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FOREWORD

An active and informed populace creates a political atmosphere within which the democratic process may thrive. Issues are debated by citizens in local meeting halls as well as in the halls of Congress. Change is sought or the status quo defended by involved people who affect events locally, nationally and internationally. Grassroots movements address global issues such as the nuclear arms race and protection of the environment, debates ensue about continuing national problems like the economy, unemployment and poverty, and public concern is expressed about our proper role in international affairs, especially in Central America and the Middle East. Questions continue about the success or failure of the policies of the Reagan Administration, about how best to address the continuing inequality of women and minorities, and about the relationship between the media and government.

The Institute of Politics participates in the democratic process through the many and varied educational programs it sponsors during the year — fellowships and study groups, conferences and debates, internships and research projects — and provides a setting for formal and informal political discourse. Students, politicians, teachers, activists, theorists, observers gather together to break bread, study, and debate issues of public policy at informal suppers and luncheons, seminars and training programs, and in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum. This fifth issue of Proceedings contains a selection of readings excerpted from speeches, articles and discussion panels and a complete roster of 1982-83 programs and participants. The readings section provides a sense of the personalities encountered and the issues discussed; the programs section demonstrates both the variety and scope of the Institute’s undertakings.
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"They all look like presidents — and that's kind of impressive," declared the Massachusetts governor, Michael Dukakis, enthusiastically when six Democratic hopefuls sang for their supper under the chairmanship of ex-hopeful Senator Edward Kennedy in the Boston Plaza hotel last week.

Ex-Vice President Mondale, for instance, looked less like a president than the smooth-talking host of a giveaway quiz show like The Price is Right. His speech consisted largely of assuring labor unions, women, minorities, etc., that if they voted for him, they stood to gain a fine bedroom suite and six priceless Waterford goblets.

Senators Cranston and Glenn had a more sinister aspect. Each of them looked rather like the butler from a horror movie — "Welcome to Castle Dracula. Enter, sir, of your own free will." Whether the voters will accept the invitation remains to be seen. But they frighten me.

Not so Senator Gary Hart, or I prefer to think of him as Young Doctor Hart—mop-headed, idealistic, irresistible to nurses, evoking a motherly sympathy even from the stern starch-aproned matron, forever defying the medical establishment when compassion demands it: "This little girl is going to get a quadruple lung transplant operation. Doctor Gillespie, even if it hasn't been invented yet."

It must be admitted that Senator Ernest ("Fritz") Hollings did look magnificently presidential — tall, silver-haired, ramrod straight and handsome in a diplomatic way. Alas, he was handicapped not by his southern accent, but by an odd quality in his voice, both mechanical and indistinct, like an "I Speak Your Weight" machine on the blink.

That leaves Senator Dale Bumpers. He is the candidate who is least well-known and he looks like it. But appearances can be deceptive. Senator Bumpers made by far the best speech of the evening — well-constructed and cliche free.

Purists may object that I have concentrated too much on the trivial question of how the candidates looked and ignored the more serious matter of what they said. But this criticism overlooks the fact that they all said much the same thing.
It was a typical evening of Boston Democratic speechmaking. Six variations on a theme by Edward Kennedy.

"Around here we all wish that Senator Kennedy were still running for president," said a local politician menacingly. And the senator's erstwhile rivals all applauded wearing expressions of bottomless regret and vast sincerity.

Thus reassured, Senator Kennedy delivered what nowadays passes for a political speech, viz. a laundry list of policies designed to attract support from every minority or interest group that happens to be standing nearby. Labor unions, feminists, nuclear freeze advocates, environmentalists and blacks were each promised their ERA and their arms control agreement.

Then the hopefuls spoke. From that point on, the evening was as stylized as haiku poetry. First Senator Kennedy would introduce the candidate with a mildly malicious joke at his expense "Lincoln, Roosevelt, Bumpers?" (To which Senator Bumpers responded, "Until just a moment ago, I had been seriously considering the possibility of a Bumpers-Kennedy ticket.")

Then the candidate would warm up the audience with five minutes of self-deprecatory jokes. "I had a full head of hair," began the famously bald Senator Cranston, "when Ronald Reagan became president . . ."

Next, he would read out his version of Senator Kennedy's laundry list of policies for the feminists, the environmentalists, the labor unions, etc. By the fifth or sixth hearing, even the most dedicated Democrat must have felt the urge to cut down an innocent tree or cross a picket line. Finally, he sat down to moderate applause.

So similar were the speeches that when Senator Bumpers arrived at the podium near the end of the line, he confessed that he had revised his own speech so extensively during each previous address that he no longer knew if it contained anything at all.

What minor variations there were came principally from the two candidates representing the liberal and conservative extremes of the Democratic party—Senators Cranston and Hollings respectively. Senator Cranston, for instance, gave an account of his visit to Moscow where he had met the Russian chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who had impressed him as a nuclear disarmer.

"I know the Russians are repressive," he revealed, "but they are human beings like us." This seemed to sway his audience who had perhaps believed until then that the Russians were vegetables or extra-terrestrial creatures.

But it is not so comfortable an assurance as the assembled Democrats apparently thought. When it comes to war, violence, murder and genocide, the record of human beings is not all that hot (vide Tamburlaine the Great, Jack the Ripper, Adolf Hitler, J. Stalin, Idi Amin, Pol Pot and many others). Vegetables look good by comparison.

Senator Hollings struck a mildly daring note when he declared that America would not elect a "big spender" to the White House in 1984. After all, the Massachusetts Democrats believe so passionately in big spending that some of them have gone to jail for it.
But the Senator's remark created scarcely a ripple. Perhaps they took the philosophical view that if Mr. Hollings were also going to create "thousands and millions of jobs," as well as starting programs for the feminists, the environmentalists, etc., then he might become a big spender in spite of himself.

The evening gradually came to an end, apparently a success. All of the candidates had spoken. None had fallen down drunk, or offended any large section of Democratic votes, or been guilty of an original thought or expression.

* * *

Falling Presidents
by Daniel Patrick Moynihan

U.S. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY), who was a member of the Institute's original Faculty Planning Committee, spoke on "Falling Presidents" in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum on April 8, 1983. Here is an edited excerpt from his address.

I think it is the case that there is more interest in this subject just now than there has been, certainly in my period either as a teacher or as someone involved in public affairs. A very large number of enterprises are afoot, examining the Constitution and asking, can an eighteenth-century Constitution serve the purposes of a present-day government. Just yesterday, a study was published in Washington by Senators Pierson and Ribicoff on the institution of the Senate, asking can it do its work. You look around and in one form or another, like the studies of the Party Nominating Convention, [the question is] can they do their work? Rather large questions of this kind seem to appear that don't go so much to policy as to process and procedure and structure. And that is, I would suggest, a change in the intellectual weather, a change, in a sense, of the political climate.
It would seem to me that it is not difficult to learn why and how this has come about. Because the United States has been experiencing an unprecedented succession of incompleted or failed or destroyed presidencies. And we may be in the midst of yet another. And this fact can be easily enough recognized. The reasons surely, as always, are more obscure. As the Dean observed, I’ve served in the cabinet or sub-cabinet for four successive Presidents. If you would like a datum of enormous inconsequence—I had it worked out by the staff today—from the first time I was confirmed by the Senate for a cabinet/subcabinet position, to the last time, the span was 12 years, 3 months, 5 days. Now that was normally, in American history, thought to be the tenure of one and a half presidents. In my experience, it spanned the terms of four. I have found myself thereafter in the Senate, dealing with a President of my Party, who served only one term, and was the first member of that party in some 80 years to be defeated for re-election as an incumbent. And now, with a President of a different Party, who is clearly having difficult times, even if the outcome is in no sense as yet resolved.

How to ascribe the particular source of the failing of one after another of these presidencies involves, obviously, a range of explanations. President Kennedy fell before an assassin’s bullet, the first Chief Executive so struck down since Mr. McKinley 60 years earlier. And yet, it was he, not his presidency, that fell. His presidency was scarcely off the ground at the time. He was succeeded by a titanic figure, Lyndon Johnson, who brought more reform and innovation to our society than any Chief Executive since Roosevelt, and before him, Wilson. Yet his presidency fell on his foreign policy. Mr. Nixon succeeded in achieving a public consensus over foreign policy, but fell before his own unwillingness or inability to appreciate the beauty and the fragility of the role of law in executing public office. He was our first President to fall from office alive, in a sense, and before election. He was followed by Mr. Ford, an honest and able and noble man, but never elected, and unable to achieve, to impart, an energetic vision of the nation. And then there followed two Presidents of whom I shall speak in some detail: Mr. Carter and Mr. Reagan. I’d like to suggest that they represent a different kind of a falling in a presidency.

They were each presidents that could reach out and touch the nation, its mind and its heart, could give a genuine sense of imparting to the people a sense that they shared their own feelings about government, but then in government, in office, could not themselves govern. They found at some level that that which enabled them to achieve office impaired their ability to succeed at it — a very old experience. Tocqueville in the United States visited the lovely small village of Canandaigua in New York State. A Jacksonian election was then in place. He noted, and I quote him, that it was “by promising to weaken it” (that is to say, the government), “that one won the right to control it.” And in that sense, these two presidents are in an older tradition, but also they are different, have been different. Both seemed to loathe and to fear the behemoth of government, which they desired not so much to control as to disestablish. As a candidate, at a
rally in Dallas in September 1976, Mr. Carter spoke of the American government in terms of true alienation, of a thing apart, hostile, dangerous. I quote him. "The American people are fair. Our system of justice is not fair. The American people are honest. Our government hasn't been honest. The American people believe in tough, competent management. We've seen evolve a bloated, confused, bureaucratic mess." Now, how do you say that? A bloated, confused bureaucratic mess? Could that be the same government which not 7 years earlier had sent a man to the moon and returned him to earth and had the President of the United States waiting for him on the deck of an aircraft carrier halfway around the world? And it all worked out fine. Carter was succeeded by Reagan. The new President, as had his predecessor, railed against the size of government. He would slash 64 billion dollars worth of fraud, waste and extravagance, especially in welfare. He would balance the budget. He would get the private economy going again. He would, of course, increase defense spending, but that was different, somehow not part of the government he scorned. And in his inaugural address he said, "Government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem."

So let me pause now to state another thought, one which I think brings you to this place tonight and to this University. Government, as the economist Alfred Marshall wrote at the turn of the century, is the most precious of human institutions. No care can be too great to see that it performs well. It must not be asked to do more than it can in the time and place and circumstances, less we put in jeopardy its ability to do what it must, or what we intelligently hope it might do. Those who rail against government, or denigrate it, do not really understand it, hence their undertakings easily fail, and their presidencies fall. But even so, there is a question of how government is organized and how much we have given it the ability to do what we expect it to do, and what, increasingly, it must do.

* * *
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The Freeze in Political Context
by Jonathan Moore

In an effort to take a broader view of the dynamic process which actually translates public opinion and political action into public policy, let me identify some contextual factors in a quick, speculative inventory of considerations and questions about where we are now, what’s ahead, and what choices are faced. This may help frame the remarks made on this panel and in the following discussion to comprehend better the relationship between freeze movements and arms control results.

What The Situation Is Now

1. The freeze movement has remained stronger than many predicted, particularly given a combination of neutralizing factors which include (a) the passage of time, (b) President Reagan’s START proposals, and (c) intense public preoccupation with the economy.

2. The freeze was a major issue in the fall 1982 elections, although it is important to keep in mind that it was decisive in very few Congressional races. The number of pro-freeze votes in the House of Representatives was increased significantly. And in referenda engaging 25% of the national electorate in eight states, the freeze won by a 3-2 margin.

3. The vitality and momentum of the freeze pressured the Administration to reduce its inflammatory rhetoric and to make its START negotiating position at least appear to be more serious — but this greater political sensitivity to and sophistication about the issue in the White House can be a double-edged sword, so to speak.

4. A number of independent polls demonstrate that public support is very strong for a mutual and verifiable freeze. But public schizophrenia and ambivalence — essentially involving hang-ups about dealing with and relying on the Russians — persist. Unqualified pro-freeze support has not taken off and could be on a plateau. And stubborn economic problems distract and diffuse attention to the issue.

5. In addition to traditional and predictable categories of support, the main line churches and a large aggregation of citizens more aware of the consequences and scared of the greater risks of nuclear war have added crucial numbers to the
movement, but not yet enough. Freeze proponents probably cannot increase their size and broaden their base without sustaining the moderate, non-extremist, and non-unilateral character of the effort.

What Lies Ahead Over the Next Two Years

1. The Administration is now more susceptible to and aware of political pressures and stakes, in terms of: (a) the potential electoral power of freeze sentiment generally; (b) whether the recurrent "leadership" issue will identify with arms control during the '84 Presidential election; (c) no longer being confident of the 1980 "mandate" or the resistance of Presidential popularity to slippage; (d) considerably less strength in the House of Representatives; and (e) not being able to count on a strong economy for the '84 election.

2. We have a President who can get the people to support virtually whatever he might want in the way of serious negotiations with the Russians, who seems quite capable of change in the policy, and who may be looking for a winning issue, so to speak. But there is a big difference between a President who can effectively contain pro-arms control sentiment to keep things roughly as they are without getting into a lot of political trouble and a President who wants to mobilize and exploit pro-arms control sentiment in the country to change the policy.

3. There are some important variables which are difficult to calculate. Does this President get the image as the first since World War II to be against arms control, or not? Does the Administration lose ground and become more vulnerable politically to the freeze merely by looking disorganized and inept, or does it begin to manage the situation more effectively? Does something happen in the way of a scary nuclear weapons-related incident or accident which could galvanize the freeze movement, or do the Russians do something menacing which could give impetus to enhanced militaristic patriotism, or neither?

4. In the relatively short run, there are two main determinants on the American side to serious progress in negotiating arms control agreements: (a) how well our national economy recovers and when, and (b) how effectively the President manages the politics and manipulates the cosmetics of arms control policy. In other words, if we were to make a certain set of assumptions for roughly eighteen months from now — a pretty good or improving economy; the appearance of negotiating progress or activity; no scary galvanizing nuclear weapons incident; and a cut-back on growth in defense spending — then the freeze might not be that big, popular or decisive in the 1984 elections.

Political and Policy Choices

1. Does the movement push the freeze as a "pure option" or as a means of bringing about some improvement in national policy in overall posture and negotiating position? It is possible that the only way of accomplishing the latter is to continue to push the formulation which has public understanding and support, without sacrificing suppleness or being rigid.
2. Should freeze proponents concentrate on influencing the current Administration to change its position or on attempting to bring about its defeat? Rejecting the former objective in favor of the latter at this point would be to risk political effectiveness and philosophical consistency.

3. Is pro-arms control, anti-arms race activism better off staying the way it is, riding the Congressional freeze resolution and drum-beating the issue into the 1984 election, or changing? It could: (a) become more ideologically pure and intense; (b) invent a "daughter of freeze" by concentrating on a more narrow objective (e.g., measures to avoid accidental war, destabilizing weapons, comprehensive test ban, SALT II); or (c) attack specific targets in Congress such as weapons systems funding, in order to sustain vitality, interest and momentum by exercising political muscle. A compelling option might be to combine retention of the essential character of the movement along with selective efforts to resist Congressional approval of authorizing and appropriating actions inconsistent with its overall philosophy.

The challenge lies with the two elements in the process — political activists and policy activists — finding convergence and reciprocalness. This requires both integrity and flexibility on both sides, and a recognition of their mutual dependency. The movement has got to strike a balance between sticking to what it's got going for it politically in order not to lose influence, and being responsive to officials and experts shaping the position further so as to affect a more progressive and viable policy. And the traditional arms control elites ought to be careful about trying to manipulate a freeze movement which is both the catalyst for and the product of public attitudes disaffected by substantive policy expertise which perpetually claims complexity and public ignorance and by "arms race business as usual" over the last thirty years. Actually to accomplish desired change in this area requires an active public to be more sophisticated and responsible about the realities of the problem on the one hand, and government officials and their advisors to be guided by what the public wants and is willing to support on the other.

* * *

16
accomplish. "You have to keep your agenda short, concentrating on a few important issues each year." What short agenda is Dukakis focusing on now? "One area is the economy and the economic future of the state," said Dukakis, "Another is crime and getting serious about prosecution."

A third area that the Governor is working on is improving the public school system. Dukakis said that Reagan's solution for the problem is "merit pay, prayer in the classroom, and tuition tax credits." Dukakis disagrees with Reagan's idea of merit pay, partially on the grounds that the state could not afford to implement the program. However, Dukakis is "in favor of a system that encourages good teachers." The Governor is of the opinion that even more important than getting better teachers is getting better principals, because good principals can create an atmosphere which is conducive to innovative and successful teaching. He added though that "higher standards of teaching are also necessary."

Dukakis also addressed the issue of taxation. He said that he was not in favor of Proposition 2½, and that his job now is to get state money allocated efficiently among communities in order to help ease their financial problems. Dukakis then added that Massachusetts' taxes were below the national average, a fact which aroused disbelief among the students from Massachusetts.

When talk shifted to the national political scene, Dukakis was non-committal and rather reticent. Throughout the conversation, Dukakis had been very frank and candid, but he was hesitant to discuss his future aspirations on the national Democratic scene. He was also cagey when questioned about the upcoming presidential campaign. When asked who he would endorse for the Democratic nomination, Dukakis politically replied, "I'll tell you in September."

* * *
Principle one is that the press has, in my view, a vital role to play in the development of what we broadly call national security. When you think about it, it is not so easy to answer the question of who is it that really looks after American national security in the purest sense, that is free of political, business or other self-interest. In other words, who makes decisions for us in this vital field purely in the interest of this country? Most people would say, well, the traditional figures — the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the chairmen of armed services committees, and the leaders of the military-industrial complex. They are the ones who sit at the banquet tables under big flags and praise the need for strong defense.

But each year, we see chairmen of powerful congressional committees stuff weapons into the Pentagon budget for their home districts that the Pentagon didn’t ask for. Are they looking out for American security? We watch the Navy and its contractors allow the new Trident submarine, the backbone of the nation’s nuclear deterrent, to be delivered 2½ years late and hundreds of millions over budget. Are they the protectors of national security? We hear, from retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. David Jones, something that we think we already know quite well. It is not surprising that the Chiefs have trouble resolving costly fundamental questions of duplication of weapons, overlapping missions, and inter-service rivalries. We know, from the Pentagon Papers, that questions of war and peace have at times been decided largely out of sight of all public understanding of what was going on. We have seen the Army take 20 years to develop a new tank and a whole array of new weapons whose performance and cost are still questionable. We have seen the decision to end the draft made in a political environment which had great appeal for an administration in 1973 that was trying to get the nation’s youth off its back yet back out of Vietnam with its guns blazing. Was that crucial defense decision at that time made in the interests of politics or real national security?

So the press has a duty to jump into this issue, both vigorously and aggressively. I do not mean irresponsibly. I do not support the idea of printing details on how to make a hydrogen bomb, or giving away codes, or anything like
that. But the track record of American actions and decision-making since the Inchon landing in Korea in the overall national security area does not inspire great confidence and it behooves all of us to press to find out what is really going on and why it is happening.

And the more the merrier when it comes to this quest. Too often we leave such reporting to only the largest newspapers or networks or magazines.

Having jumped in, however, principle two comes in to play. That boils down to a realistic assessment of who we are, what we know and when did we know it, to paraphrase the tone of Watergate era questioning.

In dealing with the questions of nuclear weapons and strategy, we are all clearly outsiders. Few, if any, of us are technical experts. We have no access to classified information. This makes this kind of reporting different from all other; we live and work without security clearance but we have to report to those who do have access. No reporter, to the best of my knowledge, has ever seen what is called the Single Integrated Operations Plan, or SIOP, which lays out how we would really fight a nuclear war. Although we have all written a lot about Jimmy Carter’s Presidential Directive 59 and Reagan’s supposed directives on nuclear strategy, none of us has ever actually seen those documents. We do not have our own spy satellites. We don’t really know how accurate our missiles are or the Russian missiles, and we need to keep that in mind. So we are only as good as our sources. We must be on our guard in terms of being used by these sources for other purposes, and we must try to understand both the arcane technology of nuclear weapons and strategy, and the history of its evolution. Most importantly, we must somehow convey to readers or viewers, what it is that we are confident about knowing and what it is that we frankly don’t know or are not sure about.

The necessity for care in such matters continues to be demonstrated publicly because, whatever else they are, questions of nuclear war and attitudes toward it are also personal, emotional and politically explosive.

For example, on August 6, 1980, both The Washington Post and The New York Times reported that President Carter had signed a new directive on nuclear war strategy known as PD-59. The Times portrayed it as a new strategy and played the story prominently on page one. The Post story, which I wrote, was somewhat more subdued. It portrayed the directive in the lead as a modification of the strategy the United States would use in fighting a nuclear war. The Post, much to my chagrin at the time, also played the story well inside the paper.

First, let me say that any new Presidential Directive on nuclear war is an important story, and whether the strategy is all new or a modification is debatable. But in hindsight, both my story and the way the Post handled it, makes me feel a little more comfortable about the way things worked out. By pointing out the evolutionary aspects of the strategy, the reporting of which was based on interviews and not on actually seeing the document, we made the reader quickly aware that nuclear war fighting policy had begun to change in 1974, under then Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger. By the way, to Schlesinger’s credit, he
was a public servant who spoke publicly about his strategic views on the record and, whether one agreed with him or not, he was willing to defend his views intellectually in public. Reporters need to press public officials these days to do the same thing. So back to the August 1980 story. It was important to make readers understand that the readiness to pull the nuclear trigger in Washington was not necessarily or suddenly being increased, although the very promulgation of this directive showed that officials were now taking more seriously the idea that a nuclear war could start and might have to be fought. Those dual themes were what we tried to portray in the first few stories.

But if you will recall in the months preceding that directive the Russians had invaded Afghanistan, American hostages were still being held in Iran, U.S. embassies were being burned in Pakistan, and the United States, generally, had been made to look relatively powerless. So, were Carter’s men, in allowing the leaking of word about this new nuclear directive, trying to make the president look tough? Who knows? But it was a legitimate question and that, I think, is why the Post put the story inside. On balance, I think they probably were right.

The issue came up again this summer on May 30 when The New York Times headlined a major front page story about Reagan’s “new nuclear strategy” and billed it as the “first strategy for fighting a long nuclear war.” Several things happened as a result of this story, which was based on a leaked copy of Caspar Weinberger’s secret five-year guidance for the Defense Department. Was this strategy really new, or was it Reagan’s version of Carter’s PD-59? Was it the first strategy for fighting a prolonged nuclear war or, again, was it basically an evolution of Carter’s directive, which Carter’s aide Zbigniew already described as a war-fighting doctrine?

I am not making these points in criticism of the New York Times. I am only suggesting that they are legitimate questions and pointing out that the Times’ interpretation of the document caused months of political heat and contributed to the explosiveness of an issue which much of the loose rhetoric of the Reagan administration on nuclear matters had created in the first place. The question, however, is what really is the policy, aside from the rhetoric?

We could spend the whole session on this particular topic, but for the moment, my only point is that knowledge of the history and evolution of both atomic weapons and strategy is very useful for both reporters and readers. It would be wrong not to alert the public if an administration came to office with radically different views on atomic arms than its predecessors and actually changed the policies and the war plans. It is also wrong to be alarming beyond the point of what we really know, or what seems to be the case based on rhetoric.

I also think that more effort needs to be devoted to letting the reader know, within the bounds of not compromising sources that you trust, where, in general, information comes from and what are the motives of those willing to talk. For example, The Baltimore Sun last month had a story about four new Russian missiles nearing the flight test stage. The only attribution was to “U.S. sources.” As I understand it, the information came out of the disputed classified briefing that the Pentagon gave to reporters a few weeks ago. I have no reason to
The Media

doubt their information, indeed it was generally well known that those missiles were at least in development. But I would argue that attribution on that story should have been better, at least to let readers know it was from Pentagon officials, in the sense that every little bit helps.

In 1980, I did a story, based on interviews, that reported estimates of how many atomic missile warheads the Soviets could have with and without the limits imposed by the SALT II agreement. My editors made me put in the story that the information came from officials who supported ratification of SALT, which was the main dispute. At first, my reaction was that the editors would help point a finger at those who talked to me and also were forcing on me a standard that was not put on some other stories. Again, however, I think they were correct.

Basic principle three that I think needs special safeguarding when reporting on nuclear matters is that emotions must be kept out of reporting. That includes not only the emotions of reporters, but also of editors and owners of the media. The nuclear issue is very emotional, and it is subject to very subjective treatment. Repeated viewing of the mock incineration of Omaha has a very clear impact. Yet, like all important issues, the nuclear one has a very legitimate other side to it. At issue is the question of how best to avoid nuclear war. On the one hand, the public and any administration needs to be reminded at every turn about the horrors of atomic war and that it is a very different matter from other kinds of conflict. On the other hand, the argument that nuclear war is best avoided by a strong defense, a balance of military power, even if some of it is wasteful, and by a policy of deterrence, is also a very legitimate one, and I think people do understand these different answers and have strong feelings about them.

Perhaps because I am so involved I am too sensitive about the subject, but there are many stories I see in which I feel I know the reporter’s or publication’s politics or feelings. On balance, I think this is wrong and doesn’t change anybody’s mind. My personal view is that the reading and viewing public generally has good sense and senses a story with spin on it. The writings of journalists who are perceived as advocates of certain views tend to have less impact than others who seek to provide all sides of the question. The thing that frustrates all of us in reporting such issues is that there are questions—such as how much is enough—that are really very hard, impossible, perhaps, to come to grips with with any sense of confidence.

There are some other, random thoughts on covering nuclear issues. One is that a sensitivity to technical issues is of great importance because we frequently find ourselves in situations where a breakthrough in a laboratory someplace develops a life of its own and winds up driving what eventually becomes foreign and defense policy. The development of multiple warheads for missiles in the late 1960’s is the classic example of a technical development that ultimately had far greater implications for policy and the arms race than people were willing to acknowledge at the outset. I would argue that Cruise Missiles will be the thing
we will be writing about, much more than we now think, a decade from now. We have an obligation to inform ourselves about such developments.

In addition, there is the tendency among media, without much time or space to devote to any one topic, to focus on the politics of an issue rather than the issue itself. Who voted for what and what does this mean in terms of support for the administration? Conservatives against moderates, and so on, rather than a fuller exploration of what the matter is that the fight is over.

This, in a way, relates to the broader need for reporters, once they are educated, to educate their editors and ultimately their readers and viewers with as much balance and explanation as we can find in our efforts to get as close to the truth as we can. And this means reporters fighting for space to explain what they know.

* * *

Press and Government:
Some Reason for Optimism
by Lewis W. Wolfson

This article appeared in the November 1983 issue of The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Lewis W. Wolfson, Professor of Communication at American University and former Washington Bureau Chief for the Providence Journal Bulletin, was a Research Fellow at the Institute of Politics and adjunct lecturer at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, spring semester, 1983.

The conventional wisdom about the press-government relationship is that:
• Public officials generally understand the press and are bent on manipulating it.
• Officials feel they keep people informed and resent the press' probing for more.
The Media

What goes on between journalists and officials is largely an "adversary" relationship and that's about all you need to know to understand it.

In seven weeks of teaching 20 current and former public officials in the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard about relations between the press and the federal government, I saw each of these cliches contradicted. I found officials who were intensely curious about journalists and journalism, sometimes unsophisticated to the point of naivete about how the press operates, eager to try to build a professional relationship with journalists and self-critical about their own and their colleagues' attitude toward informing the public.

No, the adversary relationship is not buried. But those journalists who believe that's all the press-official relationship is about may be cutting off avenues for a deeper exchange with officials that could lead to improved public understanding of government.

Yes, some officials are not interested. They will preen or dissemble. They only want to know enough about the press so as to use it, and think that giving out as little information as possible is the way to do their job. But other officials, once your break through their suspiciousness are eager to learn how to build a sounder relationship. Yes, they can be astonishingly ignorant of how the press operates, but they accept the journalists' role more readily when educated about it—even if it hurts.

At the end of the course the single strongest recommendation they made to improve public understanding of government is that officials should tell more about what goes on inside it. Several people said they thought there was practically nothing that should be held back.

The group included 12 Harvard master's candidates in government and two in business. Eleven had experience in government at the federal, state or local level; three also had been journalists, and several had dealt with the news media as press secretaries or information officers. In addition, six participants were from the Senior Executive Fellows program through which high-level civil servants are brought to the Kennedy School from various federal agencies for a semester.

The elective course, which dealt with how the press-government relationship shapes news of Washington, was part of a Kennedy School effort to have its students learn about the ethical and practical concerns of an official's job.

I was prepared to find considerable antagonism toward the press. And I wondered how I could break that down. But my worry was unnecessary. Curiosity quickly overcame hostility.

For instance, one wary federal official who only recently has had to deal with reporters started out with cliches about the press' superficiality and disruptiveness. He felt, as he told me in a memo, "uncertain and distrustful of how they might use the information" he gave them. Everything he had read and heard led him to believe they were out to "get" officials.

Three weeks into the course, he still felt that reporting on government was superficial, but he wanted to let me know that he no longer questioned journalists' motivation. He could understand their problems. His suspicions
were not completely dispelled, but his attitude had changed. His final paper showed considerable understanding about pressures on journalists.

The officials clearly felt frustrated about dealing with the press and burned by the adversary syndrome. They were less sophisticated about journalists' attitudes and practices than they often are thought to be; but the more they learned, the more they came to recognize Washington journalists' professionalism.

In one class session, we discussed stories in *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* about how President Reagan in a press conference apparently had changed his position and would no longer invoke executive privilege for Environmental Protection Agency documents. Reagan talked about the public's suspicion that executive privilege might be used to cover "some wrongdoing." The next day, the White House in a clarification said executive privilege was still being claimed for the documents. *The Post* said Reagan had "backed away" from his earlier statement, while *The Times* said the President was still pressing his claim and that they had "incorrectly reported" that he had said he would not hold back the documents.

We talked about the different ways that story was handled. But what fascinated the class most was learning what a correspondent for a morning newspaper must go through to report on a presidential press conference held in prime-time TV near deadline. They hadn't thought about what went into such reporting—the pressure to pinpoint the important news from all the President's responses, the crafting of a lead, the need for on-the-spot understanding of the background of an issue and knowing what was new about what the President had said, the interpretation that had to be made of his words—all done on the tightest of deadlines. The officials were impressed and sympathetic. I cautioned that this is what press corps members get paid for and that the pressures shouldn't excuse shortcomings in reporting.

But I also wondered how curious and understanding journalists would be about the pressures on officials. Newspeople are taught to "get inside" the subject of the story. Should we be getting inside government more? Have we let our fear of being used or co-opted by the official "adversary" paralyze good journalism?

I spoke about this to a joint dinner of the officials in the Senior Executive Fellows program and Harvard's Nieman Fellows in journalism. The journalists bristled, recalling occasions when they had been frustrated and even lied to by officials and when only a tough adversary stance would have gotten them anywhere with a story. For the next two hours, the journalists and officials berated each other.

But there were voices of reason. An Army colonel who had seen much action in Vietnam and a Nieman fellow who was a veteran wire service correspondent in Washington urged more self-examination, more effort to seek common ground; otherwise, they reasoned, both officials and journalists would short-change the public in explaining government. Nobody went home converted, but
a sense was left of the progress we could make by putting together more rooms full of journalists and officials, and smoking out the premeditated misunderstandings and uninformed resentments.

Seeing the need for better understanding of the press-government relationship and its impact on public policy, Harvard is establishing a new $5 million Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, to be housed in a wing of the Kennedy School now under construction. The center will include applied research on press-government issues as well as courses and programs to encourage journalists' understanding of government decision making and issues and officials' understanding of the press.

The new Harvard center and other institutions can do a lot to bring journalists and officials together away from the day-to-day jockeying over stories. Press practitioners can get a start on building better understanding of government that will produce sharper reporting. As one editor said, "Don't tell journalists you're going to help them communicate better with officials; they won't buy that. But you can say there might be improved understanding" of each other's work and role, and that will mean better coverage.

For their part, officials need to give understanding of the news media more than just the back of their hand. So do academicians for some of whom polemics about the press come all too easily.

There is a lot of suspiciousness to be overcome on both sides. The Army colonel told me about one session in which a panel of Boston area journalists questioned a local official in front of the federal officials in a role play. The Army man was shaking his head because, as the role play ended, one journalist said to the official being quizzed: "Now tell us what you really thought," as though it was all a charade to deceive the press. He was shocked when another panelist crowed that at his newspaper they loved to "mix it up" with officials.

Officials suffer from similar kneejerk reactions.

Officials and journalists need a relationship built on more than comfortable misunderstandings and cliches about the official "adversary" or the press "policy-wrecker." The Harvard experiment is one way to build a more constructive relationship.

* * *
Bill Raleigh walked back into his office, scooping up a handful of telephone messages from his secretary's desk as he went by. He closed the door and sat back in his chair, the same worn leather that had supported the backsides of every Mammoth editor in an unbroken succession since 1832. He was only the eleventh in the venerable line. All but the first, Jacob Vandermint, were Harvard men, and all but the first were Boston men. All, after Vandermint, knew from the moment they walked into the Mammoth that they were destined to lead the newspaper in its unique mission which was to disseminate the news without fear or favor—up to a point. The special gift of a Mammoth editor was to know when that point was reached and when the uncontrolled rush to print generated side effects that would never do, not if Boston was to remain the way it always had been: a community where civilization mattered and where the people who guarded tradition could keep it forever fresh. Raleigh understood, as did his predecessors, that the Mammoth was more than just a newspaper; it was also a social gyroscope that kept Boston from ever teetering into the wrong hands. It had kept its leverage despite the changing tides of population by the prudent exercise of power. The Irish could take control of City Hall; the Jews could dominate the city's commerce; the blacks its neighborhoods. But the Mammoth held the city's soul in its grip, forcing the upstarts of whatever questionable breed to adhere to the Mammoth's agenda, the Mammoth's values, and ultimately the Mammoth's view of reality. Vandermint, way back before the Civil War, had been the only Mammoth editor who had not understood the uniqueness of a city that held a special niche in the universe, and his failure had cost him not only his job, but his newspaper as well.

It was a lesson that was never forgotten. What the misguided zealot Vandermint had done was to insist that the Mammoth crusade against the carefully crafted statutes that kept Irish immigrants confined to the overcrowded ships that carried them across the sea to the New World. A Dutch immigrant himself, Vandermint knew at first hand the menace posed by a voyage of eight weeks or more in crowded steerage quarters. He also knew that few immigrants could afford a disembarkation fee of $100 to guarantee they would not become public wards. As he agitated for repeal of the anti-Irish laws,
he also stirred the emotions of the Irish who had already settled in Boston's tightly packed waterfront neighborhoods. Rioting broke out that only hardened the hearts of the native population and the Know-Nothings in the Legislature.

The people guarding the city's traditions turned on the Mammoth as an alien force. And even the Irish failed to support him, seeing in his crusade the hand of an opportunist seeking the main chance at their expense. It was Vandermint they blamed when a mob broke into the Ursaline convent, roughed up the nuns, smashed crucifixes and burned the building to the ground. And it was Vandermint the natives blamed when the Supreme Court overturned the disembarkation fees. Left with no constituency and no hope of merchant support, Vandermint had no choice but to sell the paper to Walter Griswold's great-great grandfather, who saw to it that the Vandiment error would never be repeated. Henceforth Mammoth editors would be men of prudence, schooled in the ways of Boston but cannily wary of the ways of the world. They would understand that, while a newspaper was in the business of news, it was also and primarily in the business of power, and that maintaining power meant keeping Boston the way it was—no matter who lived there.

Over the generations, the Mammoth had become ever more skilled in the power game, ever more subtle in playing off the incoming waves of settlers while adeptly shrouding the face of the authentic elite. Of all the men who led the Mammoth, Bill Raleigh was supreme. He could mask the most high-handed methods in the guise of participatory democracy, the most outlandish self interest in the pursuit of the common good, the most blatant bigotry behind the face of good will. In short, he was a consummate politician, who only rarely indulged in self satisfaction. It was one of those fleeting moments of smugness he enjoyed now as he sat back in his chair and surveyed the momentos that all but covered his office walls—portraits, all of them candid, of course, of popes and presidents, Nobel Prize winning chemists and medical men, statesmen and his adoring wife and children. There he was with Hailie Selassie and Pius XII, with Nasser and Mobuto, with DeGaulle and Maria Callas. A whole section of the wall recalled the days when John Kennedy was in the White House and Bill Raleigh was close at hand—at Hyannis and in the Rose Garden and there was a delightful shot of the two men by the window in the Oval Office. Under Bill Raleigh, the Mammoth meant something in New England and the nation. But it also stood for something in the world.

Life had been good to him. Of course, he had learned his lessons well, becoming a competent newsman despite a singular lack of either news instinct or writing skill. What he could not do naturally, he learned to do mechanically, painstakingly assembling a file index of virtually every conceivable news lead. As a young reporter, he had managed to compete with more gifted rivals by pulling the appropriate card, be his assignment a four-alarm fire in Chelsea or the dedication of a new library at Harvard. All Raleigh had to do when in the slightest doubt about which approach to take was to pull the appropriate card and fill in the blanks.
But if he learned his journalism by rote, his political skills came naturally. At home in the Brahmin world that produced him, he was quick to learn the ways of the Irish, the Italian and the Jew by choosing his friends with an eye toward their ethnic background. Tom O'Hara, who joined the Mammoth on the same day in June, 1935 as Raleigh, was his entree to the Irish. O'Hara taught him not only to drink, but how to hide one's intent behind self-deprecating laughter. He was also Raleigh's guide to judging political horse flesh, to read psychic charts for depths and shoals so one could determine after an hour or two of conversation whether an aspiring young man had the stuff to get to the top and stay there, or would fall by the wayside, too eager to pack a payroll with his cousins and cronies, too eager to toss aside his ethics for a crack at easy cash.

Andy Panacheo educated him in the Italians, actually after elaborate precautions were taken, leading him into a police-protected private club in the North End where he sat quietly and watched swarthy men play hearts until dawn. His Jewish mentor was Al Goldstein, who gave him a limited but serviceable Yiddish vocabulary that allowed him to sprinkle his conversation with words like "schtick" and "schmuck" and "zophtic" but also taught him what Raleigh took as the wisdom of the ages: "Steal with your eyes, never your hands." "Dress British; think Yiddish."

But mostly, he had educated himself, hungrily reaching out for any scrap of knowledge or information that would prepare him for the job he was born to hold.

* * *
Government, Networks, or Politicians

from Television and the Presidential Elections with discussion participants including: Tom Brokaw, Adam Clymer, William Leonard, Roger Mudd, Richard E. Neustadt, David R. Obey, Dot Ridings, Richard Wald


Geller sided with those who wanted to see the government out of the business of regulating appearances by presidential candidates:

I would trust the judgment of the broadcaster to begin with. You can get reports on how it works out. If there are abuses, you can take action. But the government shouldn't intervene until they see the abuses.

There have been proposals, if you want mechanistic, . . . to use a percentage, a very low percentage that brings everybody who is significant within equal time. You can use a figure of two percent generated by the party in the previous election and one percent on petitions.

But what I am saying is that whatever the percentage is, it would be one chosen to include anybody significant, but to get out the vegetarians and the others who have no real significance in the process . . .

It worked out very well in 1960. It has worked out other times very well. I would ask for reports from the FCC and others; and then if it continued to work out well, I would leave it alone and simply repeal it for president and vice president.

It is a different issue . . . when you get to local races.

Clymer wondered why the networks wanted this responsibility:

I can understand very much why you don't want the government telling you you may not sponsor debates and decide who is in them, . . . why you must be uninvolved with the League of Women Voters. . . .

Why do you want to be involved? Why do you not want to cover other people's news events? Why do you want the responsibility for saying this guy is serious and this guy isn't? Isn't the journalist's job not to make news but to cover it?
Wald said that Clymer's newspaper the *New York Times*, tried to arrange debates in the 1980 presidential election. Clymer said that is what was discussed at the *Times*, and Leonard and Bruno added that the *Des Moines Register* had staged a debate in Iowa and a paper in New Hampshire had done the same thing there. Clymer responded by saying that he still did not think it was the right thing to do and reiterated his question, why not stick to covering news "that is out there" rather than creating it? Brokaw said they wanted to do both. Bruno said that the issue was journalistic discretion and that they just wanted to be free to exercise "the same editorial judgments that any other journalists exercise."

Mudd added what appeared to be a note of basic realism to the discussion:

I think one possible answer to your question... is that a debate, for instance, between the two leading candidates, the ones that we all know and most of us follow, is a much more interesting broadcast than to have it cluttered up with five or six or seven other minor candidates. It is less exciting, probably, and I think it is easier for the networks to deal with technically and from a program standpoint, with just the two big guns.

Clymer pointed out that the debate-coverage problem was one reason for repealing Section 315 for the presidential and vice-presidential campaigns, but he did not respond to the issue of why the networks wanted to get in the business of sponsoring debates.

Geller pointed out that the equal-opportunity law also prevents local broadcasters from staging local debates:

The FCC has reported, and I think correctly, that this may be inhibiting full coverage of the campaign by restricting the broadcaster from making his contribution..... You are undermining having a fully informed electorate.

It is a phony restriction. It is still a bona fide news event, whether it is... put on by the *New York Times* or CBS and NBC and ABC.

T. Brown turned to Dot Ridings who earlier had indicated being in favor of retaining the equal-time law. She said that the League of Women Voters has had more experience running debates at the state and local, rather than the national, levels and that they have found

great relief and gratitude that the local affiliates do... turn it over to somebody else to organize, structure and present as an event which they then come to cover as news... .

I'm uncomfortable... with either real or perceived judgments being placed by news organizations on the inclusion of those kinds of candidates, ... What really elevates a non-major party contender for any office, what gives that person the right to become a major contender, and who makes those kinds of decisions... .

Warren Mitofsky pressed her on the adequacy of the league's decisions on
including independent candidate John Anderson in the 1980 debates. She answered that no one at the league was "totally comfortable" with it and characterized their standard as "the best" of a collection of "imperfect solutions." Professor Neustadt asked her why she would not prefer a news organization, which has "a great deal of experience in these sorts of judgments," to the league? She argued that the league has been in the debate-sponsoring business longer than television, although she acknowledged that the issues were troubling ones. Segelstein wondered whether it would not be better to have three organizations making those decisions, on the theory that they might very likely make different ones and "the problems might be offset from one organization to the other."

T. Brown asked Congressman Obey whether he would prefer the networks to the league as debate organizers. He replied that

while I am not at all fond of the format . . . that the league adopted on presidential races, and I think a lot of times the league gets in the way of really having true confrontations between the candidates (or are used in order to avoid true confrontations between the candidates), I still in the last analysis am somewhat more comfortable with the unbiased credentials of the league than I am a number of local broadcasters.

Congressman Obey did indicate that he would be "less concerned" if Section 315 were repealed only for presidential candidates rather than for all candidates. Small returned to the network perspective:

It isn't that we don't love the League of Women Voters, and it isn't that we would not carry a debate that they sponsored. In the final analysis, as we saw by the experience of 1980, it is the candidates who decide which forum they will go with . . . if the candidates chose only to go to a debate . . . sponsored by the Boy Scouts of America, we would cover it. What we object to is . . . excluding networks from becoming sponsors.

* * *
Examining The Issues

The State and The Poor in the 1980's

by Samuel H. Beer

Although academic in training and technique, the present authors have not lost touch with that other great source of good sense about practical affairs—vis., practical experience. Nearly all have seen government service in fields related to their academic interests. In the way they assess evidence and foresee results, the reader will detect the influence of not only the findings of research but also the voice of experience. Necessarily the 1970 study relied much more heavily upon this latter source. The present authors have strengthened the argument for an anti-poverty effort by a shift of emphasis from expert opinion to expert research, but without giving up the value of the mix in method.

What they say may surprise some readers familiar with only the criticism of earlier anti-poverty programs. While the discipline of evaluation has dealt harshly with some of those initiatives, revealing inadequacies in design and bad side-effects in outcome, the rigorous standards of this volume vindicate not a few success stories. For example, community health centers, once criticized as expensive and ineffective, have been shown to be a cost-effective means of providing health care for the poor. They not only reduce illness and infant mortality but also lessen the utilization of certain expensive and unnecessary services. The supplemental food program for women and children (WIC) has lowered the number of neo-natal deaths and low-birth-weight infants, and during the 1970's the level of infant mortality in Massachusetts fell sharply, especially among blacks. The ability of health maintenance organizations (prepaid medical care) to provide services to Medicaid beneficiaries at reduced cost is “well-established.” In the 1970s housing quality for poor households improved. Experimentation with state programs showed that subsidies to low-income residents (Chapter 707) are “much more cost-effective” than public housing or subsidies to developers in alleviating the primary problem facing poor households today—namely, high rent burdens. In the field of regional economic development, the city of Lowell, which was cited as a severely depressed area in the 1970 book, now appears as “a nationally publicized success story.” In Massachusetts, as throughout the country, the situation of the elderly, one of
the most afflicted group some years ago, has "improved dramatically," thanks to social security and supplemental security income. These same programs have also helped move the disabled out of poverty.

The success stories sustain a reasoned faith that government can help. By contrast they emphasize the near intractability of some poverty problems. To cite the most striking example: the "feminization of poverty." As Mary Jo Bane points out, the lone mother with her dependent children is increasinly the typical figure; about half the poor now lie in such families. Should these women be encouraged to turn over the care of their children to others and join the regular labor force? If the goal is to see that they become self-supporting, what scheme of cash assistance will be the most effective incentive? On the other hand, if they are expected to occupy themselves at home, how can they be protected against becoming indefinitely dependent on welfare? Generally accepted answers to these mixed questions of fact and value are yet to be found.

In the 1980s in Massachusetts, as in most other parts of the country, the problems of poverty present an ever more acute challenge to state government. One reason, as we have just seen, is the size and complexity of the problems. Another is financial. The depressed condition of the economy has reduced revenues and added to social spending. Like many other states Massachusetts is caught in a bind between the revolt against local taxation (Proposition 2½ in this state) and the new federalism's onslaught against federal spending. At the same time that state resources are being drawn on for more local aid, they are also being drained by the reduction of federal assistance.

And there is a long-run financial problem. During the 1960s spending by state governments from their own resources grew at an even faster rate than federal spending. Massachusetts was no exception. From 1963 to 1973, usually under Republican governors and Democratic legislatures, state spending rose from $759 million to $2.75 billion. Governor Francis Sargent's budget recommendations for fiscal 1975 sounded the alarm. His figures showed that spending growth regularly outstripped revenue growth, mainly because of the automatic and semi-automatic increases, largely in social programs, to which the state had committed itself.

Since that time—and again parallels can be found elsewhere—cost containment has continued to be an urgent concern of state government. Poverty-related programs comprise a large part of total state spending. The Anti-Poverty Budget prepared for fiscal year 1983 by the Massachusetts Senate Ways and Means Committee calculated the amount as 49 percent of the whole budget. If this burden on the taxpayer is to be controlled, there must be some such overview of the total cost in comparison with other fields of state activity. One may also hope that an anti-poverty budget will show how coordination can contain costs, as when, for instance, expenditures directed toward the relief of poverty can be directed to supportive services that will enable some of the poor to become self-supporting. On the other hand, at a time when politicians and administrators are trying to find programs to cut, it is imperative that the more
vulnerable members of society not be made to bear an excessive burden simply by oversight. An anti-poverty budget informed by research and experience and reflecting community standards of decency will serve both the interests of the taxpayer and of the poor.

* * *

Trade Policy and Industrial Policy
by Robert B. Reich

Robert B. Reich is a lecturer in Public Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, author of The Next American Frontier (Times Book Co., Inc., NY: 1983), and former Director of Policy Planning at the Federal Trade Commission. This piece is an edited excerpt from his remarks at a panel discussion in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum on "Trade Policy and Industrial Policy," April 11, 1983, an event co-sponsored by the Institute of Politics and the John F. Kennedy School of Government Center for Business and Government.

Underlying much of our discussion here is a premise, I think a false premise, that has guided a lot of discussion about free trade over the last few decades. And that premise is that the choice, the fundamental policy choice we have before us, is between protectionism, on the one hand, and free trade, on the other. That is the way the issue is framed. That is the way our institutions and our laws are framed.

The problem is that as we see Japanese-targetted industrial policies to an increasing extent, industrial policies and subsidies, various forms of loans and loan guarantees and so on in Western Europe, we find ourselves in the
predicament of a kind of conundrum: that is, industrial policies abroad are unfair because they give foreign countries unfair advantages, we assume, and yet at precisely the same time, we want government in the United States to get off our backs because it creates unfair disadvantages if government meddles in corporate affairs. The problem is that that contradiction is one that we're almost forced into ideologically, so long as the choice is protectionism or free trade.

As we talk about getting tough with Japan, in terms of discouraging Japan from using industrial policies, we face that contradiction more and more openly, more and more specifically. What do we mean by getting tough with Japan? What are we going to do, in terms of getting tough with Japan? Are we going to try to retaliate by protecting our markets? Well, that's probably going to result in shooting ourselves collectively in the foot, increasing costs for downstream suppliers, downstream purchasers, and purchasers of all sorts, stopping growth of third world countries in their tracks, and drying up export markets at the same time. If we're not going to retaliate with some sort of protectionism, are we going to retaliate with what Ambassador McDonald just called counter-industrial policy, trade policy? Does that mean subsidies to American industries that are victimized by Japanese industrial policies? Does that mean replicating Japanese industrial policies to try to create a level playing field? If that's the case, then we run into the conundrum that Brian Turner talked about. That is, we let them decide what we're going to target. We react to their targeting, and we probably don't even do that very well, not only because of the temporal problems—that is, we're reacting quite late—but also because the Japanese are playing in a world market, and what helps them gain economies of scale, what helps them gain a dominant position in any given generation of products in that world market, is not going to be deterred very much by American industrial policies that only govern the American market, that don't extend to the world as well.

The fact is that there have been enormous structural changes over the last fifteen years in the American economy, the Japanese economy and economies of all nations of the world, including lesser-developed nations. Those structural changes mean that every government is actively engaged in de facto or implicit industrial policies targeted to either encourage economic development or retard economic development, or force the costs of economic development on other nations, which is often the case. So long as we continue to view the critical choice as protection or free trade, we end up acting not in our own best interests. We end up, for example, imposing countervailing duties against the British for ostensibly subsidizing their steel industry, when in fact the evidence suggests that a lot of those subsidies acted to reduce the capacity of British steel, enabled them to scrap excess capacity and actually retrain a lot of workers for other things. If subsidies in foreign countries are actually intended to help scrap underutilized industrial capacity and retrain workers for other kinds of occupations, that's just the kind of subsidy that we ought to be encouraging, not just abroad, but also here at home.
We impose countervailing, anti-dumping levies against a firm, usually from Japan, that prices its goods below cost, in anticipation of a very large world market share. It's an emerging business, an emerging industry. Should we do that? Is that in our own best interests? The problem is that American purchasers of numerically-controlled machine tools, for example, can benefit enormously by getting those cheap Japanese goods. By blocking their access, whether through anti-dumping levies, orderly marketing agreements, or whatever, we are not acting in our best interests. We are actually blocking our market and blocking the development of those downstream purchasers. We're using orderly marketing agreements increasingly as the primary vehicle of international trade control, not only with steel from Europe, but automobiles from Japan. We now have under the Reagan administration a ten-fold increase of tariffs on motorcycles. Where is this all leading? What is our interest? Do we have any forum for articulating what our trade interests are? I don't think we do. I don't think we have articulated our trade interests, and I think as long as we continue to envision the choice as protection or free trade, we are not articulating that trade interest.

Ultimately, the real choice is preservation of the status quo or positive adjustment to higher value-added production that may promise higher real incomes and more jobs in the future, not just here, but around the world, as we give off some of our lowest value-added segments to other nations. That positive adjustment policy needs to be coordinated with other nations. We need to encourage other nations to embark upon positive adjustment if they have not already done so. There is a problem, a fundamental problem, but it's not an economic problem. I think it is more a political problem, and an institutional problem. We simply do not have a forum, a legal order, a set of institutions now capable of fashioning and articulating and creating agreements among nations with regard to what that positive adjustment policy might be.

* * *
Examining The Issues

Thinking For Dollars

by Robert J. Yarbrough

Robert J. Yarbrough (Harvard ‘84) is President of Harvard Political Review, a quarterly journal of the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics, in which the article, “Thinking for Dollars” originally appeared (Volume X/Number 4). This piece is an excerpt from that article.

Though the Hoover Institution may hold the oldest and warmest place in Mr. Reagan’s heart, it is more likely that research that truly makes a difference in his White House is formulated by one of the two major capital-based conservative research institutions—the long-established American Enterprise Institute or its ten-year-old counterpart: the Heritage Foundation.

“Adam Smith versus Lee Iacocca” is how Heritage’s president Edwin J. Feulner, Jr. distinguishes the research center he heads from AEI. To his mind, the latter looks to big business to solve the nation’s ills; he and his colleagues, on the other hand, look to the free market for salvation. His views reach a highly receptive audience.

In the ten years since it was founded with $250,000 from Joseph Coors, Heritage’s budget has soared to an estimated $7 million in 1982. “Under Heritage’s imprimatur,” says the National Journal, “is published an endless stream of books, reviews, studies, newsletters, digests, monographs, policy papers, and critiques on contemporary issues.” One of these was a work that may have achieved a lasting impact on the Reagan administration—and, thus, on the direction of American public policy. On November 14, 1980, Heritage presented to President-elect Reagan a 20-volume, 3,000-page research effort titled Mandate for Leadership. Feulner told the Journal two years later that the administration “had adopted 61% of the 1,270 recommendations included in Heritage’s massive study.” Mr. Reagan himself, in a preface to the foundation’s annual report, praised Heritage for providing his White House with “special substantive help.” As a matter of fact, the president continued, “one of the people it’s been most useful to and used by is me.”

Formerly administrative assistant to Rep. Philip M. Crane (R-III.) and confidential aide to defense secretary Melvin R. Laird, Feulner and Paul Weyrich—another far-right avatar—co-founded Heritage in 1973. When Feulner assumed the presidency in 1977 (Weyrich having vacated the position two years earlier), the center had an annual budget of $800,000. The new president set about beating the bushes. Other major contributors to the cause besides Coors have been the Scaife family charitable trust of Pittsburgh (the largest donor); the John M. Olin Fund; and the Noble Foundation of Oklahoma, based
on income from oil and gas. Coors sits on the center's board; so does former Secretary of the Treasury William Simon, J. Robert Fluor of the Fluor Corporation, and RKO General president Frank Shakespeare, formerly head of the U.S. Information Agency (and head media consultant for Richard Nixon's successful 1968 presidential bid).

Like the Hoover and AEI, Heritage has its academic stars who bring luster to the institution. Among them are George Gilder, whose *Wealth and Poverty* is considered the bible of the supply-side creed; author Midge Decter and her husband, Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary*; and Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute. But the day-to-day work of the foundation is carried out by a staff of about thirty research analysts. Heritage prides itself on being a haven for young, promising, conservative scholars.

One Heritage official characterizes the rationale behind the center's emphasis on younger talent in this way. "This is not a government-in-exile," he says, "or a rest home for former government officials looking to rejuvenate themselves. Neither do we look for the Arthur Burnses (Burns had spent a term at AEI between his ouster by Jimmy Carter as chair of the Federal Reserve Board and his appointment by Mr. Reagan as ambassador to West Germany), but rather the young policy analysts who deal at the cutting edge of major issues."

Heritage hones its edge by printing and distributing a virtual cornucopia of publications designed to keep its imprint before the policymakers: *National Security Record*, a defense and international affairs monthly; *Policy Digest*, a quarterly edited by John O'Sullivan, formerly assistant editor of the *London Daily Telegraph*. (The latter deals with both domestic and international topics.) Part of that task is made easier by the fact that Mr. Reagan, in the aftermath of his receipt of *Mandate for Leadership*, chose several Heritage scholars who worked on the study for key administrative positions. They include John A. Svahn, commissioner of the Social Security administration; Raymond A. Peck, Jr., administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; William Bennett, chair, National Endowment for the Humanities; and none other than perhaps the single most controversial member of the Administration, Interior Secretary James G. Watt. The increased visibility certainly has not hurt this brash institution; the reality is that for this most ardent of free-market research centers, the ultimate goal may never be reached. Even as he agrees that there will never be a truly free market in the United States, director Feulner says that that makes it all the more necessary for institutions such as his. "We need a model to which to aspire," he says; Heritage will try to supply it.

The conservative think tank which gives Brookings the closest run for its money is the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, founded in 1943 by Lewis H. Brown, chair of the Johns-Manville Corporation, to promote free-market ideology. Its growth was slow until the mid-1970s, during that decade AEI's budget leaped from $2.5 million to $6 million. Publishing is perhaps the most important component of the AEI effort; the institute's journals range in title and function from *AEI Defense Review* to *Regulation* to, simply, *Public Opinion*.

That last journal is indicative of the links that bind scholars in the conservative
A Case Study

by Susan Bitensky

Susan Bitensky (Harvard '84) completed a social action project as an intern with Bet Tzedek Legal Services, Los Angeles, during the summer of 1982 with financial assistance from the Student Summer Internship Program of the Institute of Politics. Ms. Bitensky's internship evaluation and report included case studies of 11 clients who had been evicted from their homes. This piece is one of those case studies.

Jennie Hafer and her husband became the managers of an apartment building at 310 North Gardner Street in 1971. When her husband passed away four years later, Mrs. Hafer, who was then 78, continued managing the building on her own. She lived there rent-free and received $250 per month. Mrs. Hafer cared for the building "as if it had been her own" until she got the flu in the winter of 1981. Then Mrs. Hafer was hospitalized for 3 weeks but still kept in touch with tenants in the building to make sure all was well. However, when she returned the building's owner fired her and said she had to vacate her apartment within five days. This came as a complete shock to Mrs. Hafer. She was now 84 and had planned to manage the building for the duration of her life. Mrs. Hafer believes the owner fired her to give her job to a young man living in the building, and to rent out her apartment.

Faced with the loss of her job and home at such an old age, Mrs. Hafer was devastated. She had no idea where or how to live. Her only source of income would now be her monthly social security check for $180.
Fortunately, Bet Tzedek was able to stay her eviction until she found some place to live. Friends urged Mrs. Hafer to apply to Menorah Village—a non-profit home for the aged in Reseda where resident pay whatever rent they can afford in the form of SSI, Social Security or Medical. When her application was accepted, Mrs. Hafer decided to go there as she had no other way of supporting herself.

Mrs. Hafer says Menorah Village is an “admirable project”. It “treats indigent people not as discarded or homeless creatures, but as human beings”. She stresses that the home does not just provide the basic necessities, but encourages its members to develop their talents. When she was twenty Mrs. Hafer dreamed of writing poetry—now she writes for Menorah Village’s literary magazine. Last year, for the first time in her life, she went to the Music Center to hear the philharmonic orchestra. She contrasts Menorah Village to the “vicious” board-and-care homes run for profit on Fairfax Avenue and she praises the dedication of its staff and volunteers. Mrs. Hafer says that all the residents have a real attachment to Menorah Village and help in whatever way they can to keep it going. Mrs. Hafer makes aprons to sell at the annual fund-raising fair and assists in the coffee shop.

Mrs. Hafer is thankful but “every project has its shortcomings.” She has had difficulty adjusting to the institutional nature of Menorah Village: she must always let the office know where she is going when she leaves; she must get to meals by appointed times; she must share her small room with another person. After so many years of living independently, it has taken time to adjust to regimentation and loss of privacy. Mrs. Hafer also says that she is sometimes depressed living only with elderly persons. Menorah Village has full hospital facilities so Mrs. Hafer is constantly reminded of illness and death as she watches the passing of her friends.

Still, Mrs. Hafer leaves Menorah Village on many outings planned by the staff, and also takes trips on her own to visit friends from her old neighborhood. These friends come to see her, as does her brother who lives in Monterrey, and her sister who lives in Los Angeles.

* * *
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I would like to share some observations with you about women in leadership roles, examining both the progress which has been made and exploring the barriers which remain. On the positive side, both in the public sector and in the private sector, there has been tremendous progress. There are not only statistics to bear this out, but we also have visual examples of progress as seen right here in this room. The number of women participating in this conference undoubtedly creates a different class picture than would have been visible just a few years ago. In the field of politics, progress for women has been somewhat more modest. If the criteria is that 50% of our elected officials should be female, we are very short of that goal.

As we look at the statistics of women running for office, however, it is clear that about 50% of women who receive a major party nomination for Congress or a state legislature get elected. The major barrier to women in politics seems not to be at the voting booth but rather at an earlier stage, during the primary campaign, or even earlier when women begin to think about running. The reality is that women will not achieve full political equality until more women decide to run for office.

We have to look at some of the underlying reasons which have prevented women from taking this step. So far, we have concentrated on the obvious barriers, such as raising money and building a campaign organization. I believe the barriers go deeper than that, are both internal and external. Of course, they are interrelated. The image we have of ourselves is based largely on how we perceive the world to be. If we don’t see women holding leadership positions, it’s very hard to picture ourselves in such positions. I cannot overemphasize the importance of role models. The most important deterrent for women in leadership roles is simply the lack of precedent. There are almost no women’s portraits on the walls of our state houses. That in itself is a powerful message.

One difference between men and women in leadership positions is that women are brought into the political process for different reasons. Women have a strong sense that their participation in public life should be viewed as an
extension of their family role. Some men are similarly motivated but the difference is that society accepts women's participation in politics as long as it is under the aegis of the traditional female role. But when the quest for a leadership role can no longer be justified in terms of public service alone, but invades the territory of power, going after what someone else wants, the tolerance for women diminishes.

One reason that women do not achieve political equity is that often they sense a tension between the traditional female qualities which they were taught to value, and the rough male-defined style of leadership which they are expected to emulate. A challenge which women in leadership face is to integrate these two qualities harmoniously, both in their outward behavior and in their inward psyches.

Carol Gilligan, in her book, *In a Different Voice*, writes, "Women's sense of integrity appears to be intertwined with an ethic of care . . . to see themselves as women is to see themselves in a relationship of connections". She states that women often subordinate achievement to care and feel conflict over competitive success. The aversion that women feel to highly competitive situations which can sever their cherished relationships may deter their entry into the political arena. At the same time, the female qualities of caring, as Gilligan defines them, offer a positive contribution to the existing political hierarchy.

If women are to achieve leadership positions, we have to make room for a female leadership style which is both politically effective in the traditional sense, but which also acknowledges the differences which women bring—because they are women—to the political power structure.

Let me turn to the currently popular subject of the gender gap. What does it mean? I believe it means that for the first time women are expressing themselves in a political context. When women obtained the right to vote, it took them a long time to figure out what to do with it. Women have historically voted in lesser numbers than men. The gender gap indicated for the first time that women were voting in greater numbers than men at certain age levels, and that they followed a distinct voting pattern. Women earning a paycheck are concerned about the economy; women not wanting to send their sons to war are concerned about peace. In a sense, women are our latest wave of political immigrants, discovering what every group of immigrants has discovered—that if you are going to have some control over your life, you have to have political power.

Today, women are not going to settle simply for good issues and noble causes and expect them to triumph on their merits. We learned that lesson from the defeat of the ERA. Today women are going to go a step further and develop the political skills to follow through on the causes they espouse.

In my own career, I learned early the importance of making the transition from simply believing in an issue to following through on it politically. I realized I needed both economic and political skills. That is one reason why I became a member of the Appropriations Committee, and later, its Chair. Probably the most significant decision of my political career was to force myself to develop
financial skills. I realized that I could get up and give a beautiful speech about day care, but if it did not end up as a line item in the budget, it was simply a nice speech.

In addition, I learned the importance of developing tough political skills. I believe that feminine values, such as a concern for relationships, should be part of the power structure. But at the same time, I know that is not enough. Women must also understand the political rules of the game and not consider them unsavory or conduct unbecoming a lady.

Women, in turn, have at times been too polite when denied actual power because they have confused being liked with being given power. We've been taught that it is important to be liked; that it is dangerous not to be liked. Sometimes we indulge in self sabotage by internalizing other people's doubts about ourselves, asking, "Do I really belong here?" If we are to surmount the barriers which prevent women from fully achieving leadership roles, I believe we must move toward a feminization of politics. To do so, we must integrate the female political voice with the existing male-defined structure. If we succeed, we will achieve a number of things.

One, we will have fulfilled our original commitment to equal justice, as expressed in our Constitution. Two, we will have further emancipated men, by permitting them to choose alternative leadership styles. And three, we will bring values to our political system which we desperately need when everything seems to be hanging by a slender thread. If we don't see connections between dioxin being dumped and the future of life on earth; if we don't see connections between the nuclear arms race and our possible extinction, how indeed will we survive? We need not divorce the so-called humane values from tough political values. We can find a balance between the two.

* * *
Women, Religion and Social Change

by Jean Zaru

"Women, Religion, and Social Change: An International Symposium" was held in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum on June 14 and 16, 1983, co-sponsored by the Harvard Divinity School and the Institute of Politics. This piece is excerpted from the remarks by Jean Zaru at the panel discussion, "Making Peace: Women in the Midst of Conflict," on June 14th. Jean Zaru is a Palestinian educator at The Quaker Friends' School, Ramallah, West Bank.

In Judaism, Christianity and Islam, the concept of the divine nature, existing in harmonious relationship with human nature and the natural order, has been a dominant one. The teaching of these religions of my part of the world helped undergird the belief that human beings have rights: Created in the image of God, our value comes from this likeness; God's nature as loving, free and just; God's purpose to liberate human life from inhuman conditions which exist because humans of free will have chosen behavior that disrupts the intended harmony which provides peace, justice and freedom for all. As a Palestinian Quaker woman, native of the Holy Land, I have been confronted all my life with structures of injustice. These political, cultural, economic and social structures have been at work in a destructive way throughout our community and have caused much spiritual as well as physical suffering for many, including myself.

I started to think about this. If there is that of God in every person, why is there so much evil and darkness in the world? Why is it hard for us to see that of God in others? My inward struggle was reflected in my outward action, and I became so sensitive and so aware of the suffering which reflects the evils which plague the human race. But it opened me also to God's redeeming love and activity. Involvement in any action takes an effort and there is always a cost or a price to pay. Am I ready to pay the price—to share the suffering of others? Suffering for me can be bearable if it is for the cause of liberation, to find a new community with each other and with God. I do realize that those who operate the structures of oppression are dependent on the people they oppress, and they are equally in need of liberation in God's grace. Yet it seems to me that the will and strength to end oppression comes from those who bear it in their own lives, rather than from the privileged persons and nations. But where do we begin? If life in its fullness, if the children of God wherever they are, created in the image of God, are our brothers and sisters, what do we do to preserve the dignity of their lives? What do we do to the arms race? What do we do when in the name of national security, the scarce resources are used to buy weapons, instead of combating poverty and hunger? What do we say when these arms sales, promoted by industrialized nations, are often used for internal repression,
violation of human rights, and wars within a country and between neighboring countries?

How can we bear the pain, and where do we look for hope? Is there anything we can do to solve our present political chaos and the crisis in our world? Is there anything we can do to stop wars of all kinds? Let us take a look into ourselves, for the outward situation is merely an expression of the inward state. It requires great self-denial and resignation of ourselves to God to be committed to peace and to non-violent action to bring about change. This technique may have no positive effect. And it may lead to outward defeat. Whether successful or not, it will bring suffering, but if we believe in non-violence as the true way of peace and love, we must make it a principle, not only of individual, but of national and universal conduct. But we should try to do so without any feeling of moral superiority. For we know how soon we may stumble when we are put to the test. We may talk about peace, but if we are not transformed inwardly, if we still want position, power, if we are motivated by greed, if we are nationalistic, if we are bound by beliefs and dogmas for which we are willing to destroy others, we cannot have peace in our world.

I call myself a Quaker, or a Friend, and Friends throughout history maintained a testimony for peace. And it is laid upon us to live in the virtue of that life and power that wins through love, and not war. This is not an easy testimony, for it has three aspects. One, to refuse to take part in acts of war ourselves. Two, to strive to remove the causes of war. Three, to use the way of love open to us to promote peace and heal wounds. But how can I interpret my pacifism to my children and my students when we are all victims of violence? How can I have peace within, when I worry so much about life in general, and the lives of my family members? How can I have peace within, when others label my people as terrorists, and justify our oppression by quoting the Bible?

I know the oppressor is not freer than the oppressed. Both live in fear and do not have peace. Others cannot bring us peace—no government, no army, no country, no leader is going to give us peace. What will bring us peace is inward transformation that will lead to outward action. Our miseries are not going to stop by our disapproval. If we see the urgency for immediate action, then only we will transform ourselves and peace will come when we are peaceful, when we are at peace with our neighbors. And as our shrinking world makes us all near neighbors, we should be growingly aware of two facts about our natures as peoples of this world. One is that we are very different from one another in color, lifestyles, cultures and beliefs. The other, we are exceedingly alike. There is a fantastic range of common needs and desires, fears and hopes, that bind us together in our humanness. And the well-being of each is so interrelated to the well-being of others.

Maybe the time has come when we should unite in certain common affirmations of life and these might be: One, a pledge of honor and respect for every race, culture, religion and individual. No exclusiveness. Two, recognition of the claim of every individual upon the resources of the earth for the
necessities of human survival and the moral obligation of the more fortunate to share with the less fortunate. Three, the right of every individual for the responsible use of talents, energies and resources for the benefit of the community. Four, commitment to the search for universal values, however differently expressed, that may enable the individual and the community to overcome greed, power and self-seeking. Five, affirmation of the presence, the presence of a spirit of hope and compassion, available to all by which our lives may be made more whole, more creative, more harmonious, as we draw directly upon that power around us and within us, and within all life.

* * *
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Reflections on Politics and Democracy

New Patterns of Modern Democracies: Public Opinion and Communication

by Valery Giscard d'Estaing

Valery Giscard d'Estaing, former President of France, was a Visiting Fellow of the Institute of Politics, May 2-4, and delivered the 1983 Gustav Pollak Lecture, "New Patterns of Modern Democracies: Public Opinion and Communication" in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum on May 2nd. The following is an edited excerpt from his talk.

The three functions of the new democratic leaders, I mean the elected President of the United States, or the elected President of France, or the Chancellor of West Germany, or the Prime Minister of Great Britain are to listen, to decide and to communicate. And, all these functions are rather difficult for specific reasons. I will comment on these three functions.

First, to listen. When I go to meet some French people now, they say to me, "Oh, you haven't listened enough to us"—which is curious, because I did. But if they say so, it's because they have a basic demand to be listened to. Before my first campaign I made a speech that became famous because I won. If I'd lost, that speech would not have become famous at all. I said, "I will try during my campaign to look into the eyes of France, to see what she thinks, what she feels." So, my first attitude was to look, but I think now that the modern attitude is to listen. The next campaign for the next candidate will not be to look into the eyes, but to listen to the people. Why? It's because we are living in a time of change. People want you to understand their desire for change. What is this desire for change? In recent years (I will not speak about the United States; I do not have sufficient knowledge for that) a kind of fragmentation of our traditional society has taken place. There are contradictory phenomena: a quest for new individual liberties, and, at the same time, a reference to the past. The young are bringing into the public debate some new themes, for instance, environment, human rights, truth and morality in public life. One of the accomplishments I am very proud of is to have lowered the voting age in France from 21 to 18. Probably, I assured my defeat. Probably! Because we have about 600,000 new voters a year. So, it's one million and six. And probably two-thirds of them, or three-fifths, voted for my opponents. But I think anyway that this was a major achievement.
The French citizen who traditionally had only two dimensions—his work, his job, and his multi-generational family—is more and more a part of a diversified network of associations, unions, groups, from which he develops his aspiration for culture, information, sport, and travel. New structures have appeared with the rapid evolution of our educational system, and the emergence of a new type of family relations. Women are playing an ever-growing role in the work force and in the political debate. If you watch the local elections now, there is almost always a woman candidate. And, when one looks at the various tendencies present in different measure across the borders of Europe, four fundamental trends emerge.

The first feature is a move toward autonomy and informality. When I was elected, there still was what we call mimetism; people tried to resemble successful people. My first prime minister tried to speak as I did, and to wear the ties I was wearing. It was normal at the time. And during my term, mimetism almost disappeared. If you look at the way the young girls are dressing themselves—in France, for instance, when you went into the street you had about four million of Brigitte Bardot, because they were dressing, they were doing their hair exactly like she did. And if you go now, you will not see two people similar, because there is a desire for identification, for autonomy. This quest for personal expression, the desire to speak for oneself, which was limited ten years ago, is now very strong.

The second feature is a move toward intuition and emotion with the decline of moralism or rationalism, and more probably of ideologies in general. This trend is very strong. For instance, the decline of moralism: if you take the history of moralism in our society, you will find hedonist societies around the 1960s. People wanted to be happy and what was important for them was the quest for happiness. After that, they relaxed a little. They wanted to have a happy society but not such an intense quest. And in France, the decline of moralism was also the decline of what we call Manichaeanism—the fact that people are classified in good and bad, in black and white. Of all this, there was a sharp decline. The reason the peace movement, or neutralism, in France was not very important was because of this trend, because people thought, "It cannot be true; we do not believe that there are good people on one side and wrong on the other. We prefer to have a more pragmatic attitude."

The same movement is the development of the feminine values, because at the moment what is happening in our society is the fact that the feminine values are growing much more rapidly than the values of the males. For instance, introspection, intuition, a kind of practical sense in dealing with problems, emotion, are growing faster than the rational attitude. The presence of the feminine in our society is not because there are more women in public life but the fact that the values of the society are becoming more involved with femininity itself.

The third feature, a move toward a new modernity which started with the rejection of a society dominated by consumption, a society manipulated by media
and advertising, a rejection of this toward a society which is evolving in the direction of a new realism. Two indications of this are very curious. One, for instance, is the fact that for me to have the reputation of being intelligent was not an asset for me. At the beginning it was, and then later people thought "He is too clever, when he speaks he is trying to trick us, to influence us." So they preferred people supposedly less intelligent but with whom they did not fear manipulation. Another example, everyone believed in France, and probably in the United States, that there was a growing desire for nature, for forests, rivers, and wilderness, animals. The desire for nature is now diminishing. Curiously, if you put an advertisement with a mountain, some lakes, some icecapped peaks, you will have no success because people are moving towards a kind of approximate modernity, and nature is too far from them. If you show a garden, a few flowers, a pet animal, you will touch them. It shows that the sphere of human interest is probably concentrating.

The last feature is a move towards complexity and uncertainty, the recognition of the complicated and integrated world to which all our societies belong. This movement has been supplemented by technological changes in the gathering and transmission of information because modern media add to our societies the new dimensions of instant information, instant emotion, permanent dialogue, and added selectivity in choices. When I was elected I held press conferences. During the second one I said, "One of our roles is to try to govern what is 'imprevisible.'" And I've been criticized by a prominent French politician saying that it is ridiculous for a president to say so; everything should be predictable; you cannot lead a country if you don't know what will happen three years in advance, five years in advance. And he was supported in that opinion. But now, if you take the opposite stand, you will not be believed. So, there has been a deep change in the attitude of people.

* * *
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Politics and War
by Oriana Fallaci

On September 23, 1983, Oriana Fallaci, journalist and author, spoke in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum on "Politics and War." What follows are edited excerpts from her address.

You study politics. I hope it’s true, as I was told, and I hope you have the soul for it, not only the brain. Politics is my natural environment—the air I have been breathing since I was a child, the waters where I have been swimming since I was a teenager—in spite of the imposters, the opportunists, the liars who use politics for their personal interest, their greedy ambitions, their phony promises, in spite of the tyrants who use politics for their thirst of power, their abuses, their crimes.

I cannot regard politics like those who pronounce the word politics as if it were a dirty word. I firmly believe that politics is a very beautiful thing, or if you prefer, can be a very beautiful thing, one of the noblest activities that a human being can perform—or should I say the recipient of any other activity, the frame outside which the life of a country and of a citizen becomes impossible, an empty dream. [Politics is an activity] to make this world a little more decent, a little more dignified, a little more bearable as my mother once said to me. You know, for children like those who were slaughtered last week in Beirut and for many other children of today, from Salvador to Afghanistan. The list is too long.

I was born in a place where, and in a time when, making politics as I mean was forbidden, punished. There was the fascist regime in Italy then. And those who made politics as I mean ended in prison or in a hospital or beneath the earth in a grave. So very few dared to do it. My parents did and particularly my father who had started fighting Mussolini when he was a 17 year old boy, then continued to do it as a man, notwithstanding the persecutions, the tortures. Finally he became the leader of the Resistance in Florence, my city during the Nazi occupation. And in February 1944 as a leader of the Resistance he was arrested to be tortured savagely, then thrown in the cell of a prison under the threat of an execution squad and there, one day of March, my mother and my younger sister and I were permitted to see him, to bring him some food. We went, with a bag full of food which was promptly stolen from us by the guards, I remember.

When we left, I asked my mother, "Why mother, why?" And my mother, she easily answered it, "Because your father makes politics; because he struggles to make this world a little more decent, a little more dignified, a little more bearable." "Yes, I have a high concept of politics, or if you prefer a very naive one, a very childish one but in this matter I never want to grow up."
Of course there are many ways of being political, of making politics. One need not be arrested and tortured and threatened with execution in order to perform his or her duty. I am political. For instance, I make politics, writing the books I write, doing the interviews I do, providing the people with elements that they need in order to know, to judge, to intervene. And also, intervening myself through the debate, sometimes the fight, I have with the head of state or the leader or the general I am interviewing.

I knew already since I was a child. I learned as a child to run under the bombs, to bear the terror of the air raid, of the artillery shelling, of the sniper firing, of the screams, the destruction, the dead, the corpses that stink. I learned in the Second World War that being in a war is not like watching the war on TV where it becomes a show like a movie or a football game, to be interrupted by the advertising of a toothpaste or a wine. Yes, I know everybody hates the war, or says they hate the war. Yet, everybody accepts it as a part of life or at least a curse which is part of our existence. “War has always existed and it always exists.” War is not necessary, damn it, it is not even an unavoidable curse. I’ll tell you what war is. It is the most idiotic, the most illogical, the most grotesque activity of mankind, the most objective, the most obscene, legitimized crime of the bastards who rule our life and the last resort of the imbeciles who do not know how to resolve things with their brain because they have no brain.

And so they make war. No, they don’t make it. They send others to make it. As I said to the president of Argentina during the Falkland war, I said, “You’re a General aren’t you, you are a soldier?” And he said, “Yes of course I’m a general, of course I’m a soldier.” Then I said, “Good. Now tell me, have you ever been in a war?” He blushed and he replied, “Another kind of war.” And I said, “No, no, no, I mean the real war, the one where they shoot and they die.” And he blushed even more and he replied, “No, I have not.” And so I said, “That’s the problem because those who want war, who call for war never make war, they send others to make it.”

* * *
Politics, The Noble Profession
by Jim Wright

I have to subdue the temptation to fall into the same trap that befell one of my colleagues from Indiana who found himself before a much larger audience than he had anticipated and he began his remarks in his most oratorical flourish by saying it thrills my heart, and delights the innermost recesses of my soul to see such a dense crowd gathered. I know that you aren’t dense because I am fully aware of what it is that you do. I have been impressed with the John F. Kennedy School of Government and the Institute of Politics for a long time. What you do for my profession gives it a dignity, gives it respectability. I like the fact that you use the word politics; unashamedly, apparently. Politics is as necessary to the functioning of a free society as water is to the flow of a river. The river doesn’t have to be dirty and filthy and corrupt and neither does the political system, because we have the wisdom if we have the will, to keep them both clean. I think it was maybe about 180 years ago that a man named Andrew Oliver, speaking right here in Boston, said—and I may misquote him a word or two here but I think I shall, almost verbatim, be able to recapture what I’ve read that he said because it impressed me so much when I read it 30 years ago. He said, “Politics is the noblest of all professions. There is not another in which a man may do such widespread good to his fellow creatures nor is there another,” he said, “in which by a mere loss of nerve he might do such widespread harm. Nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. Nor yet another in which one might so easily lose his soul. But,” he concluded, “with all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career that any man could choose.” I happen to believe that. If I didn’t, I think I would be doing something else. Well, there is yet another reason why I am glad to be here and participate in this event tonight, and that is, I think, that you’ve got the right idea. My vision of an ideal society has always been one in which students graded the professors and the Congressmen graded the Presidents.
Good evening, and welcome to the first of three sequences examining the past, the present and the future of Democracy with an unusual tour guide, Mr. I. F. Stone. I am not Mr. I. F. Stone in case you are confused. I am in fact James Thomson. I am curator of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University and here on behalf of three institutions that normally do not get together, namely, the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, the Kennedy School of Government, and the Department of the Classics at Harvard University. We have found gold. And I—tonight at least, there will be other introducers at the other sessions—am deeply honored to introduce our distinguished visitor for the first of his three lectures. He is of course Isadore Feinstein Stone and if any of you get on radio or television trivia programs 20 years from now, try to remember because he will only be remembered as I. F. Stone or Izzie Stone. But he was and is Isadore Feinstein Stone.

Izzie Stone is, and I use the word rather carefully and probably wrongly, a phenomenon. He is a veteran journalist of the liberal and many would say radical persuasion. In that role he has been a relentless gadfly, uncovering coverups among the mighty and the rich both in America and abroad. But then when he and his wife Esther decided to fold their famous weekly and biweekly, I. F. Stone's Weekly and I. F. Stone's BiWeekly, in 1971—and the rich and the mighty then heaved sighs of relief at the folding—he did something very strange. Izzie became, how shall I put it, a born-again classicist. He literally immersed himself in the study of the Ancient Greek language, the thought of Ancient Greece and the lifestyles of Ancient Greece. To everyone's amazement, especially to the classicists, Izzie brought to this new hobby-cum-profession the same jeweler's eye that had won him reluctant accolades from other professionals when his scrutiny of the output of the Executive and Legislative branches of the U.S. Government and other governments had caused embarrassment, anger and even, for him, the status of pariah. Classicists are apparently more forgiving
than bureaucrats because, and I have checked him out with the best of the classicists, Izzie is regarded by them not as a pariah, but as a new friend, even a pioneer and discoverer.

Since Izzie Stone has always thrived on data, let me end with some data about him. He was born in 1907 in Philadelphia and went on not far from there, like a mile, to the University of Pennsylvania in the 20's. But being properly preoccupied with more important things, he did not actually get his B.A. degree from the University of Pennsylvania until 1975, a significant time lag for you dropouts. Having plodded through various Pennsylvania and New Jersey bad newspapers, he landed at The New York Post in the 1930's, then worked for The Nation magazine,—and here we enter my adolescent years of newspaper and magazine readership—was a marvelously polemical columnist from approximately '42 through '52 in PM (something many of you never heard of), The New York Star, (many more have not heard of), The New York Post (still around under different management) and the New York Daily Compass (which came and went rather rapidly), prior to founding that most wondrous, extraordinary, Washington-based newsheet, I. F. Stone's Weekly and BiWeekly.

Well, anyway, whatever else should be said about our mentor during these three lectures should actually be said by him through Izzie's message—the message he is bringing to us tonight, has brought to New York City and to Washington, and, finally to Athens itself, namely Cambridge—the message he brings us tonight and in the succeeding two lectures about his subject, the roots of democracy and democracy's adversities. I give you Mr. I. F. Stone.

Mr. I. F. Stone: I have had an unrequited love for Harvard ever since they refused to let me in, very properly, in 1924 and so I want to begin by absolving the University from guilt by association with my bizarre views on the trial of Socrates. The most exact thing said in that placard about my lecture series was when I was described as a recent classicist. That's what Flaubert would call the mot juste indeed. The fact is that I'm still in need of remedial reading in Greek and Latin, and I really ought to wait 25 years more before having the temerity to wade in to so venerable a field. But, at 75, I don't think I can wait that long and even if I survived, by that time, considering the route on which Reagan is taking us, I would probably be too radioactive by then for Greek studies.

I'm not exactly dealing with the roots of democracy. You know in reading a book or assessing a lecture, the most important thing to know is what motivated the author or speaker to do all that work. And, authors very often don't reveal that motivation or sometimes one has to find it in an obscure footnote toward the back of the book. So, I'll put my cards upon the table and explain how I got mixed up with Athens.

When I had closed the Weekly after 19 years, I thought I would do a study in depth of the problem of freedom of thought and expression. Not just freedom which can often be freedom to exploit but freedom of thought and expression. I
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started with the seventeenth-century English revolutions, and with one of my great heroes, Milton, and worked my way backwards to Ancient Athens where I fell in love with the Greeks, except for the Spartans, and was horrified, absolutely horrified, by the trial of Socrates. I was drawn into trying to find out how it could have happened.

Now as you all know, Socrates at the age of 70, was condemned to death by his native city. The indictment said rather obscurely—it had 2 counts: one, that he didn't respect the gods of the city and was substituting new divinity, and the other than he was corrupting or disaffecting the youth. We don't know the bill of particulars, and particularly we don't know what happened before the examining magistrate. The Athenians had an institution very much like our grand jury and even more like the examining magistrate in continental law in Europe. An accuser had to pass muster, present his evidence to the witnesses before the examining magistrate, who decided whether the evidence and the witnesses and the charges merited putting the accused through all the pain and turmoil of trial. We know very little about it. We only have one side. All we hear is the defense, and what we know of the accusations comes only from the defense. We have the defense from two adoring disciples—Xenophon and Plato, and we don't hear the other side and we don't even know what Plato said. It's quite clear. To understand the trial you really are drawn into examining the bits and pieces left behind all over antiquity.

There is a source book on Socrates published in England by the Open University in 1970 that has collected all the references to Socrates in antiquity, in Greek and Roman literature down through the Church Fathers, and it's almost 300 pages, double-columned pages. The “Apology of Plato,” which is one of the great treasures of world literature is beautiful. It's lovely as a poem, but it's quite obviously not a transcript of what Socrates said. We know from other sources that Socrates was warned by his familiar spirit not to prepare a defense. But what we have in the “Apology of Plato” is an exquisite example of a genre, of what Socrates should have said and would have said if he'd been perfectly prepared. A number of scholars, beginning with a very brilliant young man at Oxford—had to be in the middle of the 19th century—down to Professor Kennedy's more recent work on Greek rhetoric, had pointed out that it's devices and charms are exquisite examples of very standard ploys in Greek oratory, particularly the opening of the “Apology”, the country boy opening, the simply country boy who says, “Oh, when I listen to the accusations, they put it so wonderfully and so persuasively, I'm almost persuaded.” All I have to offer you is just the plain unadorned truth. Apparently everybody that had a parking ticket in Athens used that kind of a ploy. It's beautiful. I spent several months reading it in Greek, painfully, word-for-word and it's lovely. But it's also a masterpiece of evasion.

So, these three lectures are a kind of mini survey of antiquity. You know Mark Patterson, the great 19th century English scholar, said that the ideal of classical scholarship should be to be able to bring to bear on any problem in ancient studies a knowledge of the whole of antiquity. I have roamed rather widely, if
superficially, to try to understand it more, because while I don't approve of the prosecution and certainly not of the sentence, I am a partisan of Athens and I want to present whatever mitigating circumstances I can. It's a very hazardous task to attack such sacred cows of learning as Socrates and Plato, both of them revered and probably venerable figures, and I share the veneration in many ways, but I don't believe in idols. Plato carried on a life-long vendetta against democracy, and I feel deeply about democracy. So I'm trying to right the scales a little bit. In the first lecture I would like to show how Socrates might have appeared to fellow Athenians in the 5th and early 4th century B.C. Again, in the pages of Plato what we have is a delightful old philosopher and his only crime is to go around and button his fellow citizens and beg them to think about virtue and their souls. He never gets around to explaining what he meant by virtue, but it rings awfully nicely, like a Sunday sermon. I would try to present some of the things that Plato as defense counselor, so to speak, doesn't tell us.

In the 2nd lecture, I want to explain how if I had been Socrates' lawyer I could have gotten him off. And this is not fantasy. It's based upon evidence. And then in the third lecture, since Plato put Athens on trial, I want to put Plato on trial and examine what kind of a city he would have substituted for the great and wonderful city of Athens. You know, the Greek story of the 5th and 6th and 4th centuries is not ancient history. By any real count, it's yesterday. All our basic approaches in philosophy, all our basic problems in politics, all our feelings as human beings are there in the pre-Socratics and the great historians and those wonderful poets.

* * *
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Paul Holtzman, Chair, Fall
James Goldgeier, Vice-Chair, Fall
Steven Grand, Chair, Spring
Peter Gelfman, Vice-Chair, Spring
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Student Study Groups

Fall 1982

"The Politics of Alternative Energies"

Karen McCarthy Benson, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Missouri State Representative; member, Energy Advisory Panel, Democratic National Committee; participant, European Community Visiting Program study of alternative energy use

Guests:
Buck Robinson, Founder, Alternative Energy Store, Cambridge, MA
Richard Munson, Director, Solar Lobby, Washington, DC
Daniel Yergin, Adjunct Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael Barrett, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Reading); Member, Legislative Energy Development Caucus
Henry Lee, Executive Director, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William DeOre, Editorial Cartoonist, The Dallas Morning News
Lee Judge, Editorial Cartoonist, The Kansas City Times
Jeff MacNelly, Editorial Cartoonist, Chicago Tribune
Paul Szep, Editorial Cartoonist, The Boston Globe
Charles Hara, Attorney, Massachusetts Law Reform Institute
Frederick Greenman, Vice President, New England Electric System, Westboro, MA
Alvin Alm, Director, Energy Security Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
David Roe, Senior Research Fellow, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"The Politics of Health Care"

Philip Caper, M.D., Research Fellow, Center for Health Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Chair, National Council on Health Planning and Development; former staff member, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Health
David Calkins, M.D., Macy Fellow, Center for Health Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Special Assistant to Patricia Harris (former U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services)

Guests:
Rashi Fein, Ph.D., Professor of the Economics of Medicine, Harvard Medical School
Steven Weiner, Attorney, Goulston and Storrs, Boston; former Chair, Massachusetts Rate Setting Commission
Stephen Lawton, Attorney, Pierson, Ball & Dowd, Washington, DC; former Chief Counsel, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Public Health and Investment
Brian Biles, Senior Staff Associate, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, U.S. House of Representatives

David Williamson, Executive Vice President, Hospital Corporation of America, Nashville, TN

Arnold Relman, Editor, New England Journal of Medicine

Walter McNerney, Professor of Health Policy, J. K. Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL; former President, Blue Cross/Blue Shield Association of America

John T. Dunlop, Lamont University Professor, Department of Government, Harvard

Jerome F. Brazda, Editorial Director, Washington Health Letter; editor, Medicine and Health, Washington, DC

"The Unemployment Crisis: What Role for Washington?"

Dennis C. Carey, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Secretary of Labor, Delaware; Chair, National Governors Association Taskforce on Employment Security; Chair, National Committee on Providing Retraining Assistance to the Unemployed

Guests:

Eleanor Craig, Chair, Economic and Financial Advisory Council, Delaware; Associate Professor of Economics, University of Delaware

Pat Choate, Senior Policy Analyst for Economics, TRW, Washington, DC

Douglas Hibbs, Professor, Department of Government, Harvard

Eugene Doody, Director, Massachusetts Employment Security

Kenneth Smith, President, Jobs for America's Graduates, Washington, DC

Howard Bloom, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Phyllis Malamud, Boston Bureau Chief, Newsweek

"The Role of the Private Sector in Community Economic Development"

James Carras, President, James Carras Associates; former Executive Director, Massachusetts Urban Reinvestment Advisory Group

Guests:

Renee Berger, Consultant, Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives, Washington, DC

Michael Rubinger, New England Regional Officer, Local Initiative Support Corporation, Boston

Joseph Breiteneicher, Director, Bird Company Foundation, Walpole, MA

Kirsten Moy, Equitable Life Insurance Company, New York, NY

Martin Crean, Aetna Life Insurance Company, Hartford, CT

John LaWare, Chair, Shawmut Bank of Boston

Ann Crowley, Vice President, Community Investment, Boston

Dr. Gerald Bush, Senior Vice President, Gulf Oil Corporation, Pittsburgh PA
Arthur Markos, Economic Development Policy Advisor to Governor, Rhode Island
Hugh MacCormack, Chair, Massachusetts Urban Reinvestment Advisory Group
Michael Ansara, Director, Massachusetts Fair Share

"Satire: A Political Commentary Weapon"
Dick Flavin, satirical commentator, WBZ-TV, Boston, and Cable News Network

Guests:
Paul Szep, editorial cartoonist, The Boston Globe
Mike Barnicle, columnist, The Boston Globe; commentator, "Chronicle," WCVB-TV, Boston
Lisa Henson, Harvard Lampoon
Albert Hunt, political correspondent, The Wall Street Journal
Barney Frank, U.S. Representative (D-MA)
Mark Shields, host, "Inside Washington," PBS-TV; syndicated columnist

"New Crisis in Urban Government: Can Boston Meet the Challenge?"
Raymond L. Flynn, Boston City Councillor; former Massachusetts State Representative

Guests:
Bruce Bolling, member, Boston City Council
Rosemary Sansone, Director, Sponsored Fellows, Alumni, Career and Student Services, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Charles Radin, Boston City Hall reporter, The Boston Globe
Rita Walsh-Tomasini, member, Boston School Committee
Alex Rodriguez, court monitor for implementation of Chapter 766, Boston Public Schools
Hubert Jones, Dean, School of Social Work, Boston University
Robert Spillane, Superintendent, Boston Public Schools
Jean McGuire, newly-elected member, Boston School Committee
James Hunt, Executive Director, Massachusetts League of Community Health Centers
Brian J. Donnelly, U.S. Representative (D-MA)
David Mundel, former Director, Neighborhood Development and Employment Agency, Boston
Ian Menzies, urban affairs columnist, The Boston Globe
Emily Achtenberg, Citizens Housing Planning Association of Metropolitan Boston
Yohel Camayd-Freixas, Assistant Professor, Urban Studies Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
John Drew, Vice President, Quincy, Corcoran, Mullins, Jennison, Inc.
John Calvin, Director, Boston Citizens Seminars, School of Management, Boston College
"The Shaping of U.S. Foreign Policy: Who Influences the Decision Makers?"

Karen Elliott House, Fellow, Institute of Politics; diplomatic correspondent. Washington bureau, The Wall Street Journal; regular guest on "This Week With David Brinkley," ABC; "Face the Nation," CBS; and "Meet the Press," NBC

Guests:
- William Drummond, diplomatic correspondent, National Public Radio, Washington, DC
- General Brent Scowcroft, partner, Kissinger Associates, Washington, DC; former National Security Advisor to President Ford
- Peter Kann, Associate Publisher, The Wall Street Journal
- Seth Lipsky, Foreign Editor, The Wall Street Journal
- Richard Darman, Special Assistant to President Reagan
- William Tavoulareas, President, Mobil Oil Corporation

"The Nuclear Threat: Imperatives and Responses"

Carla B. Johnson, Director, New Century Policies, Cambridge, MA; coordinator, National Political Field Program for Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign; coordinator, National Civil Defense Awareness Clearinghouse

Paula F. Gutlove, D.M.D., Director, Greater Boston Chapter, Physicians for Social Responsibility; general practice dentist

Guests:
- Patrick Friel, Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Systems, Lincoln, MA
- Marilyn Braun, coordinator, Greensboro-Guilford County Emergency Management Assistance Agency, Greensboro, NC
- Gordon Adams, Senior Research Associate, Council on Economic Priorities, New York; author, The Iron Triangle, a study of the politics of defense contracting
- Cyril and Alice Smith, Los Alamos historians, (evolution of scientific thinking — nuclear age)
- Hans Bethe, Professor Emeritus, Cornell University; former director, Theoretical Division, Los Alamos Weapons Laboratory, NM; recipient, 1967 Nobel Prize, physics
- Kenneth Tompkins Bainbridge, George Vasmer Leverett Professor of Physics, Emeritus, Harvard
- Joseph Addabbo, U.S. Representative (D-NY); Chair, Defense Subcommittee, Appropriations Committee, U.S. House of Representatives
- Gordon Thompson, Staff Scientist, Union of Concerned Scientists; founding member, Political Ecology Research Group, Oxford, England
"Reaganism and Civil Rights: Progress or Retreat?"

Elaine R. Jones, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Counsel and Legislative Director, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Washington, DC; trial and appellate attorney in numerous civil rights cases, including the Supreme Court; former Special Assistant to William T. Coleman (former U.S. Secretary of Transportation)

Guests:
C. Lani Guinier, Staff Attorney, NAACP Legal Defense Fund; former Special Assistant to Drew Lewis, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Carter Administration
Ralph Neas, Executive Director, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
Burt Wides, senior aide to Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA)
Phyllis Segal, Counsel, National Organization of Women Legal Defense Fund; Fellow, Bunting Institute, Harvard
Lynn Walker, Program Officer, Ford Foundation, New York, NY
Clarence Thomas, Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Barry Goldstein, Senior Staff Attorney, NAACP Legal Defense Fund
William Taylor, Director, Center for National Policy Review, Catholic University, Washington, DC
Theodore Shaw, Staff Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund
John Shattuck, Legislative Director, American Civil Liberties Union, Washington, DC
William T. Coleman, Jr., former U.S. Secretary of Transportation, 1975-1977

"See, Hear and Meet a Congressional Campaign"

James B. King, Associate Vice President for Government and Community Affairs, Harvard; former Chair, National Transportation Safety Board; Special Assistant to President Carter (Personnel)

Guests:
Michael Barone, Editor, Almanac of American Politics
Joan Barone, producer, "Face the Nation" CBS
Frank McNamara, former candidate for Congress (R-MA)
Edward Reilly, Policy Advisor to Edward J. King (former governor of Massachusetts)
Michael Shea, former press secretary to Robert Drinan (former U.S. Congressman D-MA)
Peter Lukas, political writer, Boston Herald
Nancy Korman, political activist and fund raising consultant
Michael Stern, Minority Staff Director, U.S. Senate Finance Committee
Benjamin Palumbo, Director, Federal Government Relations, Phillip Morris, Inc., Washington, DC
John Rendon, political consultant, Capital Services, Washington, DC
Wilma Goldstein, Special Projects Director, National Republican Congressional Committee, Washington, DC
“Central America at Peace: Obstacles and Opportunities”

**John McAward**, Director for Human Rights, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; former Peace Corps official in Latin America; led six Congressional fact-finding missions to Central America

*Guests:*

- **Thomas Anderson**, Professor, Eastern Connecticut College; author of a chronicle of the 1932 massacre in El Salvador and other books on Central America
- **Martin Diskin**, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- **Leonel Gomez**, former Assistant, Salvadoran Land Reform Agency, El Salvador
- **John Carbaugh**, former chief advisor on Latin America to U.S. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC)
- **Bruce Cameron**, chief human rights aide to U.S. Congressman Tom Harkin (D-IA)
- **Luis Valdez**, Cuban exile
- **Mario Hernandez**, Salvadoran exile
- **Oscar Enriguez Guerra**, Guatemalan exile
- **Brian Smith**, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- **Guy Cugliotta**, Nieman Fellow, former correspondent in Central America, Miami Herald
- **Morton Halperin**, Director, Center for National Security Studies, Washington, DC


**David E. Powell**, Associate, Russian Research Center, Harvard; lecturer, Department of Government, Harvard; author of two books and numerous articles on U.S.S.R.

*Guests:*

- **Misha Tsypkin**, Associate, Russian Research Center, Harvard
- **Mark Kuchment**, Associate, Russian Research Center, Harvard
- **Aleksandr Nekrich**, Associate, Russian Research Center, Harvard; former Associate, Institute of World History, U.S.S.R. Academy of Science
- **Natasha Rumer**, former Attorney, U.S.S.R.
- **Walter D. Connor**, Director, Soviet and East European Studies, Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State
- **Kirill Uspensky**, Assistant Professor, Russian Research Center, Harvard
- **Mark Beissinger**, Assistant Professor, Department of Government, Harvard
- **Sergei Chetverikov**, Counselor, Embassy of the U.S.S.R. (Soviet/American Relations)
- **Donald Graves**, Chief, Soviet Internal Affairs, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State
"Political Apprenticeship: How to Start Planning Your Next Ten Years"
Mark Q. Rhoads, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Illinois State Senator; former legislative aide to Illinois State Senate and the late U.S. Senate Everett M. Dirksen

Guests:
Gray Holmes, Fellowship Director, Office of Career Services and Off Campus Learning, Harvard
William Mayer, Internships Coordinator, Institute of Politics
William L. Sharpless, Partner, International Relations Consultants, Inc., Washington, DC
Margo Carlisle, Staff Director, Republican Conference, U.S. Senate
James C. Roberts, Director, President's Commission on White House Fellowships
Prescott Bloom, Illinois State Senator
Wayne Valis, Special Assistant to the President, Office of Public Liaison
W. Bruce Weinrod, Director, Foreign Policy and Defense Studies, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC
N. Stanton Evans, Director, National Journalism Center, Washington, DC
Maxene Femstrom, Political Consultant, Bill Lee Company, Washington, DC
Larry Horist, L. P. Horist and Associates
Bill Lee, President, Bill Lee Company, Washington, DC
Alan J. Dixon, U.S. Senator (D-IL)

"The U.S. — Canada Relationship: Lessons for International Politics"
Howard Stanislawski, lecturer, Department of Political Science, Boston College; consultant, international economic and political relations; former foreign policy lobbyist, Ottawa; freelance producer, political documentaries, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Guests:
Alfred O. Hero, Jr., Visiting Scholar, University Colloquium for Research on North America, Harvard
James Peterson, MP, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Economic Development, Ottawa
Fred Veneema, Canada-U.S. Energy Relations Desk Officer, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, Canada
Ross Francis, Defense Relations Officer, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, Canada
Ian Hamilton, former Director-General of Communications, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Canada
George Rajhon, Counsel for Environmental Issues, Canadian Embassy, Washington, DC
Howard Nickerson, New England Fisheries Steering Committee, New Bedford, MA
Geoffrey Dvorkin, Editor-Producer, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation News, Toronto, Canada
Robert Montgomery, Deputy Director, Office of Canadian Affairs, U.S. Department of State
Jean-Marie Dery, Consul-General of Canada, Boston, MA

"Pressure Groups, Prestige and the Press"
Chuck Stone, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Senior Editor, Philadelphia Daily News

Guests:
John C. Willke, President, National Right to Life Committee, Washington, DC
Nanette Falkenberg, Executive Director, National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL)
Jonathan Kessler, Political Leadership Director, American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, Washington, DC
Ann Cooney, Treasurer, Irish National Caucus of Boston
Ewa Brantley, Research Fellow, International Legal Studies, Harvard
Ronald Walters, Professor of Political Science, Howard University
Clarence Pendleton, Jr., Chair, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, DC
Margaret Bush Wilson, Chair, National Board of Directors, NAACP

Spring 1983

"Mediation and Conflict Resolution: Applications in the Public Sector"
Laura Blackburne, Fellow, Institute of Politics, Vice President and Chief Executive Officer, Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, New York; Counsel, New York State NAACP

Guests:
Leroy Mobley, Director, NAACP Prison Program
Basil A. Paterson, former, Secretary of State, New York; Deputy Mayor, New York City
Martha Lewis, former Deputy Commissioner, Rural and Public Affairs, Department of Social Services, New York State
Arlinda Locklear, Directing Attorney, Native American Rights Fund
Alan Van Gestell, Goodwin, Proctor and Hoar
Sylvia Watts, research assistant, Center for Negotiations, Harvard Law School
Lawrence Susskind, Director, The Public Dispute Program, Center for Negotiations, Harvard
Bernard Charles, Program Officer, Carnegie Corporation
John Turner, Associate Dean, Graduate School, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Frank Jasmine, former Assistant Secretary to Hugh Carey (former Governor of New York)
Barry Gottehrer, former, Special Assistant to New York Mayor John Lindsay; Vice President, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.
Francis O'Brien, media advisor to Walter Mondale; former Administrative Assistant to Peter Rodino, U.S. Congressman (D-NJ)
"Solidarity: A Model for Eastern Europe?"

Ewa-Teresa Elisz Brantley, international legal advisor to Solidarity;
   Visiting Professor, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University;
   Research Fellow, Harvard Law School

Guests:
   Dr. Tadeusz Szafar, Fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard; author,
   The History of the Communist Party in Poland
   Stanislaw Baranczak, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages
   and Literatures, Harvard
   Andrzezej Butkiewicz, Editor, Gos Pomorza, first Solidarity newspaper, Poland
   David Stark, Professor of Sociology, Duke University
   Janek Pachulsky, sociologist, University of Southern Australia;
   Fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard
   Irena Lasote, Director, Common Support of Solidarity, New York;
   Professor of Political Science, Fordham University
   Karl Gersham, advisor to Jean Kirkpatrick, U.S. Ambassador to
   the United Nations

"Women in Politics"

Susan Kmetty Catania, Fellow, Institute of Politics;
   former Illinois State Representative; Chair, Illinois Commission on the
   States of Women; principal Illinois House sponsor, Equal Rights Amendment;
   lecturer on U.S. women and minorities, U.S. International
   Communication Agency

Guests:
   Susan McLaine, New Hampshire State Senator
   Ann Zill, funding representative for Stewart Mott, Washington, DC
   Jackie Cooke, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees,
   New England
   Celia Weislo, Service Employees International Union, Local 285
   Ruth Mandel, Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics,
   Rutgers University; author, In the Running:
   The New Woman Candidate
   Ellen Goodman, syndicated columnist; author, At Large
   Joan Severns, Mayor of Champaign, Illinois
   Carol Bellamy, President, New York City Council;
   former New York State Senator
   Shirley Marsh, Nebraska State Senator; former Chair,
   National Order of Women Legislators; co-Chair, Women's Network of the
   National Council of State Legislatures
   Jeanne Holm, author, Women in the Military
   Mary Jean Collins, Vice President, National Organization of Women
The Student Program

Sally Lunt, Vice Chair, National Women's Political Caucus
Monica Faith Stewart, Special Projects Coordinator, 1983 campaign of Harold Washington for Mayor, Chicago, IL

Kenneth Hartnett, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Managing Editor, The Boston Herald, former columnist and editorial writer, The Boston Globe; urban affairs reporter, Associated Press, Washington, DC

Guests:
Thomas Winship, Editor, The Boston Globe
Don Forst, former Editor, The Boston Herald
James R. Polk, investigative reporter, NBC News, Washington, DC
Nicholas Horrock, Deputy Metropolitan Editor, The New York Times
Rene J. Cappon, General News Editor, The Associated Press, NY
Jack Flannery, political consultant; novelist; former aide to Francis Sargent (former Governor of Massachusetts)
Tim Taylor, Press Secretary to Thomas McGee (Speaker, Massachusetts House of Representatives)
Gordon Manning, Vice President, NBC News
Stephen Erlanger, Senior Assistant Foreign Editor, The Boston Globe
Brennon Jones, Executive Director, Interlink Press Service, New York
James Dorsey, Press Secretary to Michael Dukakis, Governor of Massachusetts
Kirk Scharfenberg, Deputy Editor, editorial page, The Boston Globe

"The Criminal Justice System Under Pressure"
Madeleine Kunin, Fellow, Institute of Politics;
former Lieutenant Governor, Vermont; Chair, House Appropriations Committee, Vermont; member, Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice

Guests:
Tubby Harrison, pollster (for Senator Kennedy and Governor Dukakis, among others)
Thomas Herman, Deputy Commissioner of Revenue, MA; issues coordinator on crime, Dukakis campaign
Edward Reilly, policy advisor, King administration
Lois Forer, Justice, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia, PA
Scott Harshbarger, District Attorney, Middlesex County
Michael Smith, Director, Vera institute, New York
Patricia McGovern, Massachusetts State Senator
Michael Flaherty, Massachusetts State Representative; Chair, Judiciary Committee, Massachusetts House of Representatives
Ellen Schall, Commissioner, Department of Juvenile Justice, New York
Mark Corrigan, National Institute for Sentencing Alternatives, Brandeis University
The Student Program

John Shattuck, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union, Washington, DC
Matthew Storin, Managing Editor, The Boston Globe
Kenneth Hartnett, Fellow, Institute of Politics
David Collins, former inmate, Massachusetts Correctional System

"Children in a World of Power"
Andrew Maguire, Fellow, Institute of Politics:
former U.S. Representative (D-NJ); Advisor, Political and Security Affairs,
U.S. Delegation to the U.N.; Director, New York City
Urban Development Program

Guests:
Melvin C. McCaw, Regional Director for Africa,
Save the Children Foundation, Westport, CT
Margaret DeMonchy, coordinator, Foster Care Program for
Indochinese Unaccompanied Minors, Lutheran Service Association
of New England, Newton
Martin Rogol, Executive Director, World Hunger Year
Martha Minow, Assistant Professor, Child and Family Law,
Harvard Law School
Elizabeth Vorenberg, Deputy Director, Massachusetts Advocacy Center
Rachel Tompkins, Executive Director, Children's Defense Fund,
Washington, DC
Tarzie Vittachi, Deputy Director, UNICEF

"The Future of American Political Parties"
Margaret A. McKenna, Administrative Vice President for Program Planning,
and Director, Mary Ingraham Bunting Institute, Radcliffe College; former
Deputy Counsel to President Carter; Deputy Undersecretary,
U.S. Department of Education

Guests:
Ann Lewis, Political Director, Democratic National Committee
Chester Atkins, Chair, Massachusetts Democratic Party
Christopher Matthews, Press Secretary, Thomas P. O'Neill
(Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives)
Anthony Podesta, Executive Director, Republican National Committee
Lee Nason, fundraising chair, Massachusetts Libertarian Party;
Convention Chair, 1983
Eloise Linger, representative spokesperson, Socialist Workers Party
Alan Baron, editor and publisher, The Baron Report; author,
The Radical Center: New Directions in American Policies
"Northern Ireland: The Continuing Crisis"

Una O'Brien, Kennedy Fellow, Harvard; former political assistant to Shadow Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, House of Commons

Louise Richardson, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Government, Harvard; Irish historian, former Rotary Fellow

Guests:

Arthur Green, senior civil servant, Northern Ireland; Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard

Padraig O'Malley, native of Northern Ireland; author, Northern Ireland in the 1980's (forthcoming); political consultant; lecturer. Center for Policy Studies, University of Massachusetts

Michael McDowell, foreign affairs writer for Canada's Globe and Mail; former BBC correspondent in Northern Ireland

Harold McCusker, Official Unionist, Member of Parliament from Belfast, Ireland

Liam Deeney, Irish National Caucus, Ancient Order of Hibernians

Oliver Napier, leader of the Alliance Party, Northern Ireland

"The New Conservatism: Ideological and National Differences"

John O'Sullivan, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Editor, Policy Review, the Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC; former Assistant Editor and Parliamentary sketch writer, London Daily Telegraph

Guests:

Robert L. Schuettinger, author, The Conservative Tradition in European Thought

Samuel Francis, author, New Right Papers

Midge Decter, Executive Director, The Committee for the Free Word, New York

Karlyn Keene, Managing Editor, Public Opinion, Washington, DC

Christopher Hitchens, Washington correspondent. The Nation

Ernest Van Den Haag, Professor of Jurisprudence, Fordham University; author, Punishing Criminals

Michael Harrington, author, The Conservative Party (1906-70)

Stephen Haseler, author, The Tragedy of Labour; founder, New Social Democratic Party

Peter Brimelow, Associate Editor, Fortune Magazine; former Business Editor, Macleans, the Canadian Time

Peter Day, Washington correspondent, The Australian

Willa Ann Johnson, Vice President. The Heritage Foundation

Anne Wortham, author, The Other Side of Racism: a Philosophical Study of Black Race Consciousness

Antonio Martino, Professor of Monetary Economics, Rome University, Italy

Howard Phillips, Director, the Conservative Caucus

Peter Samuel, Washington correspondent, The Australian

George Gilder, author, Wealth and Poverty

Peter Berger, Professor of Sociology, Boston University
"U.S. Immigration Policy: Current Issues and Policy Options"

Rosemarie Rogers, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University; author of monographs and articles on comparative problems of labor migration and immigration policies; organizer of several conferences on U.S. immigration policy

Guests:
Charles B. Keely, Senior Research Associate, The Population Council, New York
Sandra Stephens, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Andy Marshall, consultant, Refugee Resettlement in the Greater Boston area
Antonia Hernandez, Associate Counsel, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
Howard Douglas, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large; Coordinator for Refugee Affairs
Roger Conner, Executive Director, Federation for American Immigration Reform
Richard Day, Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate

"Whither Liberalism"

Kirk A. Scharfenberg, Deputy Editor, Editorial page, The Boston Globe

Guests:
Lewis Harry Spence, court appointed Receiver, Boston Housing Authority
Michael Ansara, Director, Massachusetts Fair Share
Harley Shaiken, Research Associate in the Science, Technology and Society program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Randolph Ryan, Editorial writer, The Boston Globe
Larry Smith, Defense and Foreign Policy Advisor to U.S. Senator Gary Hart (D-CO)
Evan Dobelle, former Treasurer, Democratic National Party and 1980 campaign for re-election of President Jimmy Carter
James Shannon, Massachusetts State Representative

"Poverty and Policy"

William Spring, President, Boston Private Industry Council; former Fellow, Institute of Politics; staff, employment and poverty issues, Carter White House and U.S. Senate

Guests:
Barry Bluestone, Professor of Economics, Boston University
Robert Greenstein, Director, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, DC
Charles Murray, Chief Scientist, American Institute for Research, Washington, DC
John Carr, Secretary for Social Concerns, Catholic Archdiocese, 
Washington, DC; former Director, White House Conference on Family 


Janet Diamond, former Secretary, Massachusetts Coalition for Human Needs 

Robert Hill, former Executive Director, Research Department, 
National Urban League; Senior Research Associate, Bureau of 
Social Science Research, Washington, DC 

"The Massachusetts Legislature: 
You Can't Tell the Players Without a Program" 

Joseph F. Timilty, Massachusetts State Senator; Chair, Joint Committee 
on Housing and Economic Development, National Conference of 
State Legislators; former Boston City Councillor 

Guests: 

David Locke, Massachusetts State Representative (R-Wellesley) 

Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts State Senator; 
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means 

Patricia McGovern, Chair, Joint Committee on Criminal Justice 

Joan Menard, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Bristol County); 
Vice-Chair, Joint Committee on Education 

Gerald D'Amico, Massachusetts State Senator (D-Worcester); 
Chair, Joint Committee on Education 

James Collins, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Hampshire County); 
Chair, Joint Committee on Education 

Paul Doane, Massachusetts State Senator (R-Harwich) 

Polly Logan, Representative Chair, Republican State Committee 

Peter Lucas, political writer, The Boston Herald 

Robert Jordan, staff reporter, The Boston Globe 

Judith Meredith, President, Meredith Associates, Boston 

William Delaney, President, Expert Private and Professional Services, Boston 

Gail Harris, correspondent, WGBH-TV 

Robert Turner, political columnist, The Boston Globe 

"The Caribbean Dilemma: Development and Dependence" 

Arpad von Lazar, Professor of International Energy and Development, 
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University 

Guests: 

Hewson Ryan, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 
Tufts University; former Ambassador to Honduras 

Richard Adams, Deputy Director, 
Argonne National Laboratory Team, Chicago 

Karen Hendrixon, member, Energy Planning Commission, Jamaica 

Bobby Cooley, instructor, Department of Political Science, Tufts University
Summer Research Awards

Each year the Institute offers a limited number of Summer Research Awards to Harvard undergraduates 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 1983 recipients and their topics were:

Jeffrey Abbas, (Government) Iowa Caucus
Nancy Castenholz, (Sociology) The Role of Grassroots Movements in Eliminating Hunger in the United States
Patrick Flaherty, (Social Studies) The Decline of the Democratic Organization in Connecticut, 1954 to the Present
Rani Kronick, (Social Studies) The Berkeley Center for Independent Living: the Relationship between the Medical Profession, Rehabilitation and the Disabled People's Movement
Elizabeth Marek, (Social Studies) School Desegregation and the Courts: Case Study, Delaware
Jimmy Morales, (Government) The OECD and American Economic Interdependence
Nicholas Pappas, (Government/Economics) The Process and Real Resource Costs of Changing Corporate Organizational Competency Due to Changes in the Regulatory Environment: Lessons for Policy Makers
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 private sector internship.
• Now in its second year, the Externship Program enables students to spend at least one day of Spring Break “shadowing” professionals in public affairs to witness first-hand the day-to-day activities of men and women in responsible positions in government, media, independent public sector agencies, and the like.
• An Intern Workshop sponsored by the Institute in April 1983 provided 40 classroom hours of instruction in basic skills for legislative interns before students actually began their internships. Topics included legislative research, committee and floor procedure of the Congress, Washington jargon and mores, and similar subjects intended to provide interns with information enabling them to both more quickly adjust to their places of employment and be of greater value to their sponsoring legislative offices. The Institute is evaluating the benefits of this endeavor with the prospect of sponsoring similar Workshops in the future.
• 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.
• During the summer of 1983, the Institute also began developing a Summer-in-Boston Program, arranging events similar to those of the Summer-in-Washington program, for Harvard students living and working in the Boston area.

Summer Internship Program

In 1983, the following students received Institute stipends enabling
them to intern during the summer with a wide range of organizations, as listed:

Kristina Eva Andersson, Agency for International Development, Washington, DC
Preeta Bansal, Northeast-Midwest Institute, Washington, DC
Richard A. Bennett, Republican National Committee, Washington, DC
Cindy A. Berman, New York State Democratic Committee, New York, NY
Pamela St. John Bertoli, Congress Watch, Washington, DC
Anne Coyle, East Haven Town Attorney's Office, East Haven, CT
Regional Donal Davis, Office of Congressman Ike Skelton (D-MO), Washington, DC
Leah Anne Dickerman, Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, Albany, NY
David R. Giles, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Political Access Project, Los Angeles, CA
Robert A. Henderson, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, DC
Tal A. Johnson, Office of City Manager, Tacoma, WA
Doreen Marie Kelly, New England Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Boston, MA
Marc Kushner, Religion Action Center, Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, Washington, DC
Vivian Wai-fun Lee, Asian American Resource Workshop, Boston, MA
Brita Ellen Lundberg, National Public Radio, Washington, DC
Dean R. Madden, Office of Congressman Edward J. Markey (D-MA), Washington, DC
Melanie Jean McDermott, Sierra Club International Earthcare Center, New York, NY
Paul D. Palmer, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, San Antonio, TX
Edward J. Reznik, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Office of East-West Trade, State Department, Washington, DC
Harry Mitchell Stahl, National Gay Task Force, Violence Project, New York, NY

Job Seminars

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

December 8, 1982:
Jean F. O’Neil, former aide to U.S. Representative Clarence Long (D-MD)
Mary Jane Gibson, Massachusetts State Representative
Karen Elliott House, Fellow, Institute of Politics, diplomatic correspondent, The Wall Street Journal
Peter Rainey, Public Affairs Advisor, Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning, Harvard
Constance Adams ’86 and Elizabeth Contreras ’85, former interns

March 10, 1983
Andrew Maguire, Fellow, Institute of Politics, former U.S. Representative (D-NJ)
Madeleine Kunin, Fellow, Institute of Politics, former Lieutenant Governor of Vermont
Ken Hartnett, Fellow, Institute of Politics, Managing Editor, The Boston Herald
Rick Howard, Government and Public Affairs Advisor, Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning, Harvard
Debbie Smolover ’84, former intern

Externships

Twenty-seven externships were arranged during spring break 1983 teaming up students and public sector professionals for at least one day, giving each student the opportunity to observe and participate in the daily rounds of their sponsor.

Sponsors included:
George Bachrach, Massachusetts State Senator
Morton Blackwell, conservative groups liaison for President Reagan
Julia Chang Bloch, Agency for International Development
William Perry, New York Police Department
Micho Spring, Deputy Mayor of Boston
Robert Wagner, Jr., Deputy Mayor of New York City
Judy Woodruff, NBC News, Washington, DC

Intern Workshop

Twenty-six potential interns attended the two-session Workshop in April 1983, planned and implemented by the student internship committee and offered by Jean F. O’Neil, former Congressional aide and Intern Supervisor in the Washington office of U.S. Representative Clarence Long (D-MD). Ms. O’Neil used documents, visual aides, and her 14-years’ experience on Capitol Hill to teach the training sessions, providing valuable substantive information and insights into the duties and responsibilities of, and criteria for successful Congressional interns.
The Summer-in-Washington Program

The Summer-in-Washington Program was coordinated by Martha Wood in 1983. 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:
  - James L. Tyson and Bernard Yoh, *Accuracy in Media*
  - Jeffrey F. Scott, *Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget*
  - Judd Gregg, *New Hampshire State Representative*
  - Ralph Nader, *consumer advocate, political entrepreneur*
  - Barber Conable, *U.S. Representative (R-NY); member, Committee on Ways and Means, House Ethics Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation*
  - Chhang Song, *former Minister of Information, Cambodia (Lon Nol Government)*
  - Ben Bradlee, *Executive Editor, The Washington Post*
  - Bonnie Newman, *Deputy Director of Personnel, White House*
  - Lehmann Li, *Domestic Policy Office, White House*
  - Christopher J. Dodd, *U.S. Senator (D-CT); member, Foreign Relations Committee; Senate's Children's Caucus*
  - Anthony Lanyi, *Developing Country Studies Division, Research Department, International Monetary Fund*
  - Thomas E. Petri, *Wisconsin State Representative*
  - David Broder, *national political correspondent, The Washington Post*
  - John Anderson, *Independent Presidential candidate*
  - Margaret Heckler, *Secretary of Health and Human Services; former Congresswoman (R-MA)*

- Debate between Michael Posner, *Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights, and Elliot Abrams, Central American affairs, U.S. Department of State*

- Other activities included:
  - "A Short Course on the Legislative Process" with Mark Talisman, Director, Washington Action Office, Council of Jewish Federations; advisor, Summer-in-Washington program; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
  - An informal Ivy League group party for college students summering in Washington
  - Softball games against teams from Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill's office, Northeast-Midwest Institute, Princeton University, University of Pennsylvania, Senator Carl Levin's
office, Senator Alan Dixon's office, Stanford University, Yale University, Congressman James Jefford's office
A wine and cheese reception with University of Pennsylvania students on the Hill, attended by Massachusetts Congressman Barney Frank and Pennsylvania Congressman Thomas Foglietta
A barbecue with Former Fellows of the Institute of Politics
A boat cruise on the Potomac with students from Princeton, Stanford, University of Pennsylvania, Duke and Harvard
A garden party at Dumbarton Oaks for Summer-in-Washington Program guest speakers and students
Ride for Life — 35 Harvard students riding bicycles across country to raise money for OXFAM were welcomed at a rally attended by many Summer-in-Washington Program participants

The Summer-in-Boston Program

This successful new program was coordinated by Dale Curtis during the Harvard Summer School session. The Institute hopes to continue and expand this project in the future. Program events included:
• Discussions with:
  Chris Black, political correspondent, The Boston Globe
  Mark Roosevelt, candidate for Boston City Council from Back Bay/Beacon Hill, and
  Larry DiCara, candidate for Mayor of Boston
  David Powell, Research Associate, Russian Research Center, Harvard
  Andrew Natsios, Massachusetts State Representative; Chair, Massachusetts Republican Party, and
  James Roosevelt, legal counsel to the Massachusetts State Democratic Committee
  James King, Associate Vice President for State and Community Relations, Harvard; former White House aide, Carter administration; consultant, several political campaigns
  Michael S. Dukakis, Governor of Massachusetts

• Other activities included:
  A visit to the Museum at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library
  A wine and cheese reception at the Institute of Politics

Harvard Political Review

The Harvard Political Review is a quarterly journal of political analysis published by the Student Advisory Committee. Officers during academic year 1982-83 were:
The four issues of HPR published during academic year 1982-83 contained the following articles:

**Volume X/Number 1; Fall 1982**

**Cover Story: "Lights, Camera, Controversy: Political Documentaries:**

- "Lights, Camera, Controversy," Robert Yarbrough
- "A Hard Look at Hard Ball," an interview with Roger Mudd
- "Friendly Fire," an interview with Fred Friendly
- "A Real Blockbuster," an interview with Pierce Rafferty
- "A Close-Up Angle," Mike Lubrano

- "Big Brother is Legislating," John Kent Walker
- "The Best Congress Money Can Buy," Richard Kahlenberg
- "Taxation Without Calculation," Kirk Jenkins
- "NAACP Hopes Blacks Register Disapproval," Ronald Roach
- "A Man Without A Country," an interview with Dennis Brutus
- "Poverty on the Potomac," David Theobald
- "Playing Dirty With Fairness," Gregory Fried

**Books of the Review:**

- *Reagan* by Lou Cannon; reviewed by Neil Folger
- *Atlantic High: A Celebration* by William F. Buckley; reviewed by Kirk Jenkins
- *China: Alive in the Bitter Sea* by Fox Butterfield; reviewed by Janice S. Wang
America in Search of Itself: The Making of the President 1956-1980
by Theodore H. White; reviewed by Mina Silberberg

Volume X/Number 2; Winter 1983
Cover Story: "The Decline of Public Education"
"Valuing Education," John Kent Walker
"Politicians and Pedagogues," Janice Sue Wong
"Educating for Equality?," Vilna Waldron
"Money Matters," Laurie Hall
"Race Against Racism," Jay Hamilton
"NCPAC: Tasting Its Own Medicine," Jimmy Goldgeier
"New Money Versus New Deal," Robert G. Yarbrough
"Campaigning in Dixie: GOP Appomattox," Kirk Jenkins
"Fear and Loathing at Los Alamos," Jay Hamilton
"Government as a Reluctant Partner," Ronald Roach

Books of the Review:
Keeping Faith by Jimmy Carter; reviewed by Rick Kahlenberg
The Reagan Experiment. Ed. John L. Palmer and Isabel V. Sawhill; reviewed by Neil Folger
Greed Is Not Enough: Reaganomics by Robert Lekachman; reviewed by Sean Reilly
Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism by Rosalind Rosenberg; reviewed by James Farrell

Volume X/Number 3; Spring 1983
Cover Story: "1984: The Choice"
"Mondale: Bound for Glory," Richard Kahlenberg
"Glenn: The Sky's the Limit," Ronald Roach
"Hart: High-Tech Hustle," Sean Reilly
"At the Back of the Pack," Janice Sue Wong
"Waiting for The Word," Kirk Jenkins
"The Handicappers' Forecast," interview with six political pundits

"Death of a Presidency," Robert G. Yarbrough
"All the Views That Fit," Jay Hamilton
"Mediating the Environment," John Kent Walker
"No Money, No Hope," David Theobald
"Stalking the Food Link," Michael Andrew Hunter

Books of the Review:
Liberalism and the Limits of Justice by Michael J. Sandel; reviewed by Gregory Fried
Standing Fast: The Autobiography of Roy Wilkins by Roy Wilkins with Tom Matthews; reviewed by Neil Folger
The Years of Lyndon Johnson: The Path to Power by Robert A. Caro; reviewed by Robert G. Yarbrough
Volume X/Number 4; Summer 1983

Cover Story: “American Think Tanks: The Politics of Policy”
“Thinking for Dollars,” Robert G. Yarbrough
“Minding Their Business,” Vilna Waldron and Ben Sparks
“CSIS on CSIS,” Brian Dickson

“Star Wars 1983,” Janice Sue Wong
“Rehabilitating Criminal Justice,” Laurie Hall
“Bishops and the Bomb,” Kirk Jenkins
“The Protectionism Trade-Off,” Luis Ubinas
“Reagan’s Children,” Richard Kahlenberg
“Game, Set, Asylum,” Theresa Amato
“Reservations on Indian Policy,” Michael Ricciuti
“Beyond Roe v. Wade,” Susanto Basu
“Compacting Radioactive Waste,” Andrew Buckser
“The Anderson Indifference,” Janice Sue Wong

Books of the Review:
The Africans by David Lamb; reviewed by Martin Kilson
A New Democracy by Gary Hart; reviewed by Sean Reilly

Student Projects

In Spring 1982 the Special Projects and Guests Committees of the SAC were consolidated and enlarged to create the Projects Committee. During academic year 1982-83, the Projects Committee organized and sponsored two large conferences, several panel discussions, two major addresses, visits by four Visiting Fellows, a four-week discussion series on the Presidential Nominating Process and continued the Community Outreach Program. Most of these events were held in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

A new position, Speakers Coordinator, was instituted to assist the Projects Chair and to oversee the Visiting Fellows program. Visiting Fellows, selected on the basis of distinguished experience in active political life, are invited to spend brief periods at Harvard, during which they meet with interested undergraduates, faculty members, and Fellows of the Institute of Politics.

Projects Committee members helped host the Newly Elected Congressmen Program, the Seminar for Massachusetts Mayors, The Conference on Nuclear Arms Policy Issues for Print and Television Journalists, assisted with several Forum programs and arranged the following events, most of which were held in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government:
A debate, televised by WCVB-TV, between John Kerry (D) and Leon Lombardi (R), candidates for Massachusetts Lieutenant Governor, October 12, 1982, co-sponsored by the Harvard Law School Ripon Society and the Harvard/Radcliffe Republican Club.


Richard Haas, U.S. Department of State
Leslie Gelb, correspondent, The New York Times
Edward J. Markey, U.S. Representative (D-MA)

and panel discussions with participants:
Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy and Academic Dean,
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Paul Doty, Mallinckrodt Professor of Biochemistry and Director of the
Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Samuel Huntington, Frank G. Thomson Professor of Government, Harvard
Joseph S. Nye, Professor of Government, Harvard
George Rathjens, Professor of Political Science, M.I.T.
Robert Dean, Deputy Director for Politico-Military Affairs,
U.S. Department of State
Karen Elliott House, Fellow, Institute of Politics; diplomatic correspondent,
The Wall Street Journal (moderator)

A debate, "The Death Penalty," November 1, 1982, between:

Henry Schwarzchild, Director, Capital Punishment Project,
American Civil Liberties Union
Ernest van den Haag, John M. Olin Professor of Jurisprudence and
Public Policy, Fordham University, with
Harry N. Hirsch, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard (moderator)


A conference, "Black Politics: Target '84," November 13, 1982. Conference sessions included a public address by

Parren Mitchell, U.S. Representative (D-MD);
a panel discussion with:
Samuel Cornelius, Administrator, Food and Nutritional Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Martin Kilson, Professor, Department of Government, Harvard
Manning Marable, Director, Race Relations Institute, Fisk University
Henry Marsh, Councilman and former Mayor, Richmond, VA
James Jennings, Professor, Afro-American Studies Department, Harvard (moderator)
and workshops with participants:
Rev. Dr. Audrey Bronson, Professor, Department of Psychology, Cheyney State College
Rev. Calvin Pressley, former Director, New York Mission Society
Dr. Preston Noah Williams, Houghton Professor of Theology and Contemporary Change, Harvard Divinity School
Osaratin Osaghaede, National Publicity Secretary, National Party of Nigeria
Leroy Toomes
J. Kenneth Blackwell, former Mayor, Cincinnati, OH; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
Saundra Graham, Leader, Massachusetts Black Caucus
Robert Woodson, President, National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise
Glenn Loury, Professor Department of Economics and Afro-American Studies, Harvard
J. A. Parker, President, Lincoln Institute for Research and Education
Ralph Smith, Professor, University of Pennsylvania School of Law
Christopher Edley, Jr., Professor, Harvard Law School (moderator)

A roundtable discussion, "War and the Media: Lebanon '82," November 30, 1982, with:

Hilary Brown, correspondent, ABC News
Suzette Knittl, Field Producer and East Beirut Bureau Chief, NBC News
Peter Arnett, correspondent, Cable News Network
David Greenway, Foreign and National Editor, The Boston Globe
Roger Morris, contributing writer, Columbia Journalism Review
Peter Braestrup, Editor, Wilson Quarterly (Moderator)

A panel discussion, "Congress v. the Court: Will Abortion, Busing and School Prayer Provoke a Constitutional Crisis?" December 1, 1982, with:

John Shattuck, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union
Kenneth R. Kay, Chief Counsel for Minority Staff, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers
Michael Wallace, Assistant to Minority Whip, U.S. House of Representatives
Stephen J. Markman, Chief Counsel & Staff Director, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Senate Judiciary Committee
William Schwartz, Dean, Boston University School of Law (Moderator)
A debate, “The Insanity Defense,” December 7, 1982, with:

Peter Aranella, Professor of Law, Boston University School of Law
David Michael Bear, M.D., Assistant Professor of Psychiatry,
Beth Israel Hospital
Mary Louise Westmoreland, Senior Counsel, U.S. Senate Subcommittee
on Juvenile Justice
Alan Dershowitz, Professor, Harvard Law School
Chuck Stone, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Senior Editor, Philadelphia
Daily News (Moderator)

A panel discussion, “A Mid-Term Assessment of the Reagan Administration,” February 8, 1983, with:

Edwin Meese, White House Counselor
Jim Wright, Majority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives (D-TX)
Tom Wicker, Associate Editor, The New York Times
William Rusher, Publisher, National Review
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration,
John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator)

A panel discussion, “Human Rights and American Foreign Policy,” February 15, 1983 co-sponsored by the Harvard/Radcliffe Amnesty International

William Griffith, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Rev. Robert Drinan, President, Americans for Democratic Action;
Professor of Law, Georgetown University
John G. Healy, Executive Director, Amnesty International, U.S.A.
Raymond Gastil, Freedom House, New York, NY
Michael Sandel, Assistant Professor, Department of Government, Harvard
(Moderator)

A discussion series, “Nominating a Presidential Candidate,” March 16 and 23, April 6 and 13, 1983, with participants:

Anthony Podesta, Executive Director, People for the American Way
James Roosevelt, Legal Counsel, Massachusetts Democratic Party;
member, Democratic National Committee
Christopher Lydon, anchorman, WGBH-TV, Boston
James King, Associate Vice President, State and Community Relations,
Harvard
A panel discussion, "Public Policies on Poverty: Help or Hindrance?" April 12, 1983, co-sponsored with Harvard/Radcliffe Democratic Club, with:

Robert Carleson, Special Assistant to the President, Policy Development, Reagan Administration
Arnold Packer, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor, Carter Administration
Leonard Housman, Chairman, Center for Employment and Income Studies, Heller School, Brandeis University (Moderator)

A discussion, "Professors in Politics: An Ethical Discussion," April 19, 1983, with:

James L. Medoff, Associate Professor of Labor Economics, Department of Economics, Harvard; Director, National Bureau of Economic Research
Everett I. Mendelsohn, Professor, Department of the History of Science, Harvard
James D. Wilkinson, Associate Professor, Department of History and History and Literature, Harvard

A panel discussion, "Hoeing Tobacco Row: The Politics of Cigarette Regulation," April 27, 1983, with:

Charles F. Adams, Executive Vice President, American Association of Advertising Agencies
Rita Addison, President, Group Against Smoking Pollution of Massachusetts
Thomas G. Howard, Assistant to the Vice President, Tobacco Institute
Michael Pertschuk, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission
Andrew Maguire, Former U.S. Representative (D-NJ), (Moderator)

The four Visiting Fellows and the topics of their addresses were:

Judy Woodruff, Washington correspondent, NBC, "Reflections of a White House Correspondent," November 8-9, 1982. Ms. Woodruff was accompanied by her husband, Albert Hunt, editor, The Wall Street Journal, who participated in many of the seminar discussions and meetings which highlighted her visit. She conducted a "Women in Journalism" seminar at the Cronkhite Graduate Center and met with Harvard undergraduate media representatives.
Lou Cannon, White House correspondent, *The Washington Post*; author, *Reagan* (1982), "Reagan, the Man, the President," November 17-18, 1982. At a junior tutorial on November 17th, Mr. Cannon spoke on the topic, "The Mass Media, the Presidency, and Policy-making." He met with the Fellows of the Institute and of the Nieman Foundation over lunch, was the guest speaker at the Institute Study Groups supper, and participated in meetings and seminars with students including a breakfast meeting at Winthrop House.

Hyman George Rickover, Admiral, U.S.N. (Ret.), Expert, nuclear-powered submarines; former Assistant Director of Operations, Manhattan Project; recipient of many awards and medals in recognition of his long and distinguished service, including the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964; March 15-16, 1983. Admiral Rickover spoke in the ARCO Forum on March 15th on, "Thoughts on Man's Purpose in Life," conducted a tutorial for history majors on the topic, "Origins of the Cold War," participated in meetings and student seminars and met with Harvard Navy ROTC students at a reception arranged in his honor.

Valery Giscard d'Estaing, former President of France, combined his stay as a Visiting Fellow, May 1-4, 1983, with his appearance to deliver the 1983 Pollak Lecture, "New Patterns of Modern Democracies: Public Opinion and Communication," on May 2nd in the ARCO Forum. At a tutorial earlier the same day, and at several meal-time meetings and seminars throughout his visit, President Giscard d'Estaing addressed issues such as, The Making of French Economic Policy: Reconciling Domestic and International Constraints," and "Social-Cultural Evolution of France," the latter during a French-language Study Group Meeting at Harvard's Center for European Studies.

* * *
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The Panel on Fellowship

Manuel Carballo
Lawrence S. DiCara
Kenneth Drexler, Spring
Robert Edwards, Fall
Archie Epps
Dan Fenn
Peter Gelfman
James Goldgeier, Fall
Steven Grand, Spring
Paul Holtzman, Fall
Ethel Klein
Lance M. Liebman
Richard J. Light
Michael Lipsky
Ken Louard, Spring
A. Douglas Matthews
Ernest R. May
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos
Jonathan Moore
Richard E. Neustadt
Don K. Price
Ann Ramsay
Robin Schmidt
Stanley S. Surrey, Chair
William E. Trueheart

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

Karen McCarthy Benson, State Representative, Kansas City, Missouri. While a Fellow, Ms. Benson researched an article for the Harvard Business School Energy Project. Her study group was entitled “The Politics of Alternative Energies.”

Dennis Carey, Secretary of Labor, Delaware. At Harvard, Mr. Carey worked on a proposal for alleviating Delaware’s unemployment problem. The study group he led was entitled, “The Unemployment Crisis: What Role for Washington?”

Betty Friedan, author of The Feminine Mystique and The Second Stage. Ms. Friedan returned to the Institute as a second semester Fellow to continue to work on her book in progress which will examine changing sex roles and the aging process.


Elaine R. Jones, Attorney, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. During her fellowship Ms. Jones began an examination of black appointments to the federal bench. She led a study group entitled, “Reaganism and Civil Rights: Progress or Retreat.”

Mark Q. Rhoads, Illinois State Senator (1976-1982). For his individual project, Mr. Rhoads assisted in an ongoing research project on reappointment. His study group was entitled “Political Apprenticeship: How to Start Planning Your Next Ten Years.”

Chuck Stone, Senior Editor and Columnist, Philadelphia Daily News. Mr. Stone began work on a book on political action committees while a Fellow. He led a study group entitled “Pressure Groups, Prestige and the Press.”

Spring

Laura D. Blackburne, Vice President and Chief Executive Officer, Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, Inc., New York. During her fellowship, Ms. Blackburne began research on a project on Black Women and the Law. Her study group was entitled, “Mediation and Conflict Resolution: Applications in the Public Sector.”

Susan Catania, State Representative, Twenty-Second Legislative District, Chicago, IL, 1973-1983. For her research Ms. Catania began interviewing legislators throughout the country who have sponsored the ERA. She led a study group entitled “Women in Politics.”
Kenneth O. Hartnett, Managing Editor, The Boston Herald. For his project Mr. Hartnett began working on a political novel. He conducted a study group entitled “Politics and the News Flow: The Process of Media Decision Making.”

Madeleine Kunin, Lieutenant Governor of Vermont, 1979-1983. For her project Ms. Kunin did research on the subject of women and power. Her study group was entitled “The Criminal Justice System Under Pressure.”

Andrew Maguire, Member of US Congress, Seventh Congressional District, 1974-1980. For his project Mr. Maguire studied international trade and economic issues. He led a study group entitled “Children in a World of Power.”


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

David Nyhan, political reporter, The Boston Globe
Oriana Fallaci, journalist and writer and The Nieman Foundation Fellows
Gemma Hussey, Member of Parliament, Ireland
Peter J. Gomes, Minister, Memorial Church; Plummer Professor of Christian Morals, Harvard
Benito Aquino, former Senator from the Philippines
Mel King, Boston City Councillor; Mayoral candidate
Stanley Hoffman, C. Douglas Dillon Professor of the Civilization of France, Harvard
Harvey Cox, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard
E.O. Wilson, Frank B. Baird Jr. Professor of Science, Harvard
John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard

Dinner with Honored Guest, George Kistiakowsky, Abbott and James Lawrence Professor of Chemistry, Emeritus, Harvard

A dinner program entitled, “Will There Be A Great Depression?” with
Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, Kennedy School of Government and Rudiger Dornbush, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dinner with the Senior Executive Fellows, Kennedy School of Government

Spring

Christopher Lydon, Anchor, "10 O'clock News," WBGH-TV, Boston

Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government


Mark Beissinger, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard

Noam Chomsky, Institute Professor for Linguistics and Philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology


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

Monica Faith Stewart, Former Illinois State Legislator

Al Eisele, Former Fellow, Institute of Politics

Roger Fisher, Samuel Williston Professor of Law, Harvard

Graham T. Allison, Jr., Dean of the Faculty of Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Joseph S. Nye, Professor of Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Stanley Hoffman, C. Douglas Dillon Professor of the Civilization of France, Harvard

Hyman G. Rickover, Admiral, U.S.N. (Ret.)

A dinner program entitled, "Fear, Greed and Entrepreneurialism," with Robert Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

A dinner program entitled, "Perspectives on the Central America Crisis," with Richard McCall, Deputy Staff Director, U.S. Senate Democratic Policy Committee and Margaret Daley Hayes, Professional Staff Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

A dinner program entitled, "The USA TODAY Experience," with John L. Seigenthaler, President, Tennessean Newspapers, Inc.; Editorial Director, USA TODAY.

Dinner with Valery Giscard d'Estaing, former President of France

*  *  *
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The Faculty Studies Program

The faculty studies program attempts to combine the broad concerns of the Institute of Politics, the intellectual capabilities of faculty from Harvard and other universities, and the experience and expertise of practitioners in areas of inquiry. The goal of most faculty study groups is not to perform basic research, but rather to focus on applied problems in government and politics and to make their analysis and recommendations available to interested public officials and organizations. The program of faculty studies concentrates on two areas often ignored in policy-related research but among the Institute's primary concerns: policies affecting the shape of politics, and the politics of choosing or implementing existing policy proposals. Three to five short-term faculty study groups ordinarily are under way each academic year. Some groups conduct their inquiries over longer periods of time. Topics covered have included national intelligence activities, Vice Presidential selection, ethics in public life and constitutional change.

In addition to the Faculty Study Groups listed below, two other groups can be found in the Programs section under The Press-Politics Center. They are on How the Press Affects Federal Policy Making, funded by the Charles H. Revson Foundation, and on New Communications Technology and Democratic Values, funded by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation.

Campbell Finance

The Campaign Finance Study Group, under a grant from the U.S. Senate Rules Committee, has recently investigated the impact of the federal election campaign laws upon the conduct of presidential campaigns. While recognizing that in many respects the Act has fulfilled its stated objectives, the study group's research focused upon major problem areas that have developed as a result of the outright failure of the Act, or circumstances that could not be foreseen when the Act was drafted, or changes in the law due to the actions of other institutions beyond the scope of Congressional authority. The study group report, released in March 1982, indicated that the most troublesome problems are those related to the attempt to restrict the spending of money by those seeking to influence the outcomes of presidential campaigns. Specifically, the study group offered sixteen recommendations for legislative change, presented as a package, each proposal recommended in the context of the other major changes suggested.

The study group will continue to focus its efforts on evaluating the kind of regulatory agency necessary to implement campaign laws on the federal level, examining the structures and authorities of such an
The Faculty Studies Program

agency, and on evaluating the political and institutional mechanisms of presidential selection. Currently, work is underway to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of pending policy proposals circulating in the Congress.

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
- **Gary Jacobson**, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California at San Diego
- **Xandra Kayden**, former consultant, Impact 2½ Project, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- **David Keene**, President, Keene, Monk & Associates, Alexandria, Virginia
- **Susan B. King**, former Chair, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
- **Nicholas T. Mitropoulos**, Associate Director, Institute of Politics
- **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

### 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 Faculty Study Group on Presidential Transition has, since 1968, provided to new incoming administrations nonpartisan reports designed to provide insights into the procedural options that confront a new president.

With the assistance of a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Study Group 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; the 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.

Members of the Study Group are:

- **Graham T. Allison**, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
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 (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 thus precipitated the formation of a second Faculty Study Group on the State and the Poor in order to address the question in the context of Massachusetts in the eighties. A book, The State and the Poor in the 1980’s (Auburn House Publishing, Co., 1984), delineates the findings of this second group.

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
Mary Jo Bane, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, Harvard
David Blumenthal, Executive Director, Center for Health Policy and Management, Harvard; Josiah Macy Fellow, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Walter Broadnax, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
David Calkins, Josiah Macy Fellow, John F. Kennedy School of Government
The Study Group on Legislative Reapportionment’s final report, originally scheduled for completion in the fall of 1982 and now delayed until spring 1984, examines the history of redistricting, the frequency and effects of gerrymandering, and the policy options available. It will include analysis of the results of a large-scale survey which asked state legislative leaders, state political party chairs, and reform leaders for their views on alternative methods of redistricting.

Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, chaired the group. He has been assisted by Andrew Robertson, a student at Nuffield College, Oxford University and a doctoral candidate in history at Brandeis University, Isaac Shapiro, a master of public policy degree candidate at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, and Elaine Swift, doctoral candidate at the Department of Government, Harvard.

* * *

The Faculty Studies Program
Professional Study Program

Seminar for Massachusetts Mayors
December 2-3, 1982

Twenty-two mayors from cities across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts attended this first two day seminar designed to be both a training session and a forum for the exchange of ideas. The informal environment allowed municipal chief executives to talk candidly with their peers, with leaders of state government and with public policy experts about the realities of running a Massachusetts city in the 1980s. The seminar program included topics such as financial management, press relations, managerial skills, labor relations, public-private collaboration in community development, and speech-and-discussion sessions with State Senate President William Bulger, Governor-Elect Michael S. Dukakis and U.S. Senator Paul Tsongas. Sponsors were the Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard, the Institute of Politics and the Massachusetts Municipal Association, with support from the First National Bank of Boston, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company of Springfield and Wang Laboratories of Lowell.

The participants included:
Eugene C. Bruce, Somerville
George Colella, Revere
Theodore Dimauro, Springfield
Paul Donato, Medford
Thomas Fallon, Malden
Peter Fortunato, Beverly
David Gilmartin, Fitchburg
Richard J. Girouard, Leominster
Robert Kumor, Jr., Chicopee
Richard Lamb, North Adams
Lawrence LeFebre, Lawrence
Jean A. Levesque, Salem
Theodore Mann, Newton
Francis McCauley, Quincy
David Musante, Jr., Northampton
Michael E. O'Connell, Westfield
Sara Robertson, Worcester
William Ryan, Haverhill
Charles Smith, Pittsfield
Edward Sullivan, Vice Mayor, Boston
Peter Torigian, Peabody
Carlton Viveiros, Fall River
The faculty included:

T. Dustin Alward, Regional Vice President, International Association of Fire Fighters; President, Massachusetts Professional Fire Fighters
Jonathan Brock, Lecturer in Public Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
David Gilmartin, Mayor of Fitchburg; Management Chairman, Joint Labor-Management Committee for Municipal Police and Fire Fighters
Michael Harrington, President, The Harrington Company
Ira A. Jackson, Associate Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Helen F. Ladd, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Martin Linsky, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Lowell L. Richards, III, Collector-Treasurer, City of Boston
Eugene L. Sullivan, Jr., Executive Director of Debt Management and Finance Advisory Board, Massachusetts
Lawrence Susskind, Associate Professor, Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
David Vickery, Project Manager, Hines Industrial

The Seminar Committee consisted of:

Joint Center for Urban Studies
H. James Brown, Director
Arnold Howitt, Curriculum Coordinator
Charlotte Moore, Seminar Coordinator

Institute of Politics
Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Theresa A. Donovan, Administrative Coordinator
William G. Mayer, Special Assistant to the Director
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Associate Director
Jonathan Moore, Director

Massachusetts Municipal Association
Richard Kelliher, Administrative Services Director
James Segel, Executive Director
Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress
December 9-15, 1982

The Institute and the Committee on House Administration of the U.S. House of Representatives co-sponsored its sixth week-long study program for forty-four newly-elected Members of Congress, with additional support provided by Sears, Roebuck and Company. Its purpose is to provide new Members with an introduction, through substantive analysis and process definition, of major public policy issues they would be facing in the new Congress, and to help them in their transition from candidates to legislators. Sessions focused on the role of Congress in such areas as energy, social security, the economy, agricultural policy, taxes, industrial policy, arms control, defense, and international relations.

The participants included:

Michael A. Andrews (D-Texas)
Steve Bartlett (R-Texas)
Jim Bates (D-California)
Sherwood L. Boehlert (R-New York)
Robert A. Borski, Jr. (D-Pennsylvania)
Frederick Boucher (R-Virginia)
Robin Britt (D-North Carolina)
John W. Bryant (D-Texas)
Thomas R. Carper (D-Delaware)
Ronald D. Coleman (D-Texas)
James S. Cooper (D-Tennessee)
Michael DeWine (R-Ohio)
Richard Durbin (D-Illinois)
Lane Evans (D-Illinois)
Edward F. Feighan (D-Ohio)
Nancy L. Johnson (R-Connecticut)
Marcia Kaptur (D-Ohio)
John F. Kasich (R-Ohio)
Sander Levin (D-Michigan)
Connie Mack III (R-Florida)
Buddy MacKay (D-Florida)
Alfred A. McCandless (R-California)
Francis X. McCloskey (D-Indiana)
Alan B. Mollohan (D-West Virginia)
The faculty included:

Graham Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Stuart Altman, Dean, Florence Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University
Les Aspin, Member of Congress
Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Erich Bloch, Vice President, Technical Personnel Development, International Business Machines Corporation
David Broder, Syndicated Columnist, The Washington Post
Manuel Carballo, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Barber Conable, Member of Congress
Richard N. Cooper, Maurits C. Boas Professor of International Economics, Harvard
Jorge Dominguez, Professor of Government, Harvard
Otto Eckstein, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Harvard
John K. Fairbank, Francis Lee Higginson Professor of History, Emeritus, Harvard
Rashi Fein, Professor of the Economics of Medicine, Harvard Medical School
Ray A. Goldberg, George M. Moffett Professor of Agriculture and Business, Harvard Business School
Peter D. Hart, President, Peter D. Hart Research Associates
Stanley J. Heginbotham, Chief, Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division, Congressional Research Service
William Hogan, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Henry Jacoby, Professor of Management, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
William Kaufmann, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lawrence J. Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon
Robert A. Leone, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joseph Nye, Professor of Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Oliver Oldman, Learned Hand Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Lionel Olmer, Undersecretary of International Trade, U.S. Department of Commerce
Don K. Price, Professor of Public Policy, Dean Emeritus, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert B. Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Stanford G. Ross, Former Commissioner, Social Security Administration
Nadav Safran, Professor of Government, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard
Dallas L. Salisbury, Executive Director, Employee Benefit Research Institute, Washington, DC
Howard D. Samuel, President, Industrial Union Department, A.F.L.-C.I.O.
Richard Snelling, Governor of Vermont
Susan Spencer, Correspondent, CBS News
Laurence H. Tribe, Ralph S. Tyler, Jr. Professor of Constitutional Law, Harvard Law School
Adam B. Ulam, Director, Russian Research Center, Harvard
Raymond Vernon, Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Harvard
George V. Voinovich, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio
Alvin Warren, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Daniel Yergin, Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Administrative staff for the program included:

Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Associate Director, Institute of Politics
Theresa Donovan, Administrative Coordinator
William Mayer, Faculty and Curriculum Coordinator
Jane Markham, Press Coordinator
Jim Reeder, Notebook Coordinator
Beth Golden, Travel Coordinator
Pamela Gagnon, Staff Support

*   *   *
Communications media not only report but simultaneously influence the form and substance of our political life, yet not enough is understood about the nature and consequences of this interaction between the press and government. The Institute of Politics is taking the lead in the design and development of a new Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy with a mission to build and transmit knowledge about three interrelated phenomena: the impact of the press on the electoral process; the impact of the press on government; and the impact of public policy on the press. It will mobilize an array of resources to clarify these complex issues, helping to define future threats, rights and responsibilities of a free press in our political system.

The Center will pursue four basic purposes and perform four basic functions. The four basic purposes are: more understanding by government officials about the role and value of the media; better coverage by media professionals of government and politics; better anticipation of the consequences of public policies that affect the media and the First Amendment; and more knowledge about how the media affect our political processes and governmental institutions. The four basic functions are: curriculum development and teaching; research about interactions among the press and electoral politics and government; intensive educational programs for reporters, editors and executives from the press about complex governmental processes and substantive policy issues; and outreach programs of seminars, conferences and television productions that bring together journalists, government officials, politicians and scholars for joint consideration of media-government problems.

Activity already sponsored by the Institute prior to the actual establishment of the Press-Politics Center includes:

- Modules on the media for the John F. Kennedy School of Government curricula for executive training programs for senior federal officials and state and local government officials, newly-elected Congressmen, newly-elected Mayors, as well as courses on the press offered by senior staff, Visiting Research Fellows and former Fellows of the Institute.
- Television programming including a documentary on the limitations of the presidential office, "The Presidency: How Much Alone?"

The specific projects in 1982-83 were:

An Educational Conference on Nuclear Arms Policy Issues
For Print and Television Journalists
January 7-9, 1983

Editors, reporters, correspondents and editorial writers from media organizations in a thirteen-state Northeast region, including news bureaus and news services in Washington, DC, attended a three-day conference organized with support from the Ford Foundation to provide a comprehensive understanding of nuclear arms issues and tailored especially for media professionals covering and writing about these issues. A faculty of prominent scholars and practitioners in the field conducted formal sessions in classrooms and informal discussions at lunches and dinners on topics which included strategic nuclear forces and arms control, proliferation, the defense budget and upcoming congressional agenda, media coverage of nuclear weapons issues, the future of the negotiating process and a wrap-up and evaluation session.

The participants included:

Tim Ahern, reporter, Associated Press, Washington
James C. Anagnostos, Assistant Managing Editor, The Woonsocket Call, RI
Helen Anderson, Bureau Chief, Helen Anderson News Bureau, Washington
Rick Atkinson, National Correspondent, Kansas City Times, Washington
Alan Audet, reporter, WABI-TV, Bangor, ME
David M. Barrett, Public Affairs Director, WNIT-TV, South Bend, IN
Timothy Blagg, Managing Editor, Morning Sentinel, Waterville, ME
Raymond L. Blockus, Editorial Writer, The Times Leader, Wilkes-Barre, PA
David Bohman, reporter, WPTZ, Burlington, VT
Judith W. Brown, Editor, The Herald, New Britain, CT
Sandy Butler, Assignment Editor, WUTR-TV, Utica, NY
Andrew Cassells, Bureau Chief, Cox Communications Inc., Washington
William J. Choyke, reporter, Dallas Morning News, Washington
Stephen A. Collins, Editorial Director, The News-Times, Danbury, CT
Mrs. Zell Draz, Associate Publisher, Tribune Chronicle, Warren, OH
Herb Field, Editorial Writer, Patriot-News, Harrisburg, PA
Fred Fiske, Editorial Page Editor, Post-Standard, Syracuse, NY
David Funkhouser, Assistant Metro Editor, The Middlesex News, Framingham, MA
The Press-Politics Center

Jim Gardner, News Anchor, WPVI-TV, Philadelphia, PA
William Giles, Editor, The Detroit News, Detroit, MI
Carolyn Gorman, correspondent, Satellite News Channel, Washington
John F. Greenman, Public Affairs Producer, Maine Public Broadcasting, Orono, ME
Karl Grossman, Anchor, WSNL-TV, Central Islip, NY
Roy Gutman, reporter, Newsday, Washington
Thomas K. Hamburger, correspondent, Arkansas Gazette, Washington
Jack Hurley, Bureau Chief, Director of Television News, Gannett News Service, Washington
Steve Jacobs, News Producer, ABC News, Washington
Bill Keller, reporter, Dallas Times Herald, Washington
Morris Kennedy, reporter, Daily Intelligencer, Doylestown, PA
Ron Kirksey, Chief Editorial Writer, Akron Beacon Journal, Akron, OH
Peter Knapp, Editorial Page Editor, The Patriot Ledger, Quincy, MA
Roger Langley, Senior Editor, Hispanic-American News Service, Washington
Betsy Lehman, reporter, Metro Staff, The Boston Globe, Boston, MA
William B. Long, News Editor, Press of Atlantic City, Pleasantville, NJ
Mary C. Lord, Defense Correspondent, Newsweek, Washington
Robert K. Manoff, free-lance journalist, New York, NY,
former Editor, Columbia Journalism Review
Gail T. Martin, Development Director, Elkhart Truth, Elkhart, IN
Peter McKillop, reporter, Paterson News, Paterson, NJ
Herman P. Mello, Managing Editor, Fall River Herald News, Fall River, MA
Anne L. Millet, Deputy Bureau Chief, Ottaway News Service, Washington
Roderick Nordell, Assistant Chief Editorial Writer, Christian Science Monitor, Boston, MA
Ray Ollwerther, Assistant to the Editor, Asbury Park Press, Asbury Park, NJ
Rick Pfeiffer, reporter, WIVB-TV, Buffalo, NY
Donald P. Pickard, Chief Editorial Writer, Herald Journal, Herald American, Syracuse, NY
Michael Pingree, wire editor, Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, Lawrence, MA
Wayne Reilly, editorial writer, Bangor Daily News, Bangor, ME
Fann Ring, WGBY-TV, Springfield, MA
Lee Roderick, Bureau Chief, Scripps League Newspapers, Washington
Richard Schlesinger, Bureau Chief, Post-Newsweek Stations, Washington
Robert K. Schrepf, editorial writer, Hartford Courant, Hartford, CT
Dwight Smith, Anchor-reporter, WDTN-TV, Dayton, OH
Desmond Stone, Editorial Page Editor, Democrat & Chronicle, Rochester, NY
The faculty included:

Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael Getler, Staff Reporter, Washington Post
Catherine Kelleher, Professor of Military Strategy, National War College
William H. Kincaid, Executive Director, Arms Control Association
Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Professor, Department of Government, Harvard; co-author, Living in a Nuclear World
Walter Slocombe, Caplin and Drysdale, Washington, D.C. (formerly Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense)
Larry Smith, Consultant, Reston, Virginia; former member of staff, Senate Arms Services Committee

The program was administered by Institute of Politics staff including:

Stephen Bates, Research Assistant
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Associate Director
Jonathan Moore, Director
Elizabeth Pleasants, Conference Coordinator
Lewis W. Wolfson, Research Fellow
Television and Presidential Elections

- A book, "Television and the Presidential Elections," edited by Martin A. Linsky, Assistant Director of the Institute of Politics (Lexington Books, 1983), was based on three days of intense discussion among network journalists from ABC, CBS, NBC, news executives, politicians, political consultants, print reporters, and academic experts at the January 1982 conference of the same title.

How The Press Affects Federal Policy Making

A three-year research project funded by the Charles H. Revson Foundation began its work in July, 1982 with completion scheduled for June, 1985. Conducted by a Faculty Study Group of the Institute of Politics, the goals of the project are:

- to reach out to professionals in government, the press, and the general public to increase understanding about the real, precise impacts of the media on government decision-making;
- to develop curriculum and teaching materials designed to educate present and future public policy makers about the impact of the media; and
- to create materials and settings geared for practitioners in the media to educate them about the effect of their work.

It is anticipated that the final products of the project will include a book consisting, in part, of the results of a broad survey of key government decision makers, a series of case studies of press-government interaction in specific public policy decisions, and findings and conclusions.

Members of the Study Group Are:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Yale University

Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

John Chancellor, Correspondent, NBC News

Stephen H. Hess, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution


Martin Linsky, Project Director; Assistant Director, Institute of Politics

Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Chair

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

Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Vice-Chair

Garry Orren, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Eileen Shanahan, Senior Assistant Managing Editor, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
James C. Thomson, Jr., Curator, Niemen Foundation for Journalism; former Special Assistant, Department of State; East Asian specialist, National Security Council
John William Ward, President, American Council of Learned Societies
Lewis W. Wolfson, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics and Adjunct Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Spring 1983; Professor of Communication, American University; former Washington Bureau Chief, Providence Journal

New Communications Technology and Democratic Values
The John and Mary R. Markle Foundation announced this summer a grant supporting a two-year Institute interdisciplinary research project on how new communications technologies may affect democratic values and governance in our society. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Professor of Government and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, will chair a Faculty Study Group which will direct the research.

Members of the Study Group are:
F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science and Management, Yale University
Daniel Bell, Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard
Stephen G. Breyer, Justice, U.S. Court of Appeals, First Circuit; Lecturer on Administrative Law and Regulatory Policy, Harvard Law School
Les Brown, Editor-in-Chief, Channels of Communications
Hodding Carter, Anchor and Chief Correspondent, “Inside Story”, PBS
Archibald Cox, Carl M. Loeb University Professor, Harvard Law School
John Deardourff, Chairman of the Board, Bailey, Deardourff and Associates
Henry Geller, Director, Washington Center for Public Policy Research
Winthrop Knowlton, Director, Center for Government and Business, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard Levine, Editorial Director, Data Base Publishing, Dow Jones & Company
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard M. Neustadt, Partner, Wiley, Johnson and Rein, Washington, DC
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ithiel de Sola Pool, Ruth and Arthur Sloan Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michael Sandel, Associate Professor, Department of Government, Harvard

The work of the study group is expected to result in a book, reports and other educational materials.
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 students of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, September 14, 1982, with remarks by:

- Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- H. James Brown, Professor of City and Regional Planning and Director, Joint Center for Urban Studies, M.I.T. and Harvard
- Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy and Academic Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- William W. Hogan, Professor of Political Economy and Director of the Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Ira A. Jackson, Associate Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics

A panel discussion, “Personal Perspectives on Politics,” with the Fall 1982 Fellows of the Institute of Politics, September 16, 1982. Participants were:

- Karen McCarthy Benson, Missouri State Representative
- Dennis C. Carey, Secretary of Labor, Delaware
- Betty Friedan, author, The Feminine Mystique and The Second Stage
- Karen Elliot House, diplomatic correspondent, The Wall Street Journal
- Elaine R. Jones, Counsel and Legislative Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- Mark Q. Rhoads, Illinois State Senator
- Chuck Stone, Senior Editor and Columnist, Philadelphia Daily News
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics (moderator)

A public address, “The Public Sector and America’s Growth,” by Gerald McEntee, President of American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, September 21, 1982, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government

A public address, “Politics and War,” by Oriana Fallaci, journalist and author, September 23, 1982

A public address, “Canada and World Affairs,” by Gerald Pelletier, Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations, September 28, 1982,
co-sponsored by the University Consortium for Research on North America

A panel discussion, "Cable TV and Public Policy," October 7, 1982, with:

John Schneider, President, Warner Amex Satellite Entertainment Corporation
Robert Alter, President, Cable Advertising Bureau
Sean McCarthy, President, Time-Video Information Services
Melinda Benedek, President, High Wire, Ltd.
Benjamin Compaine, Director of Media and Allied Arenas,
Program on Information Resources Policy, Harvard
Emily Card, President, Cable Card, Inc. (Moderator)

A public address by John W. Sears, Massachusetts Republican gubernatorial nominee, October 13, 1982, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee


A public address by Moshe Arens, Israeli Ambassador to the United States, October 19, 1982


A public address, "American Intelligence Systems: Are They Adequate for the 1980's?", by Admiral Bobby Inman, former, Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency," Director, National Security Agency; October 21, 1982, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government

A panel discussion, "Feminism and Families," October 25, 1982, with:

Betty Friedan, Fellow, Institute of Politics, author, The Feminine Mystique and The Second Stage
Barbara Ehrenreich, contributing editor, Ms. magazine
Donald Bell, Assistant Professor of History, Harvard; author.
Being a Man: The Paradox of Masculinity

Robert B. Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ezra Vogel, Professor of Sociology, Harvard
Bennett Harrison, Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Frank A. Weil, Partner, Ginsburg, Feldman, Weil, and Bress
Winthrop Knowlton, Director, Business and Government Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator)

A panel discussion, “The Cuban Missile Crisis: The Events and Their Implications for the Future,” October 28, 1982, with:

McGeorge Bundy, National Security Advisor, Kennedy Administration
Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government; author, Essence of Decision
Richard Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; author, Presidential Power (Moderator)

Also featured was a videotape of President Kennedy’s announcement of the crisis to the nation.

Television coverage of state, local and congressional election returns, November 2, 1982, for the John F. Kennedy School of Government community

A panel discussion, “Pharmaceuticals in the Third World: Protection or Poison?,” November 4, 1982, co-sponsored by Cultural Survival, Inc., with:

Dr. Stuart B. Levy, Tufts Medical School
Annie Street, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility
Dr. James Jennings, Vice President for Science and Technology, International Pharmaceuticals Manufacturers Association
Dr. Arthur Kleinman, Professor of Medical Anthropology, Harvard Medical School
Dr. Leon Eisenberg, Dean of Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School (Moderator)

A panel discussion, “Analyses of the Elections,” November 5, 1982, sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government, for Boston-area alumni, featuring:

Ira A. Jackson, Associate Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Chuck Stone, Fellow, Institute of Politics, Senior Editor, Philadelphia Daily News
The forum

David Nyhan, political reporter, The Boston Globe
Garry Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Rosemary Sansone, Director of Sponsored Fellows in Alumni, Career and Student Services, Harvard (Moderator)

A panel discussion, "Juvenile Criminal Justice," November 7, 1982, sponsored by Links, Inc., with:
Dr. Hubert Jones, Dean of the School of Social Work, Boston University
Julian Houston, Justice, Boston Juvenile Court
Jean McGuire, Executive Director, Metco; member, Boston School Committee
Alvin Pousaint, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School
Harry Elam, Justice, Boston Municipal Court (Moderator)

A special Study Group session featuring a panel discussion, "A Look at Ronald Reagan," November 10, 1982, co-sponsored by the Harvard Lampoon, with editorial cartoonists:
Paul Szep, The Boston Globe
Bill DeOre, The Dallas Morning News
Jeff MacNelly, The Chicago Tribune
Lee Judge, The Kansas City Times
Karen McCarthy Benson, Study Group Leader and Fellow, Institute of Politics

Slides featuring the work of each cartoonist were displayed and discussed by the panelists.

Two sessions of the conference, "Black Politics: Target '84," November 13, 1982 sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee

A panel discussion, "Regulatory Reform and the Reagan Administration," November 16, 1982, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School Project on Regulation with:
Christopher DeMuth, Administrator for Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, White House
Paul MacAvoy, Professor of Economics, Yale University; business correspondent, The New York Times
Simon Lazarus, partner, Powell, Goldstein, Frazer, and Murphy; former Associate Director, Domestic Policy Staff for Regulatory Policy and Regulatory Reform, White House
Stephen Breyer, Justices U.S. Court of Appeals; author, Regulation and Reform (Moderator)

A reception for the class of 1962, November 19, 1982, sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government
A public address, "The Fair Tax," by Bill Bradley, U.S. Senator (D-NJ), November 22, 1982, with respondents:
   Stanley S. Surrey, Professor of Law, Harvard
   Paul R. McDaniel, Professor of Law, Boston College;
   Herman B. Leonard, Assistant Professor of Public Policy,
   John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator)

A special Study Group session featuring a public address, "Nicaragua—U.S. Relations," by Francisco Fiallos Navarro, Nicaraguan Ambassador to the U.S., December 2, 1982, with respondents:
   Lawrence Harrison, Visiting Scholar, Center for International Affairs, Harvard
   Laurence Simon, Director of Policy Analysis, OXFAM America
   Julio Sergio, Ph.D. candidate, John F. Kennedy School of Government,
   John McAward, Study Group Leader

A Holiday Party, December 10, 1982, for the John F. Kennedy School of Government community

A public address, "Politics and the Media: Is This Any Way to Elect a President?", December 15, 1982, by Leonard H. Goldenson, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., with respondents:
   David Brinkley, correspondent ABC News; anchor, This Week
   With David Brinkley
   Richard C. Wald, Senior Vice President, ABC News
   David W. Burke, Vice President and Assistant to the President, ABC News
   Arthur R. Miller, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
   Dr. Frank Stanton, Retired President, CBS, Inc. (Moderator)


A panel discussion, "Personal Perspectives on Politics," with the Spring 1983 Fellows of the Institute of Politics, February 3, 1983. Participants were:
   Laura Blackburne, Vice President and Chief Executive Officer,
   Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, New York
   Susan Kmetty Catania, Illinois State Representative, 1973-1983
   Kenneth Hartnett, Managing Editor, The Boston Herald
   Madeline Kunin, Lieutenant Governor, Vermont, 1979-82;
   candidate for Governor, 1982
A panel discussion, "Extremist Groups and Their Attacks on American Minorities," February 11, 1983, sponsored by the Harvard Foundation, with:

Julian Bond, Georgia State Senator
Sharee Teng, Chinese Progressive Association, New York
Samuel Betances, Professor of Sociology, Northeastern University
John Peters, Massachusetts Commission on Indian Affairs
Phil Perlmutter, Executive Director, Jewish Community Council, Metropolitan Boston

Dr. S. Allen Counter, Director, Harvard Foundation (Moderator)

The first event of the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture series, a public address, "American Foreign Policy and Third World Nations," by Ulric Haynes, Jr., Vice President, International Business Planning, Cummins Engine Co.; former U.S. Ambassador to Algeria, March 10, 1983, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School Black Caucus and the John F. Kennedy School Students Association

A public address, "Thoughts on Man’s Purpose in Life," by Visiting Fellow Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, March 15, 1983

The second event of the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture series, a panel discussion, "The Consequences of International Conflict: Nuclear Arms or Bread and Butter," March 17, 1983 with:

Dr. Ronald Walters, Professor of International Politics, Howard University
Randall Forsberg, Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies
Albert Carnesale, Academic Dean and Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
James C. Thomson, Jr., Curator, Nieman Foundation for Journalism (Moderator)

A special Study Group session featuring a panel discussion, "Northern Ireland: Is There a Role for Irish Americans?", March 18, 1983, with:

John Hume, Leader of the Social Democratic and Labour Party, Northern Ireland
Martin Nolan, Editorial Page Editor, The Boston Globe
Tadhg O'Sullivan, Ambassador to the U.S., Ireland
William V. Shannon, former U.S. Ambassador, Ireland
Rosemary Taylor, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Tufts University (Moderator)

Study Group leaders were Una O'Brien, Kennedy Fellow, Harvard and Louise Richardson, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Government, Harvard

A panel discussion, "Financial Crisis and Economic Depression," March 22, 1983, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Henry C. Wallich, Member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System
John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard
Charles Kindleberger, Ford Professor of Economics, M.I.T.
Richard N. Cooper, Maurice C. Boas Professor of International Economics, Harvard
Robert Dorfman, David A. Wells Professor of Political Economy, Harvard (Co-moderator)
Benjamin M. Friedman, Professor of Economics, Harvard (Co-Moderator)

The final event in the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture series, a panel discussion, "Strategies for Community Political Action," March 24, 1983, with:

Melvin King, former Massachusetts State Representative
Robert Farrell, City Councilman, Los Angeles, California
Royall Bolling, Massachusetts State Representative
John O'Bryant, Vice President, Northeastern University (Moderator)


The first lecture, "What Plato Does Not Tell Us: The Case for the Prosecution," April 5, 1982

The second lecture in the series by I.F. Stone, "How Socrates Could Have Saved Himself," April 7, 1983

A public address, "Falling Presidents," by Daniel Patrick Moynihan U.S. Senator, (D-NY), April 8, 1983

Raymond Vernon, Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Harvard

Robert B. Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

David R. Macdonald, former Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, Washington, D.C.

Brian Turner, Director of Legislative and Economic Policy, AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department

Winthrop Knowlton, Director, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator)

A public address, "False Choices... Lost Opportunities," by David M. Roderick, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Steel Corporation, April 13, 1983, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government

The third and final lecture in the series by L.P. Stone, "Plato on Trial: The Hidden Horrors of the Perfect City," April 14, 1983

A panel discussion, "Hunger in the Third World," the opening event of the Fifth Annual Third World Conference, April 15, 1983, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School Students Association and the Harvard Institute for International Development, with:

C. Peter Timmer, John D. Black Professor of Agriculture and Business, Harvard Business School

Justice Abu Sayeed Chowdhury, former President of Bangladesh

Dr. Luciano Barraza, Inter-American Development Bank

Dr. John Robins, Director of Agriculture, USAID

John W. Thomas, Fellow, Institute for International Development, Harvard; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator)

A panel discussion, "Can Culture Survive the Marketplace... Government and Business Policies in the 80's," April 21, 1983, co-sponsored by the Massachusetts Cultural Alliance and the Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities, with:

Robert Solow, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Donald Melville, President, The Norton Company

Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts State Senator; Chair, Committee on Ways and Means

Paul Simon, U.S. Representative (D-IL); Chair, Sub-Committee on Post-Secondary Education, U.S. House of Representatives

Hugh Southern, Deputy Director of Programs, National Endowment for the Arts (Moderator)


A panel discussion, "Canada's Constitutional Accord and Discord," with the Deputy Ministers of Intergovernmental Affairs of five Canadian Provinces, April 26, 1983, co-sponsored by the University Consortium for Research on North America, with:

Cyril Abern, Newfoundland
Gilles Loiselle, Quebec
James Matkin, British Columbia
Peter Meekison, Alberta
Donald Stevenson, Ontario
Roger Tasse, Deputy Minister of Justice, Canada
Elliot Feldman, Director, University Consortium for Research on North America (Moderator)


A panel discussion, "Race Relations at Harvard: A Review of the Last 12 Years," May 7, 1983, with:

David Evans, Harvard College Admissions Officer
Dudley Herschbach, Master of Currier House
Deborah Hughes-Hallet, Senior Preceptor in Mathematics
L. Fred Jewett, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, Harvard College
Kiko Morimoto, Director of the Bureau of Study Counsel
George Sanchez, Administrative Intern in the Admissions Office, Harvard College; and
Harvard/Radcliffe students Winona La Duke, Bruce Lynn, Perry Pong, Sesha Pratap, and Lisa Quiroz


The first session, a panel discussion, “Making peace: Women in the Midst of Conflict,” with:

- Helen Caldicott, Founder, Physicians for Social Responsibility
- Sissela Bok, moral philosopher; lecturer on the Core Program, Harvard
- Devaki Jain, Director, Institute for Social Studies, Trust, New Delhi
- Jean Zaru, Palestinian educator
- Diana Eck, Associate Professor of Hindu Religion, Harvard (Moderator)

The second session, a panel discussion, “Seeking Justice: Women’s Lives in the Struggle for Change,” with:

- Brigalia Bam, South African exile
- Bernadette Mosala, Director, Home and Family Life, South African Council of Churches
- Nawal el Saadawi, Egyptian physician and writer
- Julia Esquivel, Guatemalan exile and writer
- Diana Eck, Associate Professor of Hindu Religion, Harvard (Moderator)

A special hour-long segment of WCVB-TV’s “Chronicle,” “Town Meeting on the Air,” June 23, 1983, featuring five of the six Governors of New England:

- Richard Snelling, Vermont
- John Sununu, New Hampshire
- Michael Dukakis, Massachusetts
- William O’Neill, Connecticut
- Joseph Garrahy, Rhode Island, and with
- Peter Mehegan, WCVB-TV (Moderator)

The following events were planned in cooperating with the Harvard Summer School. Summer School administrators responsible for the series were:

- Marshall R. Pihl, Director, Harvard Summer School
- E. Fred Yalouris, Assistant Director, Harvard Summer School
A panel discussion, "Central America: Where Should the U.S. Stand in 1984?", July 7, 1983, with:

**W. Scott Thompson**, Associate Director of Programs, U.S. Information Agency

**John McAward**, Director of Human Rights, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee

**Seyom Brown**, Professor of Politics, American Foreign Policy, and International Relations, Brandeis University; member, Harvard Summer School faculty (Moderator)

A panel discussion, "The Legal Profession Today," July 16, 1983, with:

**Molly Geraghty**, Director of Admissions, Harvard Law School

**Diane Juliar**, Chief, Criminal Bureau, Middlesex District Attorney's Office

**Daniel Tarullo**, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

**Ellsworth Fersch**, Lecturer on Psychology, Harvard Medical School, member, Harvard Summer School faculty (Moderator)

A film, "Chronicle of a Drought," July 21, 1983, with comments by filmmaker **Jean Rouch**, Professor of Audio-Visual Studies, University of Paris; member, Harvard Summer School Faculty

* * *