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Conclusion from The Presidential Nominating System: A Primer

This report was based on research and writing of several Harvard students and prepared under the supervision of Jonathan Moore. It was released in October, 1979.

During the past decade, the presidential nominating process has undergone enormous change. Not so long ago, some states did not even have written rules for their nomination procedures. A much smaller percentage of the population participated in delegate selection, and fewer pre-convention activities were open to observation by the electorate. To this extent, the new system is a vast improvement over the old.

At the same time, there has been a dramatic renewal of interest in the use of presidential preference primaries to select convention delegates. While there has undeniably been some association between the efforts of reformers and the recent proliferation of primaries, however, the two phenomena are by no means so closely related as some have supposed.

While the reformers have generally developed their goals in the context of the nominating system as a whole, the choice of basic nominating procedures still rests, ultimately, with state and local political leaders. And while the movement toward primaries may reflect and be reinforced by participatory goals, in fact, quite a few practical considerations are also involved. As a result, the current nominating process displays little in the way of evolving logic or emerging uniformity.

Moreover, at a time when many, if not most, political observers have begun to seriously question the systemic effects of the increased reliance on primaries, it becomes increasingly difficult to turn back the tide. While primaries clearly invite greater participation than alternative means of delegate selection, this is not to say that primary outcomes are more representative than those of caucuses or conventions. More importantly, in the long run, primaries have made a substantial contribution to the general debilitation of political parties.
Yet the movement toward primaries seems unstoppable. In 1968, there were 17 primaries; in 1976, there were 30; and by 1980, according to all indications, there may be as many as 35. In part, this reflects the weakened condition of state and local parties. In part too, it reflects the fact that states are faced with a variety of incentives to adopt primaries, against which arguments about "system effects" and "party decline" seem very remote.

This is not to say that the movement is inherently irreversible. For example, Texas Democrats, having experimented with a primary in 1976, now seem prepared to return to a caucus-convention procedure. And even if the trend toward primaries continues, the primaries themselves might be modified to mitigate some of their ill-effects. With a particular view toward the problem of unrepresentative results, for instance, Donald Herzberg has proposed that, where voter turnout in any primary falls below 40 percent, the outcome be ignored and a caucus-convention system be immediately substituted. Similarly, Newton Minow has suggested that primary results not be binding on elected delegates whenever turnout falls below two-thirds of those eligible.

In addition, although much attention has been devoted to the mix of nominating procedures among states, we should not lose sight of the potential for developing a mix of procedures within each state. The Massachusetts system, for example, provides for caucuses, through which delegate slates are selected, with a primary, through which delegate slots are apportioned among the candidates. Similar procedures may well represent the most realistic means of preserving some role for political parties in those states that have adopted primaries.

At the very least, while there may be little that can or should be done at the national level to foster a reconsideration of the choice that roughly 70 percent of the states have now made, further proliferation of primaries should be actively discouraged. This approach also urges a high degree of skepticism toward any plans to rationalize, and nationalize, the nominating process.

After studying a series of such proposals recently before Congress, we have concluded that the flaws in each one are too serious to ignore, and that none would demonstrably improve the present situation. In particular, either a national primary or a mandatory system of regional primaries would further isolate the voter from the nominating process by augmenting the already pervasive influence of the national and regional press, by giving incumbents and nationally-known figures maximal advantage of prior recognition, and by institutionalizing the disintegration of the parties.

In any event, nearly all of the basic nominating procedures for 1980 have now been settled upon, and today's reformers, whatever goals they may em-
brace, must redirect their energies with an eye on 1984. Over the next four years, we should expect a renewed interest in tinkering with the nominating system to appear at all levels. There are still a variety of unresolved questions facing the national parties, not the least of which asks how far the parties should ultimately go in preempting the traditional role of the states in establishing delegate selection procedures. State parties and state legislatures will continue to grapple with basic choices among primaries, caucuses, and conventions, along with secondary issues including scheduling, filing deadlines, and delegate recruitment. Finally, there will doubtless be further efforts in Congress to systematize the entire process through legislation.

In the meantime, it should be remembered that, while the current nominating process certainly has its shortcomings, its very untidiness provides something of an antidote by responding to divergent circumstances in various regions and campaigns. The current pluralistic system not only resists radical change, but probably does so for good reasons—for it appears to satisfy the demanding and often disparate criteria of the American political process more capably than any simple structure with greater theoretical appeal and finer symmetrical appearance. Caucuses, conventions, and primaries all play useful roles in a complicated drama, and in combination, they offer the best assurance that the many conflicting demands on the process can be at least partially satisfied.
A Television Interview with Jerry Brown

The following interview was broadcast in January by WGBH-TV as part of a series of interviews with presidential candidates co-produced with the Institute as part of the "Presidential Candidates '80" series. The journalist/interviewers in this excerpt are Christopher Lydon, Anchor of WGBH's "Ten O'Clock," and Ellen Goodman, syndicated columnist of The Boston Globe.

LYDON: In your frugality and your spirituality you're sounding extremely traditional tonight, and yet your trademark has been unconventionality, which sometimes translates... well we won't go into adjectives. But what is the nature of your unconventionality that people notice and that's real? What is in a man who's talking about spiritual values and penny pinching, where is the essential, as opposed to the headline, unconventionality of Jerry Brown?

BROWN: I've been willing to bring into my administration a variety of people. Rose Bird, as Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court; Mario Oblato, a person who came out of the barrios of Texas; Sim Van der Ryn, who is very interested in composting toilets, and other unconventional architectural questions—I made him State Architect; I've encouraged wind and woodchips as energy sources; I've set up an Office of Appropriate Technology; and I've been willing to be very open to ideas that are not within the center of the old boy network of politics. I've tried to use language in a way that sometimes strikes the traditional political ear as unconventional, and I do that because I think the language of politics is debased, that it is boring and that it is bereft of significant content. So I'm reaching for expressions and concepts that can alert people to the ideas that I believe are important for our time.

LYDON: How is that different than Jimmy Carter's walking down Pennsylvania Avenue when everybody expected him to ride? Or his cardigan sweaters, or the symbolic politics that had a pretty good ride with Carter, but haven't left an awful lot?

BROWN: Because I think that symbolism hasn't been taken that far, and to the extent that it's there, tends to be of the past. The walking down Pennsylvania Avenue, had there been more to that, or had there been some follow-up... but I think what I do, whether it's the interest in space, the Space Day that I had; I had a day the year before, "Whale Day," where we celebrated whales and dolphins, and had kids and their families. It was very interesting at
the time, there were probably 10,000 people that had a great time at it. But in
the transmission eastward, it began to pick up certain barnacles of skepticism
that added to this overall image. Then you add some of my support from rock
concerts, and then you add the fact that I am single, I don't have a family that
you can put on the poster and get a traditional impression, and the fact that
I'm rather young for a presidential candidate, and then that I'm from Califor­
nia, which already conjures up a certain image—you put all that together in
one package and you get Doonesbury cartoons, and other, I think, preconcep­
tions that upon analysis are somewhat superficial.

GOODMAN: Well, what would you like your public image to be if you
could create it?

BROWN: Just as we're talking now I think anyone that is listening and
watching will get a sense of what I am and what I believe.

LYDON: But again, I'm still looking for the root of the unconvention­
ality. Are you a radical? It doesn't seem to me you've led the main center of
California politics in a profoundly new direction—I'm not saying you should
have....

BROWN: It isn't easy to move any part of the society, but I acknowledge
your point. I would say it probably stems from my angle of vision, my
perspective on things. I look at things sometimes in a very unique way. I'll
look at a problem and see it in ways that other people haven't. Or I'll connect
together certain things, the ecology of saving whales and the technology of ex­
ploring outerspace, and try to see a connection in both of them in the con­
sciousness of the whole earth and getting that kind of an attitude. My ap­
proach to things I don't think is imprisoned by the perceptions of the past. And
at least I'd like to think that I'm breaking new intellectual ground and when I
express that, that does create a sense of unconventionality.

* * *
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Coping With the Current Limits

by the Campaign Finance Faculty Study Group

This excerpt is from an Interim Report by the Campaign Finance Study Group entitled, “Expenditure Limits in the Presidential Prenomination Campaign: The 1980 Experience.” The report was authored by F. Christopher Arterton, Chair of the Study Group, with the assistance of George H. White.

The major effect of the overall limit on expenditures was to force the campaigns to pick and choose among the many state primaries as to which they would wage to the fullest and which they would forego. We observed in the 1980 experience a tendency—particularly for those challenging a front runner—to by-pass totally certain state primaries rather than to fund partial efforts in all primaries. To be sure, there certainly are other reasons why candidates might choose not to run in a particular primary. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this report it is sufficient to note that the low overall ceiling does contribute to circumstances in which citizens living in some states are denied the opportunity to hear the political arguments raised by all contenders.

Another means by which campaigns can cope with the limits is through implicitly and tacitly encouraging independent expenditures. When the overall limit becomes restrictive in later primaries, candidates can encourage independent expenditures on their behalf simply by announcing that they do not have sufficient budget space left for an advertising campaign in certain states.

The Supreme Court's decision in Buckley v. Valeo ruled that unlimited independent expenditures were guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution. The study group would certainly not argue that these rights should be narrowed or abridged. Yet from the perspective of the electoral process, we must point out that money outside the control of candidates running for office may have some detrimental consequences. Elections impose upon the contending candidates a degree of responsibility and accountability for the expenditure of money made in their behalf. Their public careers are on-the-line; they stand to win or lose the election. The same restraints may not apply to independent expenditures. Unfounded charges may be disavowed by the benefiting candidate after the damage has been done to his opponent. Independent expenditures may also flood into an election as single interest groups seek to promote their special concerns at the expense of more general and balanced agendas of the candidates they favor as well as those they oppose.

The study group does not consider this possibility to be troublesome enough to justify abridging the right to make independent expenditures, but,
at the least, public policy which directly stimulates their growth ought to be minimized. A full study of the frequency and consequences of independent expenditures needs to be conducted before we could speculate further as to their effects upon the financing of presidential campaigns.

Finally, the most frequent response of campaigners to the limits has been what is facetiously called "creative accounting." Campaigners learn quickly where definitions can be stretched advantageously. The limits imposed on spending in state primaries have been the most frequent targets of efforts to evade the spirit of the Act if not the letter of the FEC's regulations. Many campaigns, for example, found it most convenient to locate their New England regional headquarters (chargeable to headquarters expenses, not to a state limit) in New Hampshire. When campaigning in a state in which the limit was a problem, candidates and their staff would be sure to spend their nights in motels located in adjacent states. One campaign, upon discovering that travel to and from a state did not have to be reported under that state's limit, whereas intra-state travel did, arranged their candidate's travel plans to take him out of and back into the state each time he moved a major distance. That way, travel would not count against the spending ceiling in that state.

As concerns the overall level of expenditures, the campaigns have been exploring the breadth of the FEC's definition of "exempt" expenditures. Fund-raising costs of 20% plus all compliance costs are exempted. (The former need not be considered here since actual fund-raising costs greatly exceed the allotted exemption.) By narrow interpretation, compliance should include only legal and accounting fees incurred in meeting the obligations of the Act. But, some campaigns have reportedly charged a proportion of each headquarters expenses (state, regional, and national) off to compliance with the reporting requirements. The costs of developing a computer system which could be highly useful for direct mailings to supporters could be charged as an accounting necessity. Photocopiers bought for the tasks of filing FEC reports can be informally available to other divisions of the campaign. None of these are overtly illegal; they are innovative means of dealing with necessarily vague regulations.

Thus, the limits have placed a premium upon ingenious ways to report expenditures as if for purposes other than the real reason they were incurred. Rewarding this skill—especially if the limits become so restrictive as to severely hamper campaign activity to the point of affecting the political outcomes—seems to us an unhealthy by-product of public policy. The real danger occurs if the mentality of circumventing the Act breeds cynicism or outright contempt for the law.
A Campaign Address on the Presidency
by Edward M. Kennedy

The speech from which this excerpt is taken was given in the Forum by Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) in February as part of the Institute's "Presidential Candidates '80" series.

Universities have traditionally been places to reflect on the powers and purposes of the Presidency. From Lord Bryce to Woodrow Wilson, from Harold Laski to Arthur Schlesinger, scholars have widened our perspective on the office. For a generation, this school of government has been in the first rank of that effort. Richard Neustadt has explored the possibilities of presidential power; Graham Allison has revealed the essence of presidential decision in a nuclear confrontation.

Indeed, the shifting view of the Presidency has become the lens through which we look at our own recent history. That office is not only the center of action or inaction in our constitutional system; it is also the first object of scholarly revision after national failure or success.

Amid the tumult of the past two decades, we have sometimes lost sight of one clear imperative. The nation still needs a strong Presidency, as Professor Neustadt has recently reminded us.

The issues today are not as clear as Vietnam or civil rights—as peace marches at the Pentagon or police dogs in the streets of Birmingham. Nor is the exercise of presidential strength as simple as it once was. With the stroke of a pen, Harry Truman abolished segregation in the armed forces, and John Kennedy commanded the integration of public housing. Lyndon Johnson in the bully pulpit of the Presidency proclaimed "We shall overcome"—and the force of those words summoned Congress and the nation to the greatest peaceful revolution of our age.

For many years, the legacy of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt was the exaltation of expansive Presidential power in all its aspects, whether it meant Eisenhower dispatching the National Guard to Little Rock, or Roosevelt secretly planning to aid the Allies and unilaterally declaring naval warfare on German submarines. Even a passive President like Eisenhower could be active when action was essential . . .

As we enter the 1980's, we must learn from the past two decades how to reshape the American Presidency. But there is always a dual danger—that we
will learn too much or forget too fast. Too often the fashion of a political season makes the right lessons obscure and the wrong lessons obvious. Beyond the events of the latest month or the last few years, we must also see the Presidency from the enduring perspective of two centuries of national experience.

We are told that the 1960's taught us the limits of government. It is surely correct that government cannot do everything. But it is a caricature to think that government cannot do anything. Yet this is what we heard in the 1978 State of the Union message. There, a Democratic President counselled resignation. He told us: "Government cannot solve our problems, set our goals, define our vision, eliminate poverty or reduce inflation."

The renunciation of government delivers national policy into the grip of narrow interests. Whatever the shortcomings of government, they pale in comparison to the abuses of private power. I would rather have government inspect the safety of coal mines, than have coal come out of the ground tainted with the blood of miners and washed in the tears of their families.

I do not believe in big government or little government as an ideological end in itself. Where the free market can be effective it should be relied on. Deregulation is right where the forces of competition are free to operate. But where the free market falters, government must step in.

The answers in the 1980's will not emerge from an empty clash of irrelevant dogmas that always call for less government or more. The question is not whether government is good or bad, but what government must do—and how government can do well.

Another lesson of recent history teaches that a President is not omniscient in foreign affairs and that the United States is not omnipotent in the world. In the 1960's, we painfully learned that we could not impose our will on every front. Yet that lesson also carried the seeds of its own undoing. Because our leaders had difficulty redefining our place in the world, many Americans came to suspect every shadow of world events as a sign of inevitable, falling darkness. This suspicion built until Iran and Afghanistan took the nation to the brink of Cold War II.

A President's world view must encompass more than the angers and anxieties of the moment. Today's certitudes are tomorrow's cliches. A President must not become trapped in analogies that bear little or no relation to reality. Neither the "domino theory" nor the new alliteration about a "crescent of crisis" conveys the world as it is. A President's responsibility is to fit the American role to actual conditions in ways that Congress can review and the people can comprehend. A President must seek unity in foreign policy that is not founded on fleeting hopes or instant fears.
Vision in the Presidency demands deeds matched to ideals. People will sacrifice if they believe in the fairness and effectiveness of the effort. For years, Administrations have been afraid to ask Americans for the sacrifices that can cure our addiction to foreign oil. In the present crisis, a President should not call for the symbol of draft registration, but for the substance of gasoline rationing.

I have heard the arguments that it is harder to be President now than it was a generation ago. I am aware of the institutional barriers, the rise of single issue voting, and the decline of the party system. But I have always believed that individuals can make a difference. And I surely believe that a President still can.

 Reform and Counterreform

from Nominating a President: The Process and the Press

This panel was the last of five roundtable discussions which comprised the conference, "Nominating a President: The Process and the Press," co-sponsored by the Institute and the Los Angeles Times. The panel members were: Kenneth A. Bode, Network Correspondent for NBC News; David A. Keene, Political Director of the Bush for President campaign; Martin F. Nolan, Washington Bureau Chief of The Boston Globe; Carl R. Wagner, Director of Field Operations of the Kennedy for President Committee; and James Wooten, National Political Correspondent for ABC News. The panel was moderated by Stephen H. Hess, Senior Fellow in Governmental Studies at the Brookings Institution, and took place in the Forum in February, 1980.

MR. HESS: The L.A. Times did a poll and asked the question, "How would you rate our system of nominating a president?" Forty-three percent said that our system is essentially good; 27 percent said it needs some improvement; 11 percent said it needs many improvements; 16 percent want a fundamental overhaul, 3 percent didn't know. Let's now see if we can get some specifics, some consensus on what is wrong, why this isn't a perfect 10 system.
Marty Nolan, what are the one, two, or three things that seem to bother you much on these scales of producing a person who would be a good president?

MR. NOLAN: I have a real problem with the fraudulent word that leads our panel, reform. In the last 10 years there's been exactly one written memo to the members of the Boston Globe Washington bureau. That was an advice, admonition, indeed, a command, an order on pain of losing a finger to put quotation marks around the word reform. It's the most loaded word in the political vocabulary. I think one man's reform is another man's loophole. Any time people talk about reform, I try to put my hand on my wallet because most reforms end up corrupting themselves.

The zenith of party responsiveness and commitment and indeed the first big primaries in which people really participated in the great American democracy came about in the election of 1920, which gave us a choice between James M. Cox and Warren Gamaliel Harding, both of whom must have been pure and spotless men because both came from the newspaper business. Didn’t turn out that way.

After that we had the Corrupt Practices Act, Teapot Dome, and as Teddy White told us at dinner, the 1968 election was probably the zenith of television’s interest in participation, and the television campaign of Richard Nixon that year was flawless and so was the campaign. It really worked. There was not much in the way of technical detail you could quarrel with. John Erlichman delivered the luggage on time and became chief of domestic programs in the White House. The reforms that followed that after Watergate produced the current system in which everyone complains about too much emphasis on these early primaries.

Somebody ought to say a good word about New Hampshire. It’s very difficult to do. (Laughter) Really disagreeable little state, you know. (Laughter) No sales tax, no income tax, people flee there because they really don’t like government very much. But, there are a lot of really disagreeable people in this country. They deserve representation. It’s a federal Republic, a sovereign state. They could do what they want. The system is as it is. I don’t think there’s any ingenious national primary idea that’s going to come through.

MR. HESS: Carl Wagner, why don’t you continue with your exchanges and problems.

MR. WAGNER: I think it’s very hard. We have lumped together campaign delegate selection and campaign finance, and I would like to dissociate them because I think the most radical change in the selection of the president over the last 20 years, and I do think it’s radical, is the campaign finance law. The resources that make it available to challengers versus incumbents, to
challengers and non-incumbents—the reappropriation of resources available to a campaign is staggering, especially given the inflation in the cost of campaigning. I mean it has been estimated that in 1960 President Kennedy spent in his primary races $750,000. That probably represents less than a third of the sum of money spent this year in the state of Iowa, the first caucus state, by all the candidates. Simultaneously, the ability of candidates to raise money, the constraints put on challengers and incumbents, plus the enormous reporting costs. The Kennedy for President Committee probably will spend between one and two million dollars in complying with the law. Financing in a very dramatic and noticeable way has influenced the nominating process far beyond the length of the primary season or proportional representation in Congress.

MR. HESS: You, too, Ken Bode, have some problems with campaign financing.

MR. BODE: Very simply I think all the laundered money in 1972 caused vast overreaction. I think the contribution limit, for example, of a thousand dollars, is unnecessary. The most important single ingredient to the whole campaign finance process is simply reporting. If a candidate wants to take $2 million from somebody and the American public knows about it, that's all that's essential. All this business of spending limits state by state, matching funds, so forth, I think a whole lot of it really can be just thrown out.

MR. KEENE: It's silly and it's unnecessary. It screwed up the system, made it difficult for challengers and even difficult for incumbents in some ways. It was ill-considered in 1974. Former Sen. Pastore in looking back on it a year later said the members of the Senate didn't act like senators, they acted like scared rats.

There was a perceived need for reform, and thegoo-goo brigade from Common Cause leaped into the breach with this proposal which has made life miserable for everybody involved in politics, has reduced discussion, has reduced public involvement and has proven once again the only thing you can count on is the reformers will accomplish almost the opposite of what they set out to accomplish.

The 1971 act, which was passed and had some problems that were taken care of by the courts, provided for full disclosure. That act was never tested because Watergate raised the question that was met with the perceived need for reform. But if the Congress was motivated by public policy concerns at this point, I think it would strike everything right back to 1971 to provide for full and complete disclosure and let the system function freely. That won't happen.

MR. HESS: But the law was passed because it turned out in 1972 that there was considerable corruption in the system.
MR. KEENE: The corruption that existed was illegal at the time it took place and it was found out at the time it took place. Nothing in the new law has done anything to make that less likely.

Take the theory behind the new reforms. It was felt by the Congress and it was felt by the reformers that the mere act of someone contributing more than a thousand dollars was per se corrupting both to the contributor and to the candidate. There's no evidence that's the fact. When the Supreme Court considered it even in upholding that portion of the act—which I personally consider a direct affront to the First Amendment—the court allowed that there is no evidence and that the people supporting the law could produce no evidence, but that there was an impression abroad in the land, and therefore the First Amendment had to take a back seat to legislation that would cure the impression, not the reality.

If you accepted the validity of the contribution limits, then I ask, what purpose did this spending limit serve except to limit discussion and debate? In 1972 George McGovern spent something like $45 million in the general election and couldn't get his message through. Today no candidate can spend that much. That hypes the advantage available to the incumbent, the guy going in ahead. . . . What's happened since then as a result of the spending limits and the law has been that campaign managers and candidates, particularly as you approach the general election, have reduced those aspects of the campaign that are not controllable and cost-effective. It's reduced anything essentially other than media campaigning because that's controllable and they feel as things get moving you can utilize that.

Grass-roots campaigning dried up both for the technical reasons and because you don't want to spend money on it. Any kind of outreach programs for most candidates are gone because that's not the most effective way to spend your dollars. You have put constraints on campaigns that are very, very serious.

MR. WOOTEN: Talking about the system's value in producing the best men for the presidency, the best nominees, does it prevent good men from becoming the nominee of the party?

MR. NOLAN: It may prevent competent men. The thing that worries me about this law is that it makes politics into another bureaucracy, which is pretty bad. The Federal Election Commission has already done for politics what the Interstate Commerce Commission has done for transportation, which is to bury it in red tape, to strangle it and immobilize it.

And the worst spinoff of it is what it's done to our business—the press, media, television. It's encouraged the attitude of pecksniffery that comes upon the press whenever it wins a couple of battles. Every cityroom in America is
crawling with young guys in trench coats who have seen the movie too many
times. They think that every politician is crooked, and by God, we are going
to find out. In national politics I don’t think there’s any doubt that the quote,
quote, quote, reform following Watergate has changed the way people look at
potential presidents. People are talking about goodness, or this year compas­sion. These ethereal qualities.

MR. HESS: Wasn’t there another underlying concern when the law was
passed, the American people seemed to think that there was too much money
being spent?

MR. NOLAN: Yes, money.

MR. WAGNER: I think not.

MR. NOLAN: They are wrong in that. Let’s be clear on this. There were
statutes on the books in the District of Columbua against burglary. There were
statutes against conspiracy, subornation of perjury, and all the President’s
men went to jail for it. We had statutes on the book against people of evil in­
tent. But they figured it must have been Clement Stone’s money that made
them that way. I don’t think so. I think they would have been that way on a
budget. (Laughter)

MR. HESS: We have consensus, it appears, on one point, that campaign
financing reforms have gone too far, that they have driven money out of the
system, money being the way that candidates translate their message to the
people through the media, and that the main thing is that we know where the
money is coming from....

MR. NOLAN: Beware of the word reform, with or without quotation
marks. Particularly beware of it when it’s accompanied by a six-point program
with four sub-proposals for every point. Particularly beware of it if it comes
out of a great academic institution. And remember that the vote for president
is the least ideological decision any American ever makes. They vote for a man
of character, and they don’t vote for a problem solver as much as a decision
maker. So anything that enhances the public’s approach and visibility of the
candidate’s character is something that ought to be encouraged.

* * *
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The Media

Leaks

An interview with Ben Bradlee

The following is an unpublished interview between Martin Linsky, Media Programs Consultant at the Institute, and Benjamin C. Bradlee, Executive Director of The Washington Post. Bradlee was a Visiting Fellow of the Institute in April, 1980.

LINSKY: How would you describe the change in the relationship between government and the press from, let's say, pre-Watergate, during the Watergate period, and now? What's happening now, what does it look like, how does it smell to you or feel to you? In terms of trust and...

BRADLEE: Well, I don't think there is much trust. I suspect there was probably too much trust beforehand. But I think the watershed that interests me about Watergate in this area was that it destroyed any feeling on the press's part that there was kind of an automatic truth to what the government said. There isn't that now. Once you have been lied to by the President of the United States, life is never the same.

LINSKY: But hasn't it gone the other way too far?

BRADLEE: That it is now ungovernable, yes...

LINSKY: Well, that no one will believe anything they say...

BRADLEE: Well, if you're right twice in a row, that begins to change that; there are people in government that I believe.

LINSKY: What is the pattern of leaks, I mean how....

BRADLEE: Well, I think you have got to decide what's a leak.

LINSKY: OK, what's a leak?

BRADLEE: It was once said that a leak isn't a leak until someone gets wet. Leak is a pejorative word. If you're the Secretary of State, and you call in Scotty Reston and tell him what's going on, that's called a background conversation...

LINSKY: That's an authorized leak.

BRADLEE: That's what the State Department calls it, and that's what Reston calls it; I call it a leak, because I didn't get any. Down at this conference I was just at, I really fell out of my seat when I heard Lloyd Cutler say that he had never been involved in a leak. That's baloney. Five minutes later he was telling me that the so-called message that Ghotbzadeh received wasn't written...
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by the President, it was written by one of the French lawyers. That's a leak. I tell you The New York Times thought it was a leak.

LINSKY: What's the difference in the prevalence between authorized leaks and unauthorized...we really are talking about unauthorized leaks, or unauthorized disclosures.

BRADLEE: Unauthorized by the powers that be, the "ins."

LINSKY: But in terms of authorized leaks, that's part of doing business everyday.

BRADLEE: That is how to do business.

LINSKY: And it has always been.

BRADLEE: Ya, I think so; I mean its less clubby than it was. You have got to remember that, you know, in 1933 Steve Early could call in the entire White House Press Corps and twelve people would be in the room with him and the President of the United States used to sit there and tease them and talk with them as part of it. It was a family atmosphere; that's gone.

LINSKY: Let's focus on unauthorized disclosures. Things that you wouldn't want your boss to know you had said. Is that on the increase? Is that part of day to day business now, is it more than it was ten years ago?

BRADLEE: Well, maybe. I think Vietnam started that. I mean, there were people who worked for the government that began to disbelieve, and who began to pass on information that tended to disprove the official line. It became of such passionate concern that they just did it and thought they were heroic in doing it, and there hadn't been any such issue previously.

LINSKY: But now we leak about everything. That kind of unauthorized heroism is not limited to matters of national defense or national security; HEW, Commerce Department, everybody is leaking, is that right?

BRADLEE: Yes, there is a lot of it. God love 'em, I mean without 'em our job is much more difficult.

LINSKY: Impossible?

BRADLEE: No, nothing is impossible, but it is harder to get. I mean, you learn in the newspaper business to seek out people who disagree because they are the people who are likely to tell you what is going on.

LINSKY: Do you think the press does enough of identifying where the leaks come from?

BRADLEE: Never, never, never enough. But you have got to understand that if I have the leak right, and I run with the story for a couple of days, everybody else in the press's interest is now identifying my leak, and sooner or later, it will come.

LINSKY: But shouldn't you identify it, not by name if you can't, but you know, the "law enforcement source?"
BRADLEE: Yes, you should give it... I mean our rules are to get as absolutely specific as you can. "A law enforcement source," "a New York law enforcement source."

LINSKY: What do you mean "your rules"; are they written down somewhere?

BRADLEE: Yes, we have a style book and in the preface to the style book are a series of rules about conflict of interest, about attribution, about things like that.

LINSKY: And you...


LINSKY: And what is the pressure on a Post reporter to get something on the record, when the source wants to give it...

BRADLEE: Well, we have worked like hell on that and not very successfully.

LINSKY: What happens? Say I'm a reporter and I come back and say that there is this terrific story, an anonymous source, but it is a guy I trust and know; do you make me go back?

BRADLEE: Well it depends, technically we do; but if it's the President, we are liable to say... you know... I'll tell you a story about that. We've been looking to stop "background," non-attributed information coming to us. Especially when the government calls you in and then puts you on a background basis, you can attribute. One evening, I was just about to leave the office, maybe 7:30 or 7:45 at night, and a series of wire stories come in: AP, UP, Agence France Press, and the LA Times wire came in, all of them saying that unless the Soviets change their attitude on Pakistan and India, the President, then Nixon, was going to cancel his trip to Moscow, "comma, informed sources said today." One of them said, "I learned today" under somebody's byline. And they were identical. I mean they were identical! They were filed immediately after the plane landed bringing the President and the Secretary of State back from the Azores, where Nixon and Kissinger had been having conversations with Pompidou. Stanley Karnow and Don Oberdorfer came to me and said maybe this is the story we are looking for. It was plainly a leak; if you want, an authorized leak. Plainly, some high muck-a-muck—it was obviously, in this case, either the President or Kissinger. I just felt that we were being so manipulated—and we weren't on the plane, we weren't part of the pool; our correspondent had stayed in the Azores to write the story in the Azores, and was coming back in the press plane. The people who wrote it were members of the pool. So I asked Don Oberdorfer to call up the White House
and ask them who did the background briefing on the plane coming back. Some woman who was there, who was a great heroine, as far as I'm concerned, said, "Henry, of course." And Oberdorfer said, "Thank you very much," and identified himself as Oberdorfer and all that.

So we wrote exactly the same story, except we said, "Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told reporters today..." Well, it hit the fan—you wouldn't believe.... Some of the guys said that I should be thrown out of Sigma Delta Chi, which I wasn't a member of; I should have my White House press card lifted, which I didn't have; and Henry got sore. But nothing happened. It was just minor victory. I tell you minor.

LINSKY: But don't you think you could do that more. Couldn't you...

BRADLEE: Well, we've tried it. We did it with Vance once. We had "a high state department official," which was Vance, but we couldn't identify...so we just run a picture of Vance, saying "high state department official." Hodding called me up and said, "You trying to tell me something," and I said, "Damn right."

* * *

Informed Sources

by Jonathan Moore

The following is the "Overview" from the book Informed Sources: A Report on Two Educational Programs for Journalists, published by the Institute in September, 1980. Jonathan Moore has served as director of the Institute since 1974.

With some exceptions, newspaper coverage of government tends to be fragmentary, sensational and superficial rather than analytically penetrating in terms of comprehending how and why government works the way it does. It lacks continuity and cohesion in defining and tracking the interacting systems of government. Better attention to process in reporting on government could provide treatment which is less misleading to the public and which would help the press in anticipating policy developments, evaluating perfor-
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mance, interpreting complex substantive issues, and predicting outcomes by understanding the context and environment in which they are shaped. Serious coverage is sufficiently meager that the question may fairly be asked if there is a connection between the low quality of information available to citizens and their growing alienation from government and mistrust of government institutions.

Often the constraints, pressures and problems which constrict public agencies and officials are ill-defined or overlooked in the press. Implied criticisms of government performance are often based on inadequate acknowledgement of severely limited options, failure to recognize resourceful handling of an extremely complex or impacted problem, a false sense of mystery simply because there was no villain in the piece, or analytical failure to identify a structural or procedural key to the result. The consequence can be a compounding of the press's lack of understanding about the government and the public's lack of confidence in the government.

All this is difficult to improve for a number of reasons. Newspaper people claim that they give their readers what their readers want. Public appetites do not increase for news on the unspectacular developments, problems and accomplishments of government. The question is properly asked: who would read the stuff? Are the impediments inherent in the nature of newspapers, the way they are produced, and their market overwhelming? Can some progress be found through changes in editorial emphasis and the selection, training, and assigning of reporters? The press sometimes rationalizes, "When we don't have the answers about government, we just print the news;" or over-simplifies, "Journalism's moral responsibility is to report what public officials are doing."

Government itself is grappling with increasingly complex issues, which are no longer isolated in separate policy categories but are intensively interacting upon one another, and is attempting analytical methodology and integrated planning to meet the challenges this represents. The press has a responsibility to deal with these same factors, and not just enough to lay back and blame government for developments the press isn't sophisticated enough to comprehend fully.

With these concerns in mind, the Institute of Politics felt it should explore the feasibility of developing short, tailored seminars for working correspondents and editors which could assist in facilitating higher quality media treatment of government and politics. Realizing that a great deal of change was occurring in the political process with uncertain outcome, but being convinced that the press and television will play an even more powerful role than they do already, we believed that an educational institution committed to
designing programs to benefit practitioners rather than just scholars should not exclude journalists from its effort. We were not sure whether we had the competence to be valuable to this community, but if its representatives were willing to participate in common exploration, we might find out. The Institute had already pioneered training programs for practitioners in the political process, such as Mayors and Congressmen; sponsors various student study groups on media issues; recently conducted (in conjunction with the Nieman Foundation and the Ford Foundation) a two-year program of regional conferences throughout New England to examine conflicts between the media and the law; and has co-produced with WGBH, Boston a number of political programs and documentaries for television.

We consulted an informal advisory group of people about the concept and planning for this program, including: Professor Samuel H. Beer, Harvard University; David S. Broder, The Washington Post; Professor Edwin Diamond, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Martin A. Linsky, Editor, The Real Paper; J. Anthony Lukas, author; James McCarty, Knight-Ridder Newspapers, Inc.; Professor Richard E. Neustadt, Harvard University; Martin A. Nolan, The Boston Globe; Neal R. Pierce, The National Journal; James C. Thomson, Jr., Curator, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University; Thomas Winship, The Boston Globe; Professor Lewis Wolfson, American University.

We met with the Ford Foundation in the winter of 1978, which encouraged us in this endeavour and agreed to support half of the costs for two programs. The first would be a three-day seminar for Massachusetts print reporters and editors on the process of government at the state level. Its emphasis would be on how the character of government institutions influence policy outcomes and program performance. To understand the nature and impact of process requires a familiarity with bureaucratic relationships and operations which is difficult to build given the daily pressures of the reporter's job. The second would be a one-day seminar for national print and television correspondents on a single, major public policy issue. The purpose here would be to provide an intensive review of a complex problem which would be receiving considerable media attention in the immediate future. Sometimes reporters are obliged to cover issues in depth and in a hurry which they have not had the time to comprehend adequately in advance.

What follows in this report covers the results of these two seminars. Based on our evaluation of them—with the help of various friends, collaborators, and potential collaborators, and potential contributors and beneficiaries—we will decide how to improve and develop such seminars further, ideally to in-
The Media

institutionalize and regularize them as part of a larger role within the Kennedy School of Government, to build greater capacity to deal with issues concerning the press, politics and public policy. Working closely with the Nieman Foundation and other relevant existing activity at Harvard, the Institute plans to develop programs in teaching, research and professional education which will address a range of subject areas including the impact of the media on the political process, government regulation and First Amendment questions, and relations between government and the media.

* * *

Covering Afghanistan
by Dan Rather

The following are excerpts from remarks made by Dan Rather, CBS News Correspondent, in a panel discussion entitled, "Afghanistan: Refugees, Politics and the Media," held in the Forum in May, 1980.

One of the things I would like very much to submit for your consideration is that if the remarks of my good friend the Doctor [Zikria] are available in any written form, I think it might be a good idea, if you are interested in the subject of Afghanistan, to get a copy of them, to read them through, think them through, and digest them through, as at least one point of view about what is happening in Afghanistan. Much of what American journalism has missed about Afghanistan—and I certainly include in American journalism this reporter and CBS News—I include myself and my organization in the long list of people and organizations who have underreported what is happening in Afghanistan. There are many reasons for this, and I don't think that we need spend a great deal of time discussing the reasons why the situation in Afghanistan has been underreported. I think our time, frankly, can be better spent on talking about what the situation is and what can be done about it, particularly as it applies to refugees from this situation. But I do want to touch upon what I consider to be some of our failings since my subject [on the panel] is media in Afghanistan.
American journalism—and I by no means mean this to confine it to American journalism, but since I'm an American I deal in American journalism; the subject at hand is that—our failure is frequently one of not understanding the world at large. We frequently fail in foreign coverage. Heaven knows, and we all know, how often we fail in domestic coverage. But we more often fail in foreign coverage.

Now particularly with Afghanistan, American journalism has failed in many important ways, the most important way being that our coverage has been too seldom, and, like Jimmy Carter's desert classic, a little too little and too late. Our coverage has been narrow and shallow. One reason our coverage has been narrow and shallow is lack of language, lack of knowledge about the country, lack of interest. That lack of interest applies both to journalists and to readers, listeners and viewers. Let us not forget that Afghanistan is almost exactly half way around the world. It is roughly twelve to thirteen thousand miles from this country. It's a landlocked country, it's not a country that any of us—very few of us know much about. But there is a lack of interest in general in this country, particularly in the post-Vietnam era. One can argue whether that lack of interest is healthy for us, whether it is justified, or unjustified, but it does exist. But in ticking off the reasons why our coverage in and about Afghanistan has been narrow and shallow; lack of language, lack of knowledge, lack of interest, both on the part of those who report and those who consume what reporters turn out. A lack of resources—this is perhaps a feeble excuse, but feeble as it is, it is one of the reasons. Afghanistan is expensive for any news organization; even for one of the major networks to undertake consistent, regular coverage of Afghanistan requires a major policy and budget decision because it does command so much of your resources. It is expensive.

There are other reasons, including that American journalism, in particular television journalism, is attracted to action. It's no good dodging this. Sometimes that works to our advantage, sometimes it works to our disadvantage. As far as television is concerned, one of the problems in Afghanistan is a lack of action. That is to say there is a lack of pictures, and when you can't get the pictures it is very difficult to command very much television time. I don't like that. I'd like to change that; in so far as I am able to change it, I will change it—I don't mean in this instance now, vis-a-vis Afghanistan, although I would like to change that as well—but in general, this is a continuing problem with us.

Also, and these problems are in no particular order, is the problem of access. Even for those organizations that are willing—and do—make the com-
mitment of their resources; even for those journalists who are prepared to make a commitment to go and try to see and hear on-scene and think for themselves there, there is the problem of access. The Soviets are not eager for journalists to be in Afghanistan, to say the least.

It is difficult once you are in Afghanistan to do much more than simply turn your flashlight—which is not a bad metaphor for the camera for that matter—but for any reporter, whether he is with camera or without, the best you can do is turn your flashlight on one spot at one time. It is impossible to turn a huge searchlight on the country as a whole. That’s another difficulty that reporters have with the story. There is no question in my mind that those who view, listen and read have this same difficulty with the story.

QUESTION [from the audience]: You take an average American citizen [who] hears stories about refugees all the time—you’ve got hundreds of thousands in Indochina, Somalia, Cubans this morning, Haitians, Mexicans, and a terrible problem with the Afghan refugees... Why should an American make a particular attempt to help out with the terrible situation with the Afghan refugees in Pakistan? How do we set our priorities? Who do we help the most?

RATHER: I’ve asked myself that question at least, and not to exaggerate, a hundred times since coming out of there, in just about that way: the Haitians, Cubans, you’ve got refugees everywhere you turn. This much I do feel strongly about however, and you put it in the framework of what am I, an American, to think about this. I don’t know how widely you have traveled; certainly, any number of people in this room have traveled widely. Wherever you travel in this world today as an American, one is faced with this dilemma: whether it is true or untrue, justified or unjustified, much of the world believes that all we are about is commercialism and militarism.

Now, the Afghan refugees, as is the case with the Cambodian refugees and the North Vietnamees refugees, represent a remarkable opportunity for us to demonstrate that we are about something else. Now you can pick your spot, or pick a number of spots. What happens with most people—it isn’t a case of saying, well I don’t quite know where to put my priority. Most people, lets face it, and I include myself in this on most days, simply turn their back and walk away from it.
Now, we are either what we say we are about, or we're not. You talk about commitment, talk about wanting to have a value, showing the world we are about something other than commercialism and militarism; there is the opportunity, in those refugee camps on the Pakistani side of the Afghan border, or on the Thai side of the Cambodian border, or in Florida where these Cubans are coming in. If you want to make an hour of your day count for something, then you pick one and say, "I'm going to work on that." What you don't do is simply say, "it's all too big for me to understand, it's all too complex" and you walk away from it.


Humanity in High Places
by John Marks

The following excerpt is from the introductory remarks of John Marks, a Fellow at the Institute, to a panel discussion with Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong, authors of the book The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court, held in the Forum in December, 1979.

Woodward and Armstrong have now written The Brethren, which is the most talked-about book of the year. It digs deep into the Supreme Court and it is investigative reporting in its purest form. To use that term "investigative reporting" really is a redundancy, since all reporting should be investigative, as indeed all scholarship should be investigative. Unfortunately, most reporters in the field do not dig below the surface, they do not go for those levels of truth that are not readily apparent, and they don't do their jobs nearly as well as Woodward and Armstrong do. They both are extremely good at what they do, they are masters in the field, and they're the kind of people one might want to emulate if one were thinking of going to journalism school, which about a quarter of the senior class in most colleges have been thinking about lately. They've done a superb job.

Now in this kind of book, a major investigative work, you find there is a tendency to want, at least in some circles when these books are published,
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want to shoot the bearers of the bad news or the good news, the messengers. We saw this when Woodward and Bernstein were investigating the Nixon White House and people said that's not the kind of work that should be done—that's not the kind of investigation the country needs. Seymour Hirsch going into My Lai or the CIA, and again there was criticism of the person doing the investigation of what the government was up to. This kind of argument detracts from the substance of what the investigation is all about. It is a convenient way to overlook that substance, and I think it is unfortunate. I think it's best to deal with a book like this on the level of substance. We of course tonight are going to discuss the question of whether the book should have been written in the first place, but I think most of us at this point will acknowledge that that is a moot question. It has been written.

The main news in this book is that the Supreme Court is made up of human beings who, like the rest of us, can be incompetent at times, they can be petty, they can be ego-centered. They also can be high-minded, they can do good things and they can do bad things. This revelation of humanity in high places is causing great consternation in the legal profession. The sanctity of the Supreme Court has been violated and there are cries of rape afoot in the land, especially coming from people who head things like the American Bar Association and certain law school professors.

My guess is that there's a man in prison tonight named Slick Moore who is also crying foul, wherever he is tonight, and he has some very good reasons, as Woodward and Armstrong document in their book. They describe how he was, let us say, railroaded into a conviction by a prosecutor who withheld vital information from a jury, and how that particular prosecutor waved a sawed-off shotgun in front of the jury which happened to be the sawed-off shot gun or the murder weapon used in a particular place, and how Slick Moore got life in prison. The reason it comes up in the book is because the case was appealed all the way up to the Supreme Court, and there was a tie developing. Justice William Brennan was the swing vote in that particular case. According to Woodward and Armstrong, who presumably have learned these things from impeccable sources and we're not doubting the sources at this moment, according to them, Justice Brennan decided that he was not going to vote to overturn the conviction of Slick Moore, because Justice Brennan did not want to offend Justice Harry Blackmun. Now he had some very good reasons for not wanting to offend Justice Harry Blackmun. Blackmun was new to the Court, and Brennan was hoping to win Blackmun's vote for abortion cases and obscenity cases. In other words, he had good reasons, he had higher reasons. The problem is that Slick Moore stayed in jail. In the corridors of
power this is called trade-off. Let he who has never made a trade-off of this sort cast the first stone at Justice Brennan.

The point is, however, the most of us had got the notion in school, perhaps from high school civics classes, that the Supreme Court did not operate on this level. We had this notion that the Supreme Court was the one place in the land where perhaps principled or constitutional notions won out. What Woodward and Armstrong have told us is that there are trade-offs at that level. It turns out that there were some insiders, some very inside insiders, people who act as clerks at the Supreme Court who knew this, some Washington lawyers. I had a friend who was a Washington lawyer who last night said to me "Ah, yes, I knew about this kind of stuff." What Woodward and Armstrong have done is to have democratized that particular knowledge. Now some would claim that the spreading of that kind of knowledge undermines our whole system. I think I would maintain, I think Slick Moore would maintain, that the system is strong enough to withstand the publication of a book of this sort, and probably is strengthened by the demystification of some of its arcane rituals.
To the first advocates of the Equal Rights Amendment, women industrial workers pleaded, "Don't cut off our heads to cure a headache!" They meant not only that the ERA would be worse than the ills of the factory system, but that it would, quite literally, kill them. The most responsible, reputable representatives of women laborers claimed that the only right the proposed amendment would guarantee was the right to die prematurely.

For decades the legitimate needs and fears of women factory workers helped block the passage of the ERA. The rigors of contemporary industrial conditions and the tendency to exploit women made the need for protective legislation for women irrefutable. The problem was that this protective legislation for women rested on the acknowledgement that women were weaker than men. By admitting that men and women were unequal, the argument for protective legislation undermined the ERA. Thus early supporters of the ERA found it impossible to promote the amendment without implying a willingness to relegate women to wretched working conditions.

In addition to the opposition of women factory workers, a majority of the former suffragists refused to support the ERA. ERA supporters, these early feminists railed, "should quit the battle now that the citadel is won." For them, the issue behind the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment had not been an issue of equality. The most prevalent arguments for women's suffrage, in fact, had advanced the notion that men and women were inherently unequal; women did not demand the vote to assert equality with men. Rather, they wanted ballots in order to protect their unique feminine interests. They maintained that the ERA would defeat the purpose for which they had struggled by mandating the repeal of special legislation for women. And women in factories would suffer most.
During the 1920s through strikes, court battles, lobbying efforts, and elections women in many states had already won minimum wage-maximum hours legislation, legal limits to the amount of weight they could be made to haul, the right to have seats at their workplace, and even separate toilet facilities. Women had been barred from trade unions by biased hostile men and unable to form effective unions on their own. In the absence of union protection, women needed this special legislation even though it still did not offer women what unions offered men. For example, the lack of organization among women laborers allowed those who were willing to work for low wages to undercut the efforts of those who tried to command higher pay. ERA opponents claimed that special legislation for women tended to equalize conditions for the sexes, while the proposed amendment—by rendering such legislation impossible—would worsen the inequalities between them.

It has taken decades to resolve this quandary, but now sufficient precedent exists to assume that rather than rescind protective laws for women, the ERA will extend such legislation to men. This premise began to gather momentum in the 1930s when some uniform wage, health, and safety standards emerged from New Deal employment programs. Eventually states and the nation as a whole established minimum wage laws for men and women. As protective legislation has lost its sex-specific nature, a huge plank has been torn from the anti-ERA platform.

Two splinters of that plank remain, however. First, some women fear that with the ERA they will lose one type of protective legislation which cannot be extended to men: maternity benefits. But most constitutional scholars agree that the ERA will not affect laws relating to physical condition, even if the particular condition is a property of one sex. Second, some men continue to fight the ERA in order to retain legislation which "protects" women from certain jobs. In reality these laws merely "protect" men from competition with women in those fields. For example, some states forbid women non-professionals to work at night. Such laws hearken back to the days when factories and the sweat trades forced women to labor long hours at risk to their health and homelife. Now these laws simply deny overtime benefits to women.

Another large anti-ERA plank is coming loose. Women industrial workers have rightfully feared that the ERA would free their husbands from automatically assuming child support and alimony obligations. Divorced women who enter the industrial work force are often victimized by the "Last hired, first fired" policy during lay-off periods. Consequently, they have depended on conventional divorce settlement. But a sweeping trend toward a sex-neutral determination of custody, child support, and alimony is evident in
Considering Sexual Equality

a recent flood of court cases. The Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act of 1973 is gaining ground throughout the country. Eventually, with or without the ERA, the capacity of the individual parent, regardless of gender, to care for children will fix the terms of divorce settlement. As a result, courts may still consider the special needs of women laborers. The difference is that they will no longer just assume them.

The strongest arguments against the ERA are being ruled away. Protective legislation for men and women and the advent of sex-neutral divorce laws will soon render moot the potent protests. Now that most of the original anti-ERA arguments are becoming irrelevant, adversaries of the ERA fear that the amendment will forever alienate from the mainstream of society women with traditional aspirations. Many women industrial workers remain zealous opponents of the ERA, clinging to objections that may be less tangible than before but which are still every bit as steadfast. Behind the laws forbidding women to work certain hours, lift certain weights, and hold certain jobs, is an ideal of womanhood which endures in the face of the fact that many women must play all of the roles—employee, mother, and father—which society prescribes for each sex. A notion, as antiquated and persistent as this ideal, is the belief that society has an obligation to promote it. A stereotype, a rhapsodic vision rather than a reality, dominates opposition to the ERA. There is security in this delusion, and that is why many women cling to it so tenaciously: security from the responsibilities of life in a society where sex does not confer special privileges or set comforting limits to potential. In clutching this ideal, women embrace the childlike statutes given them by law—a law which presents them as beings which need protection more than freedom.

But society’s demands upon women are encroaching, while legislation has snuffed the flames which fired early ERA opponents. Without the ERA, women have had to share the benefits of protective legislation with their male colleagues. Without the ERA, they will have to share the burden of child support. Clearly, today’s ERA adversaries are paying the bill and leaving the goods.

* * *
The Role of Women in Political Conventions
by Jill Ruckelshaus

The following is an excerpt from remarks made by Jill Ruckelshaus, who serves on the National Advisory Committee of the National Women's Political Caucus, at a panel discussion held in the Forum in October, 1979, entitled "The Role of Women in the 1980 Conventions."

When I was eleven and going to dancing class dressed up in my crinolines and my shining black Mary Jane shoes, it was gradually revealed to me that because I was a girl I was going to spend my entire life dancing backwards. Perhaps it was because of an early acceptance of this awkward ground rule of life that led inevitably to my becoming a Republican feminist. These words, according to some wits, are mutually exclusive. "Republican feminist" is somewhat like the phrase "business ethics...."

I first became involved with the Women's Political Caucus in 1972. With the invitation of a friend, I went to their organizing convention in Washington, D.C., and they were at that time picking out the people to represent them at the party conventions in Miami in 1972. I was standing in the back of the room, I didn't know anyone, I never had been to a meeting before, and I heard my name placed in nomination as being a spokesperson for Republicans in Miami. I knew instantly, of course, [that] I was being used, since I've been used often enough to recognize that phenomenon when it happens....

I was working at the White House at the time, on the staff of Anne Armstrong, representing women's interests in the White House. I had a very small office. I got a call from John Erlichman asking me to come over and have lunch in the White House mess—wasn't my average luncheon companion so I was pleased to go. And what he wanted to know was what we were going to do, because the entire party platform was coming out of the White House. It was the 1972 Republican convention, if you recall, in a long series of rather placid party conventions, it was very placid, really placid. And Erlichman wanted to be sure that the platform that came out of the White House would not be tampered with. So the essence of that was, what are you going to do?
And I remember sitting there in the mess and the phone rang and the little Filipino mess boy brought the phone to his table, and I was really getting the full treatment, and he answered "Yes, Mr. President," and he talked and talked. Then he hung up, and I said something manipulative, like we've learned to do, I said, "You certainly have a lot of responsibility, John," and he said to me, "I control everything out to the twenty mile limit and Henry takes care of the rest of it." At that time, I believe that my basic effective controls were no longer intact. Later back in my office I also believe that though this was true, it certainly would not prevent me from functioning smoothly with my co-workers in the White House.

So we went to Miami and Miami was a condition that only Evelyn Waugh could have gotten down exactly right. Waugh is very good at scenes of industrious self delusions, scenes of people absorbed in odd games. He should have been there to see the Nixonettes, to see the Yippies, to see the yachts filled with wealthy delegates, to see Betty Friedan, to see Spiro Agnew, to see Nelson Rockefeller and John Lindsay and all the people that paraded around in the large and pretentious hotels of Miami. I observed a very disquieting tendency on the part of all the male delegates to have settled foursquare—it seemed to me, everybody at this Republican convention was middle age. There was a heavy jocularity, there was a lot of baroque rhetoric, and there was an incredible insensitivity to issues of women and minorities. There was a feeling that the future was always going to be a rational extension of the past, that we were winning, that somehow, it was all over—there was a lot of heady feeling in 1972, that there was always going to be world enough and time for the Republican Party. Nobody seemed to be talking about the War, the dissidents, that the world was in fact not the way they wished it was anymore. People there talked about apathy—seemed to me a strange word to use in relation to what was happening on the campuses and the street demonstrations, the radicalization of the late sixties, the Yippies in the parks just south of Miami. It seemed to me as I walked through those lobbies that the delegates had frozen their vocabularies in the Fifties, except to admit an occasional new addendum like "Designated Hitter" and "bump and run." It was a strange male vernacular going on down there, and the women's movement had not penetrated. I remember sitting in the lobby of the Fontainebleu, smelling the chlorine that fills the first floor of all the hotels in Miami, watching the rain fall and the steam rising off the heated pools outside, and I had, for the first time, a sharp apprehension of what it would be like to be insane. Later, back in Washington, D.C., I forgot.
An evaluation of summer research
by Holly Sargent

Holly Sargent received a Summer Research Award from the Institute in 1979 to examine the development of corrections policy for women in the Maine criminal justice system.

The work I completed this summer was extremely rewarding and has proven to be essential to my continued inquiry. It served to answer several of my central questions and to open other peripheral questions for my consideration. I worked in three general areas to prepare my final recommendations: 1) I worked to gain an understanding of recent problems and policies in the area of Maine Corrections, i.e., prison population, violence problems, political responses, and level of spending. Further, I focused on the recent problems, policies and attitudes concerning women in the correctional system. 2) I compiled basic data on the trends of female crime in Maine over the last five years: quantitative increases in specific crime areas, and general demographic material on incarcerated women. 3) I sought to acquaint myself with the actual mechanics of correction policy making, including the types of research which are commonly done, the popular pressures that exist, and partisan or personal peculiarities that generally have substantial effects.

In researching the first area, I found the correctional system in great flux and turmoil. The Maine State Prison, the maximum and medium security facility for men, is extremely overcrowded and has had a high level of violence and tension. Relieving this problem has been the major priority for the system over the last year. The Governor's short-term solution, which involved reopening a facility which was closed in 1976 to house thirty work-release inmates, has been very expensive, somewhat ineffective, and insufficient to the problem. This has increased the tension in the department and further focused all energy on finding a solution. Several long-term solutions which would increase the overall capacity of the system are now being posted.

The effect that these problems has had upon my more specific interest of women within the correctional system is to relegate the female concerns to a very low priority. The female prison population is small and non-violent compared to the male population. Their concerns center around programs and treatment. Many of their problems are not clearly discernable or solved by adding capacity or changing schedule, but deal with attitudes and their posi-
tion within the system. The realistic assessment of their situation is that no
female policy of great dimension will receive any attention until the larger and
more public problems of the men are solved.

To respond to the situation which exists, I divided my recommendations
into two types. The first type is no-cost and attempts to correct some of the
small problems of treatment and attitude which make a major difference in the
lives of the prisoners. These changes would require little energy from the
preoccupied department. The second type is more long-term and addresses the
overarching problems of housing, capacity, and philosophy. The problems of
guiding each type of policy greatly differ, and part of my present work is to
work out the proper approach for each.

The basic research I did on female crime and the women who have been
incarcerated in the female facility consumed a great deal of my time, but has
become the backbone of my work. Before I began my research this summer,
there were no statistics available on female crime in Maine. I made simple
computations of the number of women held and sentenced in all of the county
jails in the state which showed a 100% increase over the last five years. I then
broke these figures down to indicate the areas of the state where the greatest
increases occurred. In researching the types of crimes that women have been
committing in the last five years, I used the basic jail registers to record each
crime for which a woman was held. From this information, I gleaned data for
the specific types of crime which have increased, the age, and other
demographic material. I felt this information was absolutely essential to
presenting my policy for the future. To gain a sense of what kind of woman
was actually serving time at the co-educational facility, I extracted from the
records basic demographic material for all of the women they have held over
the last three years. This information has helped me get a sense of what areas
produce the most prisoners, which will be useful in making long-term sug-
gestions.

The third area of research was comprised of listening to and observing the
people who make policy and, basically, run things. It is difficult to assess and
relate the things I learned, but this was probably the most helpful area, for I
not only gained actual factual knowledge, but some insight into the process.

Overall, I did a great deal of work and had a very interesting summer.
Thank you for all of your help in allowing me the opportunity.
The Second Stage of the Struggle
by Betty Friedan

I'm glad to welcome you tonight, women and men of Harvard, to what I hope will be an opening dawn in the second phase of the struggle. There is no question about it from my vantage point, having helped to articulate the unspoken desperate need for this revolution, nearly twenty years ago now. In fact, it is corroborated by the history books and by social and political observers, that the woman's movement has been the major movement of social change of this past decade and in some ways the most far reaching revolution of all time, though it is not necessarily what Karl Marx or anyone else ever meant by revolution before. I believe we have only seen the most overt, the tip of the iceberg of this movement. You are living it already. You are living the breakthroughs—first stage—against sex discrimination in education and employment. You are living the definition of woman in terms of her own person in society breaking through the feminine mystique.

But I want to talk to you tonight about the second phase of the struggle. Even though there may no longer be overt discrimination that keeps you from getting into the law school, the medical school, the graduate school, there is something wrong, there is something that makes you uneasy, makes you unsure. I think that it is very necessary to examine very carefully your own experience and not to fall into a new trap—either a trap of thinking all the battles have been won or a trap of mistaking what the unfinished business really is. You think when you organized this graduate coalition, that the issues that are left are mainly issues of what you would call micro-discrimination; that the macro-discrimination may have been broken, that you can get into the medical school, that you can get into the law school; but how do you get up there, how do you have access really, to the top? I think that's one issue.

Women need to have options. Women need to have choices. I don't think you have as many options and choices as you, you who are the very most able, you who are in these graduate schools think you have right now, you can choose whether or not to have children; right, you can choose whether or not to marry. You have the ability; you have won access into these professions. If
as many of you are uneasily feeling yes, you ought to have children, but you're going to be superwomen.... How are you going to have children and in effect, do eight years of residency, study six hours in a hospital, eighteen out, twenty-four on, twenty-four out, however it works. Your husband is supposed to share it equally. Well, what if he's in a residency, too? How can I get him to do it? His mother used to always take care of him. It's your fault. You want to be a doctor. You want to be a lawyer. You figure it out. You work it out. Nobody's stopping you. Oh, they can do it. They can do it. Superwomen....

This movement never was meant to have just the elite, you, with superhuman energy and ability be able to get in anywhere. It's supposed to be so the average woman, so everybody can move as a full human being in society and still be able to have some kind of a life, which for women and for men still means something that resembles family, something that meets needs for love, security and human connection.

So there have to be a new set of demands. Those demands, in my opinion, cannot be made by women alone and will never be won by women alone. While it was necessary in the first stage for women to organize, to define themselves as people, to break through the discrimination against women, to give it a name, to break through it and to get themselves taken seriously as people, and they had to get themselves together, it would never have worked if someone else had done it for them; that kind of revolution would never work. In this stage we have to realize that we can not go any further as women in isolation. I am glad there are some men here tonight. I hope the next time you meet there will be a lot more. As long as there is still a powerful sexual bond in this society, then there may be a possibility that men, for their own reasons, are ready to move with you to what I call the next stage of demands....

Society has got to be restructured. Society and every profession in it has got to be restructured in new terms that take into account that maybe as many as half the people in it will be the people who happen to give birth to children. And further, the other half of the people in it will be those who owe a parenting role to children, men and women. There is no backsliding from equality for you, it seems to me, in the second phase of this struggle. Equality is where it's at. Not just some separate definition of women, that ignores these hard, tough questions. Equality means mother and father, equal parenting. Equality means that there be maternity and paternity leave and flex time and job sharing and all of these provisions in professions not just for women, because you know that's not going to work, but for women and men both. And how will that happen? It will only happen if the men come into this.
You have to come into this battle. You have to take the next step, the next stage of the struggle. You, the women, and you, the men. To now do the inventive part, much more complex, much more interesting, as life affirming and more life affirming than the first stage. To make the equality livable, workable, and possible to love in, so that we, all of us, women and men, can finally find our full humanity, the woman and man in each of us and in each other. Take the next step in human evolution. I welcome you to the second stage.
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Paving the Streets

by Willie Velasquez

The following are excerpts from the remarks of Willie Velasquez as part of a panel discussion at a conference sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee entitled, "Hispanics and the Political Issues of the Eighties," held in the Forum in February, 1980. Velasquez is Executive Director of the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project.

Before we start, let's have some idea about where we're at. Chicanos, Mexican-Americans, Mexicans, don't vote and don't register. Right? And I think you're correct when you say that. Why? Well, I've got to make a confession that when I first started in this business, I thought that one of the reasons that we didn't register and vote was because we were unsophisticated and uneducated and didn't care and didn't appreciate the vote. And I'll bet you a bunch of us here, a bunch of you, also thought the same thing and may think the same thing now. I never expressed it, but I thought it.

Now I can say that I've changed my mind a little bit. I'm going to tell you right now that I don't think that Mexicans don't vote because they are unsophisticated, uneducated and they don't appreciate it. I don't think so, I think there are other reasons. And I'm going to tell you what those reasons are....

We asked twelve good Chicano leaders in San Antonio, "what is the biggest issue facing Mexican-Americans in the United States?" It was a long time ago, but still it is relevant. Now think about it: what's the biggest issue facing Mexican-Americans in the United States? OK, second point: Four hundred and forty-two households, we asked the same thing: "What's the biggest thing facing Mexicans?"—all Mexican households. The politicos, very good people—liberals, progressives, etc.,—said: "unemployment," "discrimination," "the gringos don't like us," stuff like that. But the Chicanos, 442 households, said, "The biggest problem facing Mexicans in the United States right now? Drainage." Drainage—water, drainage....
What that means is that the biggest problem facing Mexicans in the United States, political problem, is municipal services. Now, you’ve got different kinds of cities. You’ve got Southwestern cities and you’ve got Northeastern cities. Southwestern cities are old, and they are Mexican-type towns, old and all that sort of stuff. But they also have old traditions, and a tradition they have in the Southwest is not to pave the Mexican side of town, not to put in curbs, not to put in drainage, not to put in parks, not to employ Mexicans unless they are picking up the trash that the Anglos have dumped, not to employ them in the court house: time-honored old traditions that we have in the Southwest. But the people are saying, “the most important thing right now for me is municipal services. The trash doesn’t get picked up, the drains aren’t in, the street is mud.” Well, there’s where we stopped and said we’re going to stop asking our camaradas what the problems are and start asking the Mexicans, the Mexican voters. That means then that local elections are very important for Mexicans.

Now, let’s look at something. Most of the liberal money that comes in to the Southwest comes every four years, like this year for a presidential election, or every two years for a senatorial election. I’ll bet you my left shoe that if ever either Bush or Carter or Kennedy gets elected, that the streets in Lima, Texas, which is the Mexican suburb of Ozona, Texas, in Crockett County, the streets are not going to get paved. But I’ll bet you this: that if Sostenas DeHoyas gets re-elected to county commissioner, January 1st they will start paving the streets. . . . But what if they can’t win? What if the lines are gerrymandered? What if you discover that the Southwest is outrageously gerrymandered against Mexicans?

Frio County, 79.6% Chicano, historically had only been able to elect one Mexican. Why? Because the people don’t appreciate, because they don’t like, because they, you know. . . . you go over there and you have a beer with those people and they say, “Well you know we had a good drive. Good registration drive. But the people didn’t come out to vote.” So you order another round. Then they say, “You know this isn’t the only year we had a good registration drive. Year before last, we had an even better one. But people don’t appreciate it.” And you’re talking to the leadership. “People don’t appreciate all the work we do.” Four or five rounds later, the Mexicans say, “Esta gente cabrona. . . . we do all this work and they don’t appreciate it and they don’t come out.” Then we tell them, “Mira, we’re not going to fund a registration drive here.” “Why?” “Because you can’t win any more than one. 70% of all voters are in one county commissioner precinct, that’s 100% Mexican. You got 30% in three other county commissioner precincts, where you’re not the majority.
You can register all the Mexicans and take them to the polls, and you're not going to win." "Why?" "Because you're gerrymandered." "That's why we've been losing," you know. That's what they say. "That's why we've been losing." But you see the leadership starts telling the people that, so that's why I'm starting to say I'm changing my mind.

You know, we're up to here with studies, and a lot of them come from here. We're up to here with studies, but we had to do another one. Let's find out the extent of gerrymandering. It's a serious thing. It alienates people. At least it alienated people in Frio County and Medina County; maybe it effects these other people. The next sixty-six counties that we looked at were all gerrymandered against Mexicans. Sixty-six in a row! In a row. It is beyond the realm of statistical probability—it doesn't happen by accident. It does not happen by accident. It's on purpose. A hundred and twenty-eight counties in the Southwest right now could have Mexican-American county commissioners, if the lines were drawn according to the way the law says they ought to be drawn. That's the situation, in my opinion. The Mexican people want something better at the local level.

Their sons are starting to come.... I see a young, good friend from Odessa, Texas. They're starting to come to Harvard. But when he goes back to Pecos, Texas, with a Ph.D. in Social Anthropology, or something like that, what's he going to do in Pecos, Texas, if the tradition is that the city does not hire, when the county does not hire? What will he do if he goes to Dallas and Houston, looking for work? Or somewhere else? Well, the people want their sons and their daughters to stay there. Give us an equal chance at the jobs. Give us an equal chance at electing somebody. And get the streets paved! You know? Get the streets paved!

What about the future, let's talk about the next two years. Redistricting is the key thing. Let's talk about priorities in redistricting. City council, county commissioners, school board; that's the real redistricting priority we've got to do. They've got to redistrict anyway after the 1980 census. Then you go to state representative, senatorial, and then congressional. Redistricting is crucial. If the Mexican-American people have equitable districts, a chance to elect somebody, they will register and they will vote, and they will elect progressives....

I want to now close and I want to close in Spanish, but you are not going to miss anything because I have already said everything.

¿Qué es la cuestión, entonces? ¿Por qué es que el Mexico-Americano, la gente del suroeste, está comenzando a registrarse y a votar, y estamos comenzando a tener algo de éxito en elegir progresistas para representar la gente
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mexicana? ¿Qué es la importancia de esto? Yo pienso que lo importante de esto es que la gente mexicana, en el suroeste, está desarrollando un papel que todos grupos inmigrantes han jugado en este país. Todos grupos. ¿Y qué es ese papel? Mantener este país firme, consciente, firme a sus principios más básicos, que es la justicia.

That's my point. You know, maybe I'm inventing a new rule here, a new law. But I think that the immigrant groups are the ones that have kept this country true to its ideals, because they're the ones that don't have justice. Compare the platforms of the ranchers in west Texas—and you know, parts of west Texas, you know, I'm not being totally facetious, they're not completely civilized. Some of those candidates are very, very tough. Compare their platforms with the Mexican platform. Oh yeah, because they want a zoning change, and they want impact on the planning commission because somebody's going to put up a shopping center... Mexicans? Equity. Basic justice. And I think, I don't know, I wasn't there, but the other immigrant groups have probably played that same, same thing, because they were out. And they read that Constitution. And maybe we don't need a whole bunch of new laws, just apply the ones that are there.

I'm very proud when I see the candidates that are running. Excellent. Progresistas. Real good representatives, desde la gente trabajadora. Eh, we don't have too many aristocrats crossing over the Rio Grande. We have gente trabajadora—working class people. And these people that are running are true representatives of that working class. That's why the next twenty years, I feel, is going to be a great, great age for us, because the candidates that are running—and the ones that are losing—are excellent people that truly want to represent the working class people that are coming over, truly want to represent the Mexican people.

So I feel optimistic about this; we want to continue doing this in at least one hundred cities a year; and maybe in some near future the Mexicans may decide that they may want to elect a president, well, then maybe we'll get involved in that. But for the time being, we're going to get involved to pave the streets in Ozona, Texas.
The Democratic Left: An End and a Beginning?
by Shirley Williams

This excerpt is from the Godkin Lectures, delivered in 1980 by Shirley Williams, Fellow of the Institute of Politics, British Labour Party leader, and formerly Secretary for Prices and Consumer Protection in the British Cabinet.

The goals of social democracy, and in the United States of liberal progressive democracy, were the goals of economic growth, of full employment, of the abolition of poverty and of greater equality of opportunity. They were perhaps best described by William Beveridge in 1944 when he said, "The object of government in peace and in war is not the glory of rulers or of races, but the happiness of the common man." And the methods that we used to achieve those goals, as I argue that they were largely achieved, were the methods of planning, deficit financing, of government intervention and of a mixed economy in one phase or another of that concept.

And indeed, in 1936, if we go back to where we came from, Keynes said, "Both of the two opposed errors of pessimism which now make so much noise in the world," and you may find an echo back those forty years, "will be proved wrong in our time: the pessimism of the revolutionaries who think that things are so bad that nothing can save us from violent change, and the pessimism of the reactionaries, who consider the balance of our economic and social life is so precarious that we must risk no experiments."

Within the context of the last generation, then, the social democratic and liberal consensus produced a welfare state, a planned economy, equality of opportunity, and in effect the abolition of basic poverty. And in those thirty years, there was no year, up until 1974, in which unemployment reached the crisis levels that it reached between the wars. There was no year in which there was not an improvement in the standard of living of the ordinary man and woman. There was in effect, at least in the continent of Western Europe and the island of the United Kingdom, the abolition of primary poverty and the establishment of adequate pensions of health services and benefits. And there was, for the population as a whole, an extension of opportunity through compulsory education, through the expansion of higher education threefold and
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fourfold, through house ownership, through consumer goods, through the coming of television—not just a widening of opportunities, but a narrowing of differentials of the quality of life that had not been seen before at any stage in history....

For thirty years, the House of Maynard Keynes stood. It was a house that was embodied in words and phrases that somehow seem to sum up a sense of decent permanency. Words like Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods. What is it in the Western tradition that suggests that timber is in a sense so lasting and so pure? But that was how it was, and Keynes institutions, intended originally to be provisional and temporary, lasted for thirty years. They lasted for thirty years and they expressed the terms that were often used about the Third French Republic; but nothing is so permanent as the provisional.

But they've been destroyed now. They were destroyed by the war in Vietnam and the colossal creation of Euro-dollars that were necessary to finance that war. They were destroyed by the assertion, by the oil producers in 1973, that the price of oil would no longer be controlled by the Texas Railroad Commission, but rather by the Middle Eastern producers. They were destroyed, I believe, by the unwillingness of the Western powers to reflect in their own international economic institutions the growing power of the Third World and the gradual change in the balance of power between the traditional leaders of the Western world and the new world that emerged in the sixties and even more in the seventies. And our tragedy is that we have put nothing in the place of Keynes' institutions. We simply live in the wake of that great achievement.

But the achievement of the liberal and social democratic consensus was not only an economic one. Marked though the economic achievement was, it was also a political one....

The mood in politics has fundamentally changed and there are new actors on the stage. They are the "new conservatism," or may I perhaps call it the "retread conservatism," because those of us who have been around in politics for a while recognize it very well; and the "new romanticism," which is perhaps more commonly seen in Western Europe than it is in the United States. The "new romanticism"...is summed up by phrases like "the Green Parties," which are used today commonly in the continent of Europe, which in the United States appear in the form of ecologists and those who believe that the economic system should be basically altered in a way that makes it quite different than it is today.

The "new romanticism" has an appeal to socialists because it's a romanticism about being able to replace the quantity of production with the quality of life. And it's a concept which has within itself the idea that quality of life
should not be refused to anybody, however humble or poor. . . . I believe it has
got something to offer to the old political parties and I think it would be un­
wise to fail to recognize that ligatures and linkages matter as well as oppor­
tunities and options; and I believe that one of the aspects of the new politics,
about which I will speak in my next lecture, is essentially to see how far the
social democratic or liberal consensus can take on the concepts of the quality
of life, of ligatures and linkages, as well as the concept of greater oppor­
tunities. . . .

The "new conservatism" is featured, I believe, first by the fact that it is ex­
tremely confident, that it expresses itself in ways that suggest that there is no
real criticism, no real objection to the arguments that it puts forward. . . . In
addition is the simplicity of what they put forward. . . . If you come up with a
simple formula—for example, the argument that the supply of money directly
relates to the level of inflation—then many people in a democracy will feel that
they have managed to find the answer to many of the problems that exist in
society and they will be grateful that it should be so. And third, the "new con­
servatism" is remarkably bold. It puts forward simple, clear policies and it
claims that those policies will in fact meet the problems that so both disturb us
and worry us at the present time. . . .

And so, let me wind up what I have to say by saying this: I believe that
the great challenge to the democratic and liberal consensus comes both from
the far left and the "new conservatism," because there is a curious affinity, in
my view, between the new conservatism and the attitudes that go with state
socialism or, if you like, Marxism as far as we've seen it carried out in the
countries in which it has so far been applied. . . .

I believe that the road that has been pursued by Stalinism, and quite dif­
erently the road that is being pursued by the "new conservatism," leads
nowhere and, therefore, what we ought to consider is whether we should
follow another.

* * *
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Uncomfortable Thoughts
by Helen Caldicott

The following is from an address given by Helen Caldicott in the Forum in February, 1980, entitled "The Threat to Our Children," as part of the Channing Lecture Series, "I Call That Mind Free." Caldicott is a pediatrician and President of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

I'm a woman. I think slightly differently about war and killing than many men in the Pentagon. I have three children who are now adolescents, and they're the most precious things in my life, apart from my husband. I went through childbirth to have those children and over my dead body does anybody kill my children because they can't settle their arguments. Time and again, young people who are immature and who do not understand world events are sent off to settle arguments. Just look at the First World War, where hundreds of thousands of men were slaughtered to move a few feet from trench to trench while the officers sat in their tents and drank wine and were looked after by other people in the army. Same with the Second World War and any war you look at: absolute insanity. You look at it in terms of medicine: the vocation of a physician is to save and protect and increase the quality of life—never, never to kill.

Nuclear reactors were first designed during the Manhattan Project to manufacture plutonium to be used in bombs. The bomb used on Hiroshima was a uranium bomb, called "Little Boy;" the bomb used on Nagasaki was a twenty kilogram plutonium bomb called "Fat Man." And plutonium is a man-made element, one of the most toxic elements that we know, one of the most carcinogenic elements that we know. The minutest amount—a microgram or maybe a million-millionth of a gram, if inhaled, will induce carcinoma. It's said that if you could take a pound of it and put a little piece in every person's lung on earth, one pound would be sufficient to kill every human being on earth—and each reactor makes five hundred pounds of it a year, and it only takes ten pounds to make a nuclear bomb, and it lasts for half a million years in an unaltered state, so it can continue causing cancer after cancer in human and animal populations for the rest of time. In other words, if I died of a carcinoma induced by plutonium and I was cremated, my smoke goes out the chimney with the plutonium, somebody else can inhale it, and so the cycle continues.
It concentrates in testicles and ovaries where it's very mutogenic and changes the genes; thereby, inevitably, the incidence of genetic disease will increase. And I treat one of the commonest genetic diseases, which is cystic fibrosis, and many of my patients die. I live with dying children, dying adolescents, and grieving parents—and that's what we're talking about now. We're talking about death. And for me, nuclear war, and the nuclear weapons industry, and its embryonic offshoot the nuclear power industry, are not politics, they are not about jobs, and they're not about economics: they are about life and death.

For instance, if the only way we could manufacture electricity was to have a factory full of polio viruses in the middle of Boston that generated electricity and every now and then, by accident, [it would]send off a little plume of polio virus, and every now and then there was an epidemic of polio in Boston, would we tolerate that? Of course we wouldn't. But you see, polio takes only two or three weeks to incubate before the symptoms appear, whereas leukemia, induced by these internal emitters, these radionuclides, takes about five to ten years to appear. Leukemia went up forty times in the children in Hiroshima, five to ten years later, and new ones are still turning up now in Hiroshima, thirty-seven years later. So that it's a different thing—that period is called the latent period of carcinogenesis. It's silent, insidious and cryptogenic. And that's why the nuclear power industry and the nuclear weapons industry say, "No one's died as a result of Three Mile Island—we haven't killed a single member of the public," because when you get your cancer it doesn't wear a little flag saying, "I was made by some strontium-90 you ate in a piece of cheese that was made at Harrisburg in 1979."

As I travel in planes throughout the country all the time, I'm with people, businessmen, talking about money, making parts for cruise missiles and weapons. They're all over the place. Everyone's involved. MIT's full of characters designing guidance systems for missiles! That's what they do! Right in the middle of Boston! Here! In Cambridge! What do we do? Nothing! Do we confront them morally? I said to Joe Weitzenbaum the other day, the Professor of Computer Sciences at MIT, "Why do these men do these extraordinary things? MIRV a missile, you know? Put ten weapons on one missile that will produce incredible genocide." He said, "You know why? It's terrific fun." You have an insoluble problem: how to MIRV a missile, put a computer in the nose of each bomb, and they all go off and land independently on...It's a sweet technological problem. And you solve it, give a paper on it, go home to your wife, make love, make sure the kids clean their teeth, get up the next morning, go and solve another insoluble problem. Over half the scientists in this country are doing that right now!
Within two years, the arms race is out of control, because the cruise missiles that have just been decided to be deployed in Europe are so tiny, you can't verify them by satellite. So once they're deployed, the Russians can't count them and that is the end of arms control and SALT talks. That decision was made with no national debate, no one knows anything about it. The Russians are very, very deeply concerned and Brezhnev is very annoyed about that decision. He begged to negotiate first. Pulled troops and tanks out of East Germany so that America would negotiate. America said, "We're going to put them there and then we'll negotiate." It's all this macho stuff, you know: "Mine's bigger than yours," "I've got more than you," "Now I want more than you." You listen to the SALT talks, the SALT hearings, you know, during . . . . They talked about kill ratios, cruise missiles, how many they've got, how many more we want . . . . No one laid out what a nuclear war would mean.

So I called the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I said, "Why didn't anyone talk about that?" And the man said, "Oh, the Senators don't want to hear about that, it makes them feel uncomfortable."

But you see, in the last few weeks I've been so frightened with the politicians for the first time overtly discussing the rational possibility of using nuclear weapons. I've found it very hard to produce psychic numbing and block out these visions. I've been having to say the Twenty-third Psalm every morning to myself to keep myself on the line: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me. Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me." I can die. I deal with dying patients, I have to face my own death. I know my kids will die. But I cannot tolerate the thought of destroying this magnificent planet, nor will I. Over my dead body will any of those men in Washington or the Kremlin—and there are just a very few—do this to my earth, your earth, and our earth.
The Judiciary: Red Tape in Black Robes
by Joseph Califano

From an address by the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare given in the Forum in October, 1979.

I want to interest you this evening in a tough-minded reassessment of the role of the federal adjudicatory system in the bureaucratic halls of the executive branch. When our people and our politicians talk about big government, tedious red tape, insensitive intrusive bureaucracy, they tend to focus mostly on the executive branch. Sometimes they concentrate their fire at the Congress, but rarely on the judiciary, and the American adjudicatory system. The time has come in my judgment to broaden the discussion.

There are a lot of surprises that greet any new Secretary of HEW, but none astonished me more than the extent of my involvement as a party to litigation in the federal courts. My first sense of it came at a Washington dinner party, where I took a seat next to Justice William Brennan, who's an old friend. He said lightly, "I don't know whether I should break bread with you, Joe. There are so many cases involving you that are on my desk today...."

As I stand here, the Secretary of HEW is subject to more than 200 continuing court orders—225 as of March 31 of this year, to be exact, with an expected net increase, if the past few years are any indication, of about 25 each quarter, or 100 a year. As we sit here tonight, there are 18 thousand social security disability cases in the federal court system. As you sit here this evening, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is involved in more than 20,000 law suits in the federal courts alone, with enough new cases being filed daily to amply reward the graduating class at Harvard Law School, for many years to come. Some 18,000 are social security disability cases, but there are in addition more than 250 cases involving education, more than 700 involving health care financing, 500 cases still pending from the swine flu program, 100 civil rights cases, more than 50 Food and Drug Administration cases, and many, many others. It is no wonder that the litigation section of the American Bar Association is the fastest growing section.

Many of these judicial interventions have been invited, I agree, by improper execution of the law, by sometimes blatant attempts to ignore or thwart laws passed by the Congress. This is particularly true in the area of
Examining The Issues

racial discrimination in which the courts have been an essential ingredient in enforcing the law. In such situations, it is essential for the courts to act to protect the rights of our citizens. But not each invitation has to be accepted with such judicial gusto. Not every morsel has to be consumed at each litigious banquet just because somebody puts it on the table before a hungry federal judge. We need a penetrating examination of the adjudicatory system as applied to fair and efficient management of big social programs. And I urge you as students and the faculty that's here, to begin to take a hard look at this. It takes sophistication to deal with these issues, particularly in a democracy where as bureaucracy increases, the courts become ever more precious protectors of individual rights. Solutions to these problems will require thoughtful analysis, hard work, creative imagination, sensitivity to individual rights, delicate management skills, deep knowledge, and then political leadership to gain acceptance of proposed, sensible changes that inevitably will disrupt resistant existing power structures and institutional relationships. These problems can no more be solved by oratorical railing at bureaucracy than the energy crisis can be solved by children blowing at pinwheels. It makes little sense to undermine people's faith in their government while at the same time raising their expectations about government's ability to solve enormous problems like energy and inflation...

So I close with a call to you. You are getting a superb education here, and a whole host of skills in conflict management and adjudication, in finding facts and knowing what's relevant and what's irrelevant, in formulating public policy, in analyzing issues and thinking intelligently and skeptically about issues. Use your talent and your education to help your nation devise procedures and systems that are timely and fair, to help make government a better servant of the people. That work will be hard, often frustrating, sometimes exasperating. But the rewards are far greater for those in a democracy who work persistently to build and shape government, to serve people, than for those who lash out in despair and frustration because the task is too much for them. After many years in government, I remain an optimist. I deeply believe that we can succeed in that work of building and shaping, and I subscribe to the words of G.K. Chesterton. I do not believe in a fate that befalls men however they act, but I do believe in a fate that befalls them unless they act. And that's why I ask you to act.

* * *
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The Fellows’ Experience

The following are excerpts from evaluations written by five of the Institute’s Fellows this past year. Consult the section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.

Terry Adamson

Coming from nearly three years of government work with its pressure and time consumption attendant, I needed the time without constraints or demands, not simply to atrophy, but to allow some mental peace with gentle but constant stimulation. I also needed to focus on my own next career step, the wheres and whats that sometimes need a little percolation to appear all the clearer. Thus, the fellowship was tailormade to these needs; and fortunately, the study group became the vehicle to contribute in a small way to the Institute’s investment in having me there.

Bob Choate

...I remember still (with a shudder) the observation made by many young people somewhere in the first part of October which indicated that they thought that politics meant running for office. Politics in a democratic society is so much more than just running for office; other aspects of politics, such as organizing to change a community situation, can be a much better training ground for political decision-making; I would hope the Institute of Politics quickly disabuses young people of the conviction that politics is only electoral.

John Eade

Overall, the Fellows program is an exciting change of pace. Not work—at least for me—in the usual sense. Rather, it is cerebral, social, and academic. In all, a four month period which forces a participant to think.

I have always looked at the immediate project, step by step measuring progress in accomplishing objectives of the moment. This is not bad. However, it is very much like a salesman selling dictionaries. He hasn’t read the set and doesn’t care if you can read, making the sale all-consuming.
Of greatest importance to students is the "salesman" background of the Fellow. Political campaigns, what makes them run, is valuable to students. Very little of real value has ever been written about the day-to-day dynamics of a campaign. "Nuts and Bolts" type study groups provide insight into a little-understood aspect of the American political process.

For me... I was forced to organize my knowledge of campaigns, evaluate many techniques, and be prepared to withstand some tough questioning. But more than that I enjoyed the interaction and greatly appreciated a chance to share my ideas with a challenging assortment of young people.

Tanya Melich

...Being a Fellow was a valuable experience that I will long treasure. It gave me time to think, to plan, to learn, and to question. The resources of Harvard are truly as great as its reputation. I have a fond, special place in my heart for the institution and the Institute and that fondness won't quickly disappear. I also feel renewed and ready to do battle again in the world of politics. If the Institute can rejuvenate some of the idealism that all politicians start with, then I believe it has more than served its purpose.

Junius Williams

My study group gave me an opportunity to teach in an academic setting which was a first-time event for me... I think we all left with a greater sense of each other and a greater sense of the enormity of the international political arena... In my opinion, the Institute benefitted from my particular study group because of the number of blacks and other Third World people who attended the class on the topic. From my information, this has been the largest number of blacks who have attended anything given by the Kennedy School or the Institute on a consistent basis. My classes averaged 30 to 40 people and were 90 to 95% black. Also, it gave exposure to the Institute from other people outside of Harvard. A good portion of attendees came from Northeastern University and some others from the general Boston community.
The Student Advisory Committee, 1979-80
by Richard L. A. Weiner

The following is the Chair's Introduction to the 1979-80 Annual Report of the Student Advisory Committee. Richard Weiner, '81, a History major, was elected Chair of the SAC in December, 1979.

Many worried that the Institute of Politics would be overwhelmed sharing quarters with the Kennedy School. Yet, after two years in the new building, the Institute and its Student Program are thriving. As the number of students who organize and participate in Institute events has swelled, the Student Program has grown increasingly visible. As a result of this new prominence, the Student Advisory Committee has come to be increasingly aware of its responsibility to the Harvard/Radcliffe community. Throughout this past year, the SAC has worked hard to prove itself accountable, by streamlining our internal operations and by sharing our resources with those attracted by the Institute's continued dynamism.

The visibility we have achieved has facilitated efforts to reach out to the community. Our Associates program has increased to 300 members, permitting greater flexibility in SAC planning. Indeed, the two most provocative panel discussions of the past semester—"Palestinian-Israeli Conflict: Its Future" and "Racial Violence in the Boston Area"—and two of our new internship programs—Summer Research Team and Term-Time—were organized primarily by Associates. In a similar vein, we have formalized a "Community Outreach Program" in which students teach civics and consumer law in the Cambridge Pilot High School. Finally, in an effort to emphasize the SAC's desire to work with other campus groups, we have begun a formal co-sponsorship program with undergraduate political organizations. This pooling of resources has allowed the SAC to air an even greater number and diversity of issues. For example, this past semester we co-sponsored symposia on "Hispanic Politics," "Economic Issues of the 1980 Campaign," "Community Energy Planning," "Black Politics," and "The Power of Oil."

The continued growth of the Student Program has made structural realignment a necessity. In December, 1979 several changes were enacted—notably the lengthening of the SAC Chair's term to one year and the creation of the new position of Vice-Chair. Under this restructuring, the Chair
has been given the added responsibility of heading our oversight committee—Planning, Budget, and Evaluation—while the Vice-Chair has assumed the task of overseeing day-to-day operations. Overall, these changes bring direction and stability to the Committee. In past years, the Chair could hope only to react to events instead of to plan for the future. Now, time affords the leadership—and, in turn, the Committee—an opportunity for thoughtful reflection. In addition, the switch to one-year terms has reduced our often-divisive internal politicking, confining such jockeying to a once-a-year spree.

The evolution of more stable leadership has also provided the chance for introspection. For the first time since I joined the SAC three years ago, the Committee seems determined to understand its position as a part of the entire Institute agenda. We have written guidelines for the selection of Visiting Fellows and have formalized our speakers series. This spring we conducted a detailed evaluation of the Resident Fellowship, beginning a dialogue with the Committee on Fellowships and the Institute staff, in the hope of promoting a more diverse and demanding program.

Yet none of these reforms has reduced the flexibility of the Student Program. In fact, the SAC feels that through re-organization we have asserted a necessary professionalism without diminishing the personal qualities which make our body so special. Outreach and introspection have brought us closer to this community at a time when aloofness would have promoted resentment. Demanding more of ourselves has been productive albeit not easy. Perhaps I might conclude that the Student Advisory Committee is finally coming of age, and on our behalf, I thank the Institute staff for controlled patience and some well-intentioned prodding.
A Convocation Welcome

by Graham T. Allison

The following excerpts are from Dean Allison's remarks at the convocation of the John F. Kennedy School of Government in September, 1979.

When Kennedy was writing his book “Profiles in Courage”, he commented in a draft about Robert Taft: “He was a partisan in the sense that Harry Truman was. They both had the happy gift of seeing things in bright shades. It is the politicians who see things in similar shades that have a depressing and worrisome time of it.” Kennedy’s ambivalence about politics reflected a kind of split, of tension within himself between, on the one hand, an attraction to the world of action, and on the other hand, a commitment to the world of ideas. He was particularly fascinated by the way that the generation of founding fathers of the West had ignited, somehow, the instinct for ideas and the instinct for responsibility. Let me quote for you once more from the speech that Kennedy once gave at this university. He says: “Our nation’s first-rate politicians, those who presided at its birth in 1776 and its christening in 1787, included among their ranks most of the nation’s first-rate writers and scholars. But today the gap between the intellectual and the politician seems to be growing. Indeed today the link is all but gone. Where are the scholar statesmen? The American politician of today is fearful if not scornful of entering the literary world with the courage of abandon, and the American author and scholar of today is reluctant if not disdainful about entering the political world with the enthusiasm of a Woodrow Wilson.”

You come to a school that is in a period of development in which you have an opportunity to be involved in the shaping of an enterprise at a time when I think there is considerable excitement about this being the highest priority initiative at Harvard in this time frame. You, whether you are enrolled in the MPA program, or the MPP program, or as a Fellow of the Institute of Politics, or a Fellow of the Center for Science and International Affairs, or attached to the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, or whatever, are one part of a considerably larger enterprise, one constituency of many that the school attempts to serve. There are considerable differences between the Public Administration Program and the Program for Newly Elected Congressmen and the Programs Provided for State and Local Senior Executives.
The role of the Institute of Politics is rather different and much more cross-school than the role of some of the other centers in the school. But my purpose is to give you an overview of the array of activities that occur in the school and to remind you that there will be many activities occurring at the school when you are here and at the building during various and sundry hours which address the concerns of and attempt to serve other constituencies of the school as well as the group here. I think the opportunity for you, given the synergism among the various programs, is considerable, but I think it sometimes fails to occur to people who come to the MPA program or come to the Institute of Politics or people who come to one of the other programs is that there are lots of other people out there in different programs having different needs and whom the school is also attempting to serve.

Finally let me return to a thought that John Kennedy was frequently troubled by and which troubles me greatly. That is the link between privilege on one hand and responsibility on the other. As Kennedy once said here at Harvard: "Privilege is here and with privilege, comes responsibility." Or, as he once quoted one of my favorite New Testament verses: "To whom much is given, of them shall be also much required."

As you enter this school year, you have a great opportunity and a great challenge. As adults, you'll primarily have to decide for yourself how you are going to invest your time and energy in order to maximize the returns given your own objective function. The School of Government and the University offer you an extraordinary array of courses and activities, a most distinguished faculty, a remarkable group of fellow students. In your courses, professors will primarily do what they know how to do, namely: teach public management, or analytic methods, or economics, or arms control—skills and knowledge of understanding which can be useful to you but which you have to make especially useful and relevant to your special requirements.

For most of you, this will be the longest uninterrupted time, the longest period unencumbered by the demands of job that you will have for the rest of your life—the next year or two, for preparing yourself for your career in the public sector. It's a great opportunity and a great challenge. The faculty and administration of the school envy you this opportunity but wish you the best.
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Administration and Staff

Derek Curtis Bok, President of Harvard University
Graham T. Allison, Jr., Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government
Jonathan Moore, Director of the Institute of Politics

Carol Colborn, Staff Assistant, Summer, 1980
Geraldine Denterlein, Staff Assistant to the Forum Coordinator, Spring 1980
Theresa A. Donovan, Assistant to Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr.
Roberta Dworkin, Receptionist
Susan M. Elbow, Financial and Administrative Assistant
Andrew S. Gilmour, Assistant Receptionist, Spring, 1980
Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr., Assistant to the Director
Martin A. Linsky, Media Programs Consultant
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director and Forum Coordinator
Alan G. Mitter, Internship Program Coordinator
Anne Marie Murphy, Receptionist, Summer, 1980
Kevin F. Murphy, Bartender
Karen L. Phillips, Secretary to the Director
Terri Shuck, Staff Assistant to the Forum Coordinator, Fall 1979
Sonia Wallenberg, Student Program Assistant
George H. White, Special Assistant to the Director

The Senior Advisory Committee

Barber B. Conable, Jr.
John Sherman Cooper, Chair
John C. Culver
Michael V. Forrestal
Katharine Graham
Milton S. Gwirtzman
The Lord Harlech, K.C.M.G.
Henry M. Jackson
Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.
Edward M. Kennedy
George C. Lodge
Robert S. McNamara
Jacqueline Onassis
The Faculty Advisory Committee

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Ex-Officio
Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy, Chair
Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government
Robert Coles, Professor of Psychiatry and Medical Humanities
Stanley H. Hoffman, Professor of Government
Ernest R. May, Professor of History
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics, Ex-Officio
Mark H. Moore, Associate Professor of Public Policy, Director of Faculty Studies
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration
Don K. Price, Professor Emeritus
Daniel Steiner, General Counsel to the University
Robert E. Stobaugh, Professor of Business Administration
Stanley S. Surrey, Jeremiah Smith, Jr. Professor of Law
The Student Program

The Student Advisory Committee (SAC)

SAC Chairs were:

- Kathryn Abrams, Fellows, Fall 1979
- Adela Cepeda, Special Projects, Spring 1980
- Carol Colborn, Special Projects, Fall 1979
- Brian Dunmore, Guests, Fall 1979
- Kathryn Edmundson, Study Groups, Spring 1980
- Heidi Garland, Fellows, Spring 1980
- Mark Hostetter, Study Groups, Fall 1979
- Andy McKey, SAC Chair, Fall 1979
- Lisa Newman, Communications, Spring 1980
- Diane Siegel, Guests, Spring 1980
- Sue Staudohar, Communications, Fall 1980; SAC Vice-Chair, Spring 1980
- Dennis Wamsted, Internships, Spring 1980
- Richard Weiner, Internships, Fall 1980; SAC Chair, Spring 1980

SAC members were:

- Kathryn Abrams
- Robert Bennett
- Richard Berenson
- Jeffrey Borenstein
- Jorge Castro
- Adela Cepeda
- Benjamin Chereskin
- Evan Cherniak
- Carol Colborn
- Henry Dachowitz
- John Driscoll
- Brian Dunmore
- Patricia Early
- Kathryn Edmundson
- Clark Ervin
- Barbara Fischbein
- Michael Foster
- Heidi Garland
- Laurence Grafstein
- Richard Harper
- Nancy Hoffmeier
- Paul Holtzman
- Mark Hostetter
- Marina Hsieh
- Bruce Ives
- Marya Jones
- Alexander Kaplan
- Michael Lynton
- Andrew McKey
- Lisa Newman
- Antonio Rivera-Zamora
- Charna Sherman
- Diane Siegel
- Susan Staudohar
- Dave Stewart
- John Trasvina
- Dennis Wamsted
- Richard Weiner
- Patricia Wright
- Helene Sahadi York
Student Study Groups

Fall 1979

The Justice Department: The Tensions Between Law, Politics and Policy
Terrence Adamson

Guests:
- Michael J. Egan, formerly Associate Attorney General, 1977-79
- John Shenefield, Acting Associate Attorney General
- Philip B. Heymann, Assistant Attorney General
- Benjamin R. Civiletti, Attorney General of the United States
- Thomas S. Martin, Deputy Assistant Attorney General
- Wade H. McCree, Jr., Solicitor General of the United States
- Griffin B. Bell, former Attorney General of the United States
- John H. Shenefield, Acting Associate Attorney General

U.S.-China-Taiwan: The New Relationships
William Ayers and Leonard Unger

Guests:
- John K. Fairbank, Professor of History Emeritus, Harvard University
- Michel Oksenberg, Staff Member, National Security Council
- Charles Freeman, Department of State, Country Director for China
- A. Doak Barnett, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
- Anne Keatley, former Staff Director, Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China, and Senior Policy Analyst, Executive Office of Science and Technology Policy
- Dwight H. Perkins, Chairman, Department of Economics, Harvard University

Campaign Management: An Overview
George Bachrach

Guests:
- Thomas P. O'Neill, III, Lieutenant Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
- Dennis Kanin, Director, Draft Kennedy movement in N.H. and former Campaign Manager for Senator Tsongas
- J. Joseph Grandmaison, Campaign Manager for Michael Dukakis (1974) and John Durkin (1975)
- John Gorman, Vice-President, Cambridge Survey Research
- Jack Walsh, Political Consultant, Carter re-election campaign
- Richard Gaines, Editor, The Boston Globe
- Dan Payne, media consultant
- Michael S. Dukakis, former Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
The Quadrennial Quest: Pre-Presidential Political Perspectives
James Barron and Marjorie Arons-Barron

Guests:
- Alan Baron, Washington Editor, Politics Today; Editor of The Baron Report
- Eddie Mahe, National Campaign Manager for John Connally
- Jerry Carmen, former advisor to Reagan campaign; former Republican State Committee Chair
- Joanne Symons, co-Chair, Draft Kennedy movement; former Democratic State Committee Chair
- Tom Trimarco, Baker campaign, former field director for Edward Brooke
- William Ezekiel, former Director for Henry Jackson's campaign
- Robert O. Tiernan, Chairman, Federal Election Commission
- Kent Cooper, Assistant Staff Director, Federal Election Commission
- Robert Turner, Political Reporter, The Boston Globe
- James Thistle, News Director, WCVB-TV, Channel 5
- Chris Brown, Coordinator for the Carter campaign
- Mark Brand, advance expert and Consultant to Kennedy campaign

The Iranian Revolution of 1978-1979
Mango Bayat

Guests:
- Hamid Algar, Professor, Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of California at Berkeley
- Ervand Abrahamian, Department of Political Science, Baruch College, City University of New York
- Eric Hoagland, Professor, Bowdoin College
- Thomas Staufffer, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University
- William Griffith, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

How to Influence the System Without Clout, Constituents or Currency
Robert Choate

Guests:
- Thomas Roeser, Vice President for Governmental Affairs, Quaker Oats Company
- Susan Bennett King, Chair, Consumer Product Safety Commission
- Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs
- Thomas Foley, Congressman, Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and Chairman of the House Democratic Caucus
- Lois Pines, Federal Trade Commission
- Sheila Cheimets, formerly Chairman of the Board of Selectmen of Canton, Massachusetts
Koryne Horbal, U.S. Representative on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the U.N.
Ethel Klein, Instructor in Government, Harvard University

New Politics of the South
Robert Clark
Guests:
Owens Brooks, National Council of Churches
Hon. Ben Brown, Deputy Chairman of the Carter-Mondale campaign
John Stucker, Special Assistant for Policy Development to Governor Richard Wilson Riley, South Carolina
Walter DeVries, President of DeVries Associates, Inc., Wrightsville, North Carolina
Paul Stekler, Teaching Fellow in Government, Harvard University
Dr. Beverly Glenn, education specialist, Center for Law and Education, Harvard University

A Minority Fights Back: The Politics of Mental Retardation
Drs. Gunnar and Rosemary Dybwad
Guests:
Dr. Elizabeth Boggs, former Member of the Presidential Panel on Mental Retardation; past President of the National Association for Retarded Citizens
Douglas Bikler, Associate Professor of Special Education and Director, Center on Human Policy, Syracuse University
Hubert Jones, Dean, Boston University School of Social Work
Paul Jameson, Esq., Attorney-at-Law; Chair, Massachusetts Developmental Disabilities Council
Doris Fraser, Director, Bureau of Systems Development, Executive Office of Administration and Finance, Boston
Stanley Herr, Esq., Visiting Scholar, Harvard Law School
Dr. Stephen Taylor, Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Syracuse University
Thomas Gilhool, Esq., Executive Director of the Public Interest Law Center, Philadelphia
Charles Schottland, Professor Emeritus of Law and Social Welfare, Florence Heller School, Brandeis University; formerly U.S. Commissioner of Social Security
Florence Finkel, Chair, Mental Retardation Committee, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Mental Health and Mental Retardation
David Gregory, Professor, University of Maine, School of Law, and Master of the U.S. District Court
Donald Freeman, Esq., Attorney-at-Law, Boston
Robert DeSimone, Consultant on Housing, Massachusetts Department of Mental Health
Max Korn, Director, Project Independence for Social Planning Services, Watertown, Massachusetts

Israel's Options for the Eighties
Arie Eliav
Guests:
- Samir N. Anabtawi, Professor, Kuwait University
- Amos Ettinger, writer, producer, director, Israeli TV

Industrial Democracy in America: The Union Perspective
Charles Heckscher and Chris Mackin
Guests:
- Lloyd McBride, President, United Steelworkers of America
- John Carmichael, Executive Secretary, Twin Cities Newspaper Guild
- Vic Basile, former-President of Action Local, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
- Per Ahlstrom, Swedish Metalworkers' Union
- Marcus Raskin, Director, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.
- William Winpisinger, President, International Association of Machinists
- Donald Ephlin, Regional Director of the United Auto Workers
- Basil Whiting, Deputy Assistant Director of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Universities As Centers of Power
Enrique Hank Lopez
Guests:
- Mangol Bayat, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University
- Edwin Reischauer, Professor, Harvard University; former Ambassador to Japan
- Joseph Rapin, Councillor, French Mission to the U.N. and Member of French Foreign Ministry
- Dr. Ibrahim Shihata, Secretary General of OPEC Special Fund
- Arie Eliav, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University; former member of the Knesset and Deputy Minister in the Israeli Government
- Dr. Fernando Pérez Correa, Dean of Faculty and Director of Academic Affairs, University of Mexico
- Paul Friedrich, Kennedy Fellow, Center for European Studies, Harvard University
Secret History
John Marks

Guests:
- James Keehner, psychologist
- Thea Stein-Lewison, graphologist
- Taylor Branch, investigative reporter
- David Rhodes, former CIA psychologist and Director of the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology
- Dr. Milton Kline, past President of the American Society for Clinical Psychology
- John Kihlstrom, Professor, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University

New Hampshire: A Political Profile
Susan McLane

Guests:
- Richard Bennett, owner of a N.H. polling firm
- Chuck Brereton, author of History of the New Hampshire Primary
- Rep. Elizabeth Hager, Director, John Anderson's campaign in N.H.
- Rep. Michael Hanson, New Hampshire House of Representatives
- Rep. David Campbell, New Hampshire House of Representatives
- Dudley W. Dudley, Governor's Councillor in District 3, Chairman of the New Hampshire Democrats for Change (a draft Kennedy movement)
- Senator Thomas McIntyre
- Hilary Cleveland, Finance Chairman, Bush campaign; Professor of Political Science, Colby-Sawyer College
- Rep. Jean Wallin, first Carter supporter in New Hampshire
- Marshall Cobleigh, former Speaker, New Hampshire House of Representatives
- Alf Jacobson, former President, New Hampshire Senate
- David S. Broder, Associate Editor, The Washington Post

On-Going Negotiations for Energy Reform
Dr. Evelyn Murphy

Guests:
- Edward Brown, President, New England Power Service
- Doug Foy, Executive Director of Conservation Law Foundation
- Sarah Bates, legal counsel for Conservation Law Foundation
- Eric VanLoon, Executive Director, Union of Concerned Scientists
- Harriet Stanley, Public Relations Director, State Energy Office
- Willy Osborn, Consultant on solar energy with Arthur D. Little, Inc.
- Lou Boyd, President, Solar Solutions, Bedford, Massachusetts
Multinational Companies and Their Actions: Consistency or Conflict
With American Foreign Policy
Stephen Murphy and James Thomblade

Guests:
- David Vidal, former Bureau Chief, The New York Times, Brazil
- Alexander Dunbar, Executive Vice-President, Singer Corporation (retired)
- Lou Wells, Professor, Harvard Business School
- E. Montgomery Graham, Office of the Secretary of Treasury
- John Huhs, Senior Partner, Samuel Pisar Law Offices, New York
- R. Hartwell Gardener, Treasurer, Mobil Oil Corporation

Do It Yourself: Home Remedies for Healing America's Cities
Paul Soglin

Guests:
- Len Simon, Assistant Director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors
- John Lindsay, former Mayor, New York City
- Sam Brown, Director, ACTION

Employment, Education and Energy: Problems for the 1980's
Shirley Williams

Guests:
- William Hewitt, Chief Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor
- Hale Champion, former Undersecretary of HEW
- George McRobie, Institute for Intermediate Technology, London
- William Spring, White House Domestic Staff
- Anthony King, Professor of Government, University of Essex

Spring 1980
Desegregation—A Delicate Balance
Pamela Bullard and Judith Stoia

Guests:
- Mary Ellen Smith, founder, City-Wide Education Coalition
- Alta Star, Counselor, METCO students
- Eric VanLoon, attorney specializing in school desegregation
- Gregory Anrig, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education
- Charles Ray, Headmaster, Roxbury High School
- Frances Kelly, Principal, Lee School, Roxbury
- Lee Daniels, The New York Times
- Acel Moore, The Philadelphia Inquirer
- Bill Grant, The Detroit Free Press
- Howard Husock, reporter, WGBH-TV
The Student Program

The Making of Soviet Foreign Policy
Milene Charles

Guests:
Angela Stent Yergin, Assistant Professor, Department of Government, Georgetown University
Donald Carlisle, Professor of Political Science, Boston College and Fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Bruce Porter, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Edward Lozansky, Professor of Physics, University of Rochester and head of Sakharov International Committee

The Future of Nuclear Power
E. William Colglazier, Jr.

Guests:
George Brown, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives (D-Cal.)
Irwin Bupp, Associate Professor, Harvard Business School
Richard Wilson, Professor of Physics, Harvard University, Chair, Governor’s Advisory Panel on Nuclear Regulation
Henry Kendall, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; founder of the Union of Concerned Scientists
Richard Riley, Governor of South Carolina
Susan Wiltshire, past President of Massachusetts League of Women Voters; Member, Governor’s Advisory Panel on Nuclear Regulation
Mina Hamilton, Co-Director, Sierra Club Radioactive Waste Campaign

The Legislator—Survival of the Co-Equal Branch
Lawrence S. DiCara

Guests:
Patrick McDonough, Boston City Councillor
Michael Harrington, former Congressman
J. Kinney and Robbie O’Rourke, lobbyists
Edward J. Markey, U.S. Representative (D-Mass.)
Carol Bellamy, President, New York City Council
Walter Robinson, The Boston Globe, State House Bureau

Nuts and Bolts of Political Campaigns
John Eade

Guests:
Michael Jones, Kennedy advanceperson
Nancy Korman, member, Kennedy for President Finance Committee
Jill Buckley, political consultant
Roger Dowd, lawyer
Ed Jesser, political press operative
David Nyhan, national reporter, The Boston Globe
J. Joseph Grandmaison, Campaign Manager for Michael Dukakis (1974) and John Durkin (1975)
James B. King, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board
Helen Keyes, Secretarial Representative, Region I, Department of Commerce

Raising Funds for Political Campaigns
Nancy Korman
Guests:
Thomas Kiley, Political Consultant, Marttila, Payne, Kiley & Thorne, Inc.
Sissy Weinberg, former Campaign Manager for Scott Harshbarger
Bill Sullivan, Office of Campaigns and Political Finance, State of Massachusetts
Pam Gillman, Account Executive, D.H. Sawyer & Associates
John Gorman, Vice President, Epsilon Data Management
Bobby Altman, 760 Associates
Scott Harshbarger, legal counsel to State Ethics Committee
Dolores Mitchell, Consultant, Abt Associates, and former Secretary of Human Services, State of Massachusetts

The Impact of the New Broadcasting Technologies
Tanya Melich
Guests:
Ralph Goldberg, Associate General Counsel, CBS
James M. Alic, Senior Staff Vice-President, Selecta Vision, Videodisc, RCA
Dan Jones, Chairman, Boston Cable Television Access Coalition; independent film producer; consultant to WGBH; community media organizer
Dr. Oswald Ganley, Research Associate, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Advanced and Applied Technology, 1975-1978
Stuart Brotman, Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration
Edward Planer, Vice President, News Coverage, NBC News
Neal Gregory, Information Policy Liaison for the Committee on House Administration
Douglas Bailey, Bailey, Deardourff & Associates, political consulting firm
The Politics of Health and Safety Regulation
James Miller and Edgar Jones
Guests:
   Bob Harris, Commissioner, Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, D.C.
   Tony Mazzochi, head of Occupational Health for Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' Union
   Dr. Nicholas Ashford, Center for Policy Alternatives, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
   Dr. John Froines, Deputy Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)
   Dr. Samuel Epstein, author of The Politics of Cancer
   Ronald A. Lang, Executive Director, American Industrial Health Council
   Steve Wodka, International Representative, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers
   Stuart Eizenstat, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy
   George Cohen, United Steelworkers of America and the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO

Women in Power in Government
Valerie Nelson
Guests:
   Arvil Clark, Simmons College Women's Management Program
   Martha Cox, Goodmeasure, Management Consultant
   Lynn Kahn, political psychologist
   Anita Nelam, private management consultant
   Karen Paget, Acting Deputy Director, ACTION
   Betsy Bailey, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board
   Jane Edmonds, Chair, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination
   Ann Brassier, Director of Management, U.S. Office of Personnel Management
   Malkah Notman, psychiatrist
   David Winter, psychologist
   Betty Taymor, Director, Program for Women in Political and Governmental Careers, Boston College
   Ronnie Eldridge, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
   Ethel Klein, Instructor in Government, Harvard University
   Sally Lunt, Chair, Massachusetts Women's Political Caucus
   Frances Fox Piven, Professor of Sociology, Boston University
   Barbara Ballan, ACORN organizer
Jean Jackson, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Joan Zilbach, psychiatrist
Tanya Melich, Fellow, Institute of Politics and Delegate to the Republican National Convention
Ann Ramsay, Director of the Office of Budgets, Harvard University, and Member, President's Advisory Committee on Women
Nancy Korman, Chair, Women's Advisory Committee for Kennedy
Joan Bernstein, General Counsel, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Floss Frucher, Manager, New York State Penal System
Jonathan Brock, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Kristine Marcey, Assistant Director, Agency Relations, U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Emily Heller, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor
Georgia Strasburg, Management Consultant to the White House

Public Policy and the Role of Business Interests
Charles Powers
Guests:
  James A. Joseph, Undersecretary, Department of the Interior
  Luis Jose Oropeza, former Venezuelan Minister of Agriculture, head of Venezuelan Development Bank and private sector bank president
  Lewis Dexter, Professor of Political Science, University of Maryland

Military Affairs—Influencing the Political Process and Public Policy
Arnold Schlossberg, Jr.
Guests:
  Col. Bernard Loeffke, Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations
  Joseph Armino, doctoral candidate, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
  Dr. John Johns Brigadier General (retired): Chief, Human Resources Division, National Defense University
  Howard M. McElroy, U.S. Department of State; Fellow, Center for International Affairs
  Brigadier General Niles J. Fulwyler, Director of Nuclear and Chemical Directorate, U.S. Army staff

The Press—Does It Deserve Its Freedom?
Charles Seib
Guests:
  David Broder, Associate Editor, The Washington Post
  S.J. Micchiche, Ombudsman, The Boston Globe
The Student Program

Anthony Lewis, Columnist, The New York Times; Lecturer, Harvard Law School
Christie Basham, Senior Producer, CBS Morning News
Haynes Johnson, Columnist, The Washington Post
Benjamin Bradlee, Executive Editor, The Washington Post

Indochina—Politics, Refugees and Famine
Leonard Unger, Peter Kovler, and Llewelyn Werner
Guests:
Ambassador Victor Palmieri, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs
Steve and Hoa Young, refugees in the Boston area
Jeanne McDaniels, Washington Regional Director, International Rescue Committee
Leo Cherne, head of the International Rescue Committee in New York; Chairman of Concerned Citizens Commission on Indochinese Refugees
Robert Miller, former Ambassador to Malaysia

U.S.-Latin American Relations
Van R. Whiting
Guests:
Arthur Mudge, U.S.-A.I.D. and Visiting Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
James Hammond, Executive Director, Council of the Americas
Ramon Sanchez-Parodi, Head, Cuban Interest Section, Washington, D.C.
René Mujica, First Secretary for Academic Affairs, Cuban Interest Section, Washington, D.C.
James Thornblade and Steven Murphy, First National Bank of Boston, Multinational Division
Luigi Einaudi, U.S. Department of State
Alfredo Gutierrez-Kirchner, Minister of Trade Relations, Mexico
Ramón Escobar and Luis Oropeza, former Venezuelan ministers; Fellows, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

Urban America and the Third World
Junius Williams
Guests:
Professor Aggrey Mbere, Chairman, Sociology Department, Roxbury Community College; member, African National Congress, South Africa
Eunice Santana de Vélez, Coordinator, International Affairs of the National Ecumenical Movement of Puerto Rico (PRISA)
Jorge Castro, doctoral candidate, Harvard University, and Member, Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics
Robert Goodman, Research Director, Center for the Study of Public Policy, Cambridge
Chris Mackin, Member of Board of Directors, Industrial Cooperative Association, Boston, and Harman Fellow, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Professor Steven Slaby, Civil Engineering Department, Princeton University
Felix Mrema, Counselor of Economic Affairs, Tanzania, East Africa
Denise Carty-Benia, Professor of Law, Northeastern University

Summer Research Awards

Summer 1980

David Cook, (American Studies), Social Change and Stability in a California Community
Andrew Creighton, (Social Studies), A Comparative Study of Three Protest Organizations: The Alliance of Community Organizations for Reform, National Organization of Women; Local 880, Service Employees International Union; the Massachusetts Union of Public Housing Tenants
Daniel Esty, (Economics), The Relationship Between Economic Power and Political Influence
Amy Ewing, (Economics), Land Development in the Fringe of Western Cities
Nicholas Goldberg, (Government), American Aid to the Third World: History of the Office of Public Safety
Jeffrey Horwitz, (Government), Welfare and City Politics: Implementing an Inter-Governmental Program at a Local Level
Steven Irwin, (Government), The Judiciary as a Competing Interest in Effecting Criminal Sentencing Reform
Araceli Ramirez, (Sociology/History), A Case Study: the Efficacy of Chicano Community Organizations in Political Mobilizations
Edward Redlich, (History and Literature), Reapportionment of Election Districts in Mississippi, 1940-1980
Michael Tierney, Education and Political Development in an Isolated Mountain Community
Nancy Walker, The Theory of Equalizing Differences Disproved
Public Affairs Internships

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

Students who received Institute grants in support of summer internships in 1980 were:

Dave Balton, Campaign for UN Reform, Legislative Office, Arlington, Virginia
Wendy Blatt, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.
Helen Borello, City of New Orleans, Mayor’s Division of Human Resources
Ethan Burger, Department of State, Office of Soviet Union Affairs
Howard Chang, Democratic National Committee, Asian Affairs Unit
Greg Collins, Massachusetts Department of Elder Affairs, Advocacy Division
Denise Cox, The Chinatown Health Clinic, Project AHEAD, New York City
Nancy Everhart, Women’s Work Force Network, Wider Opportunities for Women, Washington, D.C.
Wesley Gardenswartz, Congressman Timothy Wirth’s District Office, Denver, Colorado
Anne-Marea Griffin, Senator Paul Tsongas’ Office, Washington, D.C.
Ryan Lamppa, Swift County Court, Benson, Minnesota
Mimi Lim, Massachusetts Consumer Council, Boston
Josephine Lok, South End Project Area Committee, Boston
Richard Marks, Economic Development & Industrial Corporation, City of Boston
Mark Matthews, The Arms Control Association, Washington, D.C.
Matthew Partan, The Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Maxine Pfeffer, The Center for the Study of Responsive Law, Washington, D.C.
Edward Rojas, Congressman Dante Fascell’s Offices, Washington, D.C. and Miami, Florida
Benjamin Schatz, Gay Rights National Lobby, Washington, D.C.
George Scholomite, Massachusetts Urban Reinvestment Advisory Group, Boston
The Student Program

Mark Schwartz, Post-Audit and Oversight Bureau, The General Court of Massachusetts
Cara Seiderman, Sierra Club Office of International Environmental Affairs, New York City
Mark Smith, Office of the Mayor, St. Louis, Missouri
Jess Velona, Assemblyman Steve Sanders' Office, New York City

Two seminars on job hunting in the public sector were sponsored by the Internships Committee. Guest speakers were:

Michael Dukakis, Former Governor of Massachusetts
Michael Harrington, Former U.S. Representative (D-Massachusetts)
Susan McLane, (Republican) State Senator, New Hampshire
Richard Howard, Public Sector Job Counselor, Harvard Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning
John Eade, Political Consultant
Peter Zimmerman, Assistant Dean and Director of Executive Training Program Development, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Evelyn Murphy, Chair, Presidential Advisory Committee for Oceans and Atmosphere

Summer Research Team

The Summer Research Team (SRT), proposed and sponsored by the Internships Committee, was formed in response to increased student interest in gaining public policy research experience. During the summer of 1980, the SRT worked in conjunction with the faculty study group on Presidential Transition, performing and compiling research on the four non-incumbent transitions since 1952 and providing assistance in the preparation of the group's report, to be issued in October, 1980.

The SRT was coordinated by Melanie Billings Yun, and its members were: Gail Gabler, J. Mark Lavergne, William F. Maloney, Robert S. Mudge, Jay T. Smith

Summer-in-Washington Program

The Summer-in-Washington Program had two coordinators in 1980. Dave Batton handled the spring responsibilities in Cambridge, gathering and posting housing information and compiling a directory of all Harvard
people spending the summer in DC. Nathan Szanton handled the summer program of activities, which included:

- Discussions with:
  - John Brademus, House Majority Whip
  - Jonathan Davidson, Political Counsel to the British Embassy
  - Paul Tsongas, U.S. Senator (D-Massachusetts)
  - Alan Baron, political consultant, Editor, The Baron Report
  - Ann Wexler, Senior Advisor to the President
  - Joe Duffey, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities
  - Tom Reston, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Press Affairs, Department of State
  - David Cohen, President, Common Cause
  - George Mamedov, Research Analyst, Soviet Center for the Study of the U.S. and Canada
  - Terry Lenzner, Attorney
  - Timothy Wirth, U.S. Representative (D-Colorado)
  - Francis Luzzato, Director, Community Energy Program, ACTION
  - Jim Lehrer, The MacNeil/Lehrer Report

- Other activities included:
  - A "Short Course on the Legislative Process" with Mark Talisman, lobbyist and former legislative assistant
  - A bike trip to Mt. Vernon
  - A special tour of the White House
  - Parties, picnics, and Potomac cruises with interns from other colleges
  - Bagel-making and wine-tasting sessions with gourmet Mark Talisman
  - A tour and lecture at Dumbarton Oaks
  - A weekend trip to the beach
  - A career seminar with four recent college graduates working in Washington
  - Discount tickets to plays at the Kennedy Center
  - An "All College Dance" at the Capitol Yacht Club
  - An informal meeting on registration and the draft with representatives from:
    - The American Friends Service Committee
    - The National Resistance Committee
    - The National Peace Center

- In addition, the program fielded a winning softball team who played against teams from:
  - The Republican National Committee
  - The Center for Strategic and International Studies
Harvard Political Review

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

Kathryn Abrams, Senior Editor
Linda Bilmes, Senior Editor
Bernadette Drankoski, Senior Editor
Lind Gee, Reviews Editor
Ted Janulis, General Manager
Alexander Kaplen, President
Sherill Leonard, Associate Editor
John Lie, Business Manager
Betsy Owens, Senior Editor
Richard K. Ronzetti, Managing Editor
James Scopa, Senior Editor
Diane Siegel, Associate Editor
Jay Smith, Associate Editor
Helene Sahadi York, Circulation/Alumni

The following is a list of articles appearing in the HPR:
Volume VII Number 4

"The Burden of Oil," John Kent Walker
"The Crisis of Energy Planning," Congressman David Stockman
"The Demise of an American Age," Leonard Unger
"The Distemper of the Times," Andy Stark
"Doing the Bureaucratic Shuffle," Diane Siegel
"Energy of the West: Coping with Prosperity," John Weston
"Is the Space Program Earthbound?" Lind Gee
"Issues and Images." (an HPR interview with John Deardourff and Newton Minow)
"A Kristol-Bell Look at Neoconservatism," Andy Stark
"A New Era for Women Workers," Diana Shaw
"On Foreign Affairs," (an HPR interview with Hedrick Smith)
"A Peace Corps in the Shadow of U.S. Policy," Peter Spiro
"The President as Preacher," Peter J. Gomes
"Soviet Strategy and the Islamic Revival," Marc Paul
"What's the News that's Fit to Print?" Sherill Leonard
"Will the Nuclear Industry Waste Away?" Helene Sahadi York

The HPR also sponsored a successful fundraising event, "The Dance," in the Forum, October 27, 1979.

Special Projects

The Special Projects Committee of the SAC organized and sponsored the following events, which were held in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government:

A panel discussion on "The Power of Oil," co-sponsored by the Special Projects Committee and the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC), October 17, 1979. Participants were:

Robert Engler, Author
Kathy Gorman, Co-chair of the Massachusetts Fair Share Energy Committee
Henry Lee, Research Program Coordinator, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Moderator: Steven Kelman, Assistant Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government

A pre-election public forum, "Cambridge School Committee Candidates Night," November 1, 1979, co-sponsored by the Special Projects Committee and the League of Women Voters of Cambridge. Participants included:

Henrietta S. Attles
Sara Mae Berman
David C. Blackman
Donald A. Fantini
James F. Fitzgerald
David J. Holway
David P. Kennedy
A pre-election public forum, "Cambridge City Council Candidates Night," co-sponsored by the Special Project Committee and the League of Women Voters of Cambridge, November 3, 1979. Participants included:

Charles James Caragianes
Kevin P. Crane
Thomas W. Danehy
Francis H. Duehay
Saundra Graham
Marty Foster (for Walter J. Sullivan)
Donald J. Hunt
William C. Jones
Robert J. LaTremouille
Mary Ellen Preusser
Leonard J. Russell
Severlin Singleton
David E. Sullivan
Alvin Thompson
Alfred Vellucci
David Wylie
Moderator: Francis Wirta, President, League of Women Voters of Cambridge

A panel discussion, "Tempest in a T-Pot: Issues in Boston Mass Transit," November 22, 1979. Participants were:

Jack Gallahue, President, Carmen's Union
Edward Novakoff, Brookline Selectman
Nancy Shapiro, Director, Information and Public Affairs for the MBTA
James Smith, MBTA Advisory Board
Moderator: José Gomez-Ibanez, Associate Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Design

A panel discussion on "Racial Violence in the Boston Area," February 12, 1980. Participants were:

Michael Flaherty, Massachusetts State Representative (D-South Boston)
Morris J. Gillen, Charlestown Committee on Education
J. Anthony Lukas, journalist and author
Jean M. McGuire, Executive Director, Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity
Buford Kaigler, Commissioner of Human Rights, City of Boston
Moderator: Badi Foster, Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education

A conference on "Hispanics and the Political Issues of the '80's," February 23, 1980. Participants in the two panels were:

"Chicanos, Cuban-Americans, and Puerto Ricans: What Role in Domestic Politics?"

Maria Canino, Chair, Puerto Rican Studies, Rutgers University
Maurice Ferre, Mayor, Miami, Florida
Esteban Torres, Special Assistant to the President for Hispanic Affairs
William Velasquez, Executive Director, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project
Moderator: Enrique Lopez, Author

"Hispanics: A Viable Force in Shaping U.S. Foreign Policy?"

Adolfo Aguilar, Journalist and former Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Juan M. Garcia-Passalacqua, member of the National Hispanic Advisory Board to the President
Ralph Guzman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, U.S. Department of State
Guillermo Restrepo, News Director, WXTV Channel 41, New Jersey
Moderator: Joseph John Jova, Former Ambassador to Mexico

The luncheon speaker was Modesto Maidique, Professor, Harvard Business School.

A panel discussion on "Palestinian-Israeli Conflict: Its Future," March 6, 1980. Participants were:

Tasheen Basheer, Advisor to President Sadat
Arie Elav, Israeli statesman and city planner
Mordechai Tamarkin, Professor, Tel Aviv University
Nasser Aruri, Professor of Political Science, Spokesman of Palestine Congress of North America
Moderator: Roger Fisher, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
A panel discussion on "The Draft," co-sponsored by the Special Projects Committee and The Nation, March 13, 1980. Participants were:

Joseph Doyle, Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Barry Lynn, National Chair, Committee Against Registration and the Draft (CARD)
Herbert Puscheck, Associate Director, Selective Service
Patricia Simon, Feminist Women for Peace
Moderator: Hamilton Fish, Publisher, The Nation

A panel discussion on "Inflation and the 1980 Campaign," co-sponsored by the Special Projects Committee and the Harvard Student Economic Association, March 18, 1980. Participants were:

Hendrik S. Houthakker, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
Michael J. Piore, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Robert Solow, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Robert Weintraub, Staff Director of the Subcommittee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs
Moderator: Alan J. Auerbach, Assistant Professor of Economics, Harvard University

A conference on "Black Politics," co-sponsored by the Special Projects Committee and the Harvard-Radcliffe Black Students Association, April 18-19, 1980. The participants in the three panels were:

"The Role of Blacks in Campaign '80 and National Partisan Politics"
Ronald Brown, Deputy Campaign Director for Senator Kennedy
Malcolm Dade, National Deputy Campaign Manager for the Carter-Mondale Presidential Committee
Michael Jones, Campaign Coordinator for John Anderson
Dr. Gloria Toote, Former Campaign Coordinator for Ronald Reagan
Moderator: Junius Williams, Fellow of the Institute of Politics and past President of the National Bar Association

"The Role of Blacks in Foreign Affairs"
Irving Davis, Director of the Pan-African Skills Project
Ambassador William Jones, American Ambassador to Haiti
Henry Richardson III, former Member of the National Security Council
Moderator: Badi Foster, Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education
"The Dilemma of the Black Mayor"

Kenneth Gibson, Mayor of Newark, New Jersey
Sterling Tucker, Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Moderator: Acel Moore, Nieman Fellow, member of Editorial Board of The Philadelphia Inquirer

A panel discussion on “Community Energy Planning: What Can You Do?” co-sponsored by the Special Projects Committee, the Environmental Society and the Phillips Brooks House Environmental Action Committee, April 22, 1980. Participants were:

John Altucher, private consultant
Edward Brown, President, New England Power Company
Garry DeLosse, Deputy Director, Massachusetts Energy Office
Angus Duncan, Director for Energy Planning, United States Department of Transportation

The Community Outreach Program: Consumer Law Course.
April 11-18, 1980

As part of the Institute’s continuing effort to increase Harvard’s rapport with the local community, to encourage cooperative interaction between the Institute and other Harvard-Radcliffe organizations, and to promote the involvement of citizens in their government, members of the Special Projects Committee and members of the Phillips Brooks House Small Claims Court Advisory Committee conducted a week-long course on consumer law at the Cambridge Pilot High School. A similar course was taught in 1979 on housing law. Class topics in the 1980 program included:

“The National Consumer Movement,” John Driscoll and Vicki Eastus
“Problems, Laws and Help,” Evan Cherniak, Marina Hsieh and Sue Theil
“A Closer Look at the Attorney General’s Office,” Susan Frey, Assistant Attorney General
“A Case Study: Automobiles,” Jim McDavitt, Boston Consumer’s Council
“Consumer Problems: Workshop” Marina Hsieh, Paul Holtzman, Sue Theil and Evan Cherniack

Evan Cherniak and Marina Hsieh, Program Coordinators; Nancy O’Connell, classroom teacher; Harriet Horfheinz, Cambridge School Volunteer Project Director
Guests

The Guests Committee plans and implements the student-initiated speaking events, including the SAC Speakers Series and the Visiting Fellows Program, and leads the student role in Institute training conferences. This year the Committee also helped with the Presidential Candidates '80 Series and the "Nominating a President: The Process and the Press" conference.

Speakers Series


An evening of political song and satire, "Mark Russell Plays the Forum," April 21, 1980.


Visiting Fellows

In addition to the Institute Fellows in residence for an academic term, the Institute each year invites a few people who have distinguished themselves in active political life to spend brief periods of time at Harvard on schedules designed to provide for as much useful contact as possible with the University student community. The campus appearances of these Heffernan Fellows are planned by students of the Guests Committee, who make a special effort to cooperate on this with other interested student organizations. This year's Visiting Fellows were:
Helen Suzman, Member of Parliament, Republic of South Africa, 
October 29-30, 1979
Forum Address: “Prospects for Change in South Africa”
Reubin Askew, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, 
November 12-13, 1979
Benjamin C. Bradlee, Executive Editor, The Washington Post, 
March 31 & April 1, 1980
Forum Address: "The Judgement to Publish"

The Guests Committee also arranged for television viewing and refreshments during coverage of the early presidential primaries' results.
The Fellows Program

The Panel on Fellowships

Kathryn Abrams, Fall
Lawrence DiCara
Kathryn Edmundson, Spring
Archie Epps, Spring
Dan Fenn
Heidi Garland, Spring
Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr.
Mark Hostetter, Fall
Lance M. Liebman
Richard J. Light
Michael Lipsky
A. Douglas Matthews
Ernest R. May
Thomas K. McCraw
Andrew McKey, Fall
Jonathan Moore
Richard E. Neustadt
Don K. Price
Ann Ramsay
Robin Schmidt
Susan Staudohar, Spring
Stanley S. Surrey, Chair
Richard Weiner, Spring
Paul Ylvisaker

The Fellows' Alumni Committee

Carol Bellamy
Robert Bradford
Alvin Bronstein, Chair
Bernard Gifford
Stephen Hess
David Keene
Evelyn Murphy
Martin Nolan
Philip Rutledge
Mark Talisman
Institute Fellows

Terrence Adamson, Fall 1979, Attorney; formerly Special Assistant to Attorney General Griffin Bell and Director of the Office of Public Information in the U.S. Department of Justice. While a Fellow, he contributed to a proposed book by Judge Bell and developed two articles that have appeared in legal publications. Adamson’s study group was entitled “The Justice Department: The Tensions Between Law, Politics, and Policy.”

Robert B. Choate, Fall and Spring, 1979-80, public interest advocate and President, Council on Children, Media and Merchandising. During the Fall, Choate prepared a primer entitled “How to Influence the System Without Clout, Constituents or Currency” and conducted a study group by the same name. During the Spring term he researched women’s roles in influencing public policy.

Robert G. Clark, Jr., Fall 1979, State Representative and Chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, Mississippi House of Representatives. While a Fellow he researched state education policy with particular emphasis on competency testing and school finance reform in Mississippi. Clark’s study group was entitled “New Politics of the South.”

John Eade, Spring 1980, political campaign consultant; formerly a campaign organizer for President Jimmy Carter and for other state and national Democratic candidates; and formerly Administrator of President Carter’s National Commission on Neighborhoods. While a Fellow, he prepared a report entitled “Insights into Community-based Economic Development in the United States” and led a study group entitled “Nuts and Bolts of Political Campaigns.”

John Marks, Fall and Spring, 1979-80, Author of The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate: The CIA and Mind Control and co-author of The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence; formerly a State Department and Senate Foreign Policy aide. While a Fellow, he continued his research into the behavioral sciences and public policy and led a study group entitled “Secret History.”

Susan McLane, Fall 1979, Candidate for Congress and State Senator in New Hampshire. While a Fellow, she wrote a paper on the New Hampshire primary and conducted a study group entitled “New Hampshire: A Political Profile” which emphasized the primary. She also researched the selection of women delegates to the 1980 Republican convention.

Tanya Melich, Spring 1980, Director of Civic Affairs, CBS, Inc.; formerly the National Chair of the Ripon Society. She is a feminist and a Republican political activist. While a Fellow she wrote a paper on the influence of television on the American political system and led a study group entitled “The Impact of New Broadcasting Technologies.”
Charles W. Powers, management consultant; formerly Vice President—Public Policy, Cummins Engine Company. He has also been an Associate Professor of Ethics at Yale and is co-author of *The Ethical Investor: Universities and Corporate Responsibility*. While a Fellow, Powers conducted research on the Federal Clean Air Act and led a study group entitled "Public Policy and the Role of Business Interests."


Paul R. Soglin, Fall 1979, Attorney; formerly Mayor of Madison, Wisconsin. While a Fellow, he helped revise the Transition Manual for the Institute's Seminar on Transition and Leadership for Newly-Elected Mayors and led a session on "Staffing" during the November seminar. His study group was entitled "Do It Yourself: Home Remedies for Healing America's Cities."

Junius W. Williams, Spring 1980, Attorney; formerly President of the National Bar Association and Director of the Community Development Administration and the Model Cities Program of Newark, New Jersey. While a Fellow, Williams wrote several articles about the relationships between American urban problems and the problems in the Third World. He led a study group entitled "Urban America and the Third World."

Shirley Williams, British Labour Party Leader; formerly Secretary of Education and Science and Secretary for Prices and Consumer Protection in the British Cabinet. While a Fellow, she wrote papers on the civil service and on employment policy, including an OECD study of youth employment in the U.S.A. Her study group was entitled "Employment, Education and Energy: Problems for the 1980's."

**Fellows Luncheon Speakers**

A tradition in the Fellows Program has been the series of weekly luncheons with distinguished members of the Harvard community. This year these guest speakers were:

Jim Fallows, *Washington Editor, The Atlantic Monthly*
Robert Toth, Soviet science writer
Lewellyn Werner, co-founder, *Operation California*
Joseph Califano, former Secretary, *Department of Health, Education and Welfare*
Dinner Discussions

The Institute occasionally hosts dinner discussions with distinguished speakers for the Fellows and invited guests from the Harvard community and the Greater Boston area. This year's speakers led discussions on a wide variety of contemporary political issues. They were:

Hale Champion, former Undersecretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; September 13, 1979, at 17 Quincy Street.

Robert Teeter, President, Market Opinion Research, and Robert Keefe, Consultant to the Carter-Mondale Presidential Committee; December 6, 1980, at the Harvard Faculty Club.

Otto Eckstein, Professor of Economics, Harvard University; January 24, 1980, at the Harvard Faculty Club.

William Miller, Staff Director, U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence; March 18, 1980, at 17 Quincy Street.

Jim Hoge, Editor-in-Chief, Chicago Sun-Times; April 8, 1980, at the Harvard Faculty Club.
The Faculty Studies Program

Campaign Finance


- The overall limit upon pre-nomination expenditures ought to be raised dramatically;
- There should be one limit for all campaign expenditures, the sole exception being post-election compliance costs;
- The limits imposed on spending in individual state primaries should be abolished;
- The Federal Election Commission should produce every two years a detailed monitoring of the increase in costs for campaign goods and services in federal elections.

Research assistance for the report was provided by:

George White
Jeff Kampelman
Jay Carroll
Robert Moorman

Production of the report was coordinated by Karen Phillips. An excerpt from this report is printed in the "Readings" section of this issue of Proceedings.

Study group participants are:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University, Chair
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joel Fleischman, Director, Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs, Duke University
Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr., Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Gary C. Jacobson, Professor of Political Science, University of California, San Diego
Xandra Kayden, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brandeis University
David A. Keene, Consultant, Des Indes Corporation, Washington, D.C.
Susan B. King, Chair, Consumer Product Safety Commission
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Legislative Reapportionment

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
Henry Monaghan, Professor of Law, Boston University
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University, Chair
Edward Pattison, Senior University Lecturer, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Ed Schneider, Market Opinion Research
Robert Teeter, Market Opinion Research

Research assistant:

Richard Burkholder, Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

The Chief Executive: Administrative Functions and Political Accountability

This study group was formed with the hope that it will spark two initiatives: to cause people who want to do research in this area to pay further attention to the problems of chief executives and their relationships to their nation's legislative bodies, and to inject comparative government as an element in curricular programs at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Under the leadership of Don K. Price, Professor Emeritus and former Dean of the School, and Michael Pitfield, MacKenzie King Visiting Professor of Canadian Studies at the School, the group attempts to examine more closely the
duties and responsibilities not only of the President but also of his counterparts in two systems of the same language and national parentage, Canada and Great Britain.

Study group participants are:

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy
Samuel H. Beer, Professor of the Science of Government
Joseph L. Bower, Professor of Business Administration
Jonathan Brock, Research Associate and Adjunct Lecturer
Harvey Brooks, Professor of Technology and Public Policy
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael Crozier, Visiting Professor in the Department of Sociology
Richard G. Darman, Lecturer in Public Policy and Management
Michael S. Dukakis, Lecturer in Public Policy
Hugh Heclo, Professor of Government
Carl Kaysen, Professor of Political Economy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Steven Kelman, Assistant Professor of Public Policy
Bradford A. Lee, Assistant Professor of History
Laurence E. Lynn, Professor of Public Policy
Arthur Maass, Professor of Government
Edward S. Mason, Lamont University Professor Emeritus
Ernest R. May, Professor of History
Michael McGeary, Research Assistant to Professor Heclo
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Professor of Public Policy
Richard E. Neustadt, Professor of Public Administration
Joseph S. Nye, Professor of Government
P. Michael Pitfield, Visiting Mackenzie King Professor of Canadian Studies
Don K. Price, Professor Emeritus
Roger B. Porter, Assistant Professor of Public Policy
Thomas C. Schelling, Professor of Political Economy
Lord Trend, Fellow of the Faculty of Government
Martha W. Weinberg, Associate Professor of Political Science
Shirley Williams, Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Moral Obligations of Public Officials

This study group plans to publish two volumes of curricular materials to facilitate and improve ethics instruction in undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools in March, 1981.

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 Fleischman, Director, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University, Chair
Badi Foster, Lecturer, Graduate School of Education
Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Philip Heymann, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Robert Klitgaard, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Lance Liebman, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Father Richard McBrien, Boston College
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Professor of Public Policy, 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 Emeritus, 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
Professional Study Programs

Seminar on Transition and Leadership for Newly-Elected Mayors, November 15-19, 1979

The Institute, with the co-sponsorship of the United States Conference of Mayors, conducted an intensive four-day seminar for fifteen newly-elected mayors.

The purpose of the seminar was to assist mayors in making the maximum use of the transition period and the crucial early months in office. In addition, the seminar was designed to provide insight into the governmental process, to provide instruction on several substantive policy areas, and to encourage interaction among newly-elected mayors, incumbent mayors, and urban experts. Included among the session topics were: the transition process; management principles and techniques; labor relations; economic and community development; finance and budgeting; public safety; energy conservation; and intergovernmental relations. The Institute and the U.S. Conference of Mayors collaborated on similar programs in 1975 and 1977.

The 1979 participants were:

Edward Annen, Kalamazoo, Michigan
Eugene Brune, Somerville, Massachusetts
Dennis Champine, Aurora, Colorado
Ben DiIieto, New Haven, Connecticut
Donald Fraser, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Samuel Halloin, Green Bay, Wisconsin
Allan Hancock, Altoona, Pennsylvania
Webster Hubbell, Little Rock, Arkansas
George Israel, Macon, Georgia
Robert Martinez, Tampa, Florida
Thomas McMahana, Anderson, Indiana
Arthur Morris, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
Lawrence Stone, Sunnyvale, California
George Vukovich, Youngstown, Ohio
Alan Wilson, Muncie, Indiana

The faculty included:

Ken Auletta, columnist. New York Daily News and The New Yorker
David W. Brown, Attorney: Lecturer, Yale School of Organization and Management
Richard E. Carver, Mayor of Peoria, Illinois and President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors
Gordon Chase, Associate Professor, Brandeis University
Herbert Cohen, President, Performance Management, Inc.
Roger Dahl, Director, Labor-Management Relations Service, United States Conference of Mayors
G. Edward De Seve, President, Public Financial Management Inc.
Collin Diver, Visiting Associate Professor of Law, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Angus Duncan, Director of Energy Policy, U.S. Department of Transportation
Barney Frank, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Boston)
Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director, District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees in New York City
Barry Gottchler, Senior Vice-President of Public Affairs, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company
John J. Gunther, Executive Director, United States Conference of Mayors
Michael J. Kelly, Dean, University of Maryland School of Law
Moon Landrieu, Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
George Latimer, Mayor of St. Paul, Minnesota
Henry Lee, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gerald Leighton, Director, Community Systems Division, U.S. Department of Energy
Martin Linsky, Media Programs Consultant, Institute of Politics
Robert McKersie, Professor, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Walter Robinson, State House Bureau Chief, The Boston Globe
Charles Rogovin, Professor of Law and Associate Dean, Temple University School of Law
Lawrence B. Simons, Assistant Secretary for Housing, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Paul Soglin, Institute Fellow and former Mayor of Madison, Wisconsin
Sharon Stevens, reporter, WGBH-TV, Boston
Nell Surber, Director of Development, City of Cincinnati, Ohio
Frank Tivnan, Associate Director, Massachusetts Petroleum Council
William B. Welsh, Assistant Secretary for Legislation, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Hubert Williams, Director, Newark, New Jersey Police Department

The administrative staff included:

Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr., Seminar Coordinator
Theresa A. Donovan, Administrative Coordinator
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Press Coordinator
The student support was directed by:

- Diane Siegel, **Overall Student Coordinator**
- Susan Staudohar, **Escorts Coordinator**
- Nancy Hoffmeier, **Curriculum Notebook Coordinator**
- Larry Eisenstein, **Student Discussions Coordinator**

The John F. Kennedy School of Government Research Assistants were:

- Bill Mulrow
- Don Roedner

A final summary report of the Conference was published in May, 1980.

**Seminar on Inflation for National Political Journalists, January 27-28, 1980**

The Institute conducted a two-day seminar for twenty-three national political reporters and editors, focusing on these aspects of inflation: what can start it, or cause it to speed up; what keeps it going; why once it has speeded up for a while, it will tend to continue at the faster speed; what damage it does; what are possible remedies; and what may be their costs.

The participants included:

- Dan Balz, *The Washington Post*
- William Blaylock, *Time*
- Ken Bode, *NBC News*
- Richard Cattani, *The Christian Science Monitor*
- John Cunniff, *Associated Press*
- Jim Deakin, *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*
- James Doyle, *Newsweek*
- Nancy Gabriner, *ABC News*
- Meryl Gordon, *Gannett News Service*
- Cragg Hines, *The Houston Chronicle*
- Monroe Karmin, *Knight-Ridder Newspapers*
- Robert Krutwich, *National Public Radio*
- Carl Leubsdorf, *The Baltimore Sun*
- Jon Margolis, *The Chicago Tribune*
- Bruce Morton, *CBS News*
- Larry O'Rourke, *The Philadelphia Bulletin*
- Ken Paul, *Newsday*
- Eleanor Randolph, *Los Angeles Times*
Don Reeder, U.S. News & World Report
Steve Roberts, The New York Times
Arnold Sawislak, United Press International
Frank Van Riper, The New York Daily News
Jerome Watson, The Chicago Sunday Times

The faculty included:

Gardner Ackley, Professor of Political Economy, University of Michigan
Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Alan S. Blinder, Professor of Economics, Princeton University
Robert M. Solow, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The program coordinator was Martin Linsky; Susan Elbow was administrative assistant.


The Institute conducted a two-day seminar for twenty-two national political reporters and editors, focusing on Islamic culture and beliefs, the internal politics of the Gulf region, the economics of oil, the Soviet perspective on the Gulf, and U.S. policy options.

The participants included:

Robert Ajemian, Time
Martin Berck, Newsday
Terry Brown, The Chicago Tribune
Robert P. Cooper, Los Angeles Times
Richard Dudman, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch
Michael Getler, The Washington Post
Andrew J. Glass, Cox Newspapers
Dave Greenway, The Boston Globe
Joel Havemann, The National Journal
Roberta Horning, The Washington Star
Christopher Isham, ABC News
Anthony Marro, Newsday
Max McCarthy, The Buffalo Evening News
Norman Miller, The Wall Street Journal
Joel Rigert, The Minneapolis Star and Tribune
Lee Roderick, Scripps League Newspapers
Barbara Strong, The Dallas Morning News
Les Tanzer, U.S. News & World Report
Ellen Warren, The Chicago Sun-times
Jane Whitmore, Newsweek
James Wieghart, The New York Daily News

The faculty included:

Hermann Eikts, Professor, Boston University
Robert Legvold, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.
William Quandt, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
R.K. Ramazani, Professor, University of Virginia
Robert B. Stobaugh, Director, The Energy Project, Harvard Business School

• The program coordinator was Martin Linsky; Susan Elbow was administrative assistant.

In August of 1980, the Institute published a report and evaluation of its first two experimental seminars of educational programs for professional journalists. The report, entitled Informed Sources: A Report on Two Educational Programs for Journalists, reviews and analyzes the Seminar on State Government for Massachusetts Journalists and the Seminar on Inflation for National Political journalists. The report was written by Jonathan Moore, Lewis Wolfson, Martin Linsky, Charles Greenleaf, and Meg Bowen. The “Overview” from this report is printed in the “Readings” section of this issue of Proceedings.
Special Projects

Presidential Candidates '80

During the months prior to the Massachusetts and New Hampshire primaries, the major candidates for the Democratic and Republican presidential nominations were invited to take part in a program of activities sponsored by the Institute. Three principal events comprised a typical visit: a speech by the candidate in the Forum; off-the-record meetings with selected faculty; and a roundtable interview hosted by Christopher Lydon of WGBH's "Ten O'Clock" with selected national journalists serving as questioners. Eight Harvard undergraduates, who served as Campaign '80 Interns at the Institute, provided background research and lines of questioning for the journalists. The research was designed to examine the candidates' personal motivation, values, philosophy, and capacity for public service rather than to discuss issue positions, strategies, or current developments of the campaign. The structure of the research and interviews was designed by Jonathan Moore; the interviews were co-produced and broadcast by WGBH-TV, Boston.

John Anderson, October 23, 1979
Interviewers:
  Terrence Smith, The New York Times
  David Nyhan, The Boston Globe
  Hays Gorey, Time Magazine
Faculty:
  Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy
  Ronald Fox, Lecturer on Business Administration
  Hendrik Houthakker, Professor of Economics
  George Cabot Lodge, Professor of Business Administration

Benjamin Fernandez, November 27, 1979
Interviewers:
  Chris Black, The Boston Globe
  Martin Linsky, former Editor, The Real Paper
Faculty:
  Jonathan Brock, Adjunct Lecturer
  Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy
  Robert Klatgaard, Associate Professor of Public Policy
  Mark Moore, Professor of Criminal Justice, Policy Management
  Thomas Schelling, Professor of Political Economy

Jerry Brown, January 23, 1980
Interviewers:
  Ellen Goodman, The Boston Globe
  Bill Eaton, Los Angeles Times
Faculty:
  Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy
  Roger Fisher, Professor of Law
  Michael Nacht, Lecturer in Public Policy
  Richard Neustadt, Professor of Government
  Richard Pipes, Professor of History

Phil Crane, January 29, 1980
Interviewers:
  James McCartney, Knight-Ridder Newspapers
  Robert Turner, The Boston Globe

Edward M. Kennedy, February 12, 1980
Interviewers:
  David Broder, The Washington Post
  James Doyle, Newsweek

George Bush, March 2, 1980
Interviewers:
  Peggy Simpson, The Boston Herald American
  Jules Witcover, The Washington Star

Administrative staff included:
  Nicholas Mitropoulos, Assistant Director
  Robert Ferrante, Executive Producer, WGBH News
  Terri Shuck, Forum Assistant
  Geri Denterlein, Forum Assistant
  Larry Goldberg, Media Services Coordinator
  Alan Mitter, Intern Coordinator

The Campaign '80 Interns of the Institute of Politics were:
  Mala Abraham
  Linda Drucker
  Steve Irwin
  Duby McDowell
  Jon Mosle
  Lisa Rotenberg
  Vivian Rieberg
  Jay Smith
Nominating a President: The Process and the Press, February 1-3, 1980

The Institute and the Los Angeles Times sponsored a three-day conference designed to give political experts managing the 1980 Presidential campaigns and journalists reporting on them an opportunity to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the process and to exchange ideas for better media coverage of politics. The participants in the five roundtable discussions were:

Roundtable 1: "The New Hampshire Primary: Problems of Timing and Sequence"
Moderator: Hale Champion, Executive Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government
Panelists:
J. Joseph Grandmalison, Federal Co-Chairman, New England Regional Commission
Robert J. Keefe, President, The Keefe Company
Walter R. Mears, Vice President and Chief of Bureau, The Associated Press
Jack Nelson, Washington Bureau Chief, Los Angeles Times
Robert M. Teeter, President, Market Opinion Research

Roundtable 2: "Primaries Versus Caucuses"
Moderator: F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor, Yale University
Panelists:
James Gannon, Editor, The Des Moines Register
Tim Kraft, National Campaign Manager, Carter/Mondale Presidential Committee
James N. Naughton, Metropolitan Editor, The Philadelphia Inquirer
Robert Scheer, National Correspondent, Los Angeles Times
Richard G. Stearns, Chief of Delegate Selection, Kennedy for President Committee
F. Clifton White, President, F. Clifton White and Associates, Inc.

Roundtable 3: "The Impact of Television"
Moderator: Michael S. Dukakis, Director of Intergovernmental Studies, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Panelists:
John D. Deardourff, Chairman of the Board, Bailey, Deardourff & Associates
Christopher Lydon, Anchor of "10 O'Clock," WGBH-TV
John P. Marttila, President, John Marttila & Associates, Inc.
Thomas Quinn, Campaign Manager, Brown for President
William J. Small, President, NBC News

Roundtable 4: "Covering the Issues"
Moderator: Newton N. Minow, Partner, Sidley & Austin
Panelists:
   Alan Baron, Editor, The Baron Report
   James Doyle, Washington Deputy Bureau Chief, Newsweek
   Peter D. Hart, President, Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc.
   Haynes Johnson, Columnist, The Washington Post
   Jess Marlow, Correspondent and Anchorman, KNBC News
   David A. Stockman, U.S. Congressman, (R-MI)

Roundtable 5: "Reform and Counter-Reform"
Moderator: Stephen Hess, Syndicated Columnist and Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
Panelists:
   Kenneth A. Bode, Network Correspondent, NBC News
   David A. Keene, Political Director, George Bush for President
   Martin F. Nolan, Washington Bureau Chief, The Boston Globe
   Carl R. Wagner, Director of Field Operations, Kennedy for President Committee
   James Wooten, News Producer, ABC News

The special observers were:

   Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
   Richard Bergholz, Political Writer, Los Angeles Times
   William Boyarsky, City-County Bureau Chief, Los Angeles Times
   Dennis A. Britton, National Editor, Los Angeles Times
   Otis Chandler, Publisher, Los Angeles Times
   Anthony Day, Editor of the Editorial Pages, Los Angeles Times
   Robert J. Donovan, Senior Fellow in Public Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs
   John Foley, Assistant Managing Editor, Los Angeles Times
   Donald Forst, Editor, Boston Herald American
   John J. Goldman, New York Bureau Chief, Los Angeles Times
   Robert Healy, Executive Director, The Boston Globe
   W. Thomas Johnson, President, Los Angeles Times
   David R. Jones, National Editor, The New York Times
   I.A. Lewis, Director, Los Angeles Times Poll
   Martin Linsky, Media Programs Consultant, Institute of Politics
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director & Forum Coordinator, Institute of Politics
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
George E. Reedy, Professor of Journalism, Marquette University
William Schneider, Visiting Fellow, Hoover Institution
Robert Shogan, Political Writer, Los Angeles Times
George Skelton, Assistant Metropolitan Editor, Politics, Los Angeles Times
Frank Stanton, Former President, CBS, Inc.
William F. Thomas, Executive Vice President & Editor, Los Angeles Times
James S. Toedtman, Executive Editor, Boston Herald American
Thomas Winship, Editor, The Boston Globe

The conference coordinators were:

Los Angeles Times
William F. Thomas
John Foley
Dennis A. Britton
Nancy Tew
William Schneider
Kathi Barr

Institute of Politics
Jonathan Moore
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos
George H. White
Martin Linsky
Susan Elbow
Karen Phillips
Betsy Plaests

A transcript of the proceedings of the conference, Nominating a President: The Process and the Press, edited by John Foley, Dennis A. Britton and Eugene B. Everett, Jr., with an Afterword by Jonathan Moore, was published by Praeger Publishers in April, 1980. The videotaped proceedings of the conference were edited into five, 30-minute specials which were distributed by PBS and broadcast by approximately 100 stations on different dates during the spring and summer.

An excerpt from the book is printed in the "Readings" section of this issue of Proceedings.
Other Projects

The Institute and WGBH co-produced a television special, "TV Democracy: Politics Through a Magic Box," which was broadcast nationally on the Eastern Educational Network in August, 1980. The Executive Producer was Edward Baumeister of WGBH; the Executive Editor was Jonathan Moore of the Institute of Politics; the Producer/Reporter was Charles Bennett of WGBH.

The American Council of Young Political Leaders sponsored a visit by the All-China Youth Federation Delegation to the U.S. to the Institute on December 5, 1979, which included a tour of the new building, a discussion with Institute Fellows, staff, and students, and a reception afterwards in the Penthouse. Members of the delegation were:

Hu Qili, President, All-China Youth Federation
Hao Jianxiu, Vice Minister of the Textile Industry
Zhu Liang, Advisor, All-China Youth Federation
Sun Jiachang, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Zhong Peizhang, Deputy Chief, China Youth News
Bi Siyun, Central Committee, Communist Youth League of China
Li Yi, Vice-Secretary-General, All-China Youth Federation
Gao Chonghui, Deputy Chief, Keshan Farm, Heilongjiang Province
Pan Shiqiang, International Department, All-China Youth Federation
Wu Xuefan, Vice President, All-China Students' Federation
Zhou Songbai, Vice-Secretary-General, All-China Students Federation
Li Xiaohua, Locomotive Driver, Jinhzhou Railway Bureau
Ton Yixiu, Interpreter, All-China Youth Federation
Amy Blum, Coordinator, American Council of Young Political Leaders

Members of the discussion group from the Institute included:

Rick Berenson, SAC
Linda Bilmes, SAC
Dick Burkholder, Research Assistant
Shana Chung, Associate, SAC
Robert Clark, Fellow
Carol Colborn, SAC
Terry Donovan, Staff
Brian Dunmore, SAC
Barbara Fischbein, SAC
Heidi Garland, SAC
A showing of the videotape entitled "Teheran Diary" produced by Elaine Baly, Pacifica News Service and Michael Frenchman, Lumen Associates, New York. The showing was followed by a discussion with the producers and Bill Worthy, The Baltimore Afro-American and Mackie MacLeod, WILD radio.

A dinner panel discussion with Richard Reeves, author of Democracy in America Today, was sponsored by the Institute and held at the Faculty Club, September 27, 1979. Panelists were:

- Stanley Hoffman, Professor of Government, Harvard University
- Daniel Yergin, Adjunct Lecturer in the John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Laurence Tribe, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
- Richard Neustadt, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

The Institute hosted two press conferences for OXFAM America: on October 17, Jim Howard, Technical Officer and Disaster Specialist for OXFAM America, announced a $50 million fundraising campaign for Cambodia relief; and on March 12, 1980. Joe Short, Executive Director of OXFAM America and Newell Flather, Chair of the OXFAM Board of Trustees, gave a report with photographs of their February visit to Southeast Asia.

The Institute hosted a discussion with the Fellows of the World Press Institute of Macalester College and various members of the Institute community on March 4, 1980. The participants were:

World Press Institute Fellows:
- Mustafa Ahmed, Bangladesh
Olga Curado, Brazil
Carlos Salgar, Colombia
Peter Racz, Hungary
Vaiju Mahindroo, India
Sjahrir Wahab, Indonesia
Bruno Lopez, Mexico
Peter Van Deutekom, The Netherlands
Abiodun Famojuro, Nigeria
Helge Eriksen, Norway
Gervais Ahounou, Senegal
Mohamed Mustafa, Sudan
Paul V. Sherburne, Program Director, World Press Institute, Macalester College

Institute of Politics Fellows:
Chuck Powers
Charles Seib
John Marks
John Eade

John F. Kennedy School of Government Students:
Janet Hale
Mike Fenlon
John Driscoll
Lew Werner
Wayne Tate

Institute of Politics Staff:
Charles Greenleaf
Terry Donovan
Nick Mitropoulos
Geri Denterlein
The Forum

The ARCO Public Affairs Forum is the multi-tiered central area of the 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, an arena for debate where democracy can come alive, a forum where citizens can meet with presidents and kings, or poets debate with secretaries of defense." The Institute administers all formal programs held in the Forum, which this year included:

A dinner meeting held by Friends of the Jerusalem Institute of Management, Inc., September 9, 1979.

A convocation marking the beginning of the academic year at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, September 10, 1979.

A panel of Fall Institute Fellows: "Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 12, 1979. Participants were:

Terrence B. Adamson
Robert G. Clark, Jr.
Robert B. Choate
John Marks
Susan McLane
Paul R. Soglin
Shirley Williams
Moderator: Jonathan Moore
(Consult the earlier section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.)

A debate entitled "Carter's Foreign Policy: A Balance Sheet," September 14, 1979. Participants were:

Richard Gardner, U.S. Ambassador to Italy
Richard Pipes, Professor of History, Harvard University
Moderator: Michael Dukakis, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University


The Edinburgh team members were:
Paul Bader
John McTernan
Cameron Wyllie

The Harvard team members were:
John Bredehoft
William Foutz
Chris Keyser

The judges were:
William Hogan, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
Evelyn Murphy, Acting Chair of the President's National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere
Norman Rasmussen, Chairman of the Nuclear Engineering Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology


An address by Betty Friedan, feminist author and sociologist, entitled "Women (and Men) in the 1980's: New Problems; New Possibilities," September 25, 1979. The event was co-sponsored by the Institute and the Harvard University Women Students' Coalition.


A panel discussion entitled "International Journalism: Torn Between Politics and Ethics?" co-sponsored by the Institute and the World Paper, October 1, 1979. Participants were:

Silviu Brucan, Scinteira, Bucharesta
Jacqueline Grapin, Le Monde, Paris
Mochtar Lubis, Indonesia Raya, Djakarta
Hilary Ng'weno, The Nairobi Times, Kenya
A slide presentation and panel discussion on “The Boat People Holocaust,” October 11, 1979. Participants were:

Peter Kovler, contributor to The New York Times on U.S.-Southeast Asia policy
Llewellyn Werner, founder of “Operation California” airlift project
Stephen Young, Assistant Dean, Harvard Law School

A conference on “Opportunities for Minority Students in Graduate Education: Arts, Sciences and Engineering,” October 13, 1979. This event was sponsored by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University.

An address by Lloyd McBride, President, United Steelworkers AFL-CIO, entitled "Industrial Unions, Power Politics in the 1980's," October 16, 1979. This event was part of the Sidney Harman Lecture Series on "Technology and Work."

A panel discussion entitled “The Role of Women in the 1980 Conventions,” co-sponsored by the Institute and the Massachusetts Women’s Political Caucus, October 25, 1979. Participants were:

Carol Bellamy, President, New York City Council
Jill Ruckelshaus, former Presiding Officer of International Women’s Year

A panel discussion entitled “The Carter Presidency and the Upcoming Elections,” sponsored by Associated Harvard Alumni, October 27, 1979. Participants were:

Peggy Simpson, Boston Herald American
Jim Boyd, The Idaho Statesman
Jim Fallows, The Atlantic Monthly
David Nyhan, The Boston Globe


An address by Walter Guevara Arze, former President of Bolivia, entitled "The Current Political Situation in Bolivia," December 5, 1979. This event was co-sponsored by the Institute, the Center for International Affairs, the Committee for Latin American and Iberian Studies, and the Latin American Students' Association.


A dinner meeting of the Radcliffe Club of Boston, December 10, 1979.

An address by George Hildebrand, Professor, Cornell University, entitled "Starvation and Foreign Intervention in Cambodia," December 12, 1979. This event was sponsored by: Harvard-Radcliffe Hunger Action Group; Kampuchea Support Action Group; Student Activists for Cambodia; Harvard-Radcliffe Asian-American Association; The Malaysian Students Association; The Harvard-Radcliffe Christian Fellowship; and The Harvard-Radcliffe Catholic Students Association.

A panel discussion with Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong, authors of The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court, December 13, 1979. Panelists were:

John Ely, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Charles Nesson, Associate Dean, Harvard Law School
Moderator: John Marks, Fellow, Institute of Politics

A dinner of the Boston Fulbright Committee, December 17, 1979.

An address by Irving Bluestone, Vice President, United Auto Workers Union, entitled "Work Organization and the Future of the American Labor Union," with respondent Quinn Mills, Professor of Business Administration, January 16, 1980. This event was a part of the Sidney Harman Lecture Series on "Technology and Work."

A memorial service for Gordon Chase, Associate Professor, Brandeis University, January 19, 1980. The service was led by:

- Michael S. Dukakis, presiding
- Emily H. Chase
- Charles M. Atkins
- Jonathan E. Feigelson
- Alice S. Hersh
- Peter Chase
- John V. Lindsay
- Elizabeth E. Feigelson
- McGeorge Bundy
- Christopher Chase
- Nathan Leventhal
- Naomi Feigelson Chase


A panel discussion entitled "Soviet Intervention in Afghanistan: Background and Implications," co-sponsored by the Institute and the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, January 28, 1980. Participants were:

- Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., Dean of the Fletcher School of Diplomacy, Tufts University
- Richard N. Frye, Professor of Iranian, Harvard University
- Robert Perito, Officer, U.S. Department of State

A panel of Spring Institute Fellows: "Personal Perspectives on Politics," February 4, 1980. Participants were:

- John Eade
- Robert B. Choate
- John Marks
- Tanya Melich
- Charles W. Powers
- Charles B. Seib
- Junius W. Williams
Moderator: Jonathan Moore
(Consult the earlier section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.)

A panel discussion entitled "Neoconservatism," February 5, 1980. Participants were:

Nathan Glazer, Professor of Education and Social Structure, Harvard Graduate School of Education
Irving Kristol, Editor, The Public Interest

An address by William Davis, Premier of Ontario, entitled "Canadian Politics and the Upcoming Election," February 7, 1980. This event was co-sponsored by the Institute, the Canadian consulate, the Center for International Affairs, and the Harvard Canadian Club.

A disco party, sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government Student Association.

An address by Sissela Bok, philosopher and author, entitled "Political Lying and Public Distrust," followed by a panel discussion entitled "Should We Abandon Arms Control?," February 10, 1980. Participants in the panel were:

Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University and Associate Director of the Center for Science and International Affairs
Bernard T. Feld, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Roger Fisher, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Richard Pipes, Professor of History, Harvard University

These two events were part of the Channing Lecture Series, "I Call That Mind Free," and were co-sponsored by the Institute and the Cambridge Forum.

An address by Broadus Butler, President, Robert R. Morton Memorial Institute and Chairman, International Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), entitled "Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs," co-sponsored by the Institute and the Association of Black Faculty and Administrators at Harvard University, February 14, 1980. Respondents were:
C. Clyde Ferguson, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Willard Johnson, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A panel discussion entitled “Alternative Conceptions of Development,” co-sponsored by the Institute and the Latin American Students Association, February 17, 1980. Participants were:

S. Malcolm Gillis, Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID) Fellow
Arnold Harberger, Professor of Economics, University of Chicago
Stephen A. Marglin, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
David Maybury-Lewis, Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University

A dinner of the Young Presidents Organization, February 20, 1980.

An address by Helen Caldicott, pediatrician and President, Physicians for Social Responsibility entitled “The Threat to Our Children,” followed by an address by Richard Barnet, Co-Director of the Institute for Policy Studies, entitled “Economic Power for Peace,” February 24, 1980. These two events were part of the Channing Lecture Series, “I Call That Mind Free,” and were co-sponsored by the Institute and the Cambridge Forum.


A luncheon address by Alfred Kahn, Advisor to the President on Inflation, March 8, 1980, as part of the John F. Kennedy School of Government Alumni Day.


The Second Annual Third World Conference, entitled "Political and Economic Challenges of the Third World in the 1980's," March 14-16, 1980. This conference was co-sponsored by the Institute and seventeen Third World organizations.

A panel discussion entitled "A Zimbabwe Post Election Analysis: The Implications for Southern Africa," co-sponsored by the Institute, the International Relations Council, and the United Nations Association of Greater Boston, March 16, 1980. Participants were:

Tirivai Kangai, *Chief Representative of ZANU Mission to the United States*
Eugene Schmiel, *Zimbabwe Desk Officer, Department of State*
Paul Tsongas, *U.S. Senator (D-Massachusetts)*


The Godkin Lectures were delivered by The Right Honorable Shirley Williams, British Labour Party Leader, entitled “The Challenges of Social Democracy,” on April 14, 15, and 16, 1980.


An address and slide presentation by Jean Kilbourne, Assistant Director of the New England Screen Education Association, entitled “The Naked Truth: Advertising’s Image of Women,” co-sponsored by the Institute and the Radcliffe Forum, April 17, 1980.

The Tanner Lectures on Human Values were delivered by George Stigler, Professor of American Institutions, University of Chicago. The lectures were entitled:

“The Economist as Preacher,” April 24, 1980

An evening of humor with Marshall Dodge as “Virgil Bliss — the Candidate from the Dependent Party,” April 29, 1980.

An address by Gustave Hauser, Chairman of Warner-Amex Cable Communications, entitled “Cable TV and the Home Information Revolution,” May 1, 1980. Respondents were:

Peggy Charren, President, Action for Children’s Television
Anthony Oettinger, Professor of Applied Mathematics and Professor of Information Resources Policy, Harvard University
Moderator: Tanya Melich, Director of Civic Affairs, CBS, Inc. and Fellow, Institute of Politics

A panel discussion entitled “Sexual Harassment as a Political Issue,” May 5, 1980. Participants were:

Judith Berman Brandenberg, Associate Dean, Yale College
Diane Brou Fraser, Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Harvard University
Barbara Gray, Massachusetts State Representative (R-Framingham)
Nancy Wilbur, Alliance Against Sexual Coercion
Moderator: Ruth Hubbard, Professor of Biology, Harvard University


A panel discussion entitled "Afghanistan: Refugees, Politics and the Media," co-sponsored by the Institute and the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, May 9, 1980. Participants were:

Mert Cregger, Deputy Executive Director, CARE
Dan Rather, CBS News Correspondent
Bashir Zikria, Professor of Surgery, Columbia University
Moderator: Eden Naby, Affiliate, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University

An address by Barry Bosworth, former Director, Council on Wage and Price Stability, entitled "Current Economic Policy: Conflict and Dissension," May 12, 1980. Respondents were:

Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy
James S. Duesenberry, Professor of Money and Banking
Hendrik S. Houthakker, Professor of Economics


A videodance, entitled "Springshot," co-sponsored by the Institute and Cambridge Arts Council, as part of the Cambridge River Festival, May 31, 1980.
