Student Association
Stanley Hoffmann, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Steven Kelman, Assistant Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Carl Offner, Student Alliance Caucus
Moderator: Frances Fox Piven, Professor, Boston University
A panel on "Issues in Sino-American Relations," April 30, 1979. Participants were:

Joseph Nye, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Lucian Pye, Professor of East Asian Studies, MIT
Edwin Reischauer, Professor of East Asian Studies, Harvard University
Ross Terrill, former Lecturer of Government, Harvard University
Moderator: Roy Hofheinz, Professor of East Asian Studies, Harvard University
The Fellows Program

The Panel on Fellowships

Gary Bellow, Fall 1977, Spring-Fall 1978
Jack Bloom, Spring-Fall 1978
Joseph L. Bower, Fall 1977, Spring-Fall 1978
Stephen Breyer, Fall 1977, Spring-Fall 1978
William Capron, Fall 1977, Ex-Officio
Nina Dayton, Spring-Fall 1978
Lawrence DiCara, Spring 1979
Daniel Fenn, Fall 1977, Spring-Fall 1978, Spring 1979
Barbara Fischbein, Spring 1979
Badi Foster, Spring-Fall 1978, Ex-Officio
Janet Fraser, Fall 1977, Spring-Fall 1978, Ex-Officio
Doris Kearns Goodwin, Fall 1977
Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr., Spring 1979, Ex-Officio
Joy Kahlenberg, Spring 1977
Lance Liebman, Spring 1979
Richard J. Light, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Michael Lipsky, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Jonathan D. Low, Fall 1977, Ex-Officio
A. Douglas Matthews, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Ernest R. May, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Thomas McCraw, Spring 1979
Jonathan Moore, Fall 1977-Spring 1979, Ex-Officio
Richard E. Neustadt, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Don K. Price, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Victoria Radd, Fall 1977
Ann Ramsay, Spring 1979
Elizabeth Rogers, Fall 1977
Jane Schmeiser, Spring-Fall 1978
Robin Schmidt, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
Charna Sherman, Spring 1979
Stanley S. Surrey, Fall 1977-Spring 1979, Chairman
John Trasvina, Spring 1979
Paul Ylvisaker, Fall 1977-Spring 1979
The Fellows' Alumni Committee

Carol Bellamy
Robert Bradford
Alvin Bronstein, Chairman
Bernard Gifford
Stephen Hess
Alan Otten (1977-78)
Mark Talisman

Institute Fellows

Bruce Adams, Spring 1979. Director of Issue Development, Common Cause, Washington, D.C. While a Fellow, he participated in the Institute's faculty study group on Legislative Reapportionment, completed a book on President Carter's appointment process (to be published by Lexington Books), and authored two articles, "Public Interest Politics" and "Is Anyone in Washington Thinking?"

Genevieve Atwood, Spring 1978. Geologist at the engineering firm of Ford, Bacon, and Davis Utah, Inc. and member of the Utah House of Representatives and of President Carter's Intergovernmental Panel on Science and Technology. While a Fellow, she developed material for legislation on an "Emissions Tax" and wrote an article on "Getting Into Politics" (Harvard Political Review, Fall 1978).

Herrington Bryce, Fall 1978. Vice President for Research, Academy for Contemporary Problems; formerly Director of Research, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C. While a Fellow, he completed two books, Revitalizing Cities and Planning Smaller Cities (both published by Lexington Books, 1979).

Karen Burstein, Fall 1978. New York State Public Service Commissioner; former New York State Senator. While a Fellow, she was developing a curriculum to teach public utility intervention to workers, drafting an article on the politics of regulation, and examining new issues in ratemaking.

Manuel Carballo, Fall 1977. Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services, HEW; formerly Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government and Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, and worked for New Jersey and New York City.
in transportation, urban development, and anti-poverty programs. While a Fellow, he developed a course in the management of state and local government and authored an article "Reflections on Bureaucracy."

Nicholas Carbone, Fall 1978, Deputy Mayor/Councilman, Hartford, Connecticut and member of President Carter's National Commission on Neighborhoods and of the Board of Directors of the National League of Cities. While a Fellow, he worked on the final draft of the Neighborhood Commission's Report.

A. J. Cooper, Jr., Spring 1979, Mayor of Prichard, Alabama; founder and past president of the National Conference of Black Mayors. While a Fellow, he worked on a book about the Hobbs Act and its relation to the FBI.

Ada Deer, Fall 1977, Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin-Madison; formerly chairperson of the Menominee Tribe and a member of the American Indian Policy Review Commission. While a Fellow, she worked on an article on the role of the press and Indian affairs and lectured on "Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Indians."

Barry Direnfeld, Spring 1978, Chief Legislative Counsel to U.S. Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio); formerly Legislative Assistant to U.S. Senator Richard Stone (D-Florida). While a Fellow, he worked on a political novel focusing on U.S. energy problems.

Ira Einhorn, Fall 1978, Poet, lecturer, social activist. While a Fellow, he was helping to design a network communication system for Bell Canada.

James Gleason, Spring 1979, Lecturer, University of Maryland; formerly County Executive, Montgomery County, Maryland. While a Fellow, he worked on a political novel.

Terry Goggin, Fall 1977, California Assemblyman, Chairman of the Assembly Subcommittee on Energy and author of bills concerning nuclear power plants. While a Fellow, he studied alternatives to nuclear power.

Patricia Goldman, Fall 1977, Commissioner, National Transportation Safety Board; formerly Chairperson of the Republican Women's Task Force, National Women's Political Caucus and Executive Director of the House Wednesday Group. While a Fellow, she investigated the selection and role of women on corporate boards.

Robert Kuttner, Spring 1979, Journalist; former National Affairs reporter for the Washington Post, Washington Editor for the Village Voice, and Chief Investigator for the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and
Urban Affairs. While a Fellow, he worked on a book on the politics of the tax revolt, *The Revolt of the Haves* (to be published by Simon and Schuster in 1980), and authored several magazine articles on tax policy, neighborhoods, and housing.

**Jane Pierson McMichael**, Spring 1978, Director of Legislative and Political Affairs, American Federal Government Employees’ Union; formerly Executive Director, National Women’s Political Caucus and writer, photographer, and journalist. While a Fellow, she devoted time to an ongoing project, an oral history of the Women’s Movement.

**Ernest Morial**, Spring 1978, Mayor of New Orleans, Louisiana; formerly a member of the Louisiana House of Representatives and judge of the Orleans Parish Juvenile Court. While a Fellow, he worked with his transition team to prepare for his first term as mayor.

**Evelyn Murphy**, Spring 1979, Vice Chairperson of President Carter’s National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere; former Secretary of Environmental Affairs of Massachusetts. While a Fellow, she worked on a series of articles about the environment and state government.


**Carole Parsons**, Spring 1978, Consultant to the National Security Council project on transborder data flows; former Executive Director of the U.S. Privacy Protection Study Commission and of the Domestic Council Committee on the Right to Privacy.

**Edward Pattison**, Spring 1979, Senior University Lecturer, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; former Democratic Congressman, 29th District, New York. While a Fellow, he worked on a history of the Freshman Class of the 94th Congress.


**Thomas Roeser**, Fall 1977, Director of Public Affairs, the Quaker Oats Company; formerly Director of Public Affairs for the Peace Corps and Assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans. While a Fellow, he completed a handbook for citizens’ groups called “Influencing the System.”

**Kim Skerritt**, Fall 1978, Campaign manager for former Governor Tom McCall’s 1978 primary race for governor of Oregon; formerly Assistant
Secretary of State in Oregon and Executive Director of the Oregon Government Ethics Commission. While a Fellow, she evaluated the phenomenon of reform legislation at the state level, with emphasis on Oregon.

Richard Sneider, Fall 1978, former Senior Foreign Service Officer Ambassador to the Republic of Korea and Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian-Pacific Affairs, U.S. State Department. While a Fellow, he completed a lengthy study of Korean security issues and drafted an article on East Asia.

Jack Walsh, Spring 1978, Political Director of the Carter-Mondale 1980 campaign; formerly Boston Election Commissioner and Special Assistant to Mayor Kevin White. While a Fellow, he researched and drafted a manual on running for public office and authored an article on "Getting into Politics" (Harvard Political Review, Fall 1978).

Visiting Fellows

Carla Hills, former Secretary of HUD, October 12-13, 1977
Jack Anderson, Syndicated columnist, November 1-2, 1977
Anne Armstrong, former Ambassador to England and counselor to President Nixon, March 8-9, 1978
Barbara Jordan, former U.S. Representative (D-Texas), October 19-20, 1978
Paul Warnke, former SALT negotiator and Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, December 6-7, 1978
Dan Rather, CBS news correspondent, April 23-24, 1979
The Faculty Studies Program

Campaign Finance (1977-79)

This study group has undertaken several discrete projects:

• Sponsored a two-day conference of financial officers from eight Presidential campaigns in which experiences with federal election laws were shared with academics, journalists, and staff from the Federal Election Commission and the House Administration Committee. A summary of the conference, with recommendations—"Report on Campaign Finance Based on the Experience of the 1976 Presidential Campaigns"—was prepared by Xandra Kayden (June 1977).

• Supported student research projects on campaigning, which led to the writing of three senior theses—"A Study of Access to Television for Political Candidates" by George White (Harvard 1977), "Business in Electoral Politics: The Corporate Political Action Committee" by Victoria Radd (Harvard 1978), and "Resource Allocation in the 1976 Presidential Campaign: Strategic Responses to the Campaign Environment" by Lawrence Bartels (Yale 1978). Mr. White's study was published as a report, accompanied by the study group's recommendations for expanding access to broadcasting for political candidates (May 1978).


• Developed a special library devoted to elections, housed in the Institute and containing campaign financial data, campaign training manuals, material on election laws, and scholarly writings on voting behavior, campaign practices, and political parties.

Study group participants are:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University, Chairman
Joel Fleishman, Director, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University
Gary C. Jacobsen, Associate Professor of Political Science, Trinity College, Connecticut
Xandra Kayden, Consultant and Research Associate, Hoover Institute, Stanford University
Career Interchanges Between Public and Private Sectors (1977-78)

This study group examined the decline of such interchange since the 1940's and, as a result, the decreasing opportunity for the two sectors to benefit from "mutual" personnel. In a draft report, the group has proposed measures for increasing interchange.

Study group participants were:

Clark Abt, ABT Associates
Pinney Allen, Student, Harvard Law School
Nancy Beecher, former Chairperson, Massachusetts Civil Service Commission
Howard A. Cohen, Special Counsel to the President, U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board
Richard Darman, Assistant Secretary for Policy, U.S. Department of Commerce
Robert Dumont, Vice-President for Personnel, New England Life Insurance Company
Steven Hitchner, John F. Kennedy School of Government Case Program
Roderic C. Hodgins, Professor, Harvard Business School
James King, Special Assistant to the President for Personnel
Frank Lindsay, Chairman of Itek Corporation, Chairman
Ernest R. May, Professor of History, Harvard University
Mark H. Moore, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard E. Neustadt, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Don K. Price, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Martha W. Weinberg, Professor, MIT
Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor, University of Massachusetts
Paul M. Ylvisaker, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

The Impact of Federal Programs on State and Local Management (1977-78)

This study group explored the effects which federal grant-in-aid programs, federal organizational requirements, and other factors exert on the environment in which state and local managers operate and on the internal operations of state and local agencies (particularly human services agencies).

Study group participants were:

John F. Bean, Principal Regional Officer, HEW
Samuel H. Beer, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Chairman
Gordon Chase, Lecturer, Harvard School of Public Health
Martha Derthick, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institute
Colin Diver, Associate Professor, Boston University School of Law
Stephen B. Farber, Director, National Governors' Association
Eleanor Farrar, Huron Institute
Cliff Goldman, New Jersey State Treasurer
Peter Goldmark, Executive Director, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
Ira A. Jackson, Assistant Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Mark H. Moore, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
John Pittenger, Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education
Gerald Stevens, Massachusetts Secretary of Human Services
Paul Ylvisaker, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education
Legislative Reapportionment (1977-79)

This study group has been assessing the current state of legislative and Congressional districting, evaluating alternative criteria for drawing district lines, and posing policy and implementation recommendations to guide reapportionment in the 1980's.

Study group participants are:

Bruce Adams, Director of Issue Development, Common Cause
Richard Kronick, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University
Henry Monaghan, Professor of Law, Boston University
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University, Chairman
Edward Pattison, Senior University Lecturer, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Ed Schneider, Market Opinion Research
Robert Teeter, Market Opinion Research

Research assistants are:

Richard Burkholder, Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Charles Garvin, Harvard Law School
David Golden, Harvard College

Common Cause, the Washington-based national citizens' lobby, has cooperated in the study. The study group will issue an analytical report, highlighting policy recommendations towards a more equitable reapportionment process, in the fall of 1979.

Moral Obligations of Public Officials (1977-79)

This study group has been considering the nature of the issues which ought to be covered in "Ethics and Public Policy" courses and has been developing materials for use in such courses.
The Faculty Studies Program

Study group participants are:

Graham T. Allison, Jr., Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary Bellow, Professor, Harvard Law School
Marvin Bressler, Professor, Department of Sociology, Princeton University
Peter Brown, Director, Center for Philosophy and Public Policy
Joel Fleishman, Director, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University, Chairman
Badi Foster, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Philip Heymann, Professor, Harvard Law School
Robert Klitgaard, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Lance Liebman, Professor, Harvard Law School
Father Richard McBrien, Boston College
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Bruce Payne, Professor, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University
Ralph B. Potter, Professor, Harvard Divinity School
David Price, Professor, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University
Don K. Price, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael Walzer, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Donald Warwick, Professor, Institute of International Development, Harvard University
Douglas Yates, Professor, School of Organization and Management, Yale University

The study group plans to publish two volumes of curricular materials to facilitate and improve ethics instruction in undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools. Completed drafts of articles include:

"Blowing the Whistle," Sissela Bok
"Assessing the Behavior of Public Officials from a Moral Point of View," Peter Brown
"Self-Interest and Political Integrity," Joel Fleishman
"Objectives and Process Obligations," Philip Heymann
"Ethics and the Education of Policymakers" and "Policy Corruption and Ethical Seriousness," Bruce Payne
"The Ethical Assessment of Public Policy," David Price
"The Private Lives of Public Officials," Dennis Thompson
"The Ethics of Administrative Discretion," Donald Warwick
Professional Study Programs
and Special Projects

Professional Study Programs

Seminar on Transition and Leadership for Newly-Elected Mayors, November 17-21, 1977

The Institute and the U.S. Conference on Mayors collaborated in conducting an intensive five-day study seminar for seventeen newly-elected mayors of major U.S. cities. The seminar was designed to provide insights into the transition phase and governmental process generally, to offer focused instruction in certain substantive areas, and to encourage interaction among newly-elected mayors and incumbent mayors, experienced practitioners, and fellow newly-elected mayors. Sessions highlighted political transition, personnel concerns, relations with labor, press, and citizens, financing, public safety, and intergovernmental affairs.

The participants included:

James G. Amato, Lexington, Kentucky
Ron Bair, Spokane, Washington
Isabella Cannon, Raleigh, North Carolina
James F. Conway, St. Louis, Missouri
Doug DeGood, Toledo, Ohio
Theodore Dimauro, Springfield, Massachusetts
Ken Harris, Charlotte, North Carolina
Edward I. Koch, New York, New York
Carole McClellan, Austin, Texas
Ernest Morial, New Orleans, Louisiana
John B. O'Reilly, Dearborn, Michigan
Michael Parker, Tacoma, Washington
Steven Pawlinga, Utica, New York
Charles Royer, Seattle, Washington
Arnold I. Rue, Stockton, California
William Stansbury, Louisville, Kentucky
Charles E. Whitlock, Lakewood, Colorado

The faculty included:

Gordon Chase, Lecturer, Harvard School of Public Health
Herbert Cohen, Performance Management, Inc.
Peter P. Curtin, Executive Director, New Jersey Democratic State Committee
G. Edward De Seve, Public Financial Management, Inc.
Robert J. diGrazia, Director of Police, Rockville, Maryland
Michael A. diNunzio, General Counsel, United States Conference of Mayors; Director, Mayors' Leadership Institute
Robert C. Embry, Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Badi Foster, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director, District Council 37, AFSCME
Barry Gottehrer, Executive Director, Life Insurance Association of Massachusetts
John Gunther, Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors
Edward Hamilton, President, Hamilton-Rabinowitz
Ken Hartnett, Boston Globe
Robert Healy, Executive Editor, Boston Globe
Philip Heymann, Professor, Harvard Law School
John M. Isaacson, Assistant Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Youth Services
Ira A. Jackson, Senior Assistant Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
David Kuechle, Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Education
Moon Landrieu, Mayor of New Orleans
Gary Lapierre, WBZ Radio
Thomas C. Maloney, Regional Administrator, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Theodore Monacelli, Principal, Monacelli Associates
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Frank E. Morris, President, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Raymond D. Nasher, President, Raymond D. Nasher Company
Eugene Pell, WCVB-TV3
Charles Rogovin, Professor, Temple University School of Law
Donna E. Shalala, Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, HUD
William Spring, Associate Director, President's Domestic Policy Staff
Frank Tivnan, Massachusetts Petroleum Council
Jack Walsh, Jack Walsh Associates
Kevin H. White, Mayor of Boston
Warren Widener, Mayor of Berkeley
Hubert Williams, Director of Police of Newark, New Jersey
Sam Zagoria, Director of Labor-Management Relations Service, U.S. Conference of Mayors

The administrative staff included:

Ira A. Jackson, Seminar Coordinator
Daniel Small, Administrative Coordinator
Nora Littlefield, Administrative Assistant
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Press Coordinator

A summary report of the seminar was published in June 1978.

Conference for Massachusetts City Councillors, April 14-15, 1978

The Institute and the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns jointly sponsored a two-day study conference for fifty-two Massachusetts city councillors. The conference aimed to increase councillors' awareness of their role and power as local legislators, to instruct them on substantive issues, and to help establish or strengthen lines of communication among city councils and among city councillors. Sessions covered such topics as financial and personnel management, community development, economic policy, and intergovernmental relations.

The participants included:

Attleboro: Judith H. Robbins
Beverly: Frances F. Alexander, John C. Kelleher
Boston: Lawrence DiCara, Rosemary E. Sansone
Brockton: George Cataldo, Francis Mara
Cambridge: Mary Ellen Preusser
Fall River: Michael G. Megna, Gerald Zide
Fitchburg: Henry P. Dextraze, Ronald B. Ingemie
Gardner: David J. Bessette, Rosaire J. St. Jean
Gloucester: John Lyon, Louis Sinagra
Haverhill: Herbert H. Goecke, Jr., Marjorie E. Goudreault
Holyoke: David Keith, William Slaby
Leominister: Keith W. Lauer
Lowell: Edward J. Kennedy, Raymond Lord
Lynn: Charles J. Gaeta, Robert F. Tucker
Marlborough: Arthur Bergeron, John Frey
Medford: Paul Donato, Eugene Grant
Melrose: Michael E. Festa, Richard Howe
 Methuen: Edward J. Higgins, Jr., Charles F. Thompson
Newburyport: Paul Tirone
Newton: Joseph DePasquale, Carol Ann Shea
North Adams: Frances Buckley, Michael Deep
Peabody: John J. Ferrante, William Toomey
Pittsfield: Frances A. Chichetto, Jr., Angelo C. Stracuzzi
Revere: Nicholas DiSalvo, Dan Ferrara
Salem: Leonard A. Cawley, Jr., Joseph M. Centorino
Southbridge: Lawrence Hyman, Robert MacKinnon
Springfield: Robert Markel, Richard F. Neal
Taunton: John T. Doherty, John Buckley Grant
Woburn: Barbara Opaki, Ed Robertson

The faculty included:

Jonathan Brock, Research Associate, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Nicholas Carbone, City Councillor, Hartford, Connecticut
Charles Christensen, Professor, Harvard Business School
Francis H. Duehay, City Councillor, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative
Frank T. Keefe, Massachusetts Director of State Planning
Walter Kelliher, former Mayor of Malden, Massachusetts
Ed Lehan, Finance Director, Rochester, New York
Chris Lindley, City Councillor, Rochester, New York
Irv Marsters, Director, National League of Cities/SPEER
Tom Moody, Mayor of Columbus, Ohio
William Spring, Associate Director, President’s Domestic Policy Staff
Daniel Sullivan, Regional Representative for the Secretary of Labor
James Sullivan, City Manager, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Jack Walsh, Political consultant
Paul Ylvisaker, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

The advisory committee included:

Manuel Carballo, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Lawrence DiCara, City-Council President, Boston, Massachusetts
Francis H. Duehay, City Councillor, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Conference organizers and ex-officio members of the Advisory Committee included:

- Badi Foster, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
- Martha Gershun, Staff Assistant to Conference
- Richard Howe, Executive Director, Massachusetts Selectmen's Association
- Wayne Masterman, Staff Assistant
- Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Executive Assistant to the Director, Institute of Politics
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
- Kennedy Shaw, Executive Director, Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns
- Tamera Stanton, Member, Student Advisory Committee and Chairperson of the New Projects Subcommittee

A final report of the conference was published in June 1978.


The Institute and the Select Committee on Congressional Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives co-sponsored a week-long study program for thirty-six newly-elected Congresspersons, designed to expose members of the House to analyses of major public policy issues and to insights into legislative process. Sessions focused on the structure and operation of Congress, the federal budget process, and the role of Congress in such policy areas...
as the economy, taxes, welfare, energy, urban problems, health care, defense, and international relations.

The participants included:

- Don Albosta (D-Michigan)
- Beryl Anthony, Jr. (D-Arkansas)
- Don Bailey (D-Pennsylvania)
- Michael D. Barnes (D-Maryland)
- Douglas Bereuter (R-Nebraska)
- Ed Bethune (R-Arkansas)
- Bill Boner (D-Tennessee)
- William F. Clinger, Jr. (R-Pennsylvania)
- William E. Dannemeyer (R-California)
- H. Joel Deckard (R-Indiana)
- Julian C. Dixon (D-California)
- Brian Donnelly (D-Massachusetts)
- Melvin H. Evans (R-Virgin Islands)
- Vic Fazio (D-California)
- Geraldine A. Ferraro (D-New York)
- William H. Gray (D-Pennsylvania)
- Frank J. Guarini (D-New Jersey)
- Larry J. Hopkins (R-Kentucky)
- Claude Leach, Jr. (D-Louisiana)
- Mickey Leland (D-Texas)
- Jerry Lewis (R-California)
- Mike Lowry (D-Washington)
- Dan Lungren (R-California)
- Robert T. Matsui (D-California)
- Nick Mavroules (D-Massachusetts)
- William R. Ratchford (D-Connecticut)
- Toby Roth (R-Wisconsin)
- James M. Shannon (D-Massachusetts)
- Richard C. Shelby (D-Alabama)
- Norman D. Shumway (R-California)
- Edward J. Stack (D-Florida)
- Charles Stenholm (D-Texas)
- Tom Tauke (R-Iowa)
- William M. Thomas (R-California)
- Robert Whittaker (R-Kansas)
- Howard Wolpe (D-Michigan)
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The faculty included:

- **Stephen Breyer**, Professor, Harvard Law School
- **David S. Broder**, Associate Editor, Washington Post
- **Irwin Bupp**, Lecturer, Harvard Business School
- **Samuel Philip Caper**, Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, University of Massachusetts
- **Albert Carnesale**, Associate Director, Center for Science and International Affairs
- **William R. Crawford**, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
- **Martha A. Derthick**, Director of Governmental Studies, Brookings Institution
- **Michael Dukakis**, former Governor of Massachusetts
- **Otto Eckstein**, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
- **John K. Fairbank**, Professor of History, Harvard University
- **Rashi Fein**, Professor, Harvard Medical School
- **Martin Feldstein**, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
- **John W. Gorman**, Vice-President of Cambridge Survey Research/ Cambridge Reports, Inc.
- **Stanley Hoffmann**, Professor of Government, Harvard University
- **Hendrik S. Houthakker**, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
- **Thomas L. Hughes**, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
- **Samuel P. Huntington**, Professor of Government, Harvard University
- **Daniel M. Kasper**, Assistant Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University
- **William H. Kaufmann**, Professor of Political Science, MIT
- **Laurence E. Lynn, Jr.**, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- **Nicholas A. Masters**, Director of the Majority Associate Staff, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives
- **Richard P. Nathan**, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
- **Edwin O. Reischauer**, Professor of East Asian Studies, Harvard University
- **Harold Saunders**, Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State
Donna E. Shalala, Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, HUD
Robert Blair Stobough, Professor, Harvard Business School
Stanley S. Surrey, Professor, Harvard Law School
Lester Thurow, Professor, MIT Sloan School of Management
Laurence H. Tribe, Professor, Harvard Law School
Kevin H. White, Mayor of Boston
Robert Caldwell Wood, Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools
Daniel Yergin, Member of the Energy Research Project, Harvard Business School

The program coordinator was Janet Fraser; the administrative assistant was Margaret Bowen.

A final report of the program was published in March 1979.

Program on Political Process for Corporate Executives, April 18-20, 1979

The Institute, with the support of E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, conducted an experimental seminar for eleven du Pont managers in order to better their understanding of governmental institutions and processes. Lectures, panels and case studies were presented on the three branches of Federal government, political parties, public opinion, the media, interest groups, state and local government, the budget process, bureaucratic process, and economic and regulatory policy-making.

The participants included:
Hoyle S. Bruton (observer)
Anthony J. Cardinal
George A. Cato
Richard E. Emmert
James F. Kearns
John R. Malloy
Robert P. McCuen
The faculty included:

Manuel Carballo, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard Darman, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
John Dunlop, Lamont University Professor, Harvard University
Dan Fenn, Lecturer, Harvard Business School, and Director, John F. Kennedy Library
Mel Horwitch, Assistant Professor, Harvard Business School
Martin Linsky, Editor, The Real Paper
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard B. Stewart, Professor, Harvard Law School
Grover Wrenn, Senior official in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor

The program was coordinated by Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr.

Program on State Government for Massachusetts Journalists, June 7-10, 1979

The Institute conducted a three-day seminar for thirty Massachusetts reporters and editors, focusing on the nature of government institutions and the legal, political, and bureaucratic constraints that influence policy-making. Case studies and discussions highlighted the budget process, personnel policy, decision-making, and reporting on State government.

The participants included:

Jeff Barnard, Cape Cod Times
Carl Beck, Quincy Patriot Ledger
David Brickman, Malden Evening News, Medford Daily Mercury, Melrose Evening News
Shelly Cohen, Associated Press
Andrew Dabilis, Lowell Sun
Don Ebbeling, Springfield Daily News
David Farrell, Boston Globe
Barry Gilbert, Lawrence Eagle-Tribune
Robert Hastings, Daily Evening Item, Lynn
Robert Healy, Boston Globe
David Hern, Associated Press
Howard Iverson, Beverly Times
Brian McNiff, Worcester Gazette
Abe Michelson, Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield
Mark Miller, Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield
Paul Mindus, Boston Herald-American
David Nyhan, Boston Globe
Robert Pape, Ottawa News Service
Neil Perry, Greenfield Recorder
Mary Anne Piggott, Chelsea Record
Walter Robinson, Boston Globe
Robert Rosenthal, Boston Globe
Frank Roylance, Standard Times, New Bedford
P. Michael Saint, Quincy Patriot Ledger
Earle Stern, Daily Evening Item
Loring Swaim, Hampshire Gazette, Malden Evening News
Robert Turner, Boston Globe
Mary Wessling, Worcester Telegram
Thomas Winship, Boston Globe
Wayne Woodlief, Boston Herald-American
Barbara Yagerman, Salem Evening News

The faculty included:

Chester Atkins, Chairman, Massachusetts Senate Ways and Means Committee
Joseph L. Bower, Professor, Harvard Business School
John Buckley, former Secretary of Administration and Finance for Governor Dukakis
Lou Cannon, Western Bureau Chief, Washington Post
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Colin Diver, Professor of Law, Boston University
Michael Dukakis, Lecturer and Director of Intergovernmental Studies, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Governor of Massachusetts
Jack Flannery, Author and former Chief of Staff for Governor Sargent
Paul Guzzi, Chief Secretary to the Governor
Robert Kiley, former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
Albert Kramer, Judge and former Chief Policy Advisor to Governor Sargent
Martin Linsky, Editor, The Real Paper; former member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives
A. A. Michelson, Political Editor, Berkshire Eagle
Edward Moscovitch, Director, State Government Group, Data Resources, Inc.
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Evelyn Murphy, former Massachusetts Secretary of Environmental Affairs
Allen Schick, Senior Specialist, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress
James Srodes, Economic Correspondent and former Washington Bureau Chief for Forbes magazine
Lewis Wolfson, Professor of Communication, American University; former Washington Bureau Chief for the Providence Journal-Bulletin

The program manager was Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr.; the administrative coordinator was Margaret Bowen; chief planners were Jonathan Moore, Martin Linsky and Lewis Wolfson.

Conference for Massachusetts City Councillors, June 15-16, 1979

This conference, conducted by the Brandeis Center for Public Service and co-sponsored by the Institute and the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns, was a second staging of the comparable 1978 conference held at the Institute. Nicholas T. Mitropoulos and Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr. of the In-
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The Institute, with student aides Richard Berenson and James Coster, assisted in the organizing of the 1979 conference.

Special Projects

Television Documentary on the Limitations of the Presidential Office

The Institute and WGBH co-produced a television special, "The Presidency: How Much Alone?", which was broadcast nationally on PBS one-half hour before the President's State of the Union Address, January 19, 1978. In the hopes of tempering the inflated expectations which the public attaches to the office, the program described the limitations on Presidential power and authority imposed by checks and balances, federalism, free enterprise, interest group politics, the Federal bureaucracy, and the media.

The program's commentators included:

David Broder
Otto Eckstein
Bryce Harlow
Doris Kearns Goodwin
Joseph Kraft
Jonathan Moore
Richard Neustadt

Thomas O'Neill
Elliot Richardson
Alice Rivlin
John Sawhill
Hedrick Smith
Jim Guy Tucker
Dan Yankelovich

The Executive Producer was Edward Baumeister of WGBH; the Executive Editor was Jonathan Moore of the Institute of Politics. Assistance was provided by Victoria Radd.

Research Project on the Presidential Nominating System

The Institute has undertaken a study of the Presidential nominating processes of Massachusetts and the nation as a whole. Research was begun in the
summarized three Harvard University students: Richard Burkholder, David Bush, Peter Fordham, Toni Hackett, Amy Russo, Cliff Sloan, and Ruth Streeler.

The task force was administered by Jonathan D. Low and Paul Guzzi, Massachusetts Secretary of State.

The findings were compiled, expanded upon, and prepared as reports by three Harvard students, Marilyn Booth, Barbara Fischbein, and George White, and by Nicholas T. Mitropoulos. Jonathan Moore supervised this effort, while consultation was provided by an Advisory Committee consisting of:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University
Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
H. Douglas Price, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Nancy Sinnott, Field representative, National Republican Congressional Committee
Richard Stearns, Assistant District Attorney, Norfolk County, Massachusetts

The final product is the Presidential Nominating System: A Primer to be published in Fall 1979, which reviews changes made in the nominating system over the past four years and makes recommendations regarding the future of that system.
The Forum

The ARCO Public Affairs Forum is the multi-leveled central area of the new John F. Kennedy School of Government building. It serves, as Edward M. Kennedy remarked in his Dedication Address, as a "crossroads by day and a meeting place by night." The Institute administers all formal programs held in the Forum, which to date have included:

A convocation celebrating the new John F. Kennedy School of Government building, September 12, 1978. Participants were:

- Graham T. Allison, Jr., Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Dorothy Bambach, Dean of Students, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Paul Doty, Director, Center for Science and International Affairs
- Ira A. Jackson, Associate Dean and Executive Officer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., Professor and Chairman, Master of Public Policy Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
- Thomas C. Schelling, Professor and Chairman, Master of Public Administration Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government

A panel of Fall Institute Fellows: "Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 20, 1978. Participants in the panel were:

- Herrington Bryce
- Karen Burstein
- Nicholas Carbone
- Ira Einhorn
- Kim Skerritt
- Richard Sneider
- Moderator: Jonathan Moore

(Consult the earlier section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.)

A panel on "New Age Politics." September 28, 1978. Participants in the panel were:

- Helen Caldicott, Author of Nuclear Madness
- Rick Ingrasci, Health Editor, New Age magazine
- Michael Murphy, Founder, Esalen Institute and author of Golf in the Kingdom, Jacob Atabet, and The Psychic Side of Sports
Mark Satin, *Author of New Age Politics*
Moderator: Ira Einhorn, *Institute Fellow*

A panel on “The Changing American Presidency,” October 20, 1978. Participants in the panel were:
- Richard Goodwin, *Author of The American Condition*
- David Halberstam, *Author of The Best and The Brightest*
- Richard E. Neustadt, *Author of Presidential Power and Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government*
- Moderator: John Kenneth Galbraith, *Professor Emeritus of Economics, Harvard University*

A panel on “Managing Government: Challenge of the Eighties,” October 22, 1978. Participants in the panel were:
- Allan K. Campbell, *Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission*
- Maynard Jackson, Jr., *Mayor, Atlanta, Georgia*
- Elliot Richardson, *Ambassador-at-Large and former U.S. Attorney General*
- Thomas Schelling, *Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government*

An address by Doug Fraser, *President, United Auto Workers, November 1, 1978.*


An address by Stansfield Turner, *Director, Central Intelligence Agency, November 30, 1978.*

An address by Paul Warnke, *Visiting Fellow, former Director of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on “SALT and Détente,” December 6, 1978.*
An address by Robert Anderson, Chief Executive of ARCO, on "OPEC and U.S. Energy Policy," January 10, 1979. A follow-up panel included:

Henry Jacoby, Professor, Harvard University
Robert Stobaugh, Professor, Harvard Business School
Daniel Yergin, Professor, Harvard Business School

An address by Simon Ramo, Director and Consultant, TRW, Inc., 2nd Chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, on "Technological Innovation: The International Battle for Technological Supremacy and the Role of Government," February 6, 1979. A follow-up panel included:

Richard Garwin, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert Seamans, Dean of the School of Engineering, MIT
Raymond Vernon, Professor, Harvard Business School
Moderator: Harvey Brooks, Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government

A panel of Spring Institute Fellows: "Personal Perspectives on Politics," February 7, 1979. Participants in the panel were:

Bruce Adams
A. J. Cooper, Jr.
James Gleason
Robert Kuttner
Evelyn Murphy
Edward Pattison
Moderator: Jonathan Moore
(Consult the section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.)

An address by Brock Adams, U.S. Secretary of Transportation, February 13, 1979.


An address by Cesar Chavez, President of the United Farm Workers, on "The Chiquita Banana Boycott and California Strike," April 5, 1979.

An address by John Cushnahan, General Secretary of the Northern Ireland Alliance Party, on "The Future of Northern Ireland," April 18, 1979.

An address by Dan Rather, Visiting Fellow, CBS Correspondent and Co-editor of "60 Minutes," April 23, 1979.

Pollak Lecture given by Patricia Harris, U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, on "The Role of the American Intellectual Community in Redefining Our National Purpose," May 2, 1979.


John Bredehoft
Edwin Fineman
William Foutz
Joseph Tuman
Moderator: Robert Shrum, National Editor, Politics Today

The judges were:

Stanley Hoffmann, Professor of Government, Harvard University
John Lynch, Professor of History, St. Anselm's College
Joseph Nye, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Alfred Ruben, Professor of International Law, Fletcher School of International Law and Diplomacy
James Unger, Professor of Forensics, Georgetown University

The Institute's Political Film Series showed the following films over the course of the year:

"Missiles of October"
"All the President's Men"
"The Last Hurrah"
"All the King's Men"
"The Front"
"Blue Collar"

Two original documentaries by Robert Freedman—"A House of Our Own" and "Portrait of a Nurse"

All New Projects of 1978-79 were held in the Forum. (Consult New Projects in the Student Program section.)

The Forum also housed the filming of The Advocates, a public affairs television program produced jointly by the Institute and WGBH in which current political issues are discussed in an hour-long trial-fashion debate. The 1979 Advocates season, aired on the Public Broadcasting Service network, included (with dates of filming indicated):

"Should Our Foreign Policy Include Covert Operations by the CIA?" January 31, 1979.
Moderator: Marilyn Berger, host of Special Edition and former news correspondent for Washington Post and NBC
Pro Advocate: Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Witnesses: William Colby, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency
Lyman Kirkpatrick, former Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency
Con Advocate: Margaret Marshall, Boston Attorney
Witnesses: Morton Halperin, Director, Center for National Security Systems
Robert Borosage, Director, Institute for Policy Studies
Moderator: Marilyn Berger
Pro Advocate: Lew Crampton, Senior Analyst, Arthur D. Little Company
Witnesses: Gordon McAndrew, Superintendent of Schools, Gary, Indiana
Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of California
Con Advocate: Renault Robinson, Director, Afro-American Patrolmen’s League, Chicago
Witnesses: Judah Schwartz, Professor of Engineering Science, MIT
Alex Rodriguez, Commissioner, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination

“Should Journalists Have the Right to Protect Their Sources?” February 15, 1979.
Moderator: Michael Dukakis, Lecturer and Director of Intergovernmental Studies, John F. Kennedy School of Government and former Governor of Massachusetts
Pro Advocate: Charles Nesson, Professor, Harvard Law School
Witnesses: Daniel Schorr, Columnist, author, former CBS News correspondent
Floyd Abrams, Attorney; Lecturer, Yale Law School
Con Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: David Wilson, Columnist, Boston Globe
Larry L. Simms, Attorney, Office of Legal Counsel, U.S. Department of Justice

“Should the U.S. Move to Break the Price-Setting Power of OPEC?”
March 2, 1979.
Moderator: Marilyn Berger
Pro Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Jack Blum, former member of Energy Trust Committee
James Flug, Energy Action Committee
Con Advocate: Margaret Marshall, Boston Attorney
Witnesses: James Akins, former Ambassador to Saudi Arabia
John Hill, former Deputy Administrator of Federal Energy Administration
Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Witnesses: Edward M. Kennedy, U.S. Senator (D-Massachusetts)
          James C. Miller III, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
          Leaman McCoy, President, True Transport, Inc., Newark, New Jersey
Con Advocate: Lisle Baker, Professor, Suffolk Law School
Witnesses: Daniel Sweeney, Attorney
          Arthur E. Imperatore, President, APA Transport Corporation

Moderator: Marilyn Berger
Pro Advocate: Randall Robinson, Director, TransAfrica
Witnesses: Ralph Ochan, former Ugandan Deputy to the Law of the Sea Conference
          Paul N. McCloskey, U.S. Congressman (R-California)
Con Advocate: Lew Crampton, Senior Analyst, Arthur D. Little Company
Witnesses: Northcutt Ely, Chairman of the Law of the Sea Committee
          John Flipse, Professor of Ocean Engineering at Texas A&M University

"Should We End the Courts' Authority Over Truant, Runaway, and Incorrigible Children?" March 20, 1979.
Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Charles Nesson, Professor, Harvard Law School
Witnesses: Kenneth Wooden, Investigative journalist and author
          Luke Quinn, Probate Court Judge, Juvenile Division, Flint, Michigan
Con Advocate: Margaret Marshall, Boston Attorney
Witnesses: T. George Silcott, Administrator, Wiltwyck School, New York
          John Milligan, Juvenile Court Judge, Canton, Ohio

"Should There Be a Constitutional Amendment Requiring a Balanced Federal Budget?" March 27, 1979.
Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor of California
Charles Baird, Professor of Economics, California State University
James McClure, U.S. Senator (R-Idaho)
Con Advocate: Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Witnesses: Henry Reuss, U.S. Congressman (D-Wisconsin)
John Kenneth Galbraith, Author; Professor Emeritus of Economics, Harvard University

"Should There Be a System of Compulsory National Service for All Young Americans?" March 28, 1979.
Moderator: Marilyn Berger
Pro Advocate: Paul N. McCloskey, U.S. Congressman (R-California)
Witnesses: Robin Beard, U.S. Congressman (R-Tennessee)
Harris Wofford, Co-Chairman, Committee for National Service
Con Advocate: Lew Crampton, Senior Analyst, Arthur D. Little Company
Witnesses: Barry Lynn, Minister and attorney
James Weaver, U.S. Congressman (D-Oregon)

Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Roger Fisher, Professor, Harvard Law School
Witnesses: William A. Henry III, Television Critic, Boston Globe
Eli N. Evans, President, Charles H. Revson Foundation
Con Advocate: William Rusher, Publisher of National Review
Witnesses: William Poorvu, Vice President, Boston Broadcasters, Inc.
M. Stanton Evans, Syndicated Columnist, Los Angeles Times

"Should Puerto Rico be a State, a Commonwealth, or an Independent Nation?" April 25, 1979.
Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Statehood Advocate: Jaime Fuster, Professor and former Dean of the Law School, University of Puerto Rico
Witness: Jose Arsenio-Torres, Professor of Political Theory, University of Puerto Rico
Pro Commonwealth Advocate: Joaquin Marquez, Attorney and
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Administrator, Washington Office of the Government of Puerto Rico
Witness: Reinaldo Paniagua, Attorney and former Secretary of State of Puerto Rico
Pro Independence Advocate: Fernando Martin, Professor, University of Puerto Rico Law School
Witness: Ruben Berrios Martinez, President, Independence Party
This was a special 3-sided, bilingual debate, captioned in both Spanish and English.

Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Margaret Marshall, Boston Attorney
Witnesses: Alan Campbell, Director of the Office of Personnel Management
Virginia Dondy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force
Con Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Norman Hartnett, National Director for the Disabled American Veterans
James Hanley, U.S. Congressman (D-New York)

"Should We Have Mandatory Wage and Price Controls?" May 15, 1979.
Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Margaret Marshall, Boston Attorney
Witnesses: Joan Bannon, Economist
Gar Alperovitz, Co-Director, National Center for Economic Alternatives
Con Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Marvin Kosters, Economist, American Enterprise Institute
David Meiselman, Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Moderator: Marilyn Berger
Pro Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Leonard R. Sussman, Executive Director, Freedom House
Matthew Wakatama, United African National Council
Chester Crocker, Director of African Studies, Georgetown University
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Con Advocate: Randall Robinson, Director, TransAfrica
Witnesses: Callistus Ndlovu, Professor of Political History, Hofstra University
          Sister Janice McLaughlin, Former Rhodesia Missionary
          Paul Tsongas, U.S. Senator (D-Massachusetts)

Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Arthur Shuman, Jr., Attorney
          Dale Volker, New York State Senator (R-Buffalo)
Con Advocate: Margaret Marshall, Boston Attorney
Witnesses: Don Reid, Publisher Emeritus, The Huntsville Item
          Alan M. Dershowitz, Professor, Harvard Law School

"Should We Legalize Marijuana?" June 22, 1979.
Moderator: Michael Dukakis
Pro Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witnesses: Peter Meyers, Chief Counsel for NORML
          Lester Grinspoon, Associate Professor, Harvard Medical School
Con Advocate: William Rusher, Publisher of National Review
Witnesses: Robert L. DuPont, Director, Institute for Behavior and Health
          James Buckley, former U.S. Senator (R-New York)

The administrative staff included:

  Peter Cook, Executive Producer
  Lawrence Goldberg, Media Services Coordinator
  Grady Hedgespeth, Media Services Assistant
  David Kuhn, Executive Editor
  Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Forum Coordinator
  Terri Shuck, Forum Secretary

Student interns of the Institute providing editorial and production assistance included:

  Cecelle Berry
  Robert Boorstin