Scores of debates enlivened politics during the past twelve months. One of them, nuclear disarmament, seemed to spring from nowhere into international prominence. It, like other political issues, attracted a number of religious figures, thereby raising for many people the question of the proper relationship between religious beliefs and public policy-making. Others argued over the proper relationship between press and politics, as reporters increasingly thought about their role in, and their impact upon, the events they cover. And, as always, debates have flurried around the Oval Office; questions have arisen in one sphere over President Reagan's fealty to conservative supporters, and in another sphere over his sensitivity to the poor.

Through its variety of programs, the Institute of Politics has taken an active part in these and other debates during the past year. For some of them it has gathered, synthesized, and presented non-partisan information: a special report for a Senate committee, in-depth seminars on major issues for national reporters, a book about the 1980 presidential election for political junkies. For other debates the Institute has arranged for the exchange of divergent viewpoints. Twice this year the IOP succeeded in bringing together groups of competitors who had never before sat down together to discuss common problems: in December, officials of the Republican and Democratic parties, and in January, reporters and executives from each of the three commercial television networks.

This, the fourth edition of Proceedings, provides a retrospective of Institute activities from September 1981 through August 1982. The first section contains readings, mostly excerpts from longer speeches and articles. The second section provides a complete roster of the year's programs and participants. The readings in the first part offer an idea of the Institute's substance and style; the lists in the second part delineate fully the range of its projects and people.

Like the activities its pages recall, Proceedings is designed to stimulate, inform, challenge, and, not least of all, entertain. We hope it succeeds.

Jane Markham
Stephen Bates
Editors
I. Readings
Readings
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Black America Under Siege
by Vernon Jordan

We have a unique practitioner of political and governmental arts in the White House today. Not since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has America been led by so gifted a communicator. Not since Lyndon Johnson has it been led by so skillful a politician. And not since Herbert Hoover has it been led by a president so willing to sacrifice millions of people on the altar of an outmoded ideology.

Just a brief look at some of the key programs that have been slashed — food stamps, Medicaid, welfare, legal services, education aid, public service jobs — tells us that our leaders are busy drilling holes in the social safety net for the poor. The affluent got big tax cuts. The Pentagon got a blank check. But the poor got cuts in programs that put food on their tables, that provide opportunities and hope. It is this full-scale attack that has resulted in the wave of despair engulfing the black community. Perhaps the most serious indictment of this administration’s policies is that they have robbed poor people of hope; they have replaced cautious optimism with deep despair.

When we hear our nation’s leaders talk of “getting government off our backs,” we should be very clear about what they mean. Whose government? Whose backs?

Not long ago I talked with a man sitting next to me on a flight to Los Angeles. He waxed eloquent about the government’s intrusion into his life and business. But as the conversation developed, it turned out he’d started his business with an SBA loan. He’d gotten his education under the GI Bill. He lived in a suburb made possible by federal highway money and subsidized with federal sewage grants. His home was bought with the help of an FHA mortgage. His parents were no burden to him thanks to Social Security and Medicare. His children were in college on federal merit scholarships. The government programs he condemned were the means by which he had climbed into the middle class and prospered.

His selfish meanness now appears to have been elevated to a new national philosophy, reflected by the current administration. It is a philosophy at odds with the dominant current of greater equality and social justice that has made America

This is an excerpt from the 1981 Pollak Lecture of the same title, delivered in the Forum on October 13, 1981. Vernon Jordan, a former Institute Fellow, was at the time President of the National Urban League.
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great. And it is a philosophy that leads to widening the gap between those who have much and those who have little.

But those who sow greater inequality may reap the whirlwind. They feed the terrible anger, alienation, and bitterness that are so prevalent in our society. By ignoring the interest of the bottom half, they risk all. When Miami blew up last year, I got a phone call from a friend who told me that people were acting crazy there. And I immediately recalled some lines from the great Black poet Langston Hughes, who wrote, “Seems like what makes me crazy has no effect on you/I’m gonna keep on doing it until you’re crazy, too.” When people are subjected to racism, to joblessness, and to unequal justice, don’t expect them to act as if they had good jobs, decent homes, and respect from the authorities.

I find it hard to understand why public and private sector leadership does not understand this. The President has given the nation leadership of one kind, but where is the depth of leadership that speaks for equality and justice?

* * *

Egypt After Sadat
by Mona Makram-Ebeid

Ever since the assassination of President Sadat, people have asked me why Sadat, an advocate of peace, loved by millions of Americans, whose death inspired encomiums the world over, did not trigger the same emotions at home, while the death of his predecessor, Nasser, who led his country to a crushing defeat at the hands of Israel in 1967, inspired an outpouring of grief throughout the Arab homeland. There are several reasons.

Historically, geopolitically, and socio-culturally, Egypt is at the heart of four concentric zones: the Arab, the Islamic, the African, and the Third World. Nasser was sharply cognizant of this fact very early on; his awareness of the centrality of Egypt gave him the necessary conditions to lead the Arab world.

But most of all, it was his stubborn insistence on national dignity that triggered his incredible support. His first act of defiance triggered a chain reaction that was to

This article is an excerpt from a Forum panel discussion of the same title on November 24, 1981. Another excerpt was published in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, May 12, 1982, entitled “Mubarak Is His Own Man.” Mona Makram-Ebeid, MPA ’82, an Egyptian sociologist, was at the time an Edward M. Mason fellow at the John F. Kennedy School of Government.
last for years. The West, in a penalizing and humiliating move, withdrew its offer to finance Egypt's Aswan Dam project. Nasser countered by nationalizing the Suez Canal. When Nasser's Egypt was attacked in 1956 the entire Arab nation felt and acted in unison. Victory or defeat was not so much calculated; what mattered was the challenge, the defiance, the fighting opportunity to put an end to century-long humiliation.

By virtue of succession, Sadat legitimately inherited the claim of leadership of the Arab world. But along with the inheritance came tremendous burdens, not least of which was the task of liberating Egyptian and Arab soil from Israeli occupation. The October War transformed him into an instant national hero. Again, it was not so much a matter of whether the Arabs won or lost; what mattered was that Sadat (with Assad of Syria) had led the Arabs into a fighting battle with an opportunity to defy the enemy and vindicate Arab dignity. The October War for Sadat could have been what the Suez War was for Nasser, baptizing him as a pan-Arab leader. But soon after the war, it gradually emerged that the war was fought not so much to defy the West, but rather to be accepted in the West.

To be sure, President Sadat was a bold and courageous man who loved his country. But he had carved a dazzling vision of his own to make Egypt part of the West. In so doing, his frame of reference was no longer inside the Middle East, and he became an alien to his fellow Arabs. Furthermore, with his crackdown just a few weeks before his tragic death, he succeeded in alienating all segments of Egyptian society. His massive arrests covered a wide spectrum of society; they included people from all walks of life and of diverse political persuasions. There lies part of the tragedy of his assassination and the conflicting emotions that took hold of his people.

Now let me briefly discuss the nature of the opposition which existed in Egypt. For simplicity these could be grouped under three headings: the secular left, the atheist forces, and the militant religious groups. I shall focus on the latter, as they have represented the most organized and most serious challenge to the regime.

During 1977, Egypt witnessed three major events which had collective political implications. The first was the massive population food riots in January, which were blamed on leftist elements and communist organizations, and which were followed by a multitude of repressive measures against all kinds of political opposition. The second event was a bloody confrontation between the regime and the measures of the militant Islamic group, Al Takfir Wal Hijra; the incident was sparked off when the group kidnapped a former Cabinet Minister for Religious Endowment, demanded the release of fellow detainees, then carried out their threat to kill him when the release did not materialize. The third event was President Sadat's historic decision to travel to Israel in search of peace.

Curiously, these three events are intertwined. The January riots reflected the mounting frustrations of lower and small middle classes in Egypt vis-a-vis President Sadat's socioeconomic policies. The July confrontation reflected the growing despair...
The Political Climate

of the most volatile element of the population — youth of the small middle and working classes — who sought salvation in Islamic militancy. And Sadat’s visit to Jerusalem was as much motivated by these mounting internal problems as by a genuine desire for peace. He thought that with peace would come instant prosperity.

It is my contention that the socioeconomic crisis, more than the peace process or the alliance with the West, was at the core of the mounting opposition to Sadat. Had Egypt’s problems been dealt with more seriously by the leadership, their militant appeal would not have been so massive.

In the Middle East, a social, political, or economic crisis of sufficient depth inevitably translates into a crisis of religious ideology. Most observers of the Egyptian scene would agree that the rise of these religious movements dates back to the aftermath of the Arab defeat of 1956. This acute sense of national crisis was compounded by the social dislocation taking place in Egypt as thousands of people flocked from villages to urban areas searching for work opportunities and advancements. Half the population of the urban areas was below twenty, most of them of lower middle-class backgrounds with enough education and political awareness to be aware of the goodies in life. The reappearance of opulent wealth enjoyed by the few intensified the feeling of relative deprivation. It was in this environment that a general resurgence of religiosity began to manifest itself in Egyptian society.

Observers also agree that the regime of President Sadat took a conciliatory posture toward these groups from 1970 to 1973 in order to counterbalance what the regime perceived as a Nasserist, leftist opposition. Nasser had outlawed such associations on campus but Sadat recognized they could be a political asset. The most baffling and threatening domestic question facing President Mobarak’s regime is, how broad and how deep is the Islamic militant opposition to basic Sadat policies?

President Sadat’s vision of Egypt’s future was based on four major policies: the open door, democratization, alliance with the West, and reconciliation with Israel. The genesis of his vision was to rebuild a strong, prosperous, peaceful, democratic Egypt which would make it a model for the entire Arab world to emulate. Domestically, all organized opposition forces expressed misgivings, in particular the Islamic fundamentalists and the Moslem Brotherhood. To them these policies were leading to social injustice, corruption, the destruction of traditional Muslim values, and the humiliation of Islam at Western and Israeli bidding.

The Moslem Brotherhood’s history suggests its tremendous potential to become a grassroots mass movement. Its Islamic ideology has cultural legitimacy and its political stands on most current issues are in tune with both Egyptian patriotism and Arab national struggle. The movement was founded in 1928, rose against Britain in the forties, and denounced the Soviet Union in the sixties and early seventies. This historical continuity should dispel the current Western belief that Islamic movements suddenly sprang from nowhere.

If such similarities exist between past and present Islamic movements in Egypt,
can we assume that they are the only ones whose ideology and actions challenge the present special orders? And if not, what are the other groups and ideologies, and why have they not made similar headway?

The answer seems to lie in this fact: in the absence of a credible national vision and effective programs of action to repel external encroachment, to enhance the socioeconomic prospects of the middle and lower classes, and to galvanize the imagination of the educated youth so as to give them a sense of being essential parts of a grand design, Islamic militancy is the only alternative. At each failure of a sound secular alternative — the liberal experiment of 1922 to 1952, the nationalist-socialist experiment of 1952 to 1970, and the quasi-liberal, quasi-autocratic regime of 1970 to 1981 — the appeal of Islamic militancy begins to grow until it becomes a tidal wave.

Another factor has recently tilted the balance in favor of Islamic groups over their leftist or Marxist counterparts. It is much easier for the ruling elites to discredit the latter groups as being atheists or agents of foreign powers, usually the Soviet Union. Thus they can be crushed mercilessly and with impunity.

The other opposition groups, the secular left and the atheist forces, are represented by the Socialist Labor Party, led by a veteran nationalist, Ibrahim Shukru, and the National Progressive Unionists Party, headed by Khalid Mohy el Din. Recently both parties joined other Egyptian nationalists, leftists, and moderate Muslim activists in a loose group called the National Coalition. The clampdown of September sent many of them to jail. In the last months of the Sadat regime, relations between these parties and the government deteriorated seriously. The SLP platform was against granting military facilities to the United States, providing refuge to the Shah of Iran, normalizing relations with Israel before complete withdrawal, and carrying out the government's economic program.

Today, President Mobarak has made astute overtures to some sections of the secular opposition. This move came in the wake of SLP's decision to support Mobarak's ascension to the presidency. The president's invitation for a national dialogue has been met by a keen interest from the opposition, who have retreated from their previous, extreme antigovernmental positions and indicated to the government that they are willing to play the political game. Both parties have their own solutions to the religious question: to recognize and institutionalize its activism in a political party.

As for President Mobarak, from the moment he assumed leadership, he seems to have captured a consensus of love and respect. In the eyes of the ordinary Egyptian he has evoked the image of Nasser. His clipped, direct speech, his modest living habits, his predilection for hard work, and his reputation for integrity have reinforced the Nasserist image. The new government's promise to fight corruption is a popular cause with the political left and right, as well as the poor majority.

Tentative predictions are that Mobarak will adopt the best of Nasser's era and combine the open door policy with a strong message of nationalist and patriotic appeal. If Palestinians are to join the talks in any way, that would take the pressure off
Egypt and thereby help Mobarak. The Palestinian question is thus an internal issue of Egyptian politics.

It is not in anyone's interest, least of all that of the superpowers, to divide the Arab world. A government is only as strong internationally as it is domestically. The United States failed to see that in Iran, in Vietnam, and, lately, in Egypt.

Countries in the Middle East should not be perceived and treated as only military bases and oil fields. In them live sensitive people and proud nations, and smothering military embraces inevitably arouse sensitivities.

* * *

The Campaign for President: 1980 in Retrospect
by Jonathan Moore

Looking back at the campaign in its various parts, structural and behavioral, considering how well it worked overall, what the weaknesses and strengths were, it's not a particularly pretty sight. It produced confusion and exhaustion; cost scads of money; at times seemed curiously separated from the challenges of governing ahead — not to say detached from reality; appeared to place unnatural demands, hypermetabolic pressures, and peevish tests on the candidates; and finally only about half of the eligible voters cast their ballots.

At the end of a typical eight-event day, during another seven-day week, in the fifteenth month of campaigning, while brightly spouting boiler-plate rhetoric in fear of losing momentum or making a mistake, candidates gave the impression that their brains had turned to pudding. The Democrats squabbled about making their convention a more deliberative body, but at the cost of changing the rules in the middle of the game. Political Action Committees and independent expenditures replaced individual high financiers. Media organizations functioned both as major actors and shapers of politics and as the enterprising businessmen which they, in fact, are. Fed up with cynicism, abandonment of traditional values, and corruption in political life, a band of evangelical religious leaders joined the fray, but too often contributed more of the bigotry, television promotion, money hustling, and negativism already
rampant in electoral politics, instead of wisdom and healing Christian charity. The phenomenon of three born-again Christians on the ticket, incidentally, should be attributed more to accident than to a new electoral religiosity in the land or the single-minded discipline of the zealot — indeed, each of the three proved his sophistication, pragmatism, breadth of knowledge, and sensitivity in various ways.

The public at its worst combined an attitude of irritation and anxiety about confusing and threatening events around it and one of exuberance at the prospects of returning to a simpler, more promising age; it seemed poised between demanding that government be smaller and less intrusive and that it do the impossible. Or as George Will has observed, “You cannot tell people over and over that government is a klutz that cannot help Cleveland, and then suddenly say: Oh, by the way, give the government $1.3 trillion for military assets and support its attempt to do something about Cuba.” Given the electoral uncertainty and impatience of the American people, we may be in a period when our presidents are more likely than not to be summarily tossed out of office in their first shot at re-election.

That’s the bad news. On the other hand, the process showed flexibility and pluralism, tested the stamina and resourcefulness of individual candidates and their organizations, provided them plenty of opportunity to expose their qualities and relate to events, and disseminated a plethora of information and criticism. The system “worked.” The people spoke. The transition of power occurred smoothly. The new government is hard at work, trying out new ideas within an institutional framework which still endures. Nothing we learned about 1980 suggests concrete change in the electoral process which would be clearly beneficial and feasible to implement. Even so, from the pages of this book we can reasonably conclude that some improvement in the way we nominate and elect presidents would be a good idea, and we should not simply heave a sigh of relief that the ordeal is over and put it out of our minds until it’s again too late to act.

While keeping in mind some of the trouble that “reform” has already gotten us into, efforts to improve the process might follow three basic guidelines. First, assess the drawbacks as well as the benefits of change, and don’t bite off more than can be chewed and digested. Neither the excesses of the present system nor its capacity to improve itself should be overestimated, and meddling too ambitiously can result in no change at all. Second, seek changes consistent with the strengthening of the role of political parties, which despite their weaknesses can be an antidote for the fragmentation of American political life. Stronger parties can help to reconcile disparate interests and build coalitions; to resist the separatism of campaigns run independently by “professionals”; to perform critical linkage tasks relating campaigns to governance and connecting candidates, issues, and ideology; and to bring individual citizens at the grassroots closer to their own institutions of government. Third, synchronize different kinds of recommended changes so as to avoid the discombobulation of their running headlong into each other. Over the past several years, for instance, reforms in delegate selection procedures have produced a pro-
liferation of more costly state primaries while campaign finance reforms have restricted the money available to nominating campaigns.

Proposals abound in various categories for renovating the structure of our nominating and electing system. The overall campaign is too protracted and should be shortened, and although this is very difficult to accomplish, it should probably take priority over efforts to "order" the primaries by regional or time-zone groupings. The ratios between "bound" versus "unbound" and primary-elected versus party-selected delegates should be shifted in favor of the latter categories, while maintaining some balance. Greater participation by elected officials would help in providing continuity between electoral and governing processes and in making the conventions more deliberative, but they can't be unduly pampered into delegate roles. A national primary will be promoted and should be prohibited. All of these courses involve difficult judgments about how much uniformity to impose from above on a pluralistic system which must have muscle, vitality, and individuality at the state level, and it appears better to proceed by party rather than Congressional action.

The awful problems of financing political campaigns will continue to plague us. Money should neither be allowed to run amuck nor be banished from the system — the latter attitude ignores human nature, freedom of expression, and the need for a democracy to pay for the reciprocal dynamic of exposure and education between the citizens and the officials who must both represent and lead them. In addition to proposals which encourage increased access to television by political candidates and public service broadcasts about election campaigns, the Institute of Politics Campaign Finance Study Group has made recommendations which would raise the limits on individual contributions in order to offset the amount of money coming from political action committees, increase the overall spending limit, and abolish state-by-state limits. It was only subsequent to the conference that produced this book that a Federal Elections Commission audit disclosed that the Reagan campaign, in some measure of post-Iowa panic, had overspent its New Hampshire limit by about 150 percent. The amount of overspending has paid back, but as Ken Bode has pointed out since, "Those dollars were vastly more valuable to them in January and February of 1980 than a year later." The story hardly validates the efficacy of this particular feature of the current finance rules.

Finally, the system for counting the votes of the general election needs attention, if not in the form of a direct popular vote, then by abolition of the electoral college itself and some more rational form of fallback than throwing the decision into the House of Representatives if an electoral majority is not achieved.

The legitimacy of our democratic process of choosing presidents must be proven both by the way it tests those qualities actually needed for the job and by the extent to which it avoids providing so many disincentives that our most able and qualified leaders are dissuaded from running in the first place unless they are out of a job, excessively well-heeled, or in possession of bizarre ego drives. Ultimately, even more
than the structure of the system, the values and behavior of the participants—campaign operatives, party people, big and small funders, media commentators and managers, government legislators and regulators, and the candidates and the voters themselves—will determine whether these two criteria are honored truly or in the breach. That, of course, will rest upon the maturity and selflessness of the whole society, which could improve as we spend still more time working at our democracy, spurred by the more explicit shortcoming of its institutions and intensity of the problems it faces.

It is inadequate and self-serving for some of our campaign decisionmakers to conclude that in the final analysis it's all quite properly left in the hands of the candidates and the people. Unless they are willing to point out at the same time that a good deal of their own activity can be interpreted as designed to frustrate rather than facilitate that purity, it's a cop-out. In other words, it should be made clear that neither the candidates nor the people are now fulfilling their responsibilities adequately in the electoral process and that they require more help from other components of the system in the way of less parochial and more idealistic performance. We are actually in danger of overemphasizing the performance of the presidential candidates in the course of campaigns even as we overrate the power of our presidents during the course of their terms. In both cases, we have a system which can only work pluralistically, with all of the components reinforcing one another, with leadership provided not just from those at the top but throughout the society, as required in a nation made up of its own governors, as ours still pretends to be.

It may be that most voters for Reagan reached their decision in 1980, in repudiation of President Carter's record. That's a perfectly sound basis, as long as it's accompanied by a sense of reality about the complex challenges and limited power of the presidency. It may be that the people who voted for Reagan in 1980 did so largely because of their instincts about the personal qualities of the candidates, and that's not a bad basis either, particularly given the bloated rhetoric, superficial treatment of confusing issues, and conniving and manipulating done during campaigns, as this transcript shows. It's no accident that the most non-manic candidate just got elected president. The point is that the people — all of us — have got to work harder at it and with a larger vision. We are being tested by the electoral process, not just the candidates and our various procedural and structural devices, and all the most skilled tinkering with the system will not matter a whit without basic changes in the attitudes, values, and behavior of all the supporting players.
Bipartisan Suggestions for Party Nominating Roles
from the conference on The Parties and the Nominating Process

The conference’s first drafting team, which was assigned to exploring the Primaries vs. the Caucuses issue, although not trying to reach consensus, did just that. As team captain Frank Fahrenkopf, National Chairman of the Republican State Chairmen’s Association, explained, “There was very little disagreement on the points discussed.”

First, the group felt that a national primary would be destructive to the party system. The members also felt that there should be no national imposition on state legislatures or state parties by either Congress or the national parties on the primary vs. caucus structure. The group felt strongly that national parties should encourage, not mandate, state legislatures to adopt a delegate selection system, primary or caucus, which would restrict participation to members of a particular party.

The drafting team’s view was that the caucus/convention system vs. the primary system choice should be left to the state organizations, since in some states one system may aid party strength, while in other states the other system would strengthen the party organization. One group member, Dennis Dunn, who is a member of the RNC Committee to Study Election Reform, added that there was a concern that the proliferation of primaries had gone far enough and that a balance was important. Fahrenkopf agreed that there was some feeling that primaries had peaked and might be on the downside. “We may be seeing a situation in which primaries may be decreasing because state legislatures are deciding that they are too expensive under all the circumstances,” he said. “A balance of primaries vs. caucuses was certainly felt to be healthy.” The group also felt that the national parties should not use bonus delegates or other methods to persuade states to go to the caucus system. “I think we really decided,” Fahrenkopf concluded, “that pluralism in search of unanimity is no vice.”

Regarding mixed systems; whether delegates should be chosen by caucus/convention, by primary, or both; and the issue of ex officio delegates, the group agreed such choices should be left to the state. “Let each state, depending on

In a first-time collaboration, the Democratic National Committee, the Republican National Committee, and the Institute of Politics convened party officials, political office-holders and analysts for the conference on The Parties and the Nominating Process on December 4-6, 1981. These excerpts from the report of the conference, published in the April 1981 issue of Commonsense, review the recommendations from four drafting teams for consideration by the full conference.
its own problems and historical perspectives, make those judgments," Fahrenkopf said of the group’s opinion.

On the next issue, that of bound vs. unbound delegates, drafting team captain Loren Smith, the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, explained that his group reached a general consensus on most issues. Everyone expressed some concern about the idea of legitimacy, recognized the values of federalism, and had a sense that there were no simple, clear solutions to the question of bound vs. unbound delegates. There were distinct differences in approach of the Democrats and Republicans in the group. The Republicans relied on a state system with great diversity ranging from delegates bound through the “umpteeenth ballot” to delegates with no identifiable candidate affiliation and not bound to anything. On the other hand, the Democrats’ feeling was that party tradition on this point mandated national solution, that because of their current rules the federalist option was not a viable one.

Smith noted that during the group’s discussion of whether delegates should be bound or unbound, one of the underlying issues was whether conventions could be made deliberative. Professor Samuel Beer cited the 1952 Democratic convention as one of the last in which the deliberative model applied, and the general consensus was that while the model might have good features, it is not realistic anymore. “History has bypassed it, to the extent it existed,” Smith said, “and no one had a concrete proposal for reimposing the model or felt it would be useful.”

Generally, the group felt that no federal or state legislative changes are currently needed to bind or unbind delegates. The members viewed pluralistic solutions as useful and no one believed there was an absolute answer to how many delegates should be bound or unbound. There was also some feeling that unpledged delegates to the convention would not be harmful. One member, Smith said, expressed the thought that at least these persons should run as unpledged delegates, putting the proposition before the voters.

The group held some concern that if there is to be some method to enforce the integrity of the process, that is, the delegate’s actions bearing some relation to the people who voted to send him or her to the convention, then that method should not be “unduly destructive to state party unity.” Various mechanisms were discussed. One was the provision to yank seated delegates if they do not vote a particular way. This was not supported by anyone. Other mechanisms included caucus control, establishing a caucus for each candidate (which was seen as potentially dangerous), and prior candidate approval (which was seen to have some potential for creating unnecessary party division). The group did not come up with a clear mechanism for enforcing this integrity, but they did feel the idea had value.

Nelson Polsby, Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkeley, warned the group of a fundamental problem in considering the bound vs. unbound delegate issue—that is, determining what a delegate actually represents. “If a delegate represents virtually exclusive commitment to a candidate, the issue of
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binding versus unbinding is trivial by virtue of the fact that the candidate selected the delegate to begin with," he said. "If the candidate withdraws, or if for some reason that function is made impossible to discharge, then the question goes beyond commitment to the candidate: What is a delegate and whom does the delegate represent? That's the fundamental issue to me. If the delegate represents the state party, then you've got something to work with. But if the delegate is essentially and only present at the convention by designation of a candidate, according to some formula based on primary results, or represents some interest group, then you've got a whole set of different problems."

Another team captain, Mark Siegel, a co-Chair of the Technical Advisory Committee to the DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination, reported that the drafting session of the "elected officials" group produced "amazing congruence of views" on the key and fundamental issues of what a political party is, what it should be, and what the party system should be. Both Democrats and Republicans in the group were clearly for a meaningful party system, one which gives the people realistic choices of public policy options, and one that has the opportunity to implement party programs into public policy. In other words, Siegel noted, the group was for a party government model.

The group felt that any steps that could be taken to encourage procedures which would lead to the above goals were good. They also felt that procedures which would bring participation of elected and party officials in the nominating system would lead the parties in the right direction. The group viewed parties, not statutes, as the vehicle for implementing such steps and "left it up to individual parties about whether such participation should be committed or uncommitted."

Mark Rhoads, a member of the group, noted that the only disagreement that occurred was on the question of giving these officials automatic delegate status. Siegel agreed. "There was really no feeling at all that each Congressman, Senator, or Governor should automatically, by virtue of office, be a delegate to the national convention. There was no real support for that kind of automatic status, but there was a great deal of support for a process which would include more of these people."

Rhoads also pointed out that from the party government standpoint, the group felt that such participation would serve to create a sense of national party campaign "as opposed to what was terribly trendy in 1964, 1968, and 1972—the setting up of separate citizens' committees." While the concept of the citizen committee was valid then, Rhoads said, that is, "to include people who would not traditionally associate with one of the two major political parties," in the group's opinion the idea went too far. The group noted that perhaps the Republican Party had begun to return to a more party-oriented campaign in 1980.

Rick Stearns, a member of the Technical Advisory Committee to the DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination, reported that he had agreed to captain the "shortening the primary season" discussion because he thought it would be "the least
controversial" of the topics considered. However, it was impossible to say that any consensus occurred in the group because the eight group members divided eight ways on every issue. "The reason a consensus proved elusive," he said, "(and let me say that the divisions among participants were not between Republicans and Democrats, but rather fashioned on non-partisan lines) is that what some urged as advantages for compressing the process were the same arguments pressed as disadvantages by those who opposed any fundamental change in the present system."

Those members who supported the present system argued that it gives the "less well-established candidate an opportunity to attract party and public attention before being overwhelmed by the process." They felt that the New Hampshire primary and the Iowa caucus captured the attention of an electorate that was undistracted and unjaded when these events occurred. Tinkering with the present system, they thought, "invites inevitable conflict with state legislatures and state parties which benefit from exceptional placement in the present calendar."

On the other side of the coin, opponents of the present system felt that a shortened primary season would benefit incumbent or established candidates and this was a "necessary consequence of a party peer review process." Candidates whose names and records are better known by the public deserve the benefits a shortened season would produce. "While the present system engages the attention of the electorate, it fixes public perceptions far too soon," Stearns noted. "Thus, the results in the early stages are exaggerated at the expense of later, and some argued, more representative states, depriving them of a commensurate voice in the selection of a party nominee." Finally, the point argued most ardently by the group's proponents of a compressed season was that "the placement of Iowa and New Hampshire in isolation at the front of the process lends itself to distortion by the media and by candidates who are beneficiaries of early, positive results."

Discussion centered on New Hampshire and Iowa and there was general agreement that the group's concern was more with the "disproportionate influence" the two states have over the process than with the length of the process itself. The group did not ignore arguments about the system being too long, costly, or confusing, Stearns said. However, the major concern was with the "alleged unrepresentativeness of these two states and the exploitation of their results by the media and candidates."

Three proposals dominated the group's discussion. One was that there should be a strengthened version of the present Democratic Party rule, that is, "establishing an absolute window of a defined number of weeks in which all primaries and caucuses would be required to be scheduled." Advocates of this proposal felt that such a rule should be made and enforced by the party. Stearns reported that there was "no sentiment for a federally legislated solution to any proposal."

Second, some members felt that New Hampshire and Iowa's influence on the process could be diluted by encouraging other states to hold their events simultaneously with or in very close proximity to those two states' events.

A third point of view held that things should be left alone.
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"Finally," Stearns said, "all participants seemed to agree that enforcing any significant change in the present calendar requires the consent of both parties. We have reached a position in which legislative control and party sentiment are evenly enough distributed that no one party should attempt to impose revisions without the cooperation of the other. Some, but not all, participants suggested that a joint party commission be appointed to make mutual recommendations to redress the problem, if it is a problem. And again, I emphasize to some it is not."

* * *

The Rise of the Right
by Richard Viguerie

The New Right really began to come together in about 1973. Before then, the major figures of the Conservative movement had never sat down together to plan strategy. Then we began to meet, and commiserate, and try to figure out how we could turn things around. By the middle of 1975 we decided to try fiddling with the controls to see if we could run this thing ourselves.

First we looked for an exciting issue. We'd been trying to organize our movement around more abstract issues, issues that were important to us but that weren't exciting to the public. The Left, by the use of exciting single issues, had come to prominence. Roosevelt in the thirties. Hubert Humphrey in the late forties on civil rights. Ralph Nader, who is nothing if not a collection of single-issue groups concerned with automobile safety, nuclear energy, the Vietnam War. George McGovern in 1971 and 1972, going the length and breadth of the country saying, "Make up your mind for whom you're going to vote based on one issue and one issue only" — the same man who, in 1980, complained how terrible it was that people judged him by just one issue.

Anyway, our issue came in 1977, and it was called the Panama Canal. That really started the New Right off in a big way. We began to meet, to organize, to work with groups we had never worked with before. We were on the side of maybe seventy percent of the American people, but we had the entire establishment against us — government, big business, big media, big labor, big education. For a year and a half we fought the establishment to a standstill; when the vote came we still had our seventy percent agreeing with us. It gave us a lot of confidence. We learned we
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could put together a truth squad. We could fly a 727 around the country and hold press conferences and people would actually come. We could play with the big boys. That was our first issue. Others have followed.

In terms of beliefs, there's not a lot that's new about the New Right. Our views are not all that different from those of the Old Right, though our emphasis is sometimes different. When Barry Goldwater criticized the New Right, he was quick to say, "I don't disagree with them on abortion. I just don't think it ought to be an issue we bring into politics." So in beliefs there's not a lot of difference.

Where we may differ is in terms of an aggressiveness, a feeling that we will prevail. It seems to me that the Old Right had spent the better part of their political lives in foxholes behind the bunkers, and maybe they had the attitude that they weren't ever going to win. Those of us who were a little younger didn't see any advantage in spending the rest of our lives in politics and getting only a third of the votes. We wanted to give it our best shot, with the attitude that we were going to win. Phyllis Schlafly has said that the Communists' greatest asset is their conviction that they are the wave of the future — every Communist worth his salt believes that Communism will prevail. This is an attitude the New Right brings to the political scene.

The Left, on the other hand, is confused and disillusioned; they're searching for new ideas. It's the Conservatives who have the new ideas today. People like Jack Kemp, with his supply-side economics — whether or not you agree with it, you must admit it has captured the imagination of the country. Kemp has also come up with the concept of enterprise zones, where taxes would be reduced in areas hardest hit by unemployment. Right now, most of the popular issues are with the Conservatives. If you read the major media, you may not agree with that; but if you're out in the grassroots, the issues people care about are reducing taxes, reducing the size of government, getting government out of people's lives.

Conservatives have the young leaders now, too. Liberal leadership is older and isn't in tune with the times. You campaign in the eighties in ways completely different from how you campaigned in the sixties. We saw an example of this recently in Solidarity Day. That was right out of the sixties; it's just not how you win elections now. When you go to Congressional offices to lobby, you can't say, "Vote our way because a bunch of people came to Washington in September," because probably thirty to forty percent more people went to a rock concert in Central Park that same weekend. It's like a Mack truck going down the highway: when it's right in front of you there's a lot of wind and noise, but three hundred yards down the road you can hardly remember it was there.

Also, I think you're going to see the Liberals really hurting for money. At one point they got something like seventy percent of corporate PAC money. Now, with Republicans controlling the Senate and a Republican in the White House, they'll be lucky to get twenty to twenty-five percent. And if the administration defunds the opposition to Conservatives — if the federal government stops giving massive sums
of money to the National Urban League, to the AFL-CIO, to Jesse Jackson, to Cesar Chavez, to Americans for Democratic Action — then the Liberals are really going to be hard pressed to compete. They’ve relied on the government for funding, while the Conservatives have had to develop their own sources: direct mail, computer, and telephone solicitations. Consequently the Conservatives are way ahead in this area. It’s a major gap that the Liberals are not going to be able to close for several years.

I make my living at direct mail, of course, so I think it’s wonderful. But I really feel that the Conservative movement as we know it today would not exist without direct mail. Conservatives, particularly the Old Right, used to spend a lot of time cursing the darkness. We didn’t feel we had access to the microphones of the country, whether it was the newsmagazines, the daily newspapers, the evening news, the network radio. We felt the Left had a monopoly on the microphones. We spent a lot of time in the sixties and seventies talking about how terrible it was. Then, when we began to get together in 1973 and 1974, we decided to stop cursing the darkness; instead we’d try to light the proverbial candle. We did. It was direct mail. It allowed us to bypass the microphones and go right to the American people. Now the Conservatives sell books, magazines, causes, and candidates that way. We fight all our battles through the mail.

Common situs is an example. President Ford promised George Meany in 1975 that he would sign common situs if Congress sent it to him. Well, Congress sent it to him, and the Right to Work Committee mailed out four million letters. A friend of mine in the White House press office at the time said Ford received 720,000 letters on common situs. You didn’t hear it talked about on the evening news or in the daily newspaper; it was all through direct mail. Consequently, in January of 1976, Ford broke his word to organized labor and vetoed common situs, because the Conservatives had gotten their act together through the mails. I could go through a whole list of battles we fought through the mails, some successfully, some not: the Panama Canal, SALT, instant voter registration, federal financing of Congressional elections, the Consumer Protection Act. It gave us an opportunity to compete.

Direct mail is great because it’s a very particular form of advertising. It’s not the broad brush advertising of television; it’s rifle advertising. You’re able to zero right in on the market, whether the market is for or against abortions, for or against handgun control. You can identify the people likely to support you and communicate directly to them. If you tried to use any other form of advertising you’d never get off the ground.

Some Liberals now are saying, yes, the Conservatives have a lead in direct mail, but rather than try to catch up to them there, we’re going to leapfrog over them and move into cable television. They believe that cable in the eighties will be what direct mail was in the seventies, and I think there’s a lot of merit to that. Direct mail is not going to go away, any more than radio went away when television came along. But if the Conservatives stand still, if we continue to rely on what we did in the last ten
years, then we're going to be hurt.

I've talked about some of the reasons I'm optimistic about the Right's future. I also have to say I'm getting a little pessimistic these days about the public perception of the Reagan Administration. Reagan made a serious mistake by implying that we can stop inflation, reduce the size of government, and reduce taxes without hurting anybody. He lulled people into a sense that no sacrifices will have to be made, and clearly that's not the case.

Even so, the current economic situation does not have to create a negative climate for Reagan. Roosevelt won a strong election in 1932. He increased his party's margin in Congress in 1934, and in 1936 he was reelected by a greater margin than in 1932. His party scored good victories in 1938. In other words, the Depression seemed to have no effect on the elections.

The same thing could happen with Reagan. He could still win by blaming the opposition, by being aggressive. But if you're defensive, as the Republicans in the White House are these days, you're going to lose. The Democrats are aggressive. They're charging ahead, saying that the Conservatives have given Reagan everything he wanted, that it's his economy, his interest rates, his deficits, his unemployment rate. In response to that charge the White House says, we need more time, we need another month, another six months, another year. That's the talk of losers. That concerns me and a lot of other people very greatly.

* * *

The Political Climate
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The Moral Majority in American Politics
by Michael Mills

Contrary to popular opinion, the members of the Moral Majority are not megalomaniacs bent on setting up a theocratic rule. Neither are they "peddlers of coercion," as Yale President A. Bartlett Giamatti has charged. Rather, they are Middle Americans who are hurt and threatened and fighting back. Their values have been disregarded by the culture at large, and they have entered the political arena to reclaim their America. If they have been self-righteous or arrogant in their political involvement, it has been because of their certainty about what is right, not because of a raw thirst for power and domination.

Like their forerunners in the North, fundamentalists in Alabama have responded to changes within the cultural climate by fashioning a social and theological reaction. Putting aside their pessimistic view of the millennium and their penchant for separatism, they have made common cause with other conservative evangelicals to save America from the threat of Secular Humanism. The Moral Majority of Alabama has emerged as the vehicle by which this coalition of conservative Christians can return America to its basis as a biblical nation.

Their preoccupation with the menace of Secular Humanism bespeaks a hunger for order which underlies their political involvement. Set adrift in a South no longer defined by its orthodox religion, these Christians have fallen prey to the same cultural vicissitudes that plague all of America. They have responded to a culture defined by self-expression and individual freedom by maintaining that men and women have a responsibility to a higher authority.

This response of fundamentalists in Alabama did not arise totally of its own accord, however. The actual emergence of fundamentalists in Alabama politics was brought out by the ascension to the presidency of a fellow "born-again" Southerner. Jimmy Carter's presidency forced fundamentalists and other conservative evangelicals to make the connection between their religious beliefs and political issues. Furthermore, Carter's years as commander-in-chief injected a sense of crisis into the lives of these believers. The entrance of conservative Christians into politics
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in 1980 was the immediate result of a fear for a loss of their freedoms. Urged on by this sense of crisis, the Moral Majority of Alabama was a potent force in the 1980 elections.

They were particularly effective in the Republican Congressional primary race in Alabama's Sixth District. Candidate Albert Lee Smith was the beneficiary of a remarkable effort by the Moral Majority. Smith was free to present a positive candidate image, due to the effectiveness of Moral Majority's portrayal of his opponent, John Buchanan, as an ultra-liberal out to wreck the family. Smith's candidacy benefitted from the Moral Majority in a number of other ways as well. With the assistance of New Right strategists, Smith's organization utilized eager Moral Majority volunteers in a massive door-to-door campaign. On election day, Smith's candidacy received a boost due to the registration and get-out-the-vote efforts of the Moral Majority. Although it would be a mistake to credit totally the Moral Majority with Smith's victory, their involvement undoubtedly generated a higher voter turnout and raised the issues which ultimately defeated Buchanan.

Although the Moral Majority's entrance into the political arena was based upon genuine cultural complaints and a faith in the democratic process, their involvement is characterized by a spirit which is damaging to the health of the American polity. The Moral Majority's crusade represents a refusal to accept honest disagreement, substituting instead charges of moral perversity. For the members of the Moral Majority, "truth" is not the result of debate in a public forum. Instead, truth is decreed from on high as the word of God. And this is the case not only for religious truth, but for political, economic, and social truth as well. While the Moral Majority does grant its opponents the right to speak out, it also claims that they have nothing to say. This tendency to deny others a legitimate position from which to speak is destructive of the democratic process.

At the heart of the Moral Majority's refusal to accept any debate is a rejection of the Enlightenment as a part of America's political tradition. They ignore the basic rules of the game in American politics, which assume with Thomas Jefferson that "truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, argument and debate." The Moral Majority does not trust that the truth will prevail. Instead, they are intent on requiring that all citizens acknowledge their version of the truth — the combination of Christian and political orthodoxy common to American fundamentalism.

The danger posed by the Moral Majority is real, but it is not tremendous. In the first place, much of the government action that has driven fundamentalists into the political arena has been the result of judicial action. It was the Supreme Court which struck down anti-abortion laws, liberalized obscenity laws, and outlawed prayer in public schools. "Of course, all of this can be changed, but it is costly — very costly — in political capital," as James Q. Wilson has written. The courts also pose a problem for many of the changes which the Moral Majority seeks to initiate. For exam-
Religion and Politics

ple, President Reagan's order calling for parental permission in order for minors to obtain contraceptive devices from Planned Parenthood Centers was a concession to groups like the Moral Majority. And yet this order has already been challenged in the courts on Constitutional grounds. The Supreme Court is likely to decide the fate of the issue.

Politically, it is unlikely that a crusade of the dimensions witnessed in 1980 will be launched again. The internal tensions between various sects and independent groups represented in the Moral Majority militate against prolonged cooperation. Likewise, the incentive to cooperative, namely a sense of extreme crisis, can be sustained only for so long. And who is the Moral Majority to blame this time for the pitiful shape of the country? Surely not Ronald Reagan, Jeremiah Denton, or Albert Lee Smith.

It would be naive to think that in the absence of a real crusade the Moral Majority will cease to exist or to involve Christians in the political arena. It is doubtful, however, that they will have the kind of influence they had in the 1980 elections. In the John Buchanan vs. Albert Lee Smith race, the Moral Majority's strength came in part from championing issues which even non-religious voters responded to, like the ERA and abortion. These issues are not plentiful, and cannot be utilized year after year. The ERA question will soon be moot, and abortion will only persist as a reason to vote for or against a candidate for limited numbers of very religious voters. Without these issues, the Moral Majority will have little impact. As the Chairman of Alabama's State Republican Party observed, "When abortion and ERA are dead issues, what will these people have to offer? You're not going to impress folks in the local cafe with the threat of Secular Humanism." A final factor which will work against the future success of the Moral Majority is the state of the economy. As the economic horizons continue to darken, the moral issues of status politics will probably give way to the economic issues of class politics.

The most telling indicator of the future of the Moral Majority is not found in political prognostication, but in the motivations of fundamentalists. Although fundamentalists chose the political arena for a redress of their grievances, it was not politics which offered the final answers. They recognized that the root of America's problem is sin, and that politics is a passing corruption of this world. One Moral Majority pastor admitted this after the 1980 elections: "I'm a pastor and deep down in my heart I don't feel any politician is going to save America. Only the Lord's word will save America... I've got enough sense to know that politics will go to anyone's head. If you give your neighbor a stick and a badge, he'll soon be out trying to arrest your kids." Not even Dick Vigneulle, founder of Shades Mountain Independent Church, gloated too much after victories in 1980. Instead, he admonished his people regarding the pitfalls of political change: "You don't change anything on the inside of a man. The most important priority of God's children is to win people to Jesus Christ.

* * *

28
Feminism and Religion: A Contradiction in Terms?
by Sr. Claire McGowan and Sonia Johnson

McGOWAN: The theme of our discussion tonight is “Feminism and Religion: Is It a Contradiction?” I would like to begin by personalizing that. Feminist and Roman Catholic: is that a contradiction for me? My response is an unequivocal no. I’m a feminist; I’m a Roman Catholic. Both of those dimensions of my identity are extremely important to my life. I’m not willing to sacrifice either for the sake of the other. And I’m certainly not willing to allow anyone else’s definitions to decide that I must be either one or the other.

When I call myself a feminist, I claim that my personhood as a woman is fully as free, as valuable, as responsible, and as open to becoming, as the personhood of any man, and that the personhood of all women is fully as free, as valuable, as responsible, and as open to becoming, as the personhood of all men. I further claim that the structures, the attitudes, and the practices of society in all its dimensions must be radically transformed in order to realize the full equality of women and men in every aspect of life. Perhaps most importantly, when I call myself a feminist, I claim that I give no one the power to define me — not the patriarchy or any man or group of men, not the feminist movement or any woman or group of women. I choose to define myself as a feminist because that is who I am.

When I call myself a Roman Catholic, I claim that Jesus Christ has very deep significance in my life. I claim that those who have defined themselves as part of the Roman Catholic community of faith have had a profound impact in nourishing and shaping who I have become as a person, as a woman, as a woman of faith. I claim that I share the rich heritage of the sacramentality which experiences the presence of God in and through all created things; of a communion or a community with others which extends across both space and time; of a long tradition of teaching and acting for social justice; of an openness to diverse and pluralistic sources of truth; of a unity and universality that comes from the structural connectedness of all within the Catholic Church. My Roman Catholic roots run deep, as deep as my Irish-French Canadian heritage, as deep as my family heritage as a McGowan. These roots are no better than anyone else’s roots, to be sure, but they’re mine and I choose to keep them firmly planted in the Roman Catholic community. Perhaps most importantly, when I call myself a Roman Catholic, I claim that I give no one the power to define me—not the patriarchal hierarchy or any other champions of orthodox doctrines or
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rules; not the patriarchal theologians or any other academicians who try to speak truth only out of the intellect; not even the religious congregation of women to which I have belonged for the last twenty years. I choose to define myself as a Roman Catholic because that is who I am.

Now that I have tried to articulate how being a feminist and a Roman Catholic is not a contradiction for me, let me tell you a little bit about the potential contradictions. I suppose it would be safe to say that the institutional Roman Catholic Church is one of the largest and most blatantly patriarchal organizations on the face of the earth. It has managed to preserve some of the best and some of the worst of Judeo-Greco-Roman wisdom. Writ large among the worst it has preserved is a deeply pervasive spirit and practice of misogyny — the subordination of women — which leads to fatherly protectiveness toward women at its best, outright destruction of women at its worst. Witness Thomas Aquinas's definition of a woman as a "misbegotten male." Witness the Inquisition's murder of millions of women as witches in the Middle Ages.

The verbal position of the institutional hierarchy has come a long way since then, thanks to our Mother God and the feminist movement. The second Vatican Council declared in 1965 that every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, based on sex is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God's will. Pope Paul VI sounded almost like a feminist in part of his address to the Committee for the International Women's Year in 1975: "Our task is to endeavor everywhere to bring about the discovery of respect for and protection of the rights and prerogatives of every woman, single or married, in education, in the professions, and in civil, social, and religious life." On the other hand, Rome moves very slowly from speech to action. In 1978 we received a very strong declaration from the Vatican that women cannot be priests because we do not bear a natural resemblance to Jesus Christ.

Rome is beginning to move a bit on women's roles within the Church, though. The following year, a committee of the U.S. Bishops' Conference began an official dialogue with the Catholic Women's Ordination Conference, which is still continuing on a regular basis. In the past five years, many American dioceses have issued surprisingly positive documents on the rights and roles of women in the Church and in society. Documents supporting expanded roles for women in the Church have also been published by the United States Call to Action Conference, the United States Canon Law Society, the United States Catholic Biblical Association, and the Pontifical Biblical Commission. It is significant that the United States Bishops' Conference obtained approval from the present Pope to eliminate some of the sexist language from the canonical texts of the Mass. In terms of the Church's institutional hierarchy, the chinks in the patriarchal armor are small indeed, but enough chinks will eventually shatter the entire armor, and I don't expect it ever to be patched up again.

Far more dramatic than the changes in the institutional hierarchy's stance toward the role of women in the Church is what is happening among Roman
Catholic women ourselves. Increasing numbers of Roman Catholic women have become alienated from the institutional Church by the realization of our exclusion from leadership and even from recognition. Some have joined other denominational communities. Some have withdrawn from religion altogether. Some have channeled their religious energy toward creating new forms of worship, new understandings of the scriptures and of traditional church teachings, and new approaches to ministry.

While exclusion is deeply painful and certainly contrary to the gospel message, there are ways in which I see it as somewhat of a blessing for Roman Catholic women. The issues are very clear to us, because of the blatantly sexist teachings and policies of our Church; because we have not been allowed to participate in any level of the clerical system; because we recognize that we haven't been taken seriously. In a sense we have nothing to lose in the institutional Church. So we have a great deal of freedom to be prophetic, to break through those hardened accretions of centuries of clerical domination and cultural adaptation, to explore the rich soil around our original Christian roots, and thus to envision a radical renewal of the Roman Catholic community.

This envisioning has already begun; it will continue to grow in the years ahead. Already Roman Catholic women all over the country are creating new forms of liturgy rooted in our experience and our symbol systems. Already we have Roman Catholic women providing leadership and creating new structures for social justice like Network, the national Catholic sisters' lobbying organization in Washington; like the Catholic Connection, the justice and peace organization in Boston; like the new Women's Theological Center to open in Greater Boston next year. In addition to all of this is the quiet leadership Catholic women are providing in the ecumenical movement and in the informal networks of binding that Catholic women are creating, both with one another and with a wide variety of repressed and suffering people around the world.

My view of the Roman Catholic women is, of course, not totally sanguine. Many have been deeply wounded by the negative influence of the Church, and are not yet able to acknowledge those wounds and seek healing through the community of other women. Many of us have not yet been able to make the distinction between, on the one hand, the institutional Church which speaks harshly against contraception, abortion, divorce, homosexuality, premarital and extramarital sex; and, on the other hand, the God who loves us unconditionally, exactly as we are.

Based on what I have said, it is probably clear that mine is a love-hate relationship with my Church. I hate it because of its institutional arrogance and its failure to practice the gospel which it preaches. I hate it for excluding me and my kind from institutional leadership and decision-making. I hate it most of all for telling me in so many different ways that my second-class citizenship as a woman in the Church and in the world is the will of God.

But at the same time, I love the Roman Catholic Church. I love it because I have discovered that it is not the awesome, monolithic pyramid that it sometimes tries to
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portray itself as. It is a huge, bumbling, sinful, graced, struggling community of people which manages somehow to make room for an enormous amount of plurality within a nebulous shared sense of Roman Catholic identity and faith. I love it because it has, despite all its misogyny, nurtured unique structures like the religious order of women to which I belong, where women have been able to form autonomous communities of shared life and work relatively free of male domination. I love it most of all because it is mostly through the women in my life who are Roman Catholics that I have come to know and trust the God who loves me and all of us unconditionally. I trust that the liberating power of that God in us will eventually give birth to a just Church and a just world.

I am deeply feminist. I am deeply Roman Catholic. I choose to define myself as both. And somehow, despite all of the contradictions, it's not a contradiction for me.

JOHNSON: One night in April of 1978, there was a special meeting at the Mormon Church. One of the leaders came to explain to us why the church opposed the Equal Rights Amendment. He began by telling us he hadn't really prepared anything to say, and on the way to the church he'd gotten kind of nervous about that. Then, he said, he'd remembered hearing about an article on the ERA in the current Pageant magazine — you remember that deservedly defunct little B-grade magazine. So on the way over he'd stopped at a 7-11 and bought a copy. During our opening song and prayer he'd read that article, and now he was ready to talk to us about the ERA. As I listened to that, I realized how the leaders of my church felt about women's issues: they thought they were so trivial, so peripheral to the really significant things of life, that you didn't even need to think or prepare before you came to speak about them.

I wasn't a feminist when I went into that room, but when I came out, I was. As he'd spoken, it had become quite clear to me what the women's movement was all about. When I left I was a mass of conflicting emotions. I felt betrayed, because, of course, I had been betrayed. I felt terribly angry that I'd been deceived for so long, humiliated that I'd been so easy to deceive. There isn't a word in the men's dictionary for this feeling we experience when we figure this out, because men have never felt it. "Fury" is a mild word. Around and above and all through these emotions I felt the most immense sorrow for the lives that women have had to live for as far back as we know. I felt sadness for my grandmother's life, for my mother's life — I can't forgive my mother's life — for my own life, for your lives.

On the way home I turned to my husband and said, "I'm a feminist. In fact, I'm a radical feminist." I didn't really know what that meant, but I was an English teacher and I knew what "radical" meant. I knew it meant "at the roots," and I knew I'd been changed at the very roots of my soul that night, and I would never be the same.
When I got home it was pretty clear also that I wasn't going to sleep that night, and maybe ever again. So after I got the whole family settled in, I went to the room over the garage and I locked the door and I let God have it.

I told Him — in those days, that's who I thought God was — what I thought of a Supreme Being that had made women so rich and so full, so talented and so intelligent, so eager for experience and so able to profit from it, and then put us in a little box, clamped the lid down, and said, "Now stay there, honey." I told Him that that was the ugliest, the most vicious, and ultimately the most evil thing that had ever been done. I told him if I could get hold of Him, I'd kill Him.

I think you have to understand I was not in the habit of talking to God like that. I'd grown up in a very devout and orthodox Mormon family. I was a very prayerful person, very loving and respectful of God. And I'd also read the Scriptures, so I knew that people who weren't respectful of God got zapped. The Bible is full of people who were zapped because they were not properly respectful. But all of a sudden, I didn't care if I did get zapped. I figured I'd been zapped, that all women had been zapped. In fact, I even began to think it might be a real relief to be zapped. What was I going to do with the knowledge that I'd gained that night? What was I going to do with that immense lump of pain? I didn't know how I was going to survive the next fifteen minutes, let alone the next forty years. How could I bear that? I still don't know how I'm going to bear it. But that night I was sure I couldn't.

Nothing happened, though, except that I kept railing on into the night. The only frustration I felt was that I didn't have the vocabulary I needed, I had lived such a sheltered existence. When the best you can do is, "You old son of a gun," that leaves a lot to be desired, but I made up in volume what I lacked in vocabulary.

After a couple of hours of just screaming, I found myself sitting on the floor and feeling exhausted and voiceless and absolutely wonderful. I had a momentary fantasy that up in Heaven, those beings that were particularly concerned with me, my guardian angel and all those other amorphous sorts, had gotten together in an impromptu celebration. They were saying, "Sonia, this is wonderful. We're so glad you finally figured this out. We thought you never would. For forty-two years, we have been giving you every conceivable clue. Never mind, though. We're not going to scold. This is a night for celebration. Congratulations, and welcome home. Now go do something for women."

Well, first I had to do something for me. I was a religious woman, so I had to come immediately to terms with God. First, I wondered whether even to believe in God. It was quite clear that there was no conclusive evidence either way; all people did was choose to believe or not to believe. So I decided, all right, then I'll choose to believe, on condition: that God would change enough that we could get along together.

Of course I didn't really think God was going to sit up there and change. But during that shouting match in the room over the garage I had slammed the door forever on that barbaric, war-mongering, heathen God of the Old Testament. I'd
watched Him go with His white robes and beard flowing out the door, and have not missed Him since. As I thought this over, it became clear to me that men had given us God in their own image to keep control of us. Therefore it's clear what has to be done. All we have to do is get some good strong female representation in the courts up there. We've got to have a deity that everybody can model themselves after, so that women can also feel that there's divinity in them, that they are also in the image of God, and powerful, and worthy.

Patriarchy has been almost bred into our genes, it's been around for so long and we're so thoroughly conditioned to it. Everybody born on this planet since it has been a patriarchal planet — since Abraham, about 3500 years or so ago — has believed that God and men are in this old boys' club together, with God as president. They understand one another. They speak the same language. They have a lot of business dealings together, and they're really close. And out there, with our noses plastered against the window, we're trying to see what's going on inside. Then a man comes out and he says, "Ahem. God told me to tell you that you're supposed to be my helpmate. God told me to tell you that you're to be submissive, and gentle, and nice, and kind. Be good to me, and don't make life tough for me, and do what I say." So we've always believed that in order to propitiate God we had to placate the men, because God's not going to like it if you're not good to His cronies. As Mary Daly said, as long as God is male, male is God. Well, therefore, God must not remain just male, must He? So I knew I had to add femaleness to the concept of God.

I had a little easier time than some, because Mormons believe in a Mother in Heaven. Granted, they never say anything about Her. What happened was, one day when the men were off at one of their old boys' club meetings, one of the women in the early church sneaked in and wrote a hymn. In the very last line she wrote, "In the heavens, are parents single? No, the thought makes reason stare. Truth is reason. Truth eternal tells me I've a Mother there." Well, she was a very wily woman, so she named the hymn, "O, My Father." When the men got back from the meeting, there was this wonderful hymn, just full of good father stuff. They loved it. I don't think they noticed this one subversive word in there, because it was a really good father song otherwise. And so that's how Mother in Heaven slipped into doctrine, sort of through the back door. There She is, doctrinal but we mustn't talk about Her.

Well, I instated Her on Her throne, in equal power and glory with the Father at Her side. And I remember the night I did that by sheer force of will. I remember when I first prayed to Her, feeling very subversive and wicked, and also excited, the way you feel when you know you're doing something deliberately wrong. I wasn't very deeply into that prayer before it became quite evident to me why men have loved praying to a male deity for so long. I felt so powerful, so strong and fearless. What did I have to fear, with Mother up there? Somebody like me, with all that power and strength. It was really a turning point in my life.

In this country, and perhaps in the world, there is going on all around us and
within us a religious revolution that's going to make the Reformation look like a Boy Scout picnic. The only reason that we don't have a name for it is because we're in the middle of it — I'm sure people during the Reformation didn't run around saying, "Isn't it wonderful to be alive during the Reformation?" and fifty years from now, if I could come back, I wouldn't recognize the religions on this earth. They will not be the same.

In the Scriptures it says the last shall be first and the first shall be last. I think it's only fitting that the men see, the patriarchs see, that it's the women who are going to be responsible for making the new heaven and the new earth.

* * *

The Catholic Church in El Salvador
by Harvey G. Cox, Jr.

The Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States issued a public statement a week and a half ago during their annual meeting which puts them in direct conflict with announced American State Department policy with reference to the current civil war in El Salvador. The American Roman Catholic Bishops, in that portion of their statement, opposed any further military aid to the military junta now ruling El Salvador, and pleaded for a negotiated political settlement to bring the struggle in El Salvador to some kind of a close with as little bloodshed as possible. This is not a statement from some peripheral, marginal Catholic left group. This is the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, and their position is clear.

Why is it that for virtually the first time in recorded United States history we have the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, which has not been, to put it mildly, insensitive to the threat of communism either here or in South or Central America, taking a position so clearly and completely opposite to that taken by the State Department? I would like to answer that question by referring to the delegation of heads of Roman Catholic religious orders with whom I went to Latin America, and with whom I later went to Washington to try to persuade Speaker O'Neill and Undersecretary of State James Buckley to re-think American policies.

That delegation included the head of all of the Roman Catholic religious orders of men, which includes Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits, all of whom are widely represented in Latin and Central America; the head of the comparable women's religious orders; the head of the Maryknoll order; and several other representatives

---
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of Catholic religious orders. These were not people who were either uninformed or unconcerned about Latin America. They were pleading with our government to reverse its announced policy regarding El Salvador.

In the middle of the conversation with Undersecretary Buckley, the sister representing the Sisters of St. Joseph finally said that she did not understand why this conversation should continue because not only did we disagree on what should be done in El Salvador, but we also seemed to be disagreeing about what was actually happening in El Salvador. The people who had lived there for years who were in direct contact with priests, sisters, missionaries, and lay people in every corner of that country simply did not accept the notion that some kind of international communist conspiracy was causing the civil war in El Salvador. They had lived with the hunger, the poverty, and the oppression long enough to know that these forces are the real source of that conflict.

I would like to share some remarks which I and one of my colleagues got on tape while we were in El Salvador earlier this year. I would like to have you hear their words so the picture that our media paint of them as a group of atheistic, communist, Marxist-Leninist guerrillas can be diminished. A lot of their motivation to fight has come from the instruction and discussion they have had in their own parishes. I should remind everyone that when we talk about the position of the Church in El Salvador, we have to remember we should not simply talk about the position of the Salvadoran bishops. In El Salvador, a country in which almost everyone considers himself or herself to be a Christian, when we talk about the Church, we're talking about the nation itself. We're talking about a country in which a wide network of base communities of study, worship, and action has arisen, and in which the consciousness of the need to respond in action to the demands of the Gospel has taken root.

I want to start with a few words from a priest I met. He talked about how he thought all of this got started. "In those days," he said, talking about the mid-seventies, "I was serving in a small town north of San Salvador. We had classes, and the people would at first be very nervous about talking. I led them to realize that it was not God's will that their children should die; that they should do something about it. The peasant groups and the organizations of farmers were just forming in those days. I found that some of the best people from my parish wanted to work directly with those organizations. So I encouraged them — I did not see anything wrong with them doing that. On the contrary, we all believed and still believe that those groups are a logical outgrowth of what we were saying in the Church. That was only five years ago, but the toll has been terrible. I do not think there have been more than two or three of the people from my original religious classes who are still alive."

When we talk about the thousands of people killed in El Salvador by the army, by the right-wing death squads and all the rest, I want to remind you that it is these people we are talking about.
I would like you now to listen to the words of a man who was an active layman in one of the parishes who eventually began to work with a peasant organization, which later armed itself and became a guerrilla group. “A few years ago I was working with the Christian community. I worked there for a number of years. What was it that made me choose to go into the struggle? There were many reasons. The most important was the election in 1972. We saw then that there was no chance to make the democratic machinery work; the dictatorship here in El Salvador just would not allow it. Then the land reform failed in 1976. Then there was the election fraud in 1977. The repression against everyone around us increased after that. They really forced us to take up arms. When I made my decision it was at a moment in the 1970’s when it could no longer be just a personal question. It had to be a social question. Everyone in the whole country was asking what other hope there was for change.”

These voices are portraying a people who are oppressed and who have tried everything to free themselves until they have had to resort to fighting back.

Another voice comes from a thirty-five-year-old man who started out as a member of Orden, a right-wing quasi-military organization. When I met him, he switched to fight with the guerrillas in the northern part of El Salvador. ‘Before I joined the guerrillas, I belonged to Orden. One day we were ordered to beat up some school teachers who were going on strike. They told us, Don’t kill them, just beat them up and scare them.’ So I went to the school with the others. We started dragging them out. I just didn’t have the stomach for it. Some of them were women. They were crying. And besides, there was nothing really wrong with them going on strike. They were making terrible salaries. So I went home and didn’t do anything. I didn’t want to work with Orden any more. But then they got suspicious of me. They came to my house looking for me. They told my wife they were going to kill me because they thought I had gone over to the other side, but I hadn’t. I just wanted to quit Orden. Then they came back after I had gone into hiding. They told my wife that if she didn’t find me they would kill her. That’s when we both went up to the mountains and I joined the guerrilla organization.”

I would like to finish with a quotation from the late Archbishop Romero, who just before his death, became the principal spokesperson for the opposition. Just before he was killed, Archbishop Romero said the following:

“Christians prefer the language of peace, but we are not afraid of combat. When a dictatorship gravely violates human rights and the common good of the nation, and when the dictatorship closes all channels for dialogue, understanding, and reason, then the Church speaks of the legitimate right to insurrectional violence.”

We should remember that what is happening now in El Salvador is a people is exercising its legal and moral right to claiming its human rights long deprived, not a people rushing into violence because of some base motivation, but a people who has been pressed into violence when there has been no other choice.
Religion, Morality, and Politics
by Dr. Billy Graham

I believe that the human race sits under the nuclear sword of Damocles. The world is facing the most crucial moment since creation. Never before has mankind held such awesome weapons of mass destruction. Man's technology has leaped far ahead of his moral ability to control his technology.

We're all tempted to oversimplify problems, especially in the areas of religion, morality, and politics. Yet we must resist that temptation. For one thing, the issues that confront us today are much more complex than ever before. This is not to say that human problems have ever been simple. But there are many issues we have never had to face before. Also, to an extent never before known, there is interdependence and interrelatedness to problems today. A century ago, what happened in a part of Asia or Latin America or anywhere else might have little direct effect on the world as a whole. Today, that's not true. In addition, this subject is difficult because we live in a pluralistic society. Ours is neither a theocracy nor a totalitarian state, in which the views of a select few are imposed on the others. There may have been moral consensus in the past, but today there are various and often conflicting ways of looking at things, and no group has the right to impose its views on all others. That does not mean that people with various viewpoints should not make their voices heard on matters that concern them; that's the foundation of our democratic system. But it points out one of the problems of developing public policy in a pluralistic society. Finally, this subject is difficult because it is urgent. In his invitation to me, Dean Allison referred to the nuclear-arms race as the ultimate public policy problem of our time, and I agree with him totally. But what guarantee is there that we will not blow ourselves off the planet before we get around to dealing with it? It took us ten years to mediate SALT I and II; we may not have ten years to negotiate a verifiable freeze. We're the first generation to realize that we may well be the last generation.

With this in mind, let me make four affirmations concerning this subject.

First, I believe that political decisions have an inescapable moral and ethical dimension to them. Hitler's decisions about racial superiority and the final solution involved a moral decision. The situation in El Salvador today involves serious questions about justice. The racial situation in southern Africa involves a host of grave ethical and moral questions that cannot be evaded. Many other examples can be cited, including a vast array of economic, social, and human-rights issues in our
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own nation. The question of rightness and wrongness simply will not go away; it is at the heart of every major issue that we face in the world today.

Second, government is not an end in itself; it is meant to be a servant to bring about greater peace and justice, for the good of humanity. When this goal of government is perverted, government becomes corrupt or totalitarian, or both. I believe we must keep clearly before us the goal of government.

Third, there are certain moral principles which, as a Christian, I support and urge as guidelines. Of course, this is the nub of the whole problem, because it is one thing to acknowledge that political decisions have a moral dimension, and a different and vastly complex thing to reach any agreement on moral guidelines. I personally hold the basic principles of the Ten Commandments, because I believe the Creator has given them to us. I believe that they were given to us because they will bring about what is best for society. So I accept the Ten Commandments, along with the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule, as moral guidelines. For example, as a Christian I believe that God has a special concern for the poor of the world. I believe God has a concern for things like peace, racism, the responsible use of earth's resources, economic and social justice, the use of power, and the sacredness of human life. Now, how these principles ought to be implemented is a very complex matter. People have been trying to implement them for centuries. But the alternative is to make political decisions without any concern for moral guidelines.

Fourth, government is only as good as those who govern. A man who has no regard for integrity in his personal and business relations will normally not have any regard for integrity as a political leader. The late professor C.S. Lewis had this to say: "I do not mean for a moment that we oughtn't to think and think hard about improvements on our social and economic system. Nothing but the courage and unselfishness of individuals is ever going to make any system work properly. You can't make men and women good by law. And without good men and women, you can't have a good society. That is why we must go on to think of morality inside the individual." And this is one reason I'm convinced we cannot, and dare not, omit the spiritual dimension of this issue.

* * *
Learning About Nuclear Weapons

Harvard’s Responsibility to the Public
by Derek C. Bok

A year ago on this occasion, Thomas Watson delivered an address on nuclear arms and the urgent need to reexamine America’s policies. Although we did not know it then, his remarks were only a beginning in a series of speeches and debates at Harvard on the dangers of nuclear war. And these events in turn have only been local stirrings in a swelling chorus of public concern that stretches across this country and around the world.

Last April 18, James Reston devoted his Sunday column to this growing debate. As he put it, “One of the many questions about the future of nuclear weapons is whether the people of the United States will get enough facts on this immensely complicated military and moral issue for the searching inquiry the subject requires. In short, will it be decided by government decisions, by public education, or by political demonstration?... So far, the demonstrators have outnumbered the educators, and the Reagan Administration hasn’t really helped very much.”

What is new in Reston’s column is the thought that universities have a role to play in the democratic process by helping to educate the body politic to think more effectively about important issues facing the country. Now, we are all aware that individual professors write books and articles on national issues. And we know that universities give courses for their students that sometimes touch on questions of current public concern. But universities have hardly conceived of taking on an institutional responsibility to educate the public as a whole. This is a task that we have traditionally left to newspapers, television, magazines, and other media with the experience and the capacity to reach huge audiences.

And yet, if we pause for just a moment, we must admit that this division of responsibility is a bit too neat. In fact, universities have been gradually expanding their audience in recent years by reaching out to groups quite different from the more traditional students gathered here today to receive their degrees.

Consider this fact, for example. We now enroll about 15,000 students in traditional degree-granting programs. That figure is essentially unchanged from what it was ten years ago. But we currently teach more than 30,000 additional students in a
variety of nontraditional ways. And that figure has almost doubled in the last decade.

Who are these nontraditional students? Six thousand are Summer School students. Several thousands are practicing lawyers or physicians. Eight thousand are enrolled in Extension classes.

Beyond these large clusters of students are a host of smaller groups, many of them fascinating to contemplate. In even years, we enroll more than half the newly elected congressmen and try to fill them with ideas and information before they begin their terms in Washington. In odd years, we turn to newly elected mayors and take up issues ranging from municipal finance and collective bargaining to garbage collection and housing policy. Each summer, we enroll generals and admirals in classes on national security issues. We are even giving intensive programs for Assistant Secretaries in Washington and seminars for agency heads in Massachusetts.

Now that we have seen what has been happening to our teaching activities, how can we respond to Mr. Reston's challenge to help the country prepare for the nuclear arms debate? I can perceive three separate opportunities.

First of all, we have a responsibility to inform our own community so that discussions of these important issues can proceed on a basis of careful analysis and informed judgment. If we care about our ideals, if we mean our education to have any application in the real world, if we hope to practice what we preach, then we should surely do our best to offer discussions, information, even courses that will help everyone in this community to form opinions on this vital subject in a careful, reasoned manner.

Beyond Harvard itself, what responsibility might we have to audiences away from Cambridge? One possibility is to reach out to reporters who have the task of informing the public on issues of national security and arms control. Already, nuclear debates are springing up in cities and towns and even regions of the country that have previously shown little interest in such issues. In such localities, newsmen are suddenly thrust into reporting on an extraordinarily complicated set of issues for which they often have little preparation. If we are willing to offer courses for congressmen, for local officials, for hospital trustees and school principals, then surely we can find room to invite these journalists to a program where we can offer them something of the history, the technical background, the issues and arguments that underlie the current arms debate while also giving them material and reading lists to help them learn more about the subject after they leave Cambridge. In fact, we have already planned such programs and hope that they will do some good in clarifying the public debate across the nation.

Beyond the reporters and the news commentators lies the public itself. Can Harvard do anything to help interested citizens sort out the intricacies of nuclear arms? Obviously, though individual professors can advocate any program they choose, it is not our role as a university to promote a particular policy. What we can try to do is to supply the public with an objective account of the basic facts about nuclear
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arms control and then try to sort out the various issues and proposals and present the arguments for and against each position.

In weighing this opportunity, I am sure that some people will think it a bad idea. There will always be those who feel that it is dangerous or futile to involve the public too deeply in matters of military strategy and foreign affairs. How can the man in the street possibly evaluate the complicated issues involved? Should we stir the wayward forces of popular feeling on policy matters that touch on our most elemental fears? Why not leave the process of arms negotiation to statesmen who are trained to make the necessary judgments and to experts free from political pressures that might force them into rash and expedient choices?

There may be something to be said for this point of view. The general public will never be informed enough to make the specific decisions that must be made to achieve a safer world. Even so, there are contributions that the public can make which may be lost if we are content to confide these matters to the exclusive care of experts.

To begin with, a vigorous public debate can help to give a vital issue the urgent priority it deserves. Many of us believe that this is exactly what has happened to the issue of arms control in the last few months, and we applaud it as a proper example of democracy at work.

On other occasions, public discussion will unearth facts and ideas that might otherwise go unobserved. Looking back, we have seen several lost opportunities that were too little noticed at the time — the chance to propose an agreement with the Russians not to construct a hydrogen bomb, the chance to insist upon a complete cessation of all nuclear tests. More recently, we have heard officials speak of winnable nuclear wars without appearing to be aware of the full impact of nuclear war on human health, just as we heard in earlier decades of missile gaps that failed to materialize and expensive civil defense programs that failed to take account of the practical problems of putting such plans into operation. To avoid such errors, it is wise to expose our policies to full debate, especially on issues of such importance.

In any event, an active public debate seems destined to go forward in the months ahead. Surely we can unite in trying to make the discussion as informed and reasoned as possible, for the only thing worse than leaving vital issues to experts is allowing them to be overwhelmed by emotion and demagoguery.

For all these reasons, I hope that Harvard will move boldly to do the best it can to help to educate and inform not only our students and the media but the public as a whole. In making this attempt, we should recognize that we are setting forth on a new and difficult journey. We may find ourselves accused of being biased and misleading. Our audiences may grow bored and inattentive. More likely yet, our efforts to sort out all the issues and set forth all the arguments may leave our readers confused and unable to make up their minds. In the face of such problems, cynics will ask why we were foolish enough ever to make the attempt, for cynics have always taken a dim view of public opinion. Nevertheless, we should not forget that
it was an informed public opinion that sought an end to child labor; it was an informed public opinion that persuaded politicians to protect the environment, to integrate schools and lunch-counters, and even to place at least a limited ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

If we believe in democracy, it is surely a worthy enterprise for Harvard to do its best to help inform the people. And if we do, there is surely no more important subject with which to begin than an issue that involves our very survival on this planet.

* * *

Preventing the Last Epidemic

by Helen Caldicott

The American Psychiatric Association recently looked at a thousand high school students in Boston and asked them what they thought of their futures. The majority of the children answered that they don’t have a future because they are going to be killed in a nuclear war. They see no point in going on because they’re not going to carry the responsibility from the past to the future.

These children have a sixth sense that we have learned to repress, and they don’t believe they’re going to grow up. If we examine it, they are not. In fact, how is it that we are sitting here today on July 8, 1982, when every year five thousand men who handle nuclear weapons are discharged from the military because they are either on drugs or they are mentally unstable? Or when in a recent eighteen-month period the computers in the Pentagon made one hundred fifty-one errors, thinking that missiles were coming in from Russia? And our computers are sophisticated compared to Soviet computers. What are theirs doing? Or when someone recently dropped a wrench down a Titan missile silo by accident and the thing ignited and they weren’t sure if that missile had really gone off toward Moscow, starting a nuclear war by an error? Or when a nine-megaton warhead came off a bomb and dropped in a cow pasture and cows were grazing past it? It is a sheer miracle that we are still here.

Boston has at least ten bombs aimed right at our heads. And it’s funny how we live every day without thinking about it, isn’t it? That’s called displacement activity. You know what I’m saying is really true, but you don’t think about it. And practicing displacement activity is a form of passive suicide. That’s mentally sick.
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Another thing we do is an activity called manic denial. We deny this situation with such a mania that we’re into hot tubs, jacuzzis, new china for the White House, gourmet foods, you know, the fun stuff we do every day. How dare we be having fun when we are about to blow up the world? I am addressing all nuclear powers. But we don’t often think about things like that. Isn’t that sick?

I think about it because I have three kids. Above all I want those kids to grow up and die of natural causes when they’re eighty or ninety. And you people, I want you to grow up too, not to be annihilated, not to be turned into charred statues, not to have your eyes melted. And when you think about the possibility of nuclear war like this, nothing else really matters, does it?

But people tell me that I shouldn’t be so emotional about it. They say I have to be rational and logical. I wonder how rational and logical they will be when they’re staggering around with their eardrums burst and their skin burned with all their relatives dead after a nuclear bomb explodes. It is inappropriate to be logical and rational, isn’t it? Because we are human beings with feelings. It is inappropriate to be unemotional.

Where are we now in terms of the arms race? America has about 30,000 tactical nuclear weapons and about ten thousand strategic weapons. Six to seven thousand of those tactical nuclear warheads are on the line between East and West Germany right now. As you have heard, most of the conventional forces are nuclear. So if Russia invades West Germany, our military doctrine says “use ‘em or lose ‘em.” That means nuclear war.

Russia has about 20,000 nuclear weapons, seven thousand of which are strategic weapons. Those strategic weapons, according to various estimates, can kill every American twenty times over, and the ten thousand American strategic weapons can kill every Russian citizen forty times over. These people must believe in reincarnation or something. But what are the new plans of the Administration? They plan to build 17,000 more strategic nuclear weapons over the next ten years. These new weapons will be first-strike weapons, like the Trident II missiles which can be launched from a Trident II submarine. They are going to build twenty-seven of those in the next ten years. Why? Because the way you “kill” a Russian missile is to drop a hydrogen bomb in the air right above the silo and then, seven seconds later, you land one on the ground there. It has to be seven seconds because if it’s after that so much debris is created by the first air blast that the incoming missile can hit a piece of gravel and shatter. You have to have the two explosions to incapacitate the Russian missile. Since the Russians have nearly 1,400 missile silos that means you have to drop nearly 3,000 bombs, half of them all at once, and the other half seven seconds later.

Now, the MX is a first-strike weapon too, and it is very accurate and can do the same type of thing. So can the cruise missile, but it is slower than the MX. It can be launched either from submarines, surface ships, airplanes, or from the ground in Europe. They are going to build about eight thousand of them soon. The cruise
missiles fly very low to the ground beneath radar, and they hug the contours to fly
up the hills and over the trees and down the hills. They have a homing device and
can go straight in on their target. But they do take two hours from Europe to Russia
compared to the twenty to thirty minute period taken by strategic land-based
missiles here. And the cruise missiles are not, contrary to other strategic weapons,
verifiable. Arms control is not based on trust, arms control is based on verification.

If the Administration puts strategic land-based Pershing II missiles in Europe,
they will be able to reach Moscow in six minutes. Their mission is to destroy the
command, control, and communications centers of Russia. Now, because they only
take six minutes instead of the usual twenty or thirty minutes, the Russians aren't
going to have much time to decide whether or not to push their button. So they have
to go to a system called launch on warning, where computers make that decision.

Seventy-five percent of the Russian strategic weapons are based on land, and are
vulnerable to a first strike. The other twenty-five percent of their bombs are on
noisy subs which are easily tracked. So Russia is vulnerable. On the other hand, only
twenty-five percent of American missiles are land-based. Fifty percent are in the
subs and are totally invulnerable. Twenty-five percent are in the air, or could be put
in the air quickly in the B-52's, and as such are invulnerable. So America is in pretty
good shape as far as vulnerability to a first strike goes.

There is a window of vulnerability now where America could launch a first-
strike nuclear war. The Pentagon's five-year war plan calls for a winnable, pro-
tracted nuclear war, and that plan was released the night the START talks began in
Geneva. What more do I need to say?

What worries me is that people don't really know much about this stuff. So
when the President comes up with a START plan, people do not understand the
pathology of the arms race, so they can not analyze what the President is saying.
And in order for democracy to work, people have to be informed. The trouble is
that technology has left everyone behind. I mean, do you really know what those
characters are up to in Los Alamos and Livermore Labs and all along route 128 and
at Draper Labs at M.I.T.? Do you know what they are doing? I feel that I have to
practice preventive medicine as a physician by explaining the pathology of the arms
race to you, just as I would explain the pathology of a disease to one of my patients.
So you can know what the President is talking about when he makes a proposal.
Once you are informed, what can you do? Well, this is a democracy, and there is an
election in November. The whole House of Representatives and one third of the
Senate is up for election. We have to make the arms race a major issue in this elec-
tion. This can be the most important election ever to be held in the United States of
America. Because for the first time, the majority of Americans know about nuclear
war. It is the most profound issue we have ever addressed.

We are the most important generation to ever have lived. Each one of you can
be as powerful as the most powerful person that ever lived. You have to be, because
it's your planet, and they are going to be your kids. That's your heritage out there,
the whole world. You have to take it on your own shoulders and say, "I can fix it. Not he, or she, or they, but I can fix it." And you can, you know. We must preserve God's creation, not destroy it. We can not be such an evolutionary aberrant as to take out our own species and every other species on the planet. Are we going to do the right thing, for the first time since we stood on our hind limbs, and stop fighting? I think we can do it. There is love and goodness in every human being. So let's do it, okay?

* * *

Is Reduction the Solution?

by Thomas C. Schelling

One of the most stunning events in all history is that we haven't had a nuclear war since the second bomb went off at Nagasaki. For nearly thirty years the Americans and the Russians have had the capacity to inflict great nuclear destruction on each other. In 1960, C.P. Snow said it was virtually a mathematical certainty — and he should have known what that language means — that unless we totally restructured the way the world was organized politically, nuclear holocaust would occur before the decade was over. Well, more than two decades are over, and it hasn't happened. So it turns out that it is possible for two nations like the United States and the Soviet Union to keep from pulling these weapons out of their holsters.

I remember when the neutron bomb was front-page news in the early sixties. And back in 1961 we had the Kennedy civil defense flap. During that time the Boston Globe regularly carried maps of the Boston area with contours to show the level of destruction from a five megaton weapon detonated from fifty- or a hundred-thousand feet elevation.

All these people who are now part of the nuclear freeze movement — the ones who have just discovered that in case of nuclear war there's not going to be enough blood plasma to take care of the wounded at the local hospital — where were they then? The war in Vietnam may have raised an entire generation, people now anywhere from twenty-five to thirty-five, who never knew about nuclear weapons. Napalm and yellow rain were to them the evils of warfare. Now we're having a kind of rediscovery. My own impression is that people aren't quite as scared or quite as upset as they were in the late fifties and early sixties, but that is to some extent subjective.

Thomas C. Schelling is the Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Political Economy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. This is an excerpt from a session he led for the Seminar on Nuclear Arms Control for National Political Journalists, which was held June 13-14, 1982.
Another thing that happened back then was "GCD" — general and complete disarmament. It was much discussed during Eisenhower and somewhat discussed during Kennedy, but we never hear about it anymore. Why? It could be something that is considered so far away or so infeasible that it is not worthwhile even as a goal. Or it could be something that people have decided is simply not a worthwhile goal.

I tend to view it as the latter. Lots of people have in mind that the direction to start moving is downward, so eventually we can get to zero. But my own view is that zero nuclear weapons is an exceedingly dangerous state of affairs. We and the Russians, not to speak of other countries, will never be more than days if not hours from having nuclear weapons. If the other side does not have nuclear weapons, delivering a few might not be terribly difficult and could be decisive. Therefore the stability of a system in which anybody could potentially have nuclear weapons in a great hurry, but where the great hurry is crucial in order to get them ahead of the other side, might be a terrible temptation. Most people who deal with arms control have probably long since come to the conclusion that GCD, whatever its merits as a public relations device, is not and never was a worthwhile goal — not merely unattainable, but not good.

In academic communities twenty years ago, there was a big division between the arms controllers and the disarmers. I was tagged an arms controller and the disarmers didn't like me. We were interested in arms control, which meant get nice weapons, enjoy your weapons, avoid naughty weapons, don't worry about numbers. In those days the ideal kind of non-naughty weapon was one that is neither an inviting target nor a menace to the other side's retaliatory force. The ideal situation was that it took more than one weapon to kill a weapon, and if you had anything near to parity, then neither side could benefit from being the side that started it.

I think it was precisely this notion that led Robert McNamara, in about 1964, to say that, as long as our missiles were secure, he preferred that Soviet missiles would be secure. Then the Soviets would never be so afraid of us trying to destroy their missiles fast that they would feel obligated to destroy our missiles fast.

In the mid-sixties, the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) came along. McNamara pointed out that ABM was essentially a device to degrade the other side's retaliatory force. ABM might complement a first-strike system, because if you could get off a counter-force attack with your weapons and alert your ABM to respond to a ragged retaliatory attack, your ABM might be precisely what would spoil the effectiveness of the other side's retaliation. So we started to move into the possibility of an understanding with the Soviets over not building ABM. Quite possibly it could be made understandable to the Soviets that if they didn't have ABM we didn't want it, but if they had it, we couldn't afford to be without it. Well, the social, diplomatic dynamics meant that pretty soon people began to think that you've got to have a treaty. We thus started a process that is characterized by two things. First, we have
Learning About Nuclear Weapons

treaties, treaties that go by numbers now, like Lincoln Continentals or tanks — SALT Mark 1, SALT Mark 2, SALT Mark 3. Second, we've become committed to numbers limitations.

Possibly the greatest perversion of arms control in the last ten years has been this attachment to numbers limitations. It is not important to limit the numbers of the kinds of weapons that make uninteresting targets for enemy weapons, especially weapons that are reciprocated on both sides.

I don't know why we and the Russians want to limit sublaunch ballistic missiles. If we don't have enough, I'd like to have more; I like missiles that are unlikely to be readily attacked by the Soviets in a crisis. It just happens that the easiest weapons to count are weapons on submarines. You can't launch a submarine without its being known, and anybody can count how many hatches it has on top of it. It's tempting to limit them because they're so easy to count and monitor.

Seven or eight years ago, cruise missiles looked good to me; they'd be very hard for the enemy to target. The arms control community didn't like cruise missiles because you couldn't count them, and if you couldn't count them, you couldn't limit them. Who wants to limit them? As long as we can have all we want and the Soviets can't touch them, what do we care how many they have?

With SALT we tend to block out the undersea weapons which on the whole look good to me. We tend to limit a variety of cruise missiles that in many configurations look good to me. Then we come back to where, if we're going to have more warheads, they have to be land-based, and they look bad to me. It might be the best thing we could possibly do would be to get rid of the SALT restraints on the weapons that should not be limited, and get out of the notion that numbers are the thing to limit. What we really should be trying to limit is weapon qualities, not weapon quantities.

One other problem with numeric limits is that, if the limits are low, somebody can get the jump in a renewed arms race and achieve a dominant position. If, without breaking your back, you can produce a couple of thousand warheads a year, I would like to make sure that it would take somebody at least three years to get far enough ahead to take you by surprise. If we had a hundred missiles each, somebody might deploy nine hundred more and outnumber us ten-to-one. If we've got ten thousand each, it's unlikely that he'll get to twenty thousand without our noticing it.

Once you're up to around eleven thousand warheads, that's a nice number. Agree on it if you want; it doesn't matter. If you're haggling over eleven, twelve, or thirteen thousand, why don't you tell them, "Eleven's enough for us. You got twelve? Okay. You got thirteen? Okay. You got fourteen? Then we're going to go to fifteen, and maybe you should damp down."

I get scared to death about nuclear war, but nothing bothers me less compared with that than the cost of a lot of warheads that'll never be used. They're expensive, but what the hell, if we can purchase peace by adding a thousand warheads a year, that's
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the best bargain since World War II. On the other hand, I can't imagine that we and
the Russians would be so reflex-acting that we wouldn't catch on — that we are simply
like a couple service stations at the same intersection engaged in a price war, spending
ourselves to nowhere. Once we're pretty sure that no matter what they do, we can keep
from falling so far behind that it'll matter, we can just say, "Look, don't be stupid.
You build five thousand, I'm going to build five thousand. Why do we want to do
that?"

That brings us to the concept of war fighting. I consider the single most challeng­
ing, strategic offensive force requirement to be this: that we design forces that can be
used partly rather than wholly. It's terribly important, if a war begins to escalate, to
know at what points it might be stopped.

It's easy to imagine very limited nuclear wars. You could use nuclear weapons only
at sea, only for air-to-air combat, only on your own territory. If you ask what would
cause this to escalate, I think the answer has to contain the contradiction. It must be
that the enemy thinks it's bound to escalate because he thinks you think it's bound to
escalate. But you couldn't have thought it was bound to escalate or you wouldn't have
held back — if you'd really believed it was bound to escalate all that way, you'd never
have given the enemy time to think it over and start escalation on his own terms. I can
see it's a dangerous situation with some possibility it will get out of hand, but it's very
hard for me to imagine how somebody decides to launch an all-out strategic nuclear at­
tack unless he thinks both of you have blundered so far that total escalation is in­
evitable. And I don't see any reason to think that is an ineluctable consequence,
especially if you're on the teletype talking to each other. Therefore I tend to think that
in most cases any leader of the United States or the Soviet Union would keep in mind
that he had the option to do a little less than he could, or at least to postpone some of
what he could do now. My point is simply that I wouldn't write off the importance of
that. I wouldn't want to design forces that make it impossible to do that.

A few years ago I was leader of a team that was looking into strategic problems of the
seventies. We were in the basement of the Pentagon with the damage assessment peo­
ple who were describing to us how they would know what was going on in the con­
tinental United States in case of nuclear war. They had sensors to report detonations
based on radiation, thermal flash, seismic data. I asked, "How do you know when the
war's over?" It became clear that nobody had ever asked that question before. The
idea that the war would ever be over was not part of the plan.

In the ensuing years there have been a few abortive efforts to get something going
on how to stop a war once it starts. I consider this crucially important. Nuclear war
needn't escalate all the way, and probably will only if you believe it must and don't
plan for any alternative contingency.
This seminar deals with the institution of journalism and the institution of
government in America. Both institutions have an obligation to arm the public with
the essential information that makes public policy-making a meaningful process.
That is an obligation which neither the politician nor the reporter can fulfill alone; it
is their joint responsibility.

I have been in elected office for twenty years. I served for nearly four years as at-
torney general of my state, for twelve years in the Senate, and for four years as Vice
President. I've been in campaigns for as long as I can remember. I guess I've been
around as many journalists as any living American. Based on that, I'd like to make
three points that are important to a journalist's approach to covering government.

First of all, there is no substitute for learning and understanding the subject on
which one is reporting. That may sound like a simplistic observation, but in my
public lifetime I've seen many reporters covering subjects they did not understand,
and it's impossible to do that well. The complexity of any of the questions now in
the news, whether it's the Falkland Islands, nuclear weapons, the economy, the
budget, or any of thousands of other issues, can only be covered effectively by
reporters who understand the subject.

A full understanding of the substance of an issue is especially important for those
who report television news, since television is the medium most responsible for
shaping public opinion in America. But even with that understanding, the television
reporter's task is difficult, because it is rare for television to set aside the time for a
serious subject to be given adequate attention. I worry about the capability of this
medium to explain the sophisticated and subtle aspects of serious issues.

The second thing that concerns me is the so-called "pack" journalism which has
been written about in many quarters. I think there is a tendency for journalists to
abandon their own independent and honestly held views of a story, and to join with
others so that the same event tends to be reported similarly by different reporters. I
think that must be resisted at all costs.

Former Vice President Walter Mondale gave an address in the Forum on April 12, 1982, as a
special session of Albert Eisele's study group "Government vs. the News Media: A View
from Both Sides." This article is excerpted from that speech.
Finally, there is the issue of mistrust. We had the Vietnam War, which absolutely shattered public confidence in virtually all institutions in America. That was followed by the disclosures of Watergate, which showed that it was possible for people in high office to resort to deceit and fraud in order to strengthen themselves in public life. Then there were accusations directed at American intelligence agencies, including charges of assassination attempts of foreign leaders. All these things over some fifteen years provided a steady diet of proven mendacity in the highest positions of American government. What happened, I think, was that we trained a generation of journalists to expect mendacity wherever they looked. And I think, therefore, we have been treated to a diet of almost constant cynicism toward those in public life. This deep cynicism has prevailed for far too long. It is one of my fondest hopes that it can somehow be diminished.

* * *

Television Examines Itself
from the conference on Television and the Presidential Elections

FLOYD ABRAMS, communications attorney (moderator): I would like you journalists, you television journalists in particular, to exchange some views about what you think the most real, most serious, most pervasive problems are in your ability to do a job as well as you would like to be able to do it.

RICHARD WALD, Senior Vice President, ABC News: One problem we haven't talked about is that people don't watch what we say we are most interested in doing. The history of both conventions and elections is that decreasing numbers of people watch.

We are people whose own internal juices flow in covering politics. We get all geared up and spend two years preparing for a convention. All three networks go there, and more and more people stay away. We think of it as important and as interesting, but the country thinks of it as a bore.

Then election night comes around. We elect the most important elected official in the western world, unless Mrs. Gandhi is going to be elected or appointed again, and people decreasingly watch.

ABRAMS: Do you draw any conclusion from that?

WALD: I think that somewhere in the question of horse race, personalities, and issues, we have become decreasingly connected with the people of this country. We

This is an excerpt from the January 30 session "Campaign Coverage I: How the Networks View the Challenge and the Opportunity of the Presidential Campaign" of the conference Television and the Presidential Elections, which was held January 29 - 31, 1982.
are not, except occasionally, speaking to the issues that engage them, and we 
become overly concerned with issues that engage the most vocal and active of them. 

ABRAMS: And most numerous of them?
WALD: And most numerous of them.

We vote less and less, and there is a connection between the amount we vote and 
the amount we watch. It is a problem of a nature, not merely bad, but anti-
democratic.

The FCC keeps helping us not to put things on the air, and we keep making rules 
that seem to narrow what it is we can do. I'll give you one instance. During an 
election campaign, it would be useful to have a program on the air once a week that 
would summarize the campaign. But you can't do it, because it isn't sensible to do it 
unless you can show the candidates, and you can't show the candidates because of 
Section 315.

ABRAMS: Would you do it?
WALD: Yes, we did it once. On Saturday evenings at 10:30, we produced a pro-
gram that was half an hour long, in prime time, that would deal only with the 
politics of the week. Because of the rules, it could not show any candidate for office. 
The program appeared twice, and it was terrible. You were always saying, well, 
George said, but you couldn't show George. Nobody watched it.

ABRAMS: I would be interested in getting some reaction to the falling viewer-
ship in convention and election coverage. Is it the nature of the coverage, or what?

JEFFREY GRALNICK, Vice President and Executive Producer, Special Events, 
ABC News: I don't think it is television's problem. Yes, audiences for convention 
and election coverage have fallen, and they have fallen, some studies indicate, in 
lockstep with the decrease in the number of people who vote. But I think that there 
might be a problem with politics or politicians. Maybe politicians aren't any better 
or worse today than they were before; maybe it is just that we are holding a mirror 
up to them, and letting more people see what they really are.

Yes, we would like everybody to watch election coverage. But that is un-
thinkable, because only half the people vote. Therefore, half the people don't want 
to know about the process, because they don't think it matters.

I think there may be a problem with the political process and the candidates that 
the parties are pushing forward, rather than with the coverage of what is out there.

ROGER MUDD, Chief Washington Correspondent, NBC News: For me, the 
basic problem is the conflict between being an honest reporter and being a member 
of show business, and that conflict is with me every day. If you are dedicated to 
honest, unaffected, untrammeled reporting, you run up against the demands of 
making the news that evening interesting.

I think over the last fifteen years, as competition has sharpened between the net-
works, none of us has been content to let an event be an event. We have to fix it. We 
have to hasten the end. We have to predict, before anybody else knows, who is go-
ing to win. And we won't let the candidate lay the issues out on his own terms; he
has to lay them out on our terms. We have to take quantals and spinning cubes to make the issues interesting.

For me, it is a daily dilemma. Sometimes, at three o’clock in the morning, I think that maybe we give people too much, and that's why they don't watch.

ABRAMS: Have the matters you’ve spoken of led to a less honorable craft being practiced in television news now than eight or ten years ago?

MUDD: I find it less honorable, yes.

WILLIAM LEONARD, President, CBS News: Let me try to underscore what Roger just said. I agree with a great deal of it. In addition, I feel we in television, in broadcast journalism, are a little bit trapped.

In the first place, we’re trapped by our age. We are very young, only twenty-five years old. And we’re trapped by our origins. We don’t quite know whether we’re a form of print translated via radio into pictures, or a form of pictures that come from radio. We don’t yet quite know who and what we are in television.

Second, I think we are trapped to a degree by competition. Competition has been responsible for a great many extraordinary advances in network journalism, not the least of which is the way we cover election night and the way we cover conventions. But to some degree, it has led to a distortion of what we do. We cannot help being conscious of our circulation; occasionally we are conscious of our circulation almost solely. There would be no discussion, none whatsoever, of whether we continued to cover the conventions gavel to gavel, if our circulation were high, or as high as it used to be.

Third, I think we’re also trapped by the very nature of the business that we are in. We exist in between the pages of a business that is primarily successful because it is the greatest means of mass medium entertainment ever intended. One-hundred-five million people, one out of every two people in the United States, watched the Super Bowl. That is fundamentally what the business is all about, and it is what supports most of it. We are confused with that, and sometimes we are confused by that. I think it is a tribute to the management of all three networks that they have insisted that we are important, that we be allowed to flourish, that we be given the resources to flourish; nevertheless, it is a confusion.

Finally, I think we are trapped a little bit, not by our failure, but by our success. And perhaps this is the most dangerous point of all for the future. In the last ten years, we have seen the development of a situation where news is no longer a loss leader or something stations do for the FCC. All over the country it is something that must be done, because if you don’t do it successfully, you are going to go out of business. And now we’re beginning to see that at the network level. The single most successful broadcast in the history of television is not a fictional program, but non-fiction, 60 Minutes. In the very success that we enjoy lie the real problems that we have to grapple with in the future.

WALD: News is, in Bill’s phrase, unfortunately more successful. It has become an interesting part of the network landscape; indeed, I suspect it will become an even
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more increasing entry in network broadcasting. Whether we are trapped by it or not is a true question for all of us. Whether the success makes us do things we should not or would not normally do is a question we could debate, but I would like to point out a little history.

It is the history of all journalistic concerns that, at various points in their lives, they are pretty lousy. When they first become mass in the context of their times, they develop bad pieces — the yellow journalism.

But the history of every single medium is the opposite of Gresham's Law. It is not the lousy newspaper or the sensationalist newspaper that survives, as you can see across the landscape; it is the better newspaper that survives. It is not the radio station that treats the news most cavalierly that survives; it is the one that either does away with news completely or tries to deal with it responsibly.

In television, look at what used to be the worst part of our lives, the local news. You will see that, in almost every local market in the United States, whatever the form may be, the content has gotten better. And not only has it gotten better, but it has created the experiments that a lot of network television is presently based upon.

In network television itself, I believe that our reporting has gotten better. In part it has been the sophistication of the machinery we use. I don't mean just the quantals and the dubners and whatever else. I mean the vote collecting techniques; I mean the process of setting up political desks with people who are expert in what they do. We are more expert now in the gathering and dissemination of that information than we ever were, and there is nobody in this room who has not benefited from it.

I want to go back to the first problem I mentioned. We're better, we're smarter, we're nicer, we all take baths and everything else, and yet we have not managed to convey to the people the enthusiasm we feel. That is not television's problem, but television is part of that problem.

ELIZABETH DREW, political writer, New Yorker: I'd like to bring up one point that is a very delicate one, and I do it with some misgivings. I wonder to what extent the tone with which we cover campaigns affects the public's reaction to them.

I certainly don't think we should be humorless in our approach to the comedy and absurdity of campaigns, but I wonder if sometimes the sum total of coverage doesn't reach the point where it is robbed of any sense of majesty or inspiration, where it runs down just about everybody who tries to get into it. The poor soul who straggles across the finish line has been pretty bloodied by the time he gets there.

It is a tough thing to draw, but I wonder if we haven't had some effect on the public's reaction, which is, 'To the extent I care, they are all a bunch of bimbos and fools.'

ABRAMS: Is that tone more on television than in the print press? Or is it just a part of American life of which the press is a part?

ROBIN MACNEIL, Executive Editor, the MacNeil-Lehrer Report: It is more on television, and there is a reason for that. I think that television has had in its political reporting a kind of historical inferiority complex. The relationship with the print
press was referred to earlier. Television political reporting, with apologies and deference to the very skilled reporters here, has always been largely derivative of what is in the print press. I know television makes its original contributions, but a lot of the value judgments and the feel comes from the more extensive work that full-time political reporters on the principal newspapers and the wire services are able to do.

As a result of this inferiority complex relative to print, television political reporters feel they have to express their detachment and distance from the material — even more aggressively, perhaps, since they are given such an exceedingly brief amount of time to do so, usually two sentences at the end of the piece, which is their face, their by-line, their career involvement every night.

This is not original to the 1980 campaign. I felt this myself as far back as the middle sixties. The exceedingly brief amount of time available to you, and the desire to express yourself — your individuality, your presence, your sophistication about politics — inclines you to compress into very few words what could easily be interpreted as cynicism.

MUDD: If I have given four days of my life to covering a candidate from South Dakota to Texas to Georgia, and on Thursday I’m expected to do a piece about that week and that candidate and that campaign, I don’t want my piece to end up with the nation thinking that I’m a fool and that something has been put over on me. You’re damn right I’m going to try to be sophisticated and smart. That is built into the way we sit down and look at a politician, and it becomes pernicious.

TOM BROKAW, News Correspondent, NBC: What worries me is the symbiotic relationship that has grown up between the campaigns and our business. We speak in this very curious shorthand. In 1980 I wasn’t on a campaign plane; I was doing the Today show and going to each of the primaries. I would hear my friends and my colleagues talking about the semicolon-by-semicolon change that had occurred that day, which they were reflecting in their evening reports, and I didn’t know what the hell they were talking about. That symbiotic relationship is what really has to be examined. I’m talking about the mechanics as well as the philosophy of it. That’s a major concern.

Having said that, while I believe there are some leaks in the various boats we have afloat here, I do believe there is a rising tide. I think television news is doing a far better job with every passing campaign. I also think, however, we fall in love with the subject too much. It becomes wallpaper. We are putting it on all the time.

If we found ways to share more of the process with the people whom we ostensibly are trying to communicate with, we would all be better off. If we devoted to other issues — and most of them are very obvious — the resources we devote to campaigns, we would have more credibility, and I think the country would be engaged more with what is important.

*   *   *
Ben Bradlee, then Editor of Newsweek, once telephoned President Kennedy to compliment him on a television appearance. Replied Kennedy, “When we don’t have to go through you bastards we can really get the story to the American people.” Twenty years later, Congressmen and interest groups alike are turning to a host of technological advances to circumvent the “bastards.” Previously, members of Congress have depended primarily on the news media in order to communicate with constituents; interest groups, in turn, relied on the media, direct mail, and person-to-person arm-twisting to influence Congressmen. Cable, satellites, electronic mail, and computers may be changing that picture in subtle but significant ways.

With the new technology, Senators and Representatives are increasingly able to bypass the filter of the press corps and reach their audiences directly. “Deep down inside... every Congressman believes that the correctness of his positions and votes would be evident to the electorate if only he could communicate with them directly, with no distorting intervention by the press,” said Knight Kiplinger, Bureau Chief of Ottaway Newspapers. “This is where the new space-age communications techniques offer some sobering possibilities.”

Some of the possibilities are fast becoming realities, according to a detailed survey of House and Senate press secretaries conducted early in 1982. Of the one hundred sixteen secretaries who responded:

- Forty-four percent produce some sort of regular radio program, usually weekly, which is sent to anywhere from three to 135 radio stations. In all, some one thousand-five hundred radio stations received such programs.
- Seventy-eight percent send out radio actualities—taped statements by the Congressman, fifteen to thirty seconds in length, fed to newsrooms over phone lines—on an average of five times per month.
- Forty-six percent produce a public affairs video program, usually monthly, for state or district television outlets, primarily cable outlets. Many other offices plan to begin such programs when their districts are wired for cable.
- Sixty-nine percent have word processors or memory typewriters for mail processing. Thirty-seven percent have such equipment in both their Washington and their state or district offices.

This is an excerpt from a study Anne Haskell wrote as a Research Assistant at the Institute during the summer of 1982. An excerpt of that study was also published in the November edition of the Washington Journalism Review. Ms. Haskell is a member of the John F. Kennedy School of Government’s MPA ’82 class.
Seventy-eight percent have computer systems for research, record-keeping, and/or mail processing.

Eighty-nine percent add names to computerized mass-mailing lists from incoming constituent mail.

Ninety-nine percent send newsletters to constituents, on an average of three per year. Seventy percent send an average of six “special reports” on specific issues to targeted constituents interested in a particular subject.

What such numbers don’t reveal, however, are the “state of the art” Congressmen, who are applying the new resources in novel ways. One House office prepares video briefings, to be shown to agricultural or educational groups. Another is putting together a slide show along the lines of “A Day in the Life of a Senator.” Still another has done a weekly cable show on national issues. One office produced a thirty-minute video program on the history of the White House. Several others are considering installing video display terminals (VDTs) to allow press aides direct, electronic contact with newsrooms back home. One office has a “Dial Your Congressman” program, in which residents of certain communities are notified by printed postcard that the Congressman will be available at a specific day and time to receive phone calls from constituents. A Midwestern Senator provides two camera-ready copies of his weekly column to newspapers in his state, each in a different column width to facilitate publication. And one press office reports owning a minicam.

Many press secretaries said a major focus of their efforts over the next two years will be to build up targeted mailing lists. The equipment used to respond to constituent mail can also be used to generate special mailings. When a constituent writes a letter or signs a petition to his or her Congressman or Senator, the individual’s name and other identifying data can be entered into a computer memory. Some machines have the capacity to index by age, sex, profession, subject interests, and, through the use of zip codes, neighborhood. Thus constituents who write can receive periodic reminders that the Congressman’s interest in a given subject hasn’t waned.

While computerized mail has generated a voluminous paper flow from Capitol Hill, at least one Congressman is using computers to try to reduce the flow. Pennsylvania Republican James Coyne has installed an electronic mail system in his Washington and district offices, enabling him to communicate with an estimated one thousand constituents who own home computers. Coyne believes his affluent district in suburban Philadelphia will contain 15,000 home computers within two years. Electronic mail, he feels, will help reduce the time involved in constituent casework as more federal agencies install similar equipment.

By far the most sophisticated innovations in congressional communications have come from the Senate Republican Conference. “Operation Uplink,” a satellite news service launched this year, broadcasts the views of Republican Senators to the two hundred television stations and four thousand cable systems with receiving equipment. Via “Operation Airwaves,” the GOP’s radio counterpart to “Uplink,” taped remarks of six to eight Republican Senators are sent to some eight hundred par-
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ticipating stations; Carter Clews, communications director of the group, has called it "one of the largest radio networks in the country." For print media, the Conference circulates a biweekly column by a Republican Senator on a topic of his choice, op-ed pieces, and a four-page monthly newsletter discussing issues before the Senate. "These programs provide a great service to the media, particularly the smaller news organizations that simply can't afford to have a Washington bureau," Clews said. "Our service mediates the old, hackneyed image of an adversarial relationship between the press and government."

But some reporters disagree. "The new technology in the hands of congressional press secretaries is clearly dangerous," said Leland Schwartz, founder and bureau chief of States News Service. Schwartz, a former Senate press aide, said one reason he launched SNS in 1973 was his shock at "seeing smaller daily papers and many weeklies running congressional press releases verbatim."

Diana Winthrop, vice-president of GAP Communications, a Washington-based Midwest radio news service, said, "The smaller news organizations seem to think that they are at the mercy of Congressmen to supply them with news. They don't seem to comprehend that this involves control and manipulation of information." She added, "It is irresponsible and unethical for members of Congress to present canned radio and television programs as news—and just as irresponsible for the industry to accept them."

Congress, though, is hardly alone on the new-technology bandwagon. Interest groups have begun to put recent telecommunications discoveries to work for them as well. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has launched BIZNET, which will ultimately offer via satellite weekday programming like "Today in Congress" and "Economic Forecasts." Subscribers, who include corporations, trade associations, and local chambers, pay a $5000 fee, plus the cost of a satellite receiving dish. Meanwhile the AFL-CIO is planning the Labor Institute of Public Affairs, designed to "create a program of direct communications with the union constituency and the general public to increase and improve their appreciation of labor's point of view on the crucial economic, political, and social issues of the day," according to an internal report.

It may be only a matter of time before lobbying groups use their networks, not merely to inform and to activate interested citizens, but also to reward favored candidates and officials. Satellite programming like BIZNET is not subject to the FCC's equal time or fairness requirements; thus the originating organization can freely contribute time on the network to particular candidates. Such possibilities were suggested during the summer of 1982, when the Chamber refused to let a White House spokesman appear on BIZNET to expound the administration line on the proposed tax package. "These facilities," the Chamber's media director explained, "cannot be used to oppose Chamber policy."

Such possibilities lead some observers to view the new technology in apocalyptic terms. They fear incumbents will become permanently entrenched, interest groups
will become omnipotent, and the independent, objective press will wither and die in
the flurry of partisan messages. Other prognosticators herald the new media as a
Shangri-la of democracy. They trumpet the technology’s potential to create a
citizenry better informed and more active than ever before.

No doubt the ultimate reality will lie between these stark extremes. Whether, on
balance, that reality will encourage or retard the democratic process remains, at
least for now, an open question. But it clearly calls upon the existing communica-
tions media in America—already criticized for their performance, threatened as
technologically obsolescent, and burdened by great public responsibility—to be
alert to the dangers involved and to intensify their efforts to meet the higher stan-
dards of a resourceful, thorough, objective free press.

* * *

Public Television Advertises for Help
by Neil Folger

President Reagan wants to change the channel, if not flip the switch, on public
television. Over the next four years, the Reagan administration plans to slash its
grants to public television (PTV) by one half. If not recouped elsewhere, this
decrease in federal funding, which now represents 27 percent of all support, will
combine with inflation and other cuts to substantially alter the nature of PTV. Con-
gressmen Thomas Tauke (R-Iowa) and Allan Swift (D-Wash.), however, are leading
an effort to find alternative ways for PTV to generate new monies.

PTV’s funding crisis has caused many to take a fresh look at what purpose the
system actually serves. “There is a lot of criticism that (PTV) is just a subsidy to the
wealthy,” explains Tauke, reflecting a widespread feeling that the cultural level of
PTV’s programs is so high that they interest only the affluent and well-educated. On
the other hand, some television critics argue that PTV remains the only way that
many people will ever experience opera at the Met, a Broadway play, or other ar-
tistic events whose ticket prices traditionally limit them to the rich. In short, PTV of-
fers access to the whole spectrum of human culture to anyone who owns a television
set.

For this reason and in order to save such other programming as Sesame Street,
Julia Child, and McNeil-Lehrer Report, Tauke successfully guided legislation
through Congress creating the Temporary Commission for Alternative Funding to
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explore new methods of raising money for PTV. This group, chaired by FCC Commissioner James Quello, has produced various proposals, ranging from a tax on the networks for their use of the airwaves to improving UHF broadcasting in order to make this band more attractive to viewers.

None of the plans, however, have looked as promising and easy to implement as a limited injection of advertising. To follow up on this proposal, the Commission, by authority of additional Tauke legislation, plans a ten-station advertising experiment to test whether commercials would disturb viewers or influence PTV's programming. While they see advertising as a viable fundraising alternative, both Quello and Tauke emphasize that they do not know the effect of commercials on viewers, viewer contributions, or on the programming itself. It was this need for more information that spawned the idea of running an experiment before recommending that Congress give final authorization to an advertising plan.

Even though the experiment is just underway, Quello expressed cautious optimism about advertising. "If (the stations) have very strict guidelines and very limited advertising and insist on their advertising meeting very high standards, they can probably do it successfully," he says. "I can visualize, for example, where instead of running commercials all the time, a station will run only six to eight commercials a day... If it is explained right, I think most people probably wouldn't feel that that's changing the entire character of public broadcasting, that this was essential to keep this very desirable service alive."

Tauke, conversely, sees sizeable problems with the advertising alternative. "I really have not been a proponent of advertising," he maintains. "I think that there is considerable danger that advertising will change the character of public television and radio substantially, that it will remove some of the attractiveness that the audience currently finds in public broadcasting. I am not convinced that it will raise substantial amounts of money. We just don't know. I think it's worth looking into. It seems to me to be a court of last resort."

In an attempt to balance the integrity of PTV with the advantage of advertising, Tauke restricted the amount of advertising stations can air during the upcoming experiment. The law now allows only two minutes of advertising per hour, with the stipulation that it never interrupt a program. Thus, showing a two-hour movie would require forfeiting the possibility of advertising after the first hour. Even on such a limited basis, says Quello, advertising would be able to close the funding gap. In fact, Quello states, "The law has permitted more advertising than I, as a general manager, would even think of putting on."

But what if the experiment does not work? What if massive public protest results from the advertising and stations lose as much in viewer contributions as they gain by their commercials? In this case, prospects for the future of PTV look bleak. Quello has said that the first thing he would do in such a situation would be to "have a combined committee of commercial and public broadcasters ask Congress to restore funds." Rep. Tauke, offering a congressional perspective, doubts that such
efforts would have any effect. In his opinion, "if advertising doesn't prove to be an alternative, I think the only other significant source of revenue is from the private sector, and we can step up activities to solicit funds from the private sector. Some have talked about subscription television."

"Subscription television" — the two words make any loyal PTV follower shudder. Yet, if the funding gap cannot be bridged any other way, PTV may evolve into pay TV. Then, PTV would really become the realm of the elite, and only a very select audience would enjoy the privilege of watching the educational children's programs, the investigative news shows, and the cultural events featured by public broadcasting. The less advantaged would have to go back to the unvaried programming offered by the networks. With this dreary scenario in the offing, a few commercials on PTV seems a small price compared to the more significant one of such restricted viewing. Over the next year, the public, by its reaction to the advertising experiment, will choose which price it wants to pay.

* * *

The Nashua Debate
by Stephen Bates

It was really more of a Jimmy Stewart role, but Ronald Reagan gave it his all — the calm, soft-spoken man faced with more injustice than he can humanly bear, who lets go and blows up at the powers that be. And, of course, there was the requisite villain: newcomer George Bush, playing the obnoxious, nose-in-the-air rich kid who won't play with the poor waifs from the other side of the tracks.

The Nashua debate exploded into pandemonium on February 23, 1980, a scant three days before the crucial New Hampshire primary. During those days, the debate utterly dominated media coverage of the Republican race. Nashua thus offers a valuable case study of how the press reacts to an unexpected and dramatic event in the last days before a do-or-die presidential primary. This account is based on an examination of media coverage of Nashua, on interviews with sixteen campaign officials and reporters, and on the several recent books on the 1980 campaign.

The idea for a Reagan-Bush debate surfaced after Bush beat the odds and won the January 21 Iowa caucuses. The Nashua Telegraph offered to sponsor a debate between the two frontrunners, but the Federal Election Commission ruled that such
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The excluded Republican candidates cried foul. One of them, Senator Bob Dole, called Reagan campaign chief John Sears, a friend, and asked to join the debate. The two talked at least four times during the week before the debate, according to Bob Waite, Dole's press secretary. Recalls Waite, "Sears was obviously intrigued by the idea. He must have seen it would be to his candidate's advantage to be the fellow calling for the open debate."

Sears, though, had more than that in mind. "One of the things you look for in campaigns," he explains, "is an opportunity for your opponent to have to make decisions in public... on his feet, on the spot. And that's not unfair in relation to seeking the nomination for president; a president has to do that fairly often. To a certain degree, you try to look for situations where you can assist the occurrence of that." Throwing Bush a curve ball by engineering a last-minute change in the debate format seemed just such an opportunity. So Sears began talking with the other campaigns — those of Senators Dole and Howard Baker, and of Congressmen John Anderson and Phillip Crane (John Connally was busy campaigning in South Carolina at the time) — about expanding the Saturday night debate. On Saturday morning he made it official, inviting the four to participate.

Several hours later, just before two that afternoon, the Reagan camp informed the Telegraph of the change in format. But the Telegraph would have none of that. Its executives argued that, regardless of who was footing the bill, everyone remained bound by previously agreed-to rules. The Reagan people, though, insisted that the other four candidates be included. As the hours ticked by, the impasse held firm.

Arriving at the debate site that night, George Bush didn't know what to expect. The Reagan team hadn't called Bush's staff with news of the change in plans. A Telegraph executive had done so, but his message had been garbled, and Bush had been told that Reagan would refuse to debate at all. Bush's campaign manager, James Baker, went to the Reagan holding room to see what was going on. There he found Dole, Howard Baker, Anderson, and Crane cloistered with Reagan. James Baker returned and gave Bush the news.

The four uninvited candidates, meanwhile, decided they wanted to caucus with Bush; it was Bush, they believed, who was keeping them out of the debate. A Reagan aide went to get Bush, but got only as far as James Baker. Here accounts
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diverge somewhat. A Bush aide insists that Baker's response was two-fold: that Bush wouldn't meet with the others, but that he would go along with whatever the *Telegraph* and the Reagan team decided about who was to debate. Sears, however, believes Baker made only the former point. That, in any case, was the only message the Reagan staffer took back to the excluded candidates — that George Bush refused to meet with them, period. "That was upsetting to them," remembers Sears. "That was sort of the last straw."

Bush and Jon Breen, executive editor of the *Telegraph* and moderator of the debate, came out on stage. Finally Reagan and the others — "Ronald Reagan and his Gang of Four," Breen muttered to himself — followed. Reagan sat down. The four uninvited candidates, lacking chairs, stood and waved to the confused crowd. Reagan took his microphone and started to explain that he had wanted the others to join in the debate, but that the *Telegraph* had refused to let them. Breen interrupted and tried to explain the *Telegraph*'s side of the story, including the fact that the uninvited candidates would be permitted to make brief statements at the conclusion of the Reagan-Bush exchange. But Reagan kept talking. Finally Breen commanded, "Turn off Mr. Reagan's microphone." Reagan exploded, shouting the soon-to-be-famous words, "I paid for this microphone, Mr. Green (sic)!" (It may be mere coincidence, but the line is strikingly similar to one in the 1948 film *State of the Union*: when a political heavy commands that a radio broadcast by presidential candidate Spencer Tracy be halted, Tracy cries, "I'm paying for this broadcast!") Through it all Bush had fidgeted, thumbing through his debate cards and doodling, not saying a word.

Reagan finished his statement, but Breen remained adamant, and the four excluded candidates stalked off the stage. While the Reagan-Bush debate began, the four headed for an adjoining room where they held a vituperative press conference, blaming Bush for their exclusion. Baker called it "the most flagrant effort to reinstitute closed-door politics I have ever seen;" Dole said Bush "had better find himself another party;" Anderson and Crane spoke in a similar vein.

In the days to come the Bush campaign and the *Telegraph* released lengthy explanations that exonerated Bush, but they got little media attention, Breen recalls. "Our explanation was completely ignored," he says. "The theater took center stage.... I guess this is what the New Hampshire primary is all about: something trivial becoming the major issue."

Tough criticism for a newsman to make of his colleagues, yet a study of Nashua's coverage tends to bear him out.

In quantity, the debate received massive attention. Between Sunday, the day after the debate, and Tuesday, the day of the primary, the *Boston Globe* ran six articles on Nashua, three of which began on the front page. The *New York Times* covered Nashua with front-page stories Sunday and Monday, as well as a "mood" piece Monday entitled "Grand Old Pandemonium." In contrast, the *Globe* ran just one story on the previous debate in Manchester, New Hampshire, and one on the
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subsequent debate in South Carolina; the Times's coverage of both was also less substantial (though the paper included a partial transcript of the Manchester debate) and was buried well inside the paper.

In content, most coverage of Nashua focused, as Breen noted, on the evening's theatrics. "The polite Republican presidential race exploded in anger...," the Washington Post's story began. The Times called it "a raucous release of anger and glee." The Globe referred to the evening's "full, spectacular theatrics," adding, "Eugene Ionesco or Harold Pinter could not have scripted a livelier prelude to the debates."

The giddy quality of coverage was especially apparent on television. On the CBS Sunday Morning News, correspondent Bruce Morton said, "Well, it was wonderful. Somebody said last night it was the finest moment of political theater since Ed Muskie cried in the snow here in 1972... If you can imagine Republicans, who normally go out of their way to be nice to each other... just spitting and snarling and clawing each other... It was swell." On the news that night Morton repeated his Muskie comparison. And, on the CBS Monday Morning News, Bob Schieffer referred to the debate as a "near brawl." "It's the most fun New Hampshire has had this year," Morton replied. "I think this was kind of a dull campaign up until last Saturday night..." Schieffer responded rather tellingly: "Well, it certainly has the press corps here excited."

The coverage's focus on the dramatic fits in with a truism of news selection: conflict and confrontation, action and emotion are, by definition, newsworthy qualities. "The best story," sociologist Herbert Gans has written, "reports dramatic activities or emotions." This journalistic preference has not been lost on candidates or their advisers. "If you are seeking free media coverage," counsels political coach Edward Costikyan, "create controversy. Attack or be attacked..." These necessary ingredients overflowed at Nashua. The evening had suspense — would they all debate? Confrontation—the unexpected Reagan-Breen shouting match. And, perhaps most important, apparent fury—the four excluded candidates' raucous press conference.

Besides drama, several other factors also contributed to the quantity and style of Nashua coverage.

For one thing, the Republican race had previously been rather bland, from a newsman's point of view. Breen recalls talking with Washington Post columnist David Broder after the debate: "Broder came over and said half-jokingly that he wanted to express his appreciation for Saturday night, because things had been so damn dull." As another reporter puts it, "Here were Republicans angry at each other after making nice for so long."

In addition, covering Nashua was easy. Harsh, dramatic statements were being made right and left. Reporters had only to select the sharpest barbs for their articles.

Timing also played a role. The nation's first primary was fast approaching, and reporters were paying more attention to the early contests than ever before. The
presence of all the serious Republican candidates except Connally in one place focused the inevitable last-minute coverage; what might have been roundup stories reporting on the candidates' varied activities came together as the candidates came together for a single event.

Further, the visual appeal of the on-stage confrontation lent particular strength and appeal to television coverage. The debate was not shown live, but the clip of Reagan's angry line was played time and again before the primary. The best TV stories, according to Edward Jay Epstein, show "highly dramatic conflicts between clearly defined sides." In these terms, the Reagan-Breen confrontation, as well as the subsequent all-against-Bush press conference, made terrific television.

Finally, what Nashua seemed to reveal about Bush and Reagan contributed to the shape of coverage. For weeks the Reagan team had been working to depict Bush as "the tweedy upper-class candidate, part of the 'Eastern Establishment'," as a New York Times article the day of the primary put it. The Bush forces, meanwhile, were trying to encourage the fairly widespread notion that 69-year-old Reagan was too old to be president.

Nashua seemed to confirm the former preconception and, at least for the moment, to bury the latter one. For Bush, as Globe columnist Robert Healy wrote, "The snob image was transformed into reality." For Reagan, the age issue was temporarily blunted. Shouting at Breen, Reagan "looked 20 years younger," syndicated columnist Mary McGrory wrote. A Bush aide puts it more graphically: "Ronald Reagan jumped to his feet and grabbed the microphone without keeling over."

Drama, previous dullness, ease, timing, visuals, preconceptions—all these elements help explain the magnitude and direction of the coverage. At least as important as what the press emphasized, though, is what the press ignored.

First, the actual content of the exchange between Bush and Reagan—the debate itself—received hardly any attention. Only two of the six Globe articles mentioned content: one devoted two of its twenty-eight paragraphs to a question about Reagan's age, while the other gave four of its thirty-three paragraphs over to a capsule description of the debate. In the Times, six paragraphs of the principal 26-paragraph article covered the exchange. Voters interested in the issues debated by Reagan and Bush were shortchanged.

Second, most coverage ignored the behind-the-scenes story. While reporters generally balanced, say, a Dole accusation with a Bush denial, few of them went on to try to resolve the inevitable variations between the two statements. The Globe's David Nyhan, along with syndicated columnists Mary McGrory and Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, tentatively gave Sears credit for the trap, but in no greater detail than Evans and Novak's reference to "the Sears-engineered coup." At the time they explored neither the details of Sears's maneuver, nor Reagan's role in its planning. The former would have helped put the event in context; the latter might have revealed an important facet of Reagan's personality (for the record, Sears says Reagan was "aware of what was going on"). Ultimately two articles—one by Nyhan
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in the *Globe*, the other by Remer Tyson in the *Detroit Free Press*—tried to untangle the backstage machinations. But both stories appeared over two months after the fact, tied to the news peg of Bush’s withdrawal from the race. (Other writers also dug for the full story, but saved their findings for books, which appeared later still.)

Finally, most coverage took the charges and counter-charges at face value, without plumbing for hints of opportunism. In the *Globe*, Martin Nolan wrote that the four excluded candidates left the stage with “permanent anger at Bush.” Similarly, syndicated columnist George Will wrote, “For one enchanting moment in Nashua, the Republican race had the honest passion of a spat in a sorority.”

In fact, however, the permanence of the four’s anger can be readily disproved—at the Republican convention, it was Dole who nominated Bush to be vice-president (“Things are quickly forgotten,” explains Dole’s press secretary).

The honesty of the four’s passion can likewise be questioned. Before and after Nashua, Bush and Baker were close friends. Bush had served alongside Crane and Anderson in Congress, and had preceded Dole as director of the Republican National Committee. Debate coverage generally ignored such ties. Further, the Iowa win had thrown Bush forward as Reagan’s principal competition, a part Anderson, Baker, Crane, and Dole had each hoped to play. Their criticism of Bush, therefore, had grown far harsher during the weeks since Iowa. Indeed, Baker’s aides were urging him to go after Bush more strongly—a fact revealed in several newspaper articles prior to Nashua, but not alluded to in any coverage of Baker’s post-debate attacks on Bush. Going after Bush thus jibed with the perceived interests of all four campaigns, and with the recommended tactics of at least one.

Some subsequent evidence strongly suggests that the evening’s fury was less than heartfelt. Baker told Breen that the four had expected him to “freeze, panic, or leave,” a comment which suggests a degree of forethought (albeit inaccurate forethought) that belies the evening’s apparent spontaneity. And John Anderson has spoken of the four’s behavior as nothing but a performance: “I thought we were going to have a little charade and we did have. We all stand there and smile and pirouette and turn to the crowd and beseech.” Strong hints that self-interest might be a motivating factor were present at the time, but reporters chose to ignore them.

In covering the Nashua debate, thus, the media favored the dramatic confrontation over the issues discussion, the up-front accusation over the backstage maneuvering, the surface emotion over the underlying self-interest. In so doing they wove a tapestry, not exactly inaccurate in any single detail, but woefully incomplete in its total effect. And, though the causative relationship is far from clear, when the New Hampshire votes had been counted Reagan had walloped Bush, fifty percent to twenty-three percent.

* * *
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Ernest Halperin, Professor of Political Science, Latin American Studies, Boston University; Adjunct Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
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James Cheek, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Central American Affairs
Kenneth Carstens, Executive Director, International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa
Ellen Hume, Washington correspondent, Los Angeles Times; Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Perry Ottenberg, Professor of Clinical Psychology, University of Pennsylvania
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Stephen Kinzer, Latin American correspondent, Boston Globe
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Ellen Hume, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Washington correspondent, Los Angeles Times
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Colonel Michael McRaney, Public Information Director, U.S. Strategic Air Command
Dennis Britton, National Editor, Los Angeles Times
Eddie Mahe, Republican political consultant; Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Jack Nelson, Washington Bureau Chief, Los Angeles Times
Carl Bernstein, ABC News correspondent; former reporter, Washington Post
Douglas Kneeland, Foreign and National Editor, Chicago Tribune
Albert Hunt, Washington correspondent, Wall Street Journal

"Political Parties in the 1980's"
Eddie Mahe, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Republican political consultant; former Executive Director and Deputy Chairman, Republican National Committee; Campaign Director, John Connally's 1980 campaign for the Republican presidential nomination
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Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard Wirthlin, President, Decision-Making Information, Washington, DC
Newt Gingrich, U.S. Representative (R-Georgia)
Ann Lewis, Political Director, Democratic National Committee
Tony Payton, Republican political consultant
Adam Clymer, political reporter, New York Times
Xandra Kayden, Member, Institute of Politics Campaign Study Group; Consultant to Impact 2½ Project, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

"A New Right Perspective of American's Future"
Howard Phillips, National Director, Conservative Caucus, Inc.
Guests:

Paul Weyrich, President, Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress
Lew Rockwell, Administrative Assistant to U.S. Representative Ron Paul (R-Texas)
Brigadier General Albion Knight, Director, Conservative Caucus National Task Force
John Lofton, Editor, Conservative Digest
Richard Viguerie, President, The Viguerie Company
Willa Johnson, Senior Vice President, Heritage Foundation
Morton Blackwell, Special Assistant to President Reagan, Office of Public Liaison
Brian Lamb, President, Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network (CSPAN)

"Future Directions for Welfare"
John D. Pratt, former Commissioner, Massachusetts Welfare Department

Guests:

Jules Codes, policy expert, Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare
Neil Hurley, former Director, Lowell Project
Janet Diamond, Director, Coalition for Basic Human Needs
Joanne Leppanen, welfare advocate
Diane Dujojohn, welfare advocate
William Hogan, Massachusetts Secretary of Human Services
Carl Williams, welfare consultant to the Reagan Administration
John Von Schlegel, Director, Massachusetts Workfare Program
David Budding, Abt Associates, Cambridge
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Phillip E. Pulaski, Maryknoll Lay Missioner; Associate Director, Maryknoll Center for Justice Concerns, Brookline, Massachusetts; former missioner in Bolivia
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Arthur Sist, Associate, Washington Office on Latin America, Washington, DC
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Mauricio Silva, Undersecretary of Planning, first junta of El Salvador
Lynn Kirkconnell, Maryknoll missioner, Lima, Peru
Carol Barton, Maryknoll missioner, Lima, Peru
Valerie Miller, International Education Associates
Fr. Fernando Lopez, Church in Exile Movement, Guatemala
Fr. Omar Olivera, Church in Exile Movement, Guatemala
Juan de Castro, vicar, Santiago, Chile
“Human Rights: What’s To Be Done?”
Joshua Rubenstein, New England Coordinator, Amnesty International, United States

Guests:
Juan Mendez, Argentine lawyer, Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Washington, D.C.
Jonathan Fein, Medical Director, North End Community Health Center, Boston
Ken Carstens, Executive Director, International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa
Ameen Akhalyawa, political reporter, Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, South Africa
Stanislaw Baranczak, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard
Mihajlo Mihajlov, Yugoslav dissident
Merle Goldman, author of China’s Intellectuals: Advice and Dissent
Ayshe Seytmuratova, Crimean Tatar activist
Kiril Uspensky, Russian Research Center, Harvard
William Bowers, Northeastern University; author of Executions in America
Stephen Kinzer, Latin American correspondent, Boston Globe
Jean Marie Simon, photojournalist in Central America
Edward Baker, Assistant to the Director, Harvard Yenching Institute
Abraham Sirkin, former Foreign Service Information Officer

“Life in a Nuclear-Armed Crowd”
Poul Walker, Director, Arms Control Research, Union of Concerned Scientists
Gordon Thompson, Staff Scientist, Nuclear Engineering, Union of Concerned Scientists

Guests:
Thomas Cochran, Natural Resources Defense Council
Philip Morrison, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
George Rathjens, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
William Epstein, Canadian diplomat
Robert Gallucci, Office of Non-Proliferation and Export Policy, State Department
Howard Morland, journalist; author of The Secret That Exploded
Robert Johansen, Institute for World Order

“The Chicano Movement in American Politics”
William C. Velasquez, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Executive Director, Southwest Voter Registration Project; former Field Director, National Council of La Raza Unida Party; Founder and former Director, Mexican American Unity Council
Guests:

Paul Moreno, Texas State Representative
José Angel Gutierrez, Founder, La Raza Unida Party
Gerald Wilkinson, Executive Director, National Indian Youth Council, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Gene Locke, Human Organizational Development Corporation, Houston
Alex Hurtado, Director, Political Division, Republican National Committee
Roberto Regalado, Secretary, Cuban Interest Section, Washington, DC

"Corruption and Reform: A Case Study in Massachusetts Politics"
John William Ward, former Chair, Massachusetts Special Commission Concerning State and County Buildings (the Ward Commission); President Emeritus, Amherst College; historian

Guests:

Bancroft Littlefield, former Chief Counsel, Ward Commission
Walter McCarthy, civil engineer; Professor, Southeastern Massachusetts State University
Christopher Lydon, anchor, Ten O'Clock News, WGBH-TV, Boston
Thomas Winship, Editor, Boston Globe
Thomas McGee, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Lynn); Speaker of the House

"The Impact of U.S. Foreign Aid on Africa's Development"
Percy C. Wilson, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former Peace Corps Director, Sierra Leone, Africa; Senior Program Officer, Phelps Stokes Fund (organization providing support for African students studying in the U.S.); former Senior Associate, World Development Corporation

Guests:

Marie Gadsden, Vice President and Director, Phelps Stokes Fund, Washington, DC
Dalton Griffeth, Director, West African Programs, U.S. Agency for International Development
Michael Samuels, Vice President, International Division, U.S. Chamber of Commerce
John W. Thomas, Institute Fellow in the Harvard Institute for International Development; Lecturer on Economics, Harvard
William Carmichael, Vice President, International Affairs, Ford Foundation
Edward Clinton, Liberian United Nations Representative Designate to Kenya and Ethiopia
William Smith, Alternate Executive Director, World Bank
Yao Wei, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former Chief of the Press Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China; former Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Guests:
- James C. Thomson, Jr., Curator, Nieman Foundation, Harvard; co-author, Sentimental Imperialists: The American Experience in East Asia
- Ross Terrill, China scholar and author
- Harrison Salisbury, former Op-ed Editor, New York Times; author

Spring 1982

"The Reagan Administration's New Federalism: A Collision of Ideology, Politics and Reality?"
Kenneth Blackwell, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; City Councillor, Cincinnati; former Vice Mayor and Mayor, Cincinnati; former Vice Chairman, Economic Development Committee, U.S. Conference of Mayors

Guests:
- James Q. Wilson, Henry Lee Shattuck Professor of Government, Harvard
- Larry Hunter, Director of Staff, Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations
- Manuel Carballo, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- William Donaldson, former City Manager, Cincinnati
- Willis Gradison, U.S. Representative, (R-Ohio)
- Brendon Byrne, former Governor, New Jersey
- Steven Rhodes, Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs
- Stephen Farber, Executive Director, National Governors Association

"Communications Policymaking in the New Media Era"
Stuart N. Brotman, President, Communications Strategies Incorporated, Cambridge; communications lawyer; former Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Guests:
- Nicholas Miller, Partner, Preston, Thurgoodson, Ellis & Holman; former Counsel, Senate Commerce Committee
- Newton Minow, Partner, Sidley & Austin, Chicago; former Chair, Public Broadcasting Service
- Peggy Charren, President, Action for Children's Television
Larry Levine, Vice President and Director of Research, Communications Strategies Incorporated
Henry Geller, Director, Duke University Washington Center for Public Policy Research
Les Brown, Editor, Channels of Communication
Edward Greenberg, Research Analyst, Snowford, Bernstein & Company

"Proposition 2½ and Reaganomics at Work in Massachusetts"
Francis H. Duehay, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; City Councillor, Cambridge; former Mayor, Cambridge; former Executive Director, Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University

Guests:
Robert Healy, City Manager, Cambridge
Lewis Pollack, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Health and Hospitals, Boston
David Vickery, Assistant City Manager, Cambridge
William Lannon, Superintendent of Schools, Cambridge
John Pratt, former Commissioner of Welfare, Massachusetts
Harry Spence, Court-Appointed Receiver, Boston Housing Authority
Bob Kuttner, Editor, Working Papers
Fred Jordan, Director of Communications, National League of Cities, Washington, DC

"Government vs. the News Media: A View from Both Sides"
Albert Eisele, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Communications Director, Center for National Policy, Washington, DC; former Press Secretary to Vice President Walter Mondale; former Washington correspondent, Knight-Ridder newspapers

Guests:
Douglas Cater, Senior Fellow, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Washington, DC; author of The Fourth Branch of Government
Terence Smith, Washington Page Editor, New York Times
Mortimer Zuckerman, Chairman, Atlantic Monthly
Douglas Brew, White House correspondent, Time
Larry Speakes, Deputy Press Secretary to the President
Robert Healy, Washington Bureau Chief, Boston Globe
William Leonard, former President, CBS
Walter Mondale, former Vice President of the United States
Richard M. Neustadt, former White House Advisor on Telecommunications Policy
The Student Program

Seymour Hersh, *former reporter*, New York Times; *author* of Kissinger and Nixon in the White House.

"The Cuban Revolution: 1959 to the Present"
*James Higgins*, *former Editor*, The Gazette and Daily, York, Pennsylvania; *former Professor of Journalism*, Boston University; *author*

*Guests:*
- Susan Eckstein, *Associate Professor of Sociology*, Boston University
- Jose Salazar, *former leader of New England anti-Cuban Revolution exiles*
- William Atwood, *former Editor*, Look
- Otilia Meilan, *Chief Legal Adviser*, National Bank of Cuba
- Arthur MacEwan, *Associate Professor of Economics*, University of Massachusetts, Boston
- Miles Frechette, *Coordinator of Cuban Affairs*, Department of State
- Ramon Sanchez Parodi, *Chief of Cuban Interest Section*, Washington, DC

"The Second Stage: Transcending Sexual Politics"
*Betty Friedan*, *Fellow of the Institute of Politics*; *author* of The Feminine Mystique and The Second Stage; *Founder and first President*, National Organization for Women; *original convener* of the National Women's Political Caucus

*Guests:*
- Linda Gordon, *Professor of History*, University of Massachusetts, Boston
- Eric Rofes, *author* of The Kids Book of Divorce
- Avery Corman, *author* of Kramer vs. Kramer
- Ellen Goodman, *columnist*, Boston Globe
- Barry Stein, *Goodmeasure Inc.*
- Carol Gilligan, *Associate Professor of Education*, Harvard Graduate School of Education
- Moshe Safdie, *Israeli architect*
- Joseph Blasi, *Director*, Project for Kibbutz Studies, Harvard

"The Nuts and Bolts of Political Campaigns"
*Nancy Korman*, *partner in 760 Associates*, a public relations firm; *political activist and fund-raising consultant*; *member*, Radcliffe Seminars faculty; *former Finance Chair*, U.S. Representative Barney Frank (D-Massachusetts); *Chair*, Women's Advisory Committee, Kennedy Campaign '80

*Guests:*
- Jack Leslie, *Executive Director*, Fund for a Democratic Majority
- Tubby Harrison, *pollster for Senator Edward Kennedy* (D-Massachusetts)
Michael Ventresca, political consultant
John Corrigan, Director of Field Operations, Michael Dukakis gubernatorial campaign
Brian Delaney, Press Secretary, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Massachusetts)
Daniel Payne, media consultant, Daniel Payne and Associates, Boston
John Florescu, cable television consultant
John Gorman, Vice President, Epsilon Data
Chris Black, political reporter, Boston Globe
Wayne Woodlief, political reporter, Boston Herald
Michael Barrett, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Reading)

"Economic Growth/Economic Justice"
Bob Kuttner, Editor, Working Papers; former national reporter, Washington Post; former chief investigator, U.S. Senate Banking Committee; author of The Revolt of the Haves; former Fellow of the Institute of Politics

Guests:
  Gosta Esping-Andersen, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Harvard
  Sidney Blumenthal, political writer for New York Times Magazine and Boston Globe Magazine
  James Shannon, U.S. Representative (D-Massachusetts)
  Robert Zevin, economic historian; journalist; Senior Vice President, U.S. Trust Company
  Bennett Harrison, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
  Barry Bluestone, Professor, Social Welfare Regional Research Institute, Boston College
  Mark Bloomfield, Director, American Council on Capital Formation
  David Gordon, economist
  Bernard Aronson, Director of Policy, Democratic National Committee

"Curbing the Courts: The Limits of Judicial Power"
Gary L. McDowell, Fellow in Law and Political Science, Harvard Law School; Assistant Professor of Political Science, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Guests:
  Nathan Glazer, Professor of Education and Social Structure, Harvard
  Abram Chayes, Professor of Law, Harvard
  Levin Campbell, Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, First Circuit, Boston
  Hrach Gregorian, Assistant Professor of Government, Simmons College
  Henry Abraham, Professor of Government, University of Virginia
  Eugene Hickok, Professor of Political Science, Dickinson College
  James Cramer, former court reporter, The American Lawyer
"Gay Politics in a Straight System"
Elaine Noble, Deputy Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Boston; Chair, Boston Democratic City Committee

Guests:
- Donna Taylor, Director, Exodus Center
- Bianca Cody Murphy, psychologist
- Steven Tierney, Chair, Massachusetts Gay Legislative Caucus
- Joseph McGowan, Boston gay activist
- Brian McNaught, founder, gay Catholic organization “Dignity”
- Betsy Zelden, attorney, Gay and Lesbian Legal Defense Fund
- Ethan Geto, political consultant who organized campaign against Anita Bryant
- Steven Endean, Chair, National Gay Caucus
- Michael Wasserman, aide to Katherine Kane, Deputy Mayor, Boston

"Southeast Asia after 1975: Peace or War?"
Jean-Christophe Oberg, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard; former Swedish Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and Singapore

Guests:
- Mgo Vinh Lung, specialist in Vietnamese and Chinese history
- J. Kumaraseri, Minister, Embassy of Malaysia
- Benigno Aquino, former Philippine Senator, Associate Fellow in the Center for International Affairs, Harvard
- Morton Abramovitz, former U.S. Ambassador to Thailand

"U.S.-Israel Relations: Prospects for the Mid-Eighties"
Gad Ranon, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former Director, North American Division, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Israel; Member, Israeli Sinai negotiating team; former Press Counsellor, Israeli Embassy, Washington, DC

Guests:
- Thomas Dine, Executive Director, American-Israel Public Affairs Committee
- Major General Menachem Maron, Defense and Military Attache, Israeli Embassy, Washington, DC
- Barry Schochet, Counsel and Staff Member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
- Gilbert Kulick, Deputy Director, Israel-Arab Affairs, State Department

"The U.S. Foreign Policy Decision-making Process"
Sally A. Shelton, Associate Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard; former U.S. Ambassador to ten Eastern Caribbean countries; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America; former Legislative Assistant, U.S. Senate
Guests:

James Cheek, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America
William Miller, former Chief Counsel, Senate Intelligence Committee
Millard Arnold, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights
Samuel Huntington, Director, Center for International Affairs, Harvard
William Maynes, Managing Editor, Foreign Policy

"Going for Governor: The 1982 Massachusetts Race"

Robert L. Turner, political columnist, Boston Globe; MPA candidate,
John F. Kennedy School of Government

Guests:

Chester Atkins, Massachusetts State Senator (D-Concord); Chair, Democratic State Committee
Peter Flynn, Campaign Manager for Governor Edward King, Democratic gubernatorial candidate
John Sasso, Campaign Manager for Michael Dukakis, Democratic gubernatorial candidate
Larry Moulter, Campaign Manager for Tom O'Neill, Democratic gubernatorial candidate
Roger Woodworth, Campaign Manager for John Lakian, Republican gubernatorial candidate
Edward O'Sullivan, state convention floor manager for William Robinson, Republican gubernatorial candidate
John Sears, Republican gubernatorial candidate; former Boston City Councillor
Andrew H. Card, Jr., Republican gubernatorial candidate; Massachusetts State Representative (R-Holbrook)
Ed Reilly, strategist, King campaign
Judith Kurland, Chief of Staff, O'Neill campaign
John Lakian, Republican gubernatorial candidate
Pat Caddell, Cambridge Survey Research, Washington, DC
Robert Squier, media consultant, Dukakis campaign

Summer Research Awards

Each year the Institute offers a limited number of Summer Research Awards to Harvard and Radcliffe undergraduates (freshmen, sophomores, and juniors) for field work contributing to senior honors theses or comparable projects. These research grants provide financial aid during the summer months to encourage direct observation of political and governmental processes within the United States.
The 1982 recipients and their topics were:

Alida Castillo, (Economics) Unemployment in Puerto Rico: Are the Federal Government Programs a Disincentive to Work?
Diane Chira, (Sociology) Women and Public Policy
Edward Cumella, (Sociology/Government) A Social Structural Approach to Urban Politics
Shawn Harriman, (Government) Bipartisanship in the New Hampshire State Legislature
Reginald Hudlin, (Visual and Environmental Studies) Black at Harvard: A Study of Black Politics on Campus
Judith Levenfeld, (Government) Domestic Influences in the Formation of American Foreign Policy: AWACS, a Case Study
Deborah Pege, (Economics) National Science Foundation: The Allocation, Administration, and Management of Research Funding
Sean Reilly, (Government) The Politics of Domestic Energy Production
Kathryn Sessions, (Social Studies) The Interrelations of Government and the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers of North Carolina
David Taylor, (Sociology/Afro-American Studies) Voting Behavior and Voting Attitudes in the South End of Boston
Gilad Troy, (History) Ben Hecht: From Literary Gadfly to Political Activist

Public Affairs Internships

In support of student participation in public sector internships, the Institute offers several services to Harvard undergraduates:

- In conjunction with the Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning, the Institute provides a jobs clearinghouse, where students can learn about internship and employment opportunities in all aspects of politics and public affairs.
- Each year the Institute awards a number of summer internship stipends to students whose financial needs would otherwise prohibit accepting a public sector internship.
- During the winter and spring, the Institute sponsors a series of job seminars aimed at undergraduates interested in public sector internships. Each seminar features several participants familiar with internship availabilities, requirements, and hiring practices, as well as a student who has held a public sector internship.
- The Institute sponsors the annual Summer-in-Washington Program. During the spring, the program helps students find summer housing in the capital. During the summer, it brings together Harvard students working in Washington in a variety of intellectual, social, and athletic activities.
Summer Internship Stipends

The following students received Institute stipends in 1982, permitting them to accept internships with the accompanying organizations:

- Michelle D. Banks, Office of the Public Defender, Camden, New Jersey
- Susan Bitensky, Bet Tzedek Legal Services, Los Angeles
- Menzie David Chinn, House Subcommittee on International Development
  Institutions and Finance, Washington, DC
- Peter C. Choharis, National Journal
- Elizabeth Y. Contreras, office of Congressman Richard C. White (D-Texas),
  Washington, DC
- Douglas F. Curtis, Human Services Forum, Washington, DC
- Sean M. Healey, Public Defender Service, Washington, DC
- Craig Kennedy, Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, Washington, DC.
- Daniel J. Kiley, Massachusetts State House, Boston
- Damon Krukowski, office of City Councilman Henry Stern, New York
- Jeffrey S. Laverty, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services, Boston
- Leo Levenson, office of Shirley Williams, Member of Parliament, London
- Ann Park, office of Congressman Henry A. Waxman (D-California),
  Washington, DC
- Perry Pong, Chinatown Housing and Land Development Task Force, Boston
- Christopher Reyna, office of State Senator David Roberti, Sacramento, California
- Ronald Roach, Massachusetts Black Legislative Caucus, Boston
- Edward D. Rogers, Democratic National Committee, Washington, DC
- Mary Kate Sampson, Institute for Program Evaluation, General Accounting
  Office, Washington, DC
- Deborah S. Smolover, Special Committee on Resolution of Minor Disputes,
  American Bar Association, Washington, DC
- Anastasia E. Thomas, office of San Diego County Supervisor Roger
  Hedgecock, San Diego, California
- David E. Weng, Friends of the Earth, Cambridge

The Summer in Washington Program

The Summer in Washington Program was coordinated by Jamin Raskin in 1982. In addition to developing and compiling substantial housing opportunities for Harvard students spending the summer in DC, the program sponsored a wide-ranging series of activities all summer, which included:

- Discussions with:
  - Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisconsin)
  - Congressman John LeBoutellier (R-New York)
The Student Program

Congressman Edward Markey (D-Massachusetts)
Congressman Barney Frank (D-Massachusetts)
Congressman Thomas Foglietta (D-Pennsylvania)
Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger
Seymour Hersh, author of Kissinger and Nixon in the White House;
former New York Times reporter
Former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski
Chairman of the Republican Party Richard Richards
Marcus Raskin, Director, Institute for Policy Studies
Senator Paul Tsongas (D-Massachusetts)
Congressman Philip Crane (R-Illinois)
Ralph Nader, Consumer Advocate
Morton Halperin, Director, Center for National Security Studies
Supreme Court Justice Byron White
Roy Jones, Legislative Aide to Rev. Jerry Falwell
Michael Parenti, author of Democracy for the Few
Stanley Sienkewicz, special assistant to Undersecretary of State
James Buckley
Hilda Mason, at-large member of the D.C. City Council

• Other activities included:

“A Short Course on the Legislative Process” with Mark Talisman,
lobbyist and former legislative assistant
A barbecue with Former Fellows of the Institute of Politics
A wine and cheese reception with University of Pennsylvania students
on the Hill
Softball games against teams for Senator Strom Thurmond’s office,
Brown University, Smith College, Stanford University, Congressman
Thomas P. O’Neill’s office, and Princeton University
A barbecue with Yale, Princeton, Wellesley, Smith, and University of
Pennsylvania students.

Job Seminars

Two seminars on job hunting in the public sector were sponsored by the Inter­
ships Committee. Panel members were:

November 3, 1981:

Newt Gingrich, U.S. Congressman (R-Georgia)
Cleta Deatherage, Oklahoma State Representative; Member, Hunt
Commission on Presidential Nomination and Selection, Democratic
National Committee, Fellow, Institute of Politics
Eddie Mahe, Republican political consultant; former Executive Director, Republican National Committee; Fellow, Institute of Politics
Rick Howard, Government and Public Affairs Adviser, Harvard Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning

March 23, 1982:

George Bachrach, Massachusetts State Senator (D-Watertown); former Campaign Director, U.S. Representative Edward Markey (D-Massachusetts)
Kenneth Blackwell, City Councillor and former Mayor, Cincinnati; and Fellow, Institute of Politics
Janet Hale, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; former staff member, George Bush 1980 Presidential Campaign.
Rick Howard, Government and Public Affairs Adviser, Harvard Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning
Jamin Raskin, Coordinator, Institute of Politics Summer-in-Washington Program; former intern, New Republic.

Harvard Political Review

The Harvard Political Review is a quarterly journal of political analysis published by the Student Advisory Committee. Its officers during the 1981-82 academic year were:

Neil Folger, Reviews Editor
Lauren Gilbert, Assistant Managing Editor
Laurie Hall, General Manager
Jay Hamilton, Assistant Managing Editor; President
Kirk Jenkins, Associate Editor
Sherill Leonard, President
Mike Lubrano, Business Manager
Marc Paul, Associate Editor
Michael Riseman, Managing Editor
Katarina Sawtelle, Circulation Manager
Mina Silberberg, Business Manager
Peter Spiro, Reviews Editor
John Kent Walker, Associate Editor; Managing Editor
Mark Wilder, Circulation Manager
Robert Yarbrough, Associate Editor
Helene Sahadi York, General Manager
The following is a list of the contents of the four issues of the HPR published during the 1981-82 academic year.

Volume IX/Number 1; Fall 1981
Midsection: The Spectered Isle
“The Changing of the Guard?: The Rise of the Social Democrats,”
John Kent Walker
"Parliament Through the People’s Eyes," Robert M. Worcester
"Reason on the Right," an interview with Norman St. John Stevas, Member of Parliament, former Leader of the House of Commons
"Britain’s Balancing Act," Marc Paul and Robert Yarbrough
"Controlling the Controllers: Reagan Clips PATCO’s Wings,"
Michael Rissman
"Division of Spoils Splits California Legislators," Joseph Keene
"Liberals Retreat, Regroup, and Rethink," John Kent Walker
"America Arms Argentina Again," Lauren Gilbert
"Comparable Worth Raises Wages and Questions," Kirk Jenkins
"Gray Power: Not a Black and White Issue," Helene Sahadi York
"Cabinet Marked by Conflict," Robert G. Yarbrough
"The FCC Tunes in on TV Satellites," Jimmy Goldgeier
"Book of the Review":
Vichy France and the Jews, by Michael R. Marrus and Robert O. Paxton;
and Auschwitz and the Allies, by Martin Gilbert; reviewed by Peter Spiro
Sentimental Imperialists, by James C. Thomson, Jr., Peter W. Stanley, and John Curtis Perry; reviewed by John Lie

Volume IX/Number 2; Winter 1982
Midsection: The New Right and the Law
“Three Paths to Conservative Change,” Jay Hamilton, Joe Keene, and Sherill Leonard
"Fighting Legal Liberalism," an interview with Howard Phillips, National Director, Conservative Caucus, Inc.
"The Ebb and Flow of Justice," an interview with Alan Dershowitz, Professor, Harvard Law School
"Reagan as Pangloss: Good Intentions Gone Bad," Sherill Leonard
"The Delinquent Juvenile Justice System," Laurie Hall
"A Cartoon is Worth a 1,000-Word Column," an interview with Jules Feiffer and Paul Szep
"Is America a Closed Shop?", Kirk Jenkins
"A Radioactive Road to Rio," Lauren Gilbert
"Throwing the Post Out on Its Ear," David E. Sanger
"Regulated at Home, Reckless Abroad," Jimmy Morales
“Books of the Review”:

*Breakthrough*, by Moshe Dayan; reviewed by Mina Silberberg
*National Defense*, by James Fallows; reviewed by Peter Spiro
*The Second Stage*, by Betty Friedan; reviewed by Ellen Hume

Volume IX/Number 3; Spring 1982
Midsection: Nuclear Protest

“Armistice or Armageddon?”, Lauren Gilbert, James Goldgeier, John Lie, and Helene Sahadi York
“Race Without Winners,” Dr. Helen Caldicott
“A Final Test,” Paul Walker
“Iceland Cools Toward Cold War Powers,” Peter Spiro
“EPA Confronts Gorsuch and Other Health Hazards,” Neil Folger
“Waging War Over the Prevailing Wage,” Kirk Jenkins
“A Recession by Any Other Name,” Robert G. Yarbrough
“Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail,” Laurie Hall

“Books of the Review”:

*The Ugly Truth About Milton Friedman*, by Lyndon LaRouche; reviewed by Kirk Jenkins
*Witness to Power*, by John Ehrlichman; reviewed by Neil Folger
*Human Rights*, by Lars Schoultz; reviewed by Wayne McDuffy

Volume IX/Number 4; Summer 1982
Midsection: Business as Usual

“Minding Their Own Business,” an interview with Ralph Nader
“The Business of Governing,” Mike Lubrano, Kirk Jenkins, and John Lie
“Reagan’s Micro Macro: Reagan Abandons Equity for Efficiency,” Alan Stone
“The High Ground of High Ideals?”, John Kent Walker
“Public Television Advertises for Help,” Neil Folger
“Sun, Surf, and Simmering Discontent,” Jimmy Morales
“Energy Cutbacks Spark a Solar-Heated Debate,” John Kent Walker
“Reagan Goes Back on Moynihan’s Promise,” Robert G. Yarbrough
"Nicaragua: After the Deluge," an interview with Francisco Fiallos Navarro,
Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States
"‘Indecent’ Broadcasts: A Not in TV’s Cable," Stuart N. Brotman
"Can Trickle-down Fill the Basin?", Vilna Waldron
"Books of the Review":
The Kennedy Imprisonment by Garry Wills; reviewed by Alexander
Kaplan
An End to Silence, edited by Stephen Cohen; reviewed by Sean Reilly
The Pursuit of Virtue and Other Tory Nortions, by George Will; reviewed
by Marc Wilder
Strictly Personal and Confidential, edited by Monte M. Poen; reviewed by
Peter Spiro

Special Projects

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

A panel discussion entitled “Organizing as a Political Strategy,” October 15,
1981, co-sponsored with Phillips Brooks House. Participants were:

Mary Mitchell, Chair, Massachusetts 9 to 5
Mike Regan, President, Mass Fair Share
Peter Dreier, Founder, Massachusetts Tenants Organization
Ron Bloom, Service Employees International Union
Moderator: David Blankenhorn, Boston Fair Share

A speech by Michael Harrington entitled “Other Visions of America,” October
16, 1981, co-sponsored with the Harvard-Radcliffe Democratic Socialist Organiz­
ing Committee.

“Cambridge Candidates Nights,” co-sponsored with the Cambridge League of
Women Voters, the Cambridge Democratic City Committee, and the Cambridge
Republican City Committee. City Council candidates appeared on October 22,
1981; School Committee candidates appeared on October 26, 1981. Moderator:
Dr. Renee Sperber, President, Cambridge League of Women Voters.

A panel discussion entitled “Handgun Control: Problems and Possibilities,”
November 2, 1981, co-sponsored with the Harvard Coalition for Handgun Con­
trol and the Harvard-Radcliffe Democratic Club. Participants were:
John Buckley, former Sheriff, Middlesex County, Massachusetts
Warren Cassidy, former Mayor, Lynn, Massachusetts; member, Board of
Directors, National Rifle Association
Mark H. Moore, Florence and Daniel H. Guggenheim Professor of Criminal
Justice, Policy Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Moderator: Susan Estrich, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

A panel discussion entitled "Proposition 2½ and Massachusetts's Future," February 11, 1982, co-sponsored with the Harvard Radcliffe Democratic Club. Participants, who were candidates for the Democratic nomination for Lieutenant Governor in Massachusetts, were:

John Kerry, Assistant District Attorney, Middlesex County, Massachusetts
Evelyn Murphy, former Secretary of Environmental Affairs, Massachusetts
Louis Nickinello, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Natick)
Lois Pines, former New England Director, Federal Trade Commission
Samuel Rotundi, Massachusetts State Senator (D-Winchester)

A panel discussion entitled "Qaddafi's Libya," March 25, 1982, co-sponsored with the Center for Middle Eastern Studies. Participants were:

Omar Fathaly, Professor of Government, Florida State University
William Zartmann, Director of African Studies, Johns Hopkins University
Lisa Anderson, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard
Donald Snook, Senior Public Affairs Adviser, Middle East Policy, Exxon
Corporation
Moderator: A.J. Meyer, Professor of Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard

A panel discussion entitled "Extremist Groups in America: Their Impact Upon Black and Jewish Communities," April 19, 1982, co-sponsored with the Harvard/Radcliffe Black Students Association. Participants were:

Leonard Zakim, Civil Rights Director, Anti-Defamation League, Boston
B'rai Brith
Joseph Feaster, President, Boston Chapter, National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People
Tony Sager, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Massachusetts
Moderator: Walter Broadnax, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy
School of Government

"The 1982 Hispanic Politics Conference: Prospects for Political Success," April 23 and 24, 1982, co-sponsored with Harvard-Radcliffe La Raza. The films "Chicana" and "Puerto Rico: Paradise Invaded" were shown. Speakers were:

Maggie Rivas, Boston Globe
Awilda Ramos, La Semana
Pedro Ruiz Garza, Executive Director, SER—Jobs for Progress
Jorge Quiroga, reporter, WCVB-TV; host, "Aqui," WCVB-TV
David Montoya, Chair, Forum of National Hispanic Organizations; President, National Image, Inc.
Martin Poblete, Professor, St. Thomas Aquinas College
Henry Zuniga, Deputy Special Assistant to the President, Office of Public Liaison, White House.
Magdaleno Rose-Avila, Director, Hispanic Desk, Democratic National Committee
Olga Mendez, New York State Senator
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

A speech entitled "Who Cares About Gay People?", April 25, 1982, co-sponsored with the Gay and Lesbian Awareness Day Planning Committee. The speaker was Brian McNaught, author of A Disturbed Peace.

The Feminist Politics and Public Policy Series

The Feminist Politics and Public Policy Series was designed to encourage the participation of undergraduate women in the student program and to show that feminist perspectives can provide legitimate critiques of "traditional" political or public policy concerns. A year-long program, the series reached out to a number of different communities, with 1500 people from Harvard, Radcliffe, groups on other campuses, and Massachusetts women's organizations attending.

A panel discussion entitled "Feminist Perspectives on Women in the Labor Movement," October 20, 1981, co-sponsored with the Radcliffe Union of Students. The films "We Dig Coal" (Boston-area premiere) and "With Babies and Banners" were shown. Participants were:

Susan Ware, Lecturer on History, Harvard
Mary Mitchell, Chair, Massachusetts 9 to 5

A panel discussion entitled "Betty Friedan: The Second Stage," November 10, 1981, co-sponsored by the Radcliffe Union of Students and the Schlesinger Library. Participants were:

Betty Friedan, author of The Second Stage
Jane Edmonds, former Chair, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination
Ethel Klein, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard
Anita Diamant, commentator, WBUR; reporter and columnist, Boston Phoenix
Moderator: Margaret McKenna, Director, Mary Ingraham Bunting Institute, Radcliffe

A panel discussion entitled "Feminism and Religion: A Contradiction in Terms?", December 4, 1981. Participants were:

Sonia Johnson, Founder, Mormons for the ERA
Cathy Felix, Rabbi, Chaplain at Brown University
Claire McGowan, Sister of the Dominican Order
Jane Heckles, Minister of the United Church of Christ
Moderator: Dr. Francine Cardman, Professor, Weston School of Theology

A panel discussion entitled "Women and the New Federalism: Finding Strategies for Survival," March 11, 1982, co-sponsored with Phillips Brooks House Women's Affairs Committee and Massachusetts Women's Equity Action League. Participants were:

Pat Reuss, Legislative Director, Women's Equity Action League
Delores Mitchell, former Health and Human Services Director, Massachusetts
Betsy Stengel, Director of Legislation, Boston University Hospital
Maria Platé, social welfare lobbyist, Meredith and Associates

A panel discussion entitled "Gaining Political Access: Is Affirmative Action the Best Route for Women?", March 17, 1982, co-sponsored with the Harvard-Radcliffe Democratic Club. Participants were:

Pat Bailey, Federal Trade Commissioner
Mary Crisp, former Chair, National Unity Campaign for John Anderson
Saundra Graham, Cambridge City Councillor; Massachusetts State Representative (D-Cambridge)
Betty Heitman, Co-chair, Republican National Committee
Ann Lewis, Political Director, Democratic National Committee
Sissy Weinberg, former Executive Director, Massachusetts Democratic State Committee
Moderator: Susan Estrich, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

A panel discussion entitled "Does Ronald Reagan Have a Woman Problem?", April 13, 1982, co-sponsored with the National Women's Political Caucus and the Kennedy School Women's Association. Participants were:

Robert Drinan, President, Americans for Democratic Action
Sally Lunt, Vice Chair, National Women's Political Caucus
John Deardourff, Chairman of the Board, Bailey, Deardourff and Associates
Maria Jiménez Van Hoy, President, National Conference of Puerto Rican Women

Moderator: Carol Mueller, political sociologist, Tufts University
The Delta District Project

This summer three students were sponsored for a five-day trip to Mississippi's Second District to work on the Democratic Congressional primary campaign of former Institute of Politics Fellow Robert Clark. The students, James Goldgeier '83, Robert Yarbrough '84, and Jay Hamilton '83, all members of the Student Advisory Committee, prepared position papers, distributed literature in housing projects in Tchula, Mississippi, and joined the candidate's caravan on a Sunday swing through eight churches.

Guests

The Guests Committee administers the Visiting Fellows Program. Selected on the basis of distinguished experience in active political life, Visiting Fellows are invited to spend brief periods at Harvard, during which they meet with interested undergraduates, faculty members, and IOP Fellows.

Robert Healy, Washington Bureau Chief of the Boston Globe, spent March 17 and 18 as a Visiting Fellow. During his visit, Healy addressed a study group, lunched with IOP Fellows, and met with representatives of several undergraduate publications.

In addition, Guests Committee members helped host the Newly Elected Mayors Conference and the Conference on Parties and the Nominating Process, and assisted with several Forum events.
The Fellows Program

The Panel on Fellowship

Manuel Carballo  
Lawrence S. DiCara  
Robert Edwards, Spring  
Archie Epps  
Dan Fenn  
Julie Friedli, Spring  
James Goldgeier  
Nancy Hoffmeier, Fall  
Paul Holtzman  
Ethel Klein  
Lance M. Liebman  
Richard J. Light  
Michael Lipsky  
A. Douglas Matthews  
Ernest R. May  
Jonathan Moore  
Richard E. Neustadt  
Don K. Price  
Ann Ramsay  
Antonio Norberto Rivera-Zamora, Fall  
Robin Schmidt  
Stanley S. Surrey, Chair  
William E. Trueheart  
Paul Ylvisaker

Fellows' Alumni Advisory Committee

Robert Bradford  
Alvin J. Bronstein, Chair  
Bernard R. Gifford  
Stephen H. Hess  
David Keene  
Evelyn Murphy  
Martin F. Nolan  
Philip J. Rutledge  
Mark E. Talisman
Institute Fellows

Fall

Clleta Deatherage, Oklahoma State Representative; Member, Hunt Commission on Presidential Nomination and Selection, Democratic National Committee. During her semester at Harvard, Ms. Deatherage studied the new federalism and its potential impact on the states. She led a study group entitled "Mr. Smith Leaves Washington: The Federalism of the 80's."

Ellen Hume, Washington correspondent, Los Angeles Times. For her independent study, Ms. Hume examined the relationship between the government and the news media. Her study group was entitled "Media Politics: How Newsmakers Manage the News."

Eddie Mahe, Republican political consultant. During his Fellowship, Mr. Mahe analyzed the future of the Republican Party. He conducted a study group entitled "Political Parties of the 80's."

William C. Velasquez, Executive Director, Southwest Voter Registration Project. For his independent study, Mr. Velasquez investigated the political influence of the Chicano voting bloc. His study group was entitled "Chicano Politics in the Southwest."

Yao Wei, Chief of Press Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China. While at Harvard, Mr. Yao studied the foreign policy decision-making process in the U.S. He led a study group entitled "The Evolution of U.S.-China Policy, 1954-1979: The Chinese Perspective."

Percy Wilson, former Peace Corps Director, Sierra Leone, Africa. For his independent project, Mr. Wilson began writing about his experiences in Africa. He led a study group entitled "The Impact of U.S. Foreign Aid on Africa's Development."

Spring

Kenneth Blackwell, Associate Vice President for Community Relations, Xavier University; City Council member, Cincinnati. While a Fellow, Mr. Blackwell studied proposed changes in federal programs, and their implications for state and local governments. His study group was entitled "The Reagan Administration's New Federalism."

Francis Duehay, City Councillor, Cambridge. During his Fellowship, Mr. Duehay examined methods whereby Harvard and the city of Cambridge could better utilize each other's resources. His study group was entitled "Proposition 2½ and Reaganomics at Work in Massachusetts."

Albert Eisele, author; journalist; former Press Secretary to Vice President Walter Mondale. At Harvard, Mr. Eisele began work on a biography of Cardinal Cushing. He led a study group entitled "Government vs. the News Media: A View from Both Sides."
Betty Friedan, author of The Second Stage and The Feminine Mystique. During her Fellowship, Ms. Friedan began research for her next book, which will examine changing sex roles and the aging process. Her study group was entitled "The Second Stage: Transcending Sexual Politics."

James Higgins, journalist; former Editor, Gazette and Daily, York, Pennsylvania.
For his independent project, Mr. Higgins began writing a book on the problems of contemporary city governments. He led a study group entitled "The Cuban Revolution: 1959 to the Present."

Gad Ranon, Director, North American Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Israel. During his Fellowship, Mr. Ranon studied U.S. policy options in the Middle East. His study group was entitled "U.S.-Israel Relations: Prospects for the Mid-Eighties."

Fellows Luncheon Speakers

Weekly luncheons with members of the Harvard community and other distinguished guests have become a tradition of the Fellows Program. Guest speakers this year were:

Fall

Roger Fisher, Samuel Williston Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Laurence Fouraker, President, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Edsel Bryant Ford Professor of Business, Harvard Business School
George Kistiakowsky, Abbott and James Lawrence Professor of Chemistry Emeritus, Harvard; former White House Science Adviser
Sissela Bok, Lecturer on Medical Ethics, Department of Social Medicine and Health Policy, Harvard
Geoffrey Smith, political writer, The Times of London
Ithiel de Sola Poole, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Director, MIT Research Program on Communications Policy
William Shannon, former U.S. Ambassador to Ireland; Professor, Boston University
Benigno Aquino, Associate Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard
Ellen Goodman, columnist, Boston Globe
Sonya Hamlin, communications consultant/trainer and TV post-producer, Boston and New York

The Nieman Foundation Fellows
A dinner program entitled "An Evening with James Michael Curley," presented by James Balvin, historian and Robert Manning, editor, Boston Publishing Company
Spring

Roger Fisher, Samuel Williston Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Alan Dershowitz, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Christopher Lydon, Anchor, Ten O'Clock News, WGBH-TV, Boston
Adam Ulam, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science, Harvard; Director, Harvard Russian Research Center
Robert Brustein, Director, Loeb Drama Center; Professor of English, Harvard
David McCullough, author of Mornings on Horseback and Path Between the Seas
E.O. Wilson, Frank B. Baird Professor of Science, Harvard
Paul Sweezy, economist; author
Carl Brauer, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics
Jean Kilbourne, social commentator; researcher on images of women in advertising
David Nyhan, political writer, Boston Globe
Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Helen Caldicott, President, Physicians for Social Responsibility
William O. Taylor, Publisher, Boston Globe
Thomas Winship, Editor, Boston Globe
Martin Nolan, Editor, Editorial Page, Boston Globe; former Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Larry Speakes, Deputy White House Press Secretary

The Nieman Foundation Fellows

A dinner program entitled "Strategic Weapons Management and Control," presented by Abram Chayes, Felix Frankfurter Professor of Law, Harvard Law School; and Antonia Chayes, Adjunct Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Undersecretary, Department of Air Force.
The Faculty Studies Program

Legislative Reapportionment

The Study Group on Legislative Reapportionment is currently completing its final report, planned for publication in the fall of 1982. The report will examine the history of redistricting, the frequency and effects of gerrymandering, and the policy options available. It will include the results of a large-scale survey, which asked state legislative leaders, state political party chairs, and reform leaders for their views on alternate methods of redistricting.

Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, is chair of the group. He has been assisted by Andrew Robertson, a doctoral candidate in history at Brandeis University, and Isaac Shapiro, a master of public policy degree candidate at the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Constitutional Change

The Study Group on Constitutional Change was formed in the fall of 1981 in response to growing sentiment in favor of major changes in the structures of American government. Major areas of investigation thus far have included executive-legislative relations and the Congressional budget process. The study to date has indicated that major restructuring of constitutional mechanisms is unnecessary, and that considerable institutional reform is possible within the current constitutional framework.

The study group is currently considering the establishment of three interlocking faculty groups to explore issues of institutional change. One group would be a research seminar for faculty members writing on specific issues. A second group would develop a course for the Kennedy School. A third group would continue to meet with officials directly involved in dealing with the tensions of the political system.

In the course of its initial work, the group has held discussion sessions with:

Anne Wexler, Assistant to the President, Carter Administration
Eugene Eidenberg, Secretary to the Cabinet and Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs, Carter Administration
Alonzo McDonald, Assistant to the President and Staff Director, Carter Administration
Richard Bolling, U.S. Representative (D-Missouri); Chairman, House Rules Committee
Stuart E. Eizenstadt, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy, Carter Administration
Richard Cheney, U.S. Representative (R-Wyoming)
Bruce E. Babbit, Governor of Arizona
Barber B. Conable, Jr., U.S. Representative (R-New York)
The Faculty Studies Program

Alice M. Rivlin, Director, Congressional Budget Office
Richard G. Darman, Assistant to the President and Deputy to the Chief of Staff, Reagan Administration

Study Group members are:

Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, Harvard
David Blumenthal, Executive Director, Center for Health Policy Management, Harvard; Josiah Macy Fellow, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Hugh C. Hecl, Professor of Government, Harvard
Philip B. Heymann, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
David T. Kresge, Deputy Director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard
Ernest R. May, Charles Warren Professor of American History, Harvard
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Roger Porter, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Don K. Price, Albert J. Weatherhead III and Richard W. Weatherhead Professor of Public Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government

The State and the Poor

The Faculty Study Group on the State and the Poor was initially formed in 1970 to examine the capabilities and responsibilities of a state government to mitigate the impact of poverty. A book entitled The State and the Poor (Cambridge: Winthrop, 1970) was the end result of the study group's findings.

The question of what a state government can and ought to do about poverty was resurrected by the Reagan Administration's concept of "new federalism," and this precipitated the formation of the second faculty study group on the State and the Poor, which will try to answer that question in the context of Massachusetts in the eighties. A book of its findings is scheduled to be published just after the 1982 Massachusetts gubernatorial elections.

Study Group members are:

Manuel Carballo, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Secretary of Health and Social Services, Wisconsin, Chair
The Campaign Finance Study Group, under a grant from the U.S. Senate Rules Committee, investigated the impact of federal election campaign laws upon the conduct of presidential campaigns. Released in March 1982, the group's report concluded that troublesome problems exist regarding federal spending restrictions on candidate organizations, political parties, and others seeking to influence electoral outcomes. The study group drafted a set of sixteen recommended legislative changes.

Study group members are currently developing a proposal to evaluate campaign law enforcement at the federal level, contrasting structures and authorities to those of state-level counterparts. In addition, the group hopes to share its understanding of federal election law with others researching the political and institutional mechanisms of presidential selection.

Members of the study group are:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University, Chair
Joel Fleishman, Vice Chancellor of the University; Chairman, Department of Public Studies; and Professor of Law and Policy Sciences, Duke University
Presidential Transition

In the several weeks following election and in the several months following inauguration, a new president makes a series of critical choices about personnel, organization, and policy. What he decides, or fails to decide, during this period fundamentally shapes his ability to govern for the next four years.

The Institute of Politics has long been interested in presidential transition. In the spring of 1980, a Faculty Study Group on Presidential Transition was formed under the chairmanship of Ernest R. May, Professor of History. The group's nonpartisan report was not prescriptive in policy or process matters; rather, it was designed to provide insights into the procedural options that confront a new president. The report was submitted to the staff of President-elect Reagan the day after the election.

Now, with the assistance of the grant from the Ford Foundation, the Institute has engaged historian Carl M. Brauer as a Research Fellow to write an analytical history of presidential transitions since 1952. No such reference work now exists; this book, to be completed in 1984, promises to be a useful tool for new Presidents and their staffs, as well as an informative guide for the press and the public.

Dr. Brauer is being assisted by an oversight committee of veteran transition advisers:

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Laurence E. Lynn, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ernest R. May, Charles Warren Professor of American History, Harvard
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Professional Study Programs


The Institute, along with the United States Conference of Mayors, conducted an intensive four-day seminar for newly-elected mayors. Additional support was provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Sears, Roebuck and Company.

The broad purpose of the seminar was to assist new mayors in making optimal use of the transition period and the crucial early months in office. To this end, 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. Specific topics addressed included 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, 1977, and 1979.

The 1981 participants included:

- Emile Beaulieu, Manchester, New Hampshire
- Gordon Bricken, Santa Ana, California
- James Chase, Spokane, Washington
- Gregory Cox, Chula Vista, California
- Joseph Daddona, Allentown, Pennsylvania
- Alvin DuPont, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
- John Forbis, Greensboro, North Carolina
- Ruth Yannatta Goldway, Santa Monica, California
- Ron Gonzales, Sunnyvale, California
- Caroline Ham, Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Harry Kinney, Albuquerque, New Mexico
- Tony Knowles, Anchorage, Alaska
- Paul Leonard, Dayton, Ohio
- Sheila Lodge, Santa Barbara, California
- Gerald McCann, Jersey City, New Jersey
- Francis McCauley, Quincy, Massachusetts
- Terry McKane, Lansing, Michigan
- James McNulty, Scranton, Pennsylvania
- Raul Martinez, Hialeah, Florida
- Thirman Milner, Hartford, Connecticut
- Thomas O'Connor, Norwalk, Connecticut
- Charles K. Peart, Davenport, Iowa
- Chuck Pickering, Westland, Michigan
Cameron Priebe, Taylor, Michigan
James Randlett, Warren, Michigan
Arnold I. Rue, Stockton, California
Harvey Sloan, Louisville, Kentucky

The faculty included:

T. Dustin Alward, Regional Vice President, International Association of Fire Fighters, Boston
Carol Bellamy, President, New York City Council
Rick Borten, Cable TV Regulator, Boston
Jon Brock, Visiting Lecturer, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington
David M. Brown, Lecturer, Yale School of Organization and Management
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Roger Dahl, Director, Labor-Management Relations Service, United States Conference of Mayors
Cleta Deatherage, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Oklahoma State Representative
Michael Dukakis, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Governor, Massachusetts
Barry Gottehrer, Vice President for Public Affairs, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company
John Gunther, Executive Director, United States Conference of Mayors
Donald Haider, Director, Public and Not-for-Profit Management Program, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Robert Hastings, Editor, Editorial Page, Lynn (Massachusetts) Daily Evening Item
Franklin J. Havelick, Special Adviser to the Mayor, New York
C.A. Howlett, Executive Assistant to the Mayor, Phoenix
John Isaackson, Pequod Associates
Ira A. Jackson, Associate Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Fay Smulevitz Joyce, Political Editor, St. Petersburg Times, St. Petersburg, Florida
George Latimer, Mayor, St. Paul, Minnesota
Timothy Leland, Managing Editor, Daily, Boston Globe
Martin Linsky, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Sheila Mahony, Vice President and Director of Franchise, Cablevision, Woodbury, New York
Louis Masotti, Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Chuck Matthei, Institute for Community Economics, Greenfield, Massachusetts
Tom Moody, Mayor, Columbus, Ohio.  
Ernest Morial, Mayor, New Orleans, Louisiana  
David S. Mundel, Director, Employment and Economic Policy Administration, Boston  
Patrick V. Murphy, President, Police Foundation, Washington, DC  
Tom Oliphant, political reporter, Boston Globe  
George Peterson, Program Director, Center of Public Finance and Research Urban Institute, Washington, DC  
J. Steven Rhodes, Special Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Relations  
Charles Rogovin, Associate Dean, Temple University School of Law, Philadelphia  
Emanuel S. Savas, Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC  
Kirk Scharfenberg, Deputy Editor, Boston Globe  
Peter Sleeper, City Hall reporter, Boston Herald American  
Hubert Williams, Director, Police Department, Newark, New Jersey  
Janet Wu, reporter, WGBH-TV, Boston  
James Young, Executive Vice President, Cabot, Cabot & Forbes, Boston

The administrative staff included:

Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Seminar Coordinator  
Theresa A. Donovan, Administrative Coordinator  
William G. Mayer, Curriculum Coordinator

Student support was supervised by:

Kathy Goodman, Overall Student Coordinator  
Bruce Ives, Curriculum Notebook Coordinator

Mayoral research and recruiting were handled by:

Bill Anderson  
Brian Gallogly  
Beverly Paul  
Jim Reeder

Secretarial support was provided by:

Pamela Gagnon  
Elaine Rossignol

A final Summary Report on the seminar was published in April, 1982.
Seminar on Social Security for National Political Journalists December 13–14, 1981

The Institute brought together eighteen national reporters and editors for an intensive two-day seminar on the Social Security system. A distinguished faculty discussed the system's history, its immediate and long-range problems, and potential policy solutions.

The participants included:

Timothy Adams, Cox Newspapers
Steve Berg, Minneapolis Tribune
Timothy Clark, National Journal
Richard Cooper, Los Angeles Times
Jim Craig, Houston Post
John Falka, Wall Street Journal
Richard Fly, Dallas Times Herald
Meryl Gordon, Gannett News Service
William Hines, Chicago Sun-Times
Sheila Kast, ABC News
David Lightman, Hartford Courant
Pat Owens, Newsday
Spencer Rich, Washington Post
Jeanne Saddler, Time
Jon Sawyer, St. Louis Post-Dispatch
Peggy Simpson, Boston Herald American
Marsha Taylor, Newhouse News Service
Tom Waterson, Christian Science Monitor

The faculty included:

Henry Aaron, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
Lance Liebman, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
George Masnick, Associate Professor, Department of Behavioral Sciences, Harvard School of Public Health; Associate, Harvard Center for Population Studies
Alycia Munnell, Vice President and economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Stanford G. Ross, Partner, Califano, Ross & Heineman, Washington DC
Thomas Woodruff, Visiting Associate Professor, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University

The program was coordinated by Martin Linsky, assisted by Stephen Bates, Elizabeth Pleasants, and David Strickland.
Sub-Cabinet Seminar in Professional Public Management January 15–16, 1982

An experimental Seminar in Professional Public Management was held for twenty-five sub-cabinet officials in the Reagan Administration on January 15 and 16, 1982, in the Old Executive Office Building, Washington, DC. The program, which was co-sponsored by the White House Office of Cabinet Affairs and the John F. Kennedy School of Government, is expected to become institutionalized with a series of seminars designed to enhance the managerial effectiveness of recently appointed political executives at the sub-cabinet level. The project was developed and negotiated over a period of eighteen months by Jonathan Moore, Director of the Institute of Politics, working with Edwin Meese and Craig Fuller of the White House staff. Other members of the Harvard faculty involved in the seminar included:

Mark H. Moore, Florence and Daniel Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice, Policy Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joseph L. Bower, Professor of Business Administration, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration
Philip Heymann, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Peter Zimmerman, Assistant Dean and Director of Executive Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Seminar on Nuclear Arms Control for National Political Journalists June 13–14, 1982

As the nuclear arms debate became increasingly a subject of media coverage, the Institute conducted a two-day seminar for journalists who cover the issue. Strategic matters, proliferation questions, and policy options were among the topics discussed.

The participants included:

Joseph Albright, Cox Newspapers
George Bates, Boston Herald American
Steve Bosh, Independent Network News
Raymond Coffey, Chicago Tribune
John Dillin, Christian Science Monitor
Robert Dudney, U.S. News and World Report
John Fialka, Wall Street Journal
John Fogerty, San Francisco Chronicle
Dan Haney, Associated Press
James Klurfeld, Newsday
Jeff Mapes, Scripps League Newspapers
Christopher Redman, Time
William Ringle, Gannett News Service
J. Randolph Ryan, Boston Globe
Robert Toth, Los Angeles Times
Jerome Watson, Chicago Sun-Times
Christopher Wright, ABC News

The faculty included:

Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy and Academic Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Catherine McArdle Kelleher, Professor of Military Strategy, National War College
Jan M. Lodal, Executive Vice President, Director, and co-founder, American Management Systems, Inc.
Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Professor of Government, Harvard
Thomas C. Schelling, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

The program was coordinated by Martin Linsky, assisted by Elizabeth Pleasants and David Strickland.
Special Projects

The Campaign for President: 1980 in Retrospect

On December 5, 6, and 7, 1980, the Institute hosted its third post-election conference of the major decisionmakers from each presidential candidate's campaign organization to recount and review with their actions and perceptions of the campaign. A transcript of the conference, edited and introduced by Jonathan Moore, was published by the Ballinger Publishing Company in the fall of 1981 entitled The Campaign for President: 1980 in Retrospect. Elizabeth Pleasants, principal assistant to Jonathan Moore, coordinated the production of the book. Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director of the Institute of Politics, and staff assistant Alan Mitter also contributed to the book's production.

The Parties and the Nominating Process

A conference on “The Parties and the Nominating Process” was held December 4, 5, and 6, 1981. Sponsored by the Institute of Politics and the Democratic and Republican National Committees, the conference addressed the presidential nominating process and how to strengthen the role of parties within it. Prepared comments, which had been published in a special issue of Commensense magazine just prior to the conference, were presented and discussed at the round-table sessions. Presentations and discussions of draft findings and recommendations occupied the agenda of the closing session. Conference participants included:

- Ernest Angelo, Jr., Chair, RNC Committee to Study Election Reform
- F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University; Chair, Institute of Politics Campaign Finance Study Group
- Michael E. Baroody, Director of Public Affairs, White House
- Polly Baca Barragan, Vice Chair, Democratic National Committee
- Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, Harvard
- John F. Bibby, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
- Mrs. Don C. Boulton, Member, RNC Committee to Study Election Reform
- E. Mark Braden, House Counsel, Republican National Committee
- Ronald H. Brown, Deputy Chairman, Democratic National Committee
- Carol F. Casey, Executive Director, Vermont State Democratic Committee
- Paul Douglas Coverdell, George State Senator
- William J. Crotty, Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University
- Cleta Deatherage, Oklahoma State Representative; Member, DNC
- Commission on Presidential Nomination; Fellow of the Institute of Politics
- Dennis H. Dunn, Member, RNC Committee to Study Election Reform
- Eugene Eidenberg, Director, Democratic National Committee
- Susan Elbow, MPA '83, Conference Coordinator
Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr., National Chair, Republican State Chairman's Association
Walter E. Fauntroy, U.S. Representative (D-District of Columbia)
Geraldine A. Ferraro, U.S. Representative (D-New York)
Donald L. Fowler, Member, Executive Committee, Democratic National Committee
Charles V. Hamilton, Professor of Government, Columbia University
Margaret M. Heckler, U.S. Representative (R-Massachusetts)
Paul B. Henry, Michigan State Representative
James B. Hunt, Jr., Chair, DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination; Governor, North Carolina
Xandra Kayden, Member, Institute of Politics Campaign Finance Study Group
Everett Carll Ladd, Executive Director, Roper Center, University of Connecticut
James I. Lengle, Assistant Professor of Government, Georgetown University
Louise Lindblom, Executive Director, Alabama State Democratic Committee
Eddie Mahe, Republican political consultant; Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Trudy McDonald, Member, RNC Committee to Study Election Reform
Ginny Martinez, Member, RNC Committee to Study Election Reform
Donald F. Michael, Chair, Indiana State Democratic Committee
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Martha C. Moore, Member, RNC Committee to Study Election Reform
Roger Allen Moore, General Counsel, Republican National Committee
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Dennis M. Olsen, Member, RNC Committee To Study Election Reform
Gary R. Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Jane Patterson, Member, Technical Advisory Committee to DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination
Nelson W. Polsby, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley
Douglas W. Prescott, New York State Assemblyman
David Price, Staff Director, DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination
John Rendon, Member, Technical Advisory Committee to DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination
Mark Q. Rhoads, Illinois State Senator
Henry B. Sayler, Florida State Senator
Antonin Scalia, Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School
Richard Scammon, Director, Elections Research Center
Melvin L. Schweitzer, Counsel, New York State Democratic Committee
Mark A. Siegel, Co-Chair, Technical Advisory Committee to DNC Commission on Presidential Nomination
Television and the Presidential Elections

The Institute of Politics sponsored a conference entitled “Television and the Presidential Elections” on January 29, 30, and 31, 1982. The conference, which was jointly underwritten by ABC, CBS, and NBC, consisted of four working sessions and one wrap-up session conducted by a moderator using the Socratic method.

Conference moderators included:

Benno C. Schmidt, Jr., Professor of Law, Columbia University School of Law
Floyd Abrams, communications attorney; Lecturer on Law, Columbia University School of Law
Anthony Lewis, Columnist, New York Times; Lecturer on Law, Harvard Law School
Tyrone Brown, former Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission; member, Steptoe & Johnson, Washington, DC
Ithiel de Sola Pool, Professor of Political Science and Director, Research Program on Communications Policy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Participants/observers included:

Graham T. Allison, Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joseph Angotti, Executive Producer, NBC News
Roone Arledge, President, ABC News and Sports
F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University; Chair, Institute of Politics Campaign Finance Study Group
Ben H. Bagdikian, Professor, Graduate School of Journalism, University of California at Berkeley
Derek C. Bok, President, Harvard University
Tom Brokaw, News Correspondent, NBC News
Ronald H. Brown, Deputy Chairman, Democratic National Committee; 
Partner, Patton, Boggs & Blow, Washington
Harold Bruno, Jr., Director of Political Coverage, ABC News
Adam Clymer, Political Correspondent, New York Times
Les Crystal, Senior Executive Producer, Political Coverage and Special 
Programs, NBC News
John D. Deardourff, Chairman of the Board, Bailey, Deardourff & 
Associates
Edwin Diamond, Editorial Director, Ad Week
Elizabeth Drew, political writer, The New Yorker; and author
David L. Garth, President, Garth Group
Henry Geller, Director, Washington Center for Public Policy Research
David R. Gergen, Assistant to the President for Communications
Alan Gerson, Vice President, Law and Broadcast Administration, NBC News
Jeffrey Cralnick, Vice President and Executive Producer, Special Events, 
ABC News
Mimi Gurbst, Associate Producer, ABC News
Betty Hudson, Vice President, Corporate Relations, NBC, Inc.
W. Hamilton Jordan, Distinguished Visiting Fellow, Emory University
Jack Kiermaier, Vice President, Public Affairs, CBS Inc.
Ernest Leiser, Vice President and Special Assistant to the President, 
CBS News
William Leonard, President, CBS News
Martin Linsky, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Stuart Loory, Vice President and Managing Editor, Cable News Network
Robert MacNeil, Executive Editor, MacNeil-Lehrer Report
Mary McInnis, Assistant General Counsel, CBS, Inc.
Newton N. Minow, former Chair, Federal Communications Commission; 
Partner, Sidley and Austin, Chicago
Warren Mitofsky, Director, Election/Survey Unit, CBS News
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Jo Moring, Vice President, Radio News, NBC News
Bruce Morton, Correspondent, CBS News
Roger Mudd, Chief Washington Correspondent, NBC News
Robert J. Murphy, Director of News Coverage, ABC News
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration 
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard M. Neustadt, Communications Attorney, Kirkland & Ellis, 
Washington, DC
David R. Obey, U.S. Representative, (D-Wisconsin)
Anthony Oettinger, Gordon McKay Professor of Applied Mathematics and 
Professor of Information Resources Policy, Harvard
Stan Opotowsky, Director of Political Operations, ABC News
The Revson Study

The Charles H. Revson foundation announced this spring that it will sponsor a three-year study aimed at identifying the ways in which media affect policy-making by the federal government. Martin Linsky, Assistant Director of the Institute of Politics, is the project's director. Research will be directed by a study group consisting of scholars and practitioners of media and government. Jonathan Moore, Director of the Institute of Politics, and Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration at the Kennedy School of Government, will chair the group.
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:

Convocation for the students of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, September 16, 1981, with remarks by:

Graham T. Allison, Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government
Calvin Mosley, Assistant Dean and Director of the Program in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Coordinator, ARCO Forum; Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Laurence Lynn, Professor and Chairman of the Masters of Public Policy Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Thomas Schelling, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Political Economy and Chair of the Masters in Public Administration Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Perspectives on Politics," a panel with the Fall 1981 Institute of Politics Fellows, September 17, 1981. Participants were:

Cleta Deatherage, Member, Oklahoma House of Representatives; Chair, Oklahoma Appropriations and Budget Committee; Member, Hunt Commission on Presidential Nominations and Selections, Democratic National Committee
Ellen Hume, Washington correspondent, Los Angeles Times
Eddie Mahe, Republican political consultant; former Executive Director, Republican National Committee
William C. Velasquez, Executive Director, Southwest Voter Registration Project
Percy Wilson, former Peace Corps Director, Sierra Leone, Africa; Chairman, Boston Chapter, AFRICARE
Yao Wei, former Chief of Press Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China
Moderator: Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics

"‘Survival' in North America," an address by Canadian fiction writer Margaret Atwood, co-sponsored by the University Consortium on North American Studies, on September 22, 1981.
"President Reagan's Foreign Policy: An Interim Assessment," a panel discussion on September 24, 1981. Panelists included:

Stanley H. Hoffmann, C. Douglas Dillon Professor of the Civilization of France, Harvard
Joseph S. Nye, Professor of Government, Harvard
Uri Ra'anan, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Moderator: Graham T. Allison, Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Criminal Justice and Administration," a two-day symposium co-sponsored by the Harvard Civil Rights/Civil Liberties Law Review on September 30 and October 1, 1981, with participants:

James Vorenberg, Dean of the Faculty, Harvard Law School
Jack Greenberg, Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
Daniel Freed, Professor of Law, Yale Law School
Mark H. Moore, Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice, Policy Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William Kunstler, Staff Attorney, Center for Constitutional Rights, New York
Nancy Gertner, Criminal Defense Attorney and Instructor, Boston University School of Law
Jim Fyfe, Consultant, the Police Foundation, Washington, DC
Anthony Jackson, former Executive Director, PHILCOPS, Philadelphia

"Sentimental Imperialists: The American Experience in East Asia," a panel discussion held on October 5, 1981, featuring panelists:

Hiroshi Hirabayashi, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard
John Curtis Perry, Professor of Diplomatic History, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Associate of the Japan Institute, Harvard; co-author of the book Sentimental Imperialists
James C. Thomson, Jr., Curator, Nieman Foundation; co-author of Sentimental Imperialists
Yao Wei, former Chief of Press Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People’s Republic of China; Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Benigno Aquino, Associate Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard
Moderator: Merle Goldman, author of China's Intellectuals: Advice and Dissent


Cambridge City Council Candidates Night and Cambridge School Committee Candidates Night, question-and-answer sessions with the two groups of candidates for Cambridge office on October 22 and October 26, 1981, respectively, co-sponsored by the Cambridge League of Women Voters, the Student Advisory Committee and the Cambridge Democratic and Republic City Committees. City Council candidates who participated include:


Participating School Committee candidates were:

Sara Mae Berman, David Blackman, Mary Blessington, Frances Cooper, Glenn Koocher, and Maryann McEachern.


*Antigone*, written by Jean Anouilh and directed by Ted Osius '84 was performed October 29-November 1, 1981. The cast and crew was composed of Harvard undergraduates, and included Chad Hummel as Creon, Kate Levin as Antigone, Laura Luz as Ismene, Alex Pearson as Haemon, Elizabeth Wilber as the Nurse, Deborah Wasser as Eurydice, James Orenstein as the First Guard, Marc Dolan as the Second Guard, Ralph Vetters as the Third Guard, Dina Michels as the Messenger, and Bernadette Staso as the Page. Each character, except for Creon and Antigone, assumed a role as a member of the chorus in addition to his or her primary role. The crew included producer Helen Montag, stage director Diana Nelson, technical director Peter Miller, lighting designer Peter Koso, publicity manager Eve Cohen, choreographer Nicole Grace and costume designer Martha Eddison. The play was co-sponsored by the Harvard-Radcliffe Dramatic Club and the Student Advisory Committee.
“Betty Friedan: The Second Stage,” a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, and a part of the Feminist Politics and Public Policy Series, on November 10, 1981. Panelists included:

**Betty Friedan**, founder of the National Organization for Women; author of *The Feminine Mystique* and *The Second Stage*

**Anita Diamant**, columnist, the *Boston Phoenix*

**Jane Edmonds**, former Chair, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination

**Ethel Klein**, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard

*Moderator: Margaret McKenna, Director, Mary Ingraham Bunting Institute, Radcliffe*

*Hair... the 80's*, a play, was performed on November 12 through November 15 and November 20 and 21, 1981. The play was written by Harvard undergraduates Thania Papas, David Edelman, Sabrina Peck, and John Gennari. The cast and crew were composed of Harvard undergraduates, and included Allen Gifford as Greenie, Brooks Whitehouse as Frank Mills, Merv Griffin as Curtis Mann, Dede Schmeiser as Donna Barona, Anthony Calnek as C. Stafford Kingsley III, Sabrina Peck as Myrna Gellman, Sue Morris as Barbara MacNeill, with David Edelman, Sue Cheng, John Gennari, Gifford Duffy, and Jared Hoffman as the members of the band “The Dial,” and with Dancers Maria Davila, Jennifer Goodall, Linda Hammett, and Arlene Yu. The crew consisted of Thania Papas, director; David Edelman, music director; Allie Nicholson, producer; Jacquelyn Burt, assistant producer; Maxine Segal, stage manager; Sabrina Peck, choreographer; Peter Koso, lighting designer; Walter Freitag, master electrician; Dan Ertel, technical director; Harry Phillips, sound engineer; Edward Hill, slide coordinator; Peter Miller and Doug Oettinger, lighting crew; Rico Arimond, Stan Chartoff, Mary Hernandez, David Kerr, Chuck Silva, and Peter Sorger, set crew; Dean Norris, wardrobe and makeup coordinator; Emily Miller, publicity coordinator; Kathy Baker, assistant publicity coordinator; and Emily Miller, Brian Mullaney, and Mark Lubkeman, poster designers. The production of *Hair... the 80's* was co-sponsored by the Harvard-Radcliffe Dramatic Club and the Student Advisory Committee.

“The Guardian Angels: A Response to Crime?”, a panel, November 18, 1981, with participants:

**Curtis Sliwa**, leader and founder, the Guardian Angels

**James Q. Wilson**, Henry Lee Shattuck Professor of Government, Harvard

**Mark H. Moore**, Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice, Policy Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government

“Egypt After Sadat,” a panel co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, November 24, 1981, with panelists:
Herman Eilts, former Ambassador to Egypt  
Hanna Batatu, Visiting Professor of Political Science from the American University of Beirut  
Mona Makram Ebeid, MPA '82; Sociologist, American University of Cairo  
Moderator: A.J. Meyer, Associate Director, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, and Professor of Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard

"Policies and Politics in the Arts," a lecture by Sir Roy Shaw, Secretary-General of the Arts, Great Britain, on November 30, 1981, co-sponsored by the American Repertory Theatre.

"The Reagan Economic Program," a panel discussion on December 1, 1981, with:

Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government  
John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard  
Allan H. Meltzer, Professor of Social Sciences and Economics, Carnegie-Mellon University  
William Niskanen, Member, Council of Economic Advisers

"El Salvador and the Central American Crisis," a panel discussion on December 3, 1981, featuring:

Harvey G. Cox, Jr., Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard  
Bianca Jagger, recent visitor to Salvadoran refugee camps in Honduras and Costa Rica  
Alfredo Monge, Representative of the F.D.R., El Salvador  
Congressmen James Shannon (D-Massachusetts)  
Moderator: George Wald, President, Permanent People's Tribunal on Salvador and Higgins Professor of Biology, Emeritus, Harvard


"Feminism and Religion: A Contradiction in Terms?", a panel co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, and the second in the Feminist Politics and Public Policy Series, on December 8, 1981, with participants:

Sonia Johnson, leader and founder, Mormons for ERA  
Rabbi Cathy Felix, Chaplain, Brown University
Rev. Jane Heckles, Minister, United Church of Christ
Sr. Claire McGowan, of the Dominican Order
Moderator: Dr. Francine Cardman, Professor of Historical Theology, Weston
School of Theology

"Beyond Reagan: Other Visions of America," a teach-in on December 11, 1981, sponsored by Working Papers magazine in cooperation with the Institute of Politics, with speakers:

Congressman John Conyers (D-Mississippi)
Tony Mazzocchi, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Union
Mark Green, author of Who Runs Congress; former Director, Congresswatch
Joan Quinlan, Director, 9 to 5
David Smith, Center on Economic Alternatives
M. William Howard, President, National Council of Churches
Nancy Gertner, criminal defense attorney; Instructor, Boston University School of Law
Michael Ansara, Staff Director, Mass. Fair Share
I.F. Stone, journalist and political commentator
John Womack, Professor of History, Harvard
Heather Booth, Director, Midwest Academy
Brian Turner, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO
Peter Marchetti, Latin American affairs specialist
Congressman Barney Frank (D-Massachusetts)
William Niskanen, Member, Council of Economic Advisers

"Our Foreign Policy Dilemmas," an address by Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Adviser, Carter Administration, on December 15, 1981.

"The State of the Union," an address by writer Gore Vidal, on February 2, 1982.

"Perspectives on Politics," a panel discussion with the Spring 1982 Institute of Politics Fellows, on Wednesday, February 3, 1982:

Kenneth Blackwell, Associate Vice President for Community Relations, Xavier University; City Council Member and former Mayor, Cincinnati, Ohio
Francis Duehay, City Councillor and former Mayor, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Albert Eisele, author; journalist; former Press Secretary to Vice President Walter Mondale
Betty Friedan, author of *The Feminine Mystique* and *The Second Stage*; Founder, National Organization of Women
James Higgins, journalist; former Editor, Gazette and Daily, York, Pennsylvania
Gad Ranon, Director, North American Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Israel
Moderator: Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics

"F.D.R. Revisited," a symposium held on February 4, 1982, in commemoration of the centennial of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt, with audio and video clips, and commentary by:

Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, Emeritus, Harvard; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Professor of American Politics, Boston College
David Ginsburg, former General Counsel, Office of Price Administration
Ernest R. May, Charles Warren Professor of American History, Harvard
James Rowe, Jr., former Administrative Assistant to F.D.R.
Moderator: Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Would the World Be Better Without Politicians?", a debate between the Harvard Graduate Speaking Union and the New Zealand National Debate Team of Auckland University, co-sponsored by the Harvard Graduate Speaking Union, on February 9, 1982. Debaters included:

Stuart Bugg, New Zealand National Debate Team
David Kidd, New Zealand National Debate Team
Thomas Rozinski, Harvard Graduate Speaking Union
Neil Buchanan, Harvard Graduate Speaking Union

"Miller's Court," a taping of the WCVB-TV program with Harvard Law School Professor Arthur R. Miller discussing the issue of child custody, February 15, 1982.

"The San Bushmen in South Africa," a symposium on February 16, 1982, co-sponsored by Cultural Survival, Inc., including the showing of the film *N!ai, the Story of a !Kung Woman*, with commentary by:

Lorna Marshall, author of works on the San bushmen
Marjorie Shostak, author of *Nisa: The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman*
Rob Gordon, Professor of Anthropology, University of Vermont
Moderator: David Maybury-Lewis, Professor of Anthropology, Harvard
"Miller's Court," a taping of the WCVB-TV program with Harvard Law School Professor Arthur R. Miller discussing the issue of drunk driving, February 22, 1982.

"Current U.S.-Japan Economic Relations," a panel co-sponsored by the Program on U.S.-Japan Relations at the Center for International Affairs, on February 23, 1982, with participants:

Naohira Amaya, Vice Minister for International Affairs, MITI, Japan
Raymond Vernon, Herbert F. Johnson Professor of International Business Management, Harvard
Congressman Toby Roth (R-Wisconsin)
Moderator: Ezra Vogel, Professor of Sociology, Harvard

"Vibrations of Power in Foreign Affairs," an address by Warren Christopher, former Deputy Secretary of State, Carter Administration, on February 24, 1982.

Keynote address of the commemorative Malcolm X Weekend, February 25, 1982, delivered by Audre Lorde, feminist poet. Co-sponsors included the Afro-American Cultural Center, the Afro-American Studies Department, the Association of Black Radcliffe Women, the Black Students Association, the Radcliffe College Associate Dean's Office, and the Radcliffe Union of Students.

"Learning from the 60's to Build for the 80's," a panel in commemoration of Malcolm X, on February 26, 1982, co-sponsored by the Afro-American Cultural Center, the Afro-American Studies Department, the Association of Black Radcliffe Women, the Black Students Association, the Radcliffe College Associate Dean's Office, and the Radcliffe Union of Students. Panelists included:

Demita Frazier, Jamaica Plain Legal Services
Evelynn Hammonds, feminist activist
Annette Samuels, former editor, Essence magazine
Mary Stansel, legislative aide to U.S. Senator Howell Heflin
Betty Shabazz, Medgar Evers College; widow of Malcolm X

"Blacks and the Political Process," the first lecture in the Second Annual Oliver C. Cox Lecture Series, co-sponsored by the Kennedy School Students Association and the Kennedy School Black Caucus, on March 4, 1982. Panelists included:

Kenneth Blackwell, former Mayor, Cincinnati, Ohio; Fellow of the Institute of Politics
Johnny Ford, Mayor, Tuskegee, Alabama
Dianne Pinderhughes, Fellow, Brookings Institution
Moderator: Walter Broadnax, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
"20/20," the taping of ABC-TV's prime-time television news magazine, March 7, 1982. The segment taped focused on juvenile justice, and featured audience discussion with Jerome Miller, former Director, Department of Youth Services, Massachusetts. Discussion was moderated by "20/20"'s Sylvia Chase.

"Miller's Court," the taping of the WCVB-TV program with Harvard Law School Professor Arthur R. Miller discussing the issue of jury duty, on March 8, 1982.

"Issues in Energy and Security," a panel discussion co-sponsored by Harvard-AIESEC on March 9, 1982, with panelists:

Joseph S. Nye, Professor of Government, Harvard
Wilson Clark, author of Energy, War, and Vulnerability
William Hogan, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Alvin Alm, Adjunct Lecturer and Intergovernmental Personnel Act Research Fellow, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Moderator: Daniel Yergin, Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Blacks and the New Media: Views and Perspectives for the 80's," the second lecture in the Second Annual Oliver C. Cox Lecture Series, on March 11, 1982, with:

Percy Sutton, Chairman, Inner City Broadcasting
Dr. Gilbert Maddox, President, City Communications
Darlene Tolbert Palmer, former Manager, White House Minority Telecommunications Development Program
Riley Temple, Communications Counsel, U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Moderator: Mackie McLeod, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Community Fellow and local radio personality

"Miller's Court," the taping of the WCVB-TV program with Harvard Law School Professor Arthur R. Miller discussing students' rights, on March 15, 1982.

"Gaining Political Access: Is Affirmative Action the Best Route for Women?", a roundtable discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, as part of the Feminist Politics and Public Policy Series. Participants included:

Ann Lewis, Political Director, Democratic National Committee
Pat Bailey, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission
Mary Crisp, former Chair, National Unity Campaign for John Anderson
Betty Heitman, Co-chair, Republican National Committee
Sissy Weinberg, former Executive Director, Democratic State Committee (Massachusetts)
Saundra Graham, Cambridge City Councillor
Moderator: Susan Estrich, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

"Reaganomics: The Impact on Black Economic Mobility," the final Oliver C. Cox Lecture, March 18, 1982, with panelists:
James Hefner, Chairman, Department of Economics and Business, Morehouse College
Ronald Ferguson, Assistant Professor of Economics, Brandeis University
Christopher Edley, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

"Larry Cuba in Person," a discussion with Larry Cuba, computer graphics artist, on March 21, 1982, co-sponsored by Center Screen.


Dennis Brutus, exiled black South African poet
Grace Ibingira, former Ugandan Minister of Justice
Bereket Habte Selassie, former Attorney General, Ethiopia
Moderator: C. Clyde Ferguson, former U.S. Ambassador to Uganda; Henry L. Stimson Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

"Standardized Testing and Public Policy," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee on March 24, 1982, with:
Denise Carty-Bennia, Professor of Law, Northeastern University; Co-chair, National Conference of Black Lawyers
Robert Klitgaard, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
James Loewen, Professor of Sociology, University of Vermont
Moderator: John Weiss, Director, DE-TEST; author of 1977 "Truth-in-Testing" legislation

"Qaddafi's Libya," a panel co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, March 25, 1982, with panelists:
Lisa Anderson, Assistant Professor, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard
Omar Fathaly, Professor of Government, Florida State University
Donald Snook, Senior Public Affairs Adviser on the Middle East, Exxon Corporation
Moderator: A.J. Meyer, Associate Director of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, and Professor of Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard

"Proposition 2½," the taping of a WNAC-TV special program on March 29, 1982 with panelists:

Barbara Anderson, Director, Citizens for Limited Taxation
James Seigel, Director, Massachusetts Municipal Association
Massachusetts State Sen. John Olver (D-Amherst)

The Oxford Union Society vs. The Harvard Debate Council on the resolution, "That the British Government's treatment of Northern Ireland is an utter disgrace," on April 7, 1982, with debaters:

William Foutz, President of the Harvard Debate Council in 1977;
member of the Harvard Law Class of '83
John Bredehoft, President of the Harvard Debate Council in 1977;
member of the Harvard Law School class of '83
Christopher Keyser, President of the Harvard Debate Council in 1981;
member of the Harvard College class of '81
Alan Duncan, St. John's College, Oxford; President of the Union in 1979
Nicholas O'Shaughnessy, Keble College, Oxford; President of the Union in 1978
William Hague, Magdalen College, Oxford; President of the Union in 1982
The debate was chaired by Alan E. Heimert, Powell M. Cabot Professor of American Literature, and Master of Eliot House, Harvard.

"Local Politics," an address delivered by Massachusetts State Senator William Bulger (D-South Boston), President of the Senate, on April 8, 1982, and co-sponsored by the Kennedy School Students Association.

Walter Mondale, former Vice President of the United States, delivered an address at a special session of Albert Eisele's study group in the Forum on April 12, 1982.

"Does Ronald Reagan Have a 'Woman Problem'?", a panel co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee as part of the Feminist Politics and public Policy Series, on April 13, 1982, with participants:
Abba Eban, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Israel, delivered a public address at a special session of Gad Ranon’s study group in the Forum on April 15, 1982.

"Revitalization of the Workplace: Employee Participation in Ownership and Management," a conference on April 17 and 18, 1982, co-sponsored by the National Center for Employee Ownership, the Association for Workplace Democracy, the Harman Program at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, New Systems of Work and Participation Program at Cornell University, the Social Economy Program at Boston College, the Trusteeship Institute, and the Workplace Democracy Group at Yale University. Speakers included:

Michael Maccoby, Director, Project on Technology, Work and Human Character
John Simmons, Coordinator, Association for Workplace Democracy
Corey Rosen, Executive Director, National Center for Employee Ownership
Joseph Blasi, Lecturer in Social Studies, Harvard
Sen. Russell Long (D-Louisiana), Ranking Minority Member, U.S. Senate Finance Committee

"El Salvador: Another View," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Conservative Club on April 19, 1982, with:

Jack Heberle, American Institute for Free Labor Development/AFL-CIO
Fr. Enrique Rueda, translator for Salvadoran Bishops
Francisco Zaldana, Secretary General, El Salvador

"Religion, Morality, and Politics," an address by Dr. Billy Graham on April 20, 1982.

A live telecast of ABC-News’s "Nightline" focusing on Ground Zero Week, on April 22, 1982, with ABC’s Ted Koppel moderating. Joining the discussion via satellite were:

Richard Burt, Director of the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, State Department
Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of State, Nixon and Ford Administrations
McGeorge Bundy, Professor of History, New York University; former Staff Officer on foreign and defense policy in the Kennedy and Johnson Administration

Herman Kahn, Director, Hudson Institute

Roger Molander, Executive Director, Ground Zero; former nuclear strategist for the White House National Security Council

Monsignor Bruce Kent, Nuclear Disarmament Campaign Leader, London

Gennadi Gerasimov, Soviet political analyst, Moscow

Franz Josef Strauss, former West German Defense Minister and current West German Opposition Leader

"Mystery-Bouffe," Act I of the play by Vladimir Mayakovsky, on April 25, 1982, co-sponsored by the Office for the Arts at Harvard and Radcliffe. The cast included:

Mark DriscoU as the Construction Worker, Robin Driscoll as the Miner, Chris von Baeyer as the Policeman, Kate Butler as the Farmhand, John Rabinowitz as the Plumber, Jenny Raiser as the Housepainter, Susan Moffat as the Eskimo Hunter, Estela O'Brien as the Eskimo Fisherman, Saskia Bailey as the Waitress, Marc Dolan as the American Diplomat, Andy Atkinson as the Russian Diplomat, Alison Carey as the Lady with the Hatboxes, Alice Brown as the Priest, Jim Goldstein as the Arab, Betsy Hopkins as the Australian, Tere Davila as the Australian’s friend, Nela Wagman as the Frenchwoman, and Billy Ruane as Rod Stewart. In addition, there were forty persons with non-speaking parts.

The play, consisting of five acts, took place all over campus, with the first act in the Forum. "Mystery-Bouffe" was directed by Bill Rauche with the assistance of Lynn Jeffries, and was coordinated by Ann Bennett.

"Miller’s Court," a taping of the WCVB-TV program with Harvard Law School Professor Arthur R. Miller, featuring guest Ralph Nader, on the issue of consumer rights, on April 26, 1982.

"Perspectives on Civil Rights Issues in the 1980’s," a lecture by John Jacob, President of the National Urban League, on April 27, 1982. The lecture, which was part of the 1982 Martin Luther King Lectures, was co-sponsored by the Afro-American Studies Department, the Center for International Affairs, the Divinity School, the John F. Kennedy School of Government, the W.E.B. Du Bois Institute, and President Derek Bok's office.

Seymour Hersh, author of Kissinger and Nixon in the White House, delivered a lecture at a special session of Albert Eisele's study group on April 28, 1982.
Georgia State Senator Julian Bond (D-Atlanta) delivered a lecture entitled "Civil Rights...What's Next?" on April 29, 1982. The lecture was co-sponsored by the Harvard Black Faculty and Administrators Association.

The fourth annual Third World Conference was held on May 1, 1982, and was co-sponsored by the Lincoln Land Institute, the Harvard Institute for International Development, and the Kennedy School Students Association. Speakers included:

Joseph Short, Executive Director, OXFAM America
Peter Bell, President, Inter-American Foundation
Jehan Raheen, Chief of Regional Program Division, Asia and Pacific, UNDP
Adriano Garcia, Associate Fellow, Center for International Affairs
Ian-Marten Zegers, Special Representative to the U.N.
Sundaram Sankara, Head of Developing Countries Unit, Public Affairs Division, World Bank
Robert Morris, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility
Myron Weiner, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Francisco Altschul, Representative, Frente Democratico Revolucionario
Edward Azar, Director, Center for International Development, University of Maryland
Steve Cohen, Professor, City University of New York, Director of the Institute for Middle East Peace and Development
Herman Eilts, former U.S. Ambassador to Egypt and Saudi Arabia
Jovito Salonga, former Senator, Phillipines
Dov Ronen, Associate, Center for International Affairs, Harvard
Jack Powelson, Professor, University of Colorado
Laurence Simon, Director, Development Education, OXFAM
Tan de Wilde, Director, Appropriate Technology Extension Services, A T International
Dr. Peter Timmer, Professor of Agriculture and Business, Harvard
Dr. Cathy Overholt, Lecturer, Harvard School of Public Health

"Church vs. State? What Catholic Leaders Are Saying About Nuclear Arms," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Social Justice Committee at the Harvard-Radcliffe Catholic Student Center, on May 2, 1982, with panelists:

Dr. Victor Weisskopf, Professor of Physics, Emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Dr. John Pastore, Professor of Medicine, Tufts Medical School
Rev. David Hollenbach, S.J., Professor of Theology, Weston School of Theology
Rev. J. Bryan Hehir, Director, U.S. Catholic Conference Office for International Justice and Peace
"American Foreign Policy and the Iranian Revolution," a panel discussion on May 5, 1982, with panelists:

Nikki Keddie, author of Revolution in Iran
Gary Sick, former Member, National Security Council
William Miller, Former Chairman, Senate Intelligence Subcommittee
Richard Falk, Professor of International Relations, Princeton
Moderator: Mangol Bayat, Assistant Professor of History, Harvard

The Mass. PAC Daycare Alliance co-sponsored a gubernatorial candidates convention on May 8, 1982. Participating gubernatorial candidates included:

Michael Dukakis, candidate for the Democratic nomination
Donald Gurewitz, Socialist Workers Party candidate
John Lakian, candidate for the Republican nomination
Andrew H. Card, Jr., candidate for the Republican nomination
Frank Rich, Independent candidate
John W. Sears, candidate for the Republican nomination.

"America in 1982: How Does It Look from Europe?" the first annual Joe Alex Morris, Jr., Lecture, sponsored by the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard, was delivered by Flora Lewis, New York Times Foreign Affairs columnist, on May 10, 1982.

"The Advocates" addressed the question, "Should cities and towns in Massachusetts be able to refuse hazardous waste disposal facilities?" in a live debate on May 12, 1982. The debate, which was produced by WGBH-TV, featured advocates Avi Nelson (pro) and Margaret Marshall (con), with media personality David Finnegan moderating.

A conference for writers was held on May 22, 1982, addressing issues pertaining to unionization of artists. The conference was sponsored by the Organizing Committee for a National Writers Union, Boston Local. Participants included:

Gerald Peary, contributing editor, American Film
Karen Corbin, freelance journalist for the Bay State Banner and Equal Times
Christy George, freelance journalist for WGBH-TV
Amy Hoffman, Managing Editor, Gay Community News
Robert Kuttner, Editor, Working Papers; author of The Revolt of the Haves
Robert Lovinger, freelance journalist for Boston Magazine and the Boston Globe
Ellen Cantarow, writer for Mademoiselle, Ms., and Mother Jones
Alice Hoffman, author of White Horses and The Drowning Season
Karen Lindsey, author of Friends as Family
Connie Paige, writer for Mother Jones and the Village Voice
Kathleen Spivak, author of Swimmer in the Spreading Dawn and The Jane Poems
Marge Piercy, author of Small Changes, Woman on the Edge of Time, and Braided Lives
Suzanne Gordon, writer for Working Papers
Lila Garrett, Emmy Award-winning screenwriter
Christopher Hitchens, Contributing Editor, The Nation and The New Statesman; member, British National Union of Journalists
Leonard Liebowitz, counsel to symphony musicians and dancers in the American Ballet Theatre

"Miller's Court," a taping of the WCVB-TV program with Harvard Law Professor Arthur R. Miller discussing the rules of evidence, on May 24, 1982.

The taping of WCVB-TV's "Miller's Court, with Harvard Law School Professor Arthur R. Miller discussing the issue of credit, on June 14, 1982.

The following events were planned in cooperation with the Harvard Summer School. Summer School administrators responsible for the series included:
Michael Shinagel, Director, Harvard University Extension Studies
Marshall R. Pihl, Director, Harvard Summer School
E. Fred Yalouris, Assistant Director and Registrar, Harvard Summer School
John Powell, Associate Dean of Students, Harvard Summer School

Akio Morita, Chief Executive Officer of the SONY Corporation delivered a lecture entitled "The Role of Lawyers in Handicapping Entrepreneurial Efforts in the United States," on June 24, 1982.


A live televised debate on the nuclear freeze was sponsored by WCVB-TV's "Chronicle" on July 7, 1982, with Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Massachusetts) debating Senator Gordon Humphrey (R-New Hampshire). "Chronicle" anchorman Chet Curtis moderated.

Dr. Helen Caldicott, founder of National Physicians for Social Responsibility, discussed the medical effects of nuclear war after the showing of the film "The Last Epidemic" on July 8, 1982. The event was co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School and Harvard-Radcliffe Students for Social Responsibility.

"Global Insecurity," a panel discussion on July 14, 1982, with:
Arpad von Lazar, Professor of International Development and Energy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Robert Dohner, Assistant Professor of Economics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Alvin L. Alm, Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Director, Harvard Energy Security Program

Moderator: Daniel Yergin, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

George Gilder, author of Wealth and Poverty, and Bob Kuttner, editor of Working Papers magazine, debated the Reagan economic program on July 28, 1982. Mary Jo Bane, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, moderated.
