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The following is an edited excerpt from "The Advocates '84: Who Should Be President?" a special pro­
gram broadcast live from the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs on November 3, 1984 and produced by
WGBH-TV Boston in cooperation with the Institute of Politics. Participants included William Rusher,
publisher of The National Review, advocate for the Reagan team; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, U.S.
Ambassador to the United Nations, Reagan witness; and Barney Frank, U.S. Representative from
Massachusetts, advocate for the Mondale team.

WILLIAM RUSHER: Madame Ambassador, what do you consider the Reagan ad­
ministration’s principal accomplishments in the fields of foreign policy and defense?
JEANE KIRKPATRICK: First, I think that the President and the administration have
restored the American defense position around the world. Second, I think that they
have, along with that, strengthened alliances. Third, we have developed some new
flexible forms of cooperation with friends and allies to help contain conflict and to
reinforce peace in the world. Fourth, I think we have, after a rather long period to
the contrary, managed to develop peaceable means for reinforcing freedom and in­
dependence in the world. Freedom and independence have stopped losing. And
finally, I would emphasize peace has been maintained for the United States in this
period.

R: How has the restored confidence and pride that you mentioned manifested itself?
K: In a great many ways. Social scientists are always impressed by polls and sur­
vey results. All survey research and polling today demonstrate that American con­
fidence in the future has been restored, that Americans believe our best times are
still ahead of us. That’s a very sharp turnaround. Second, the dollar; the value of
the dollar started up after the President was elected and before he was inaugurated,
as a kind of harbinger of international understanding that something new was go­
ing to happen. And, a simple indicator like the quality and quantity of enlistments
and reenlistments, in making the voluntary military service a practical alternative,
demonstrate this as well.

R: And in respect to defense, and the restoration of our defenses, what are the
principal achievements of the President and his administration?
K: Very near the top would be the deployment of the Euro-missiles in conjunc­
tion with our NATO allies. That’s very important because it eliminates some unilateral
vulnerabilities of our European allies which were putting a very heavy strain on
NATO. Second, there has been a general reinforcement of research and deployment plans for a wide range of weapons systems, including the B-1, long-range Cruise missiles, and so forth, which had been cancelled under the previous administration.

R: You used an interesting expression in your first answer. You said that freedom has stopped losing. What do you mean by that?

K: Between the fall of Saigon in 1975 and the inauguration of Ronald Reagan, a dozen or so countries either slid into the Soviet bloc or came heavily under Soviet influence, losing effectively their own national independence and their freedom. That simply stopped happening. We’ve developed some successful forms of cooperation to secure containment of Soviet expansionism in the world.

****

BARNEY FRANK: When you talk about renewed confidence and pride, I ask about Lebanon. We were told [by Mr. Rusher] that no Americans are now in combat—but a goodly number died in Lebanon on behalf of a policy that made very little sense and was based on misunderstandings by Secretary of State Shultz about Syria. How do you characterize the American involvement in Lebanon under this administration? Is this an example of a successful foreign policy?

K: I characterize it as a tragedy. The Marines were murdered in their sleep by terrorists. Marines were there as part of an international, multinational peacekeeping force in Lebanon, sent with the consent of the Congress and after careful consultation and in cooperation with the British, the French, the Italians, and the Israelis.

F: George Shultz said that if Israel signed the treaty that he pressured them into signing, Syria would agree to withdraw its troops. They didn’t, and the tragedy in Lebanon unfolded. Is that an example of successful foreign policy?

K: There have been a great many words given and a great many commitments broken in the course of Lebanon’s recent history. And some of those broken commitments resulted in the murder of our Marines and also in the murder of a good many French troops and in the murder of some Israelis at exactly the same time. And some of those broken commitments resulted in the Syrians refusing to do what they had committed to do. Now is that based on a misunderstanding? I’m not sure it’s a misunderstanding. It is certainly a commitment violated and from that experience we should learn.

F: [Violated] by whom?

K: By Syria, clearly.

F: It seems totally at odds with your description of this tough and successful [foreign policy], and this respect for America.

K: I don’t think our side is necessarily the one inclined to believe that any old agreement with any old party is likely to be regarded as sacred.

F: No one here is defending the terrorists in Syria. We’re talking about the claims of this administration that it’s been able to cope with it. We know there are bad people in the world. It doesn’t solve anything to point to them. The question is how
successfully you cope with them. Now, let's turn to reinforcing freedom. You said that is one of the things we are doing. The Nobel Prize was just given to Bishop Tutu in South Africa, who said the Reagan administration has made the white-dominated government there more intransigent. We've had this policy of constructive engagement. There's still the South Africans in charge of Namibia. We have a Nobel Prize winner denouncing America for its complicity with the South African regime. Is that an example of reinforcing freedom under this administration?

K: No. Mr. Frank. I would like to say that, personally, I have very high regard for Bishop Tutu. I think he's wrong about the policy of constructive engagement, and wrong about its effects on South Africa, even. And I do not think that we want to suggest here that we're going to take as a measure of U.S. policy the views of anyone and everyone who have won a Nobel Prize on whatever subject. I don't think you'd like to do that either, Congressman Frank. I'm sure Mr. Solzhenitsyn, for example, has views about the world and foreign policy that you wouldn't like to accept.

F: I asked about Bishop Tutu, only Mr. Tutu.

K: Yes, but you are recommending him as a Nobel Prize winner.

F: Yes, and a leading South African—he is both. Let's ask about Ronald Reagan and arms reduction. He has opposed every arms reduction effort by every president. Ronald Reagan said, when he ran for president, "Under this President and this Secretary of State, the nation has become number two in a world where it is dangerous to be second best. [We see the] collapse of American world and retreat of American power." That's what he said about Ford and Kissinger. Is this the reflection of a man who has any interest at all in reaching serious agreements, when he's criticized the Nixon and the Ford efforts to negotiate with the Russians as well as everybody else?

K: I think the world today is clearly safer for our values and our civilization. It's safer because we're stronger, because the President does have a commitment to peace. He has maintained peace, and he has created a new correlation of forces, the Soviets like to call it, which puts us today in a position to negotiate arms control agreements with the Soviets, in the next administration.

*****

WILLIAM RUSHER: Madame Ambassador, I'd just like to share with you a quotation from one of our prominent officials. September 21st, 1982. I quote him verbatim. "I think the President did the right thing. I think there is a need to get forces in Lebanon to stabilize the situation." Do you take the same comfort that I do in reflecting that the man who said that was Walter Mondale?

K: It doesn't surprise me, Mr. Rusher.

*****
Student Presidential Straw Poll

On October 24, 1984, the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics conducted a presidential straw poll among Harvard undergraduates, the first computerized plebiscite of its kind at Harvard University. Nearly two-thirds of the undergraduate population participated in the poll by marking ballots in their dining halls for the Mondale-Ferraro or Reagan-Bush tickets.

The results of the poll—ballots marked "other" and "undecided" are not included—and breakdowns by gender, class year, ethnic affiliation, and house affiliation are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reagan-Bush</th>
<th>Mondale-Ferraro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Vote</strong></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote by Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote by Class Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote by Ethnic Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote by House Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabot</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunster</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Union</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverett</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the state of American electoral politics as measured by the essential characteristics of the candidates, campaigns, media and the electorate of the 1984 Presidential election? Given some of the activities and observations of our decision-makers, it’s not all good. The professionalization, commercialism and mechanization of political campaigns continue to feed manipulation of both issue treatment and voting behaviour and to discourage serious policy dialogue and real political leadership. Campaign consultants, polling, computers, direct mail, media buys, television ads are in, actually indispensable; while parties, issues and voters in their own right are out, or at least diminished. How much are targeting and tracking polls used to educate and persuade rather than exploit and manipulate? How subject to constraint...
is "negative advertising", once unleashed? How driven to ideological extremes are
direct mail appeals in order to be cost-efficient? How many competent candidates
never emerge because they won't abide what needs to be done to raise wads of
money? There's a brand new, all-American industry out there, and those who don't
use it, and pay for it, won't win. It's grown like topsy in the great American en­
trepreneurial, competitive tradition, supported by everybody, but that doesn't mean
the Founding Fathers aren't turning over in their graves. Granted that the health
of any electoral process which is as vigorous, changing and pluralistic as ours does
not lend itself to simple-minded diagnosis, but the patient in this case should be
feeling pain.

Some of the more damaging characteristics of Presidential campaigns as they are
practiced today tend to reinforce each other in a vicious circle. The proliferation of
nominating primaries was partly a reaction to the perception of political parties as
elitist and ineffective, and parties have as a result been undermined further. The
role of television in Presidential electoral politics has increased exponentially as
primaries have proliferated and parties have attenuated. Without the interest-
aggregating, coalition-building, and issue-orientation of parties there develops a sys­
tem which is more vulnerable to open conflict of narrower interests, gives less sub­
stantive attention to issues, and provides less linkage of political leadership between
politicking and governing. Television, which informs more people faster more effi­
ciently than ever before, also does it in quick bites, and is prone to the entertain­
ment side of its personality and to symbols and images which can be portrayed
visually. Thus, candidates are encouraged to be more superficial and rhetorical—
and sometimes artificially dramatic—in response to television's opportunities and
requirements. Raising and spending a lot of money is necessary because candida­
cies are cut loose from parties and dependent on new techniques and campaign ex­
perats, and because television-dominated campaigns are very costly. The methods
by which that money is raised tend to push the candidate toward glibness and postur­
ing and away from education and problem-solving. It's a familiar litany, and no­
boby's fault, but the trends are intensifying. A genuine dilemma is suggested in
an exchange during our conference which can be paraphrased like this: Q: Don't
you think it's important to debate the issues? A: Not if it's going to destroy you.
Q: But doesn't our democratic system require it? A: Not if you don't interpret it
that way.

The implications of the statement by several Democratic leaders after the conclu­
sion of the '84 campaign that "next time" they would have to field a candidate who
was a much better television performer than Fritz Mondale are weighty indeed, even
menacing over the long run, and support the worry that the politics of Presidential
campaigning is becoming less relevant to the challenges of Presidential governing.
Television is only one of many resources and instruments of Presidential power and
leadership. In campaigns, it both amplifies and creates qualities of style and per­
sonality and aspects of superficiality, sensationalism, polarization, illusion and hyper­
bole. So a candidate must perform accordingly, and this produces a widening chasm
between the perception of his competence in one realm as against the one to come next. A magnification of the power of the Presidential office and an accompanying inflation in expectations during campaigns both ignore the significant constraints he must actually deal with on the job and hamper his capacity to do so.

When a shift occurred from voting based more on party affiliation to voting based more on the personal qualities of individual candidates, it was aided and abetted by the culture of television. Substantial benefits are reaped when this medium brilliantly portrays the face and speech, the eyes, the physical demeanor of candidates. After a while the voter's personal judgement should be working sensitively, and it shouldn't miss much. Television—even with the scripts, props, make-up, special effects and acting usually associated with the theatre—over time allows little hiding; the essence and the character of the person is liable to get through, and this is very good indeed.

But there is, of course, more to shaping government than the personality of the candidates. Their actual competence to govern is considerably more difficult to comprehend, particularly in a time of increasing complexity of the problems we face and of the institutions and policy alternatives we have as means to effect progress and forestall destruction. Here is another unwholesome, self-reinforcing dynamic. These prickly issues are dangerous to address in the campaign—as you will find in reading the discussion in this book about deficit and tax proposals, for instance—and the policies and resources with which to deal with them are too easy to slough off until later. Television's strong suit isn't detailed analysis and substantive dialogue anyway, but sweeping rhetoric stressing broad values, and evocative symbols to define, focus and inspire the country. Again, this can be fundamentally valuable for a democracy. Of course the Reagan campaign stressed "the macro-politics of national mood elevation", in the words of one political journalist—he's good at it, television loves it, the people want it. But at the same time, this tends to pre-empt the electorate's capacity to understand what the actual nature of our problems are and what the specific options, compromises and trade-offs are. The willingness to insist that the popular answers aren't there, to reject the notion of the free lunch, is necessary for us to be a self-governing society, and this is increasingly difficult to do when the aggregate forces of our Presidential electoral system produce reality denial.

Dreams and reality can't be divorced from one another, yet it frequently appears as if we have, at least during campaigns, greater affinity and talent for the former than the latter. We tend to reject the unpleasant, complexity is a dirty word, shades of gray are tougher to admit than blacks and whites are to recognize. We are irritated at having to net out the pros and cons of a given candidate or public problem prescription, liking rather to see things with a purity matching our own ideology or self-interest, and rejecting the politics of the whole. We want to avoid the anxieties and ambiguities produced by burgeoning, threatening problems. The commitment and discipline needed on the part of the public to deal with the requirements of a republican-democratic system may be waning—assisted by the confluence of
our various collective campaign practices.

The political participation of the citizenry in this country has interested us in theory and in practice since our beginnings, and the subject is no less compelling today. Jefferson believed that political freedom essentially meant the right "to be a participator in government" or nothing at all. De Tocqueville wrote later that "... every individual has an equal share of power, and participate equally in the government of the state." Hannah Arendt more recently observed that, "The trouble, in other words, is that politics has become a profession and a career, and that the "elite" therefore is being chosen according to standards and criteria which are themselves profoundly unpolitical."

Political theorists, including our Founding Fathers, interested in the quality of participation and its relationship to the capacity for self-government are preoccupied with the structure of our system, in particular participation through intermediate, representative bodies vs. more direct means. There is suspicion with over-reliance on representative democracy, and frustration at the impracticalities of direct democracy. There needs to be some combination, and to an extent there is—for instance, we have elected legislatures and political parties, on the one hand, and the New England town meetings and initiatives and referenda, on the other. Yet adequate participation of the people as their own governors in this country is lacking, and it may be as much a matter of public attitudes, and individual behaviour as of structure and institutions. There are signs that our political involvement, although not without vigor, is disjointed—a curious mixture of lackluster voting, impressive but uneven engagement at the local level of government, headlong, trumpeting gallops on behalf of one special cause or another, and aggressive spectator sporting.

Almost ninety-three million people voted in 1984, or 53.3% of the eligible population—compared to 52.6% in 1980 and 62.8% in 1960. There were more than twelve million new registered voters, totalling 127.1 million, yet the registered voters who voted declined from 75.2% in 1980 to 72.6% in 1984. And even though voting is a crucial part of participation and even if we were voting more, that’s not the whole story. There is the need, simply, for greater commitment and harder work in Presidential elections on the part of supposedly self-governing citizens. We must make ourselves better informed, to engage boldly the hard choices and the concerns of others which compete with our own short-sighted self-interest, and to be demanding and discriminating about our leaders and our institutions. We must translate general principles into effective action, into grasplable, manageable causes, but not pursue them so zealously as to become mean-spirited or exclusively adversarial. Our most treasured values can be wasted or corrupted as effectively by abstraction or by single-issue virulence as by sterile indifference.

Conflict is as much part of our politics as part of the world we live in, but dealing in excessive negativism is not the answer, and much of our political activity is seized as much by what we don’t like as what we do. Negative advertising, demagogic attacks on the religious views of others, fear of self-criticism, and indulging anti-
Washington, anti-Sun Belt, anti-ethnic, anti-rich or anti-labor prejudices don't get us very far. What are we for? "Where's the belief?" The qualities of magnanimity, generosity, and social consciousness which transcend partisan and ideological distinctions, may be more difficult to achieve given the nature of our relative affluence, the complexity of our problems, and the current culture of campaign politics, but therein lies the challenge to any self-governing system, let alone America in the latter twentieth century wanting to be the best and to lead the rest.

During the summer of 1984, as the general election campaign was beginning, Ben Wattenberg wrote a column about the explosion of participatory democracy in this country constituting a moderating process and producing a reborn, reinvigorated political center capable of curbing excesses and runaway negativism. Later, in the fall, as the campaign was grinding down, James Reston wrote a column about the rise of factionalism in this country, about our system being made up more of checks than balances, "the consensus of the moderate majorities of both parties" having ebbed, and fragmentation and polarization of our political power. They are probably both right. And, as usual, there are pending a bunch of reforms and adjustments for various parts of the process, some sensible, some outlandish. Examples are restricting the costs of campaign consultants, regulating television commercials, controls on PACs, allowing more money to flow to party committees, enabling better access to television by campaigns, experimenting with regional primaries and voting calendars, and so forth. Given the freedom, pluralism and Constitutionalism of our system, this kind of thing may help a little but won't get us very far.

Of course, the various major actors in their daily individual and organizational activity should upgrade their leadership and resist degrading of the electoral process, but perhaps we shouldn't hold our breath. It is still fundamentally up to the citizens and how energetic and imaginative their political participation is—how clearly we recognize that we get what we deserve in our government, because it's us, and how confidently we seize the ideal.

*****
Sins of the Democrats
by William Schneider

The following is excerpted from remarks by William Schneider, a Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, during a panel discussion, "The Future of the Democratic Party," in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs, on March 14, 1985. The event was co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics and the Harvard Democratic Club.

When Democrats talk about their party these days, it begins to sound like Kol Nidre, the confessional Jews recite on the Day of Atonement. "We have no post-welfare program" (Stuart Eizenstat). "We have moved away from any notion of growth and economic competition" (Sharon Pratt Dixon). "We're obsessed with our process" (Gov. Bruce Babbitt). "We're still torn apart by Vietnam and Iran" (Richard Moe). "We've abandoned white male voters"... "We're a captive of our constituency groups"... "We're too liberal"... "We're a party of the past"... For all these sins, Father, forgive us, pardon us, and grant us atonement.

"God will forgive," Heinrich Heine once said. "C'est son metier." But what about the electorate?

The critics are concerned with what the Democratic Party should not be. It should not be too liberal. It should not be too tied to the past. It should not be too close to special interests. But people don't support a political party because of what it is not. At some point, you have to ask what the party should be.

Take the charge that the Democratic Party is too liberal. That, on the surface, is true. The conservative wing of the Democratic Party, like the liberal wing of the Republican Party, is dying. (Add up the votes for John Glenn, Reubin Askew, and Ernest Hollings in last year's Democratic primaries and you'll get some idea of how many conservative Democrats there are.) The party has been losing support among white Southerners and blue-collar "ethnics," who do not share its prevailing social and foreign policy liberalism.

But these voters supported the Democratic Party in the past for economic reasons. They tolerated the Democrats' social liberalism because they liked the party's economic populism. The main reason the party is losing their support is not that it is too liberal, but that it has lost economic credibility. If the Democratic Party has nothing to offer them economically, these voters are not going to come back just because the party is "centrist."

The Democrats' problem is, in a word, statism. The party has learned too much from its successes of the past. From the New Deal, the party learned that federal power could be used to promote economic justice. From the civil rights revolution, the party learned that federal power could be used to promote social justice. Now the party is wedded to the instrumentality of federal power. It has to keep finding injustices so the federal government can do something about them.
For nearly two hundred years, the Democratic Party has been the party of social and economic justice. It has represented the interests of the out-groups of American society (a category that at one time included Southern slaveowners). The party's commitment to statism, on the other hand, is much more recent. In fact, for the first 100 years of its existence, the Democrats were anti-statist. Their platforms called for laissez faire, states' rights and low tariffs. To Jeffersonians and Jacksonians, the state was a bastion of wealth and privilege, and to be anti-statist was to be democratic and egalitarian.

Take a poll today and you'll find out that what people like about the Democratic Party is still its democratic and egalitarian values: it's more for "the average person," the worker, the ordinary citizen, and less for the rich and the powerful. What do people dislike about the Democratic Party? "Too much government spending." The party has to figure out how to keep its commitment to democracy and equality but wean itself from an excessive reliance on government.

It will not be easy to get Democrats to think universalistically. The party's style runs more in the direction of interest-group politics. The public has no problem with the Democratic Party speaking out for the interests of women, blacks and working people; that is its traditional role as advocate for the disadvantaged and discriminated. But speaking out for the interests of feminists, labor unions and civil rights organizations is something else. That is not populism. That is interest-group liberalism.

Nor will it be easy to curb the party's fixation on government. Blacks, for instance, have no quarrel with statism. The federal government has always worked for them. Twice in American history, the 1860s and the 1960s, the federal government rescued black Americans from intolerable situations. Anyone who talks about reconstructing the Democratic Party is going to have to think about reconstructing black voters, who now make up a quarter of the national Democratic vote.

To Democrats, the choice between Mondale and Hart was a choice between two different approaches to politics. Mondale represented the "old politics," which is to say, interest politics; you support organized interests and they support you. He reached out to the left and brought New Politics groups into the party by showing them how Democrats have traditionally done business. Women's groups, civil rights groups, environmental groups, gay rights groups and anti-nuclear groups were so many more organized interests that the party could accommodate in time-honored fashion, alongside organized labor, big city mayors and party functionaries.

Hart offered the New Politics: problem-solving. His "new idea" was to treat issues as problems susceptible to rational solutions, not as conflicts of interest to be negotiated and reconciled. Thus, he accused Mondale of trying to find a fairer, more compassionate way to divide up a stagnant economic pie, while his aim was to get a bigger pie. He offered elaborately detailed proposals to use the tax system and other incentives to "solve" the nation's economic and security problems. In answer to Mondale's charge that he lacked compassion ("a heartless wretch," Mondale once called him), Hart replied, "Compassion is not just getting red in the face and wav-
What was missing in Sen. Hart's approach was a sense of advocacy. That is why Mondale could read Hart's books and position papers and ask, "Where's the beef?" The party regulars heard about Hart's disdain for protectionism and for bailing out financially troubled industries and companies and wondered, "What's in it for us? Is this guy really on our side?" Hart promised only, in an echo of John F. Kennedy, to pull together "the best and the brightest" in order to "get the country moving again."

What many Democrats feared was that Hart was not another John Kennedy, but another Jimmy Carter. Carter too rejected advocacy politics in favor of problem-solving. He got into trouble when his solutions didn't work, and there was no one around to stick up for him. Party regulars distrust technocrats who believe politics is an objective, wholly rational business. Ronald Reagan, for instance, is an exceptionally skilled advocacy politician who built a following among people who feel he is on their side. When his solution for the nation's economic problems didn't seem to work during the first two years of his presidency, these people "stayed the course." They were his political base.

"Your base," Rep. Barney Frank once said, "is the people who are with you when you're wrong." Without a base, you'd better hope your solutions work, and work quickly. When Gary Hart presented himself as an issue politician, it was mostly to differentiate himself from the Johnson-Humphrey-Mondale school of politics—interest politics, the "old politics." Among Hart's constituency of Independents and baby boom voters, problem-solving is the preferred political style. Which is exactly why, in the November election, many of them went for Ronald Reagan over Walter Mondale. They put performance ahead of ideology.

Thus the civil war in the Democratic Party continues, though it is less ideological than in the past. The new element in 1984 was Jesse Jackson. Black voters had never played a key role in the conflict between liberals and regulars. For years, they had tended to split their vote in Democratic primaries along class and generational lines. In fact, most analysts expected the black vote to divide the same way in 1984, with about half going to Mondale and half to Jackson. After all, the black political establishment opposed Jackson's candidacy from the outset.

The big surprise was that Jackson held on to older, middle class, establishment-oriented black voters as well as to younger and poorer blacks. His secret weapon was religion. He was a preacher, and that clearly legitimized him to more conservative blacks who probably did not share many of his views, but for whom the church is an institution of trust and authority. What blacks discovered is that, as long as white Democrats were divided, they could wield a good deal of influence as a power block within the party.

"It will be possible to get their disparate party to agree on anything until we get a powerful, popular figure at the top of the ticket," says Brian Atwood, former executive director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. The rule is that
the Democratic Party wins when it nominates tough liberals like Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

The other strain of Democratic leaders are those who would probably be ministers if they weren’t politicians (Adlai Stevenson, Hubert Humphrey, George McGovern, Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale). These kinds of Democrats seldom win because they are “not tough enough for the job.” We did elect Jimmy Carter of course—once, narrowly—but that was because, after Watergate, what the country really wanted was a preacher. And what did we discover? That he was not tough enough for the job.

In 1984, Democrats chose between three principal contenders. One was the son of a minister. Another started his career by going to divinity school. And the third was, by profession, a minister.

As for Kennedy, not in the farthest reaches of the imagination can one imagine him following a religious vocation. He seems fated to play his traditional role in the party, which is to serve as the starting gun for each presidential campaign. Nothing serious can happen in the race for the Democratic nomination until Sen. Kennedy makes his intentions known.

Is Gov. Mario Cuomo the new Kennedy? Perhaps. He is certainly liberal enough, and he has a tough, street-smart demeanor. But he spends an awful lot of time arguing with bishops and talking about religion.

In the meantime, the populist base of the Democratic Party has pretty much disintegrated. The religious right in the Republican Party thinks it can appeal to these fallen-away Democrats with traditionalist moral values. The Jack Kemp faction in the House of Representatives dreams of a Republican economic populism based on tax reform.

What have the Democrats got to compete with this? Hart suffered from a severe deficiency of populism in the 1984 primaries. Neo-liberals don’t really play the populist game at all (“the adversary approach to problems,” their leading theorist calls it). Mondale offered the failed interest-group liberalism of the past. And Jackson proposed a radical, redistributive populism that frightened the wits out of the middle classes.

In other words the Democrats don’t have much.

On the other hand, the Democrats are an opposition party no longer in control of the national agenda. They don’t have to govern the country. What they have to do is convince people that they have their act together and can govern when the Republicans screw up, which they inevitably will. They also have to show that they have learned something. Americans were afraid to vote Republican from 1932 to 1952 because they were afraid the Republicans hadn’t learned anything; they would get into office and undo the New Deal. People have the same fears about the Democrats now—if they manage to get elected, they will pretend Ronald Reagan never existed and go back to the way things used to be. As a party program, that will never do.
International Perspectives

Apartheid and Violence

by James North and Kenneth Carstens

James North, the author of Freedom Rising, and Kenneth Carstens, executive director of the U.S. Committee of the International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, were members of a panel on personal perspectives at the April 20, 1985 intercollegiate conference, "Inside South Africa," sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. The following is excerpted from their remarks during that panel discussion.

JAMES NORTH: In the course of researching my book, I lived in Southern Africa for more than four years. One of my habits was to turn every Saturday morning to the Rand Daily Mail to see what publications the regime had banned the previous week. Two principles guide this censorship: puritanism and politics. This leads to some interesting juxtapositions. You'd see Nadine Gordimer's latest serious novel and right next to it would be something called Cave Man Sex. In 1978, the censors even banned the book Black Beauty. I was never sure whether politics or puritanism guided that decision. They also briefly banned Anna Karenina. One bookseller commented, "Somebody with a gaping ignorance of literature decided on the basis of the title that first, it was Russian and second, it was probably Marxist."

Another of my hobbies was to collect the various euphemisms that the government used to describe its racial policies. The growing protest movement here in our country and elsewhere has forced them to do some disguising. The National Party came to power in 1948. It called its policy "apartheid." This word means just apartness, but it soon fell into disrepute. The government then tried "separate development." That, too, eventually failed because it became synonymous with the oppression that it was meant to masquerade. The current president, P. W. Botha, is something of a wordsmith. He's tried "vertical differentiation," "friendly nationalism," and even "good neighborliness." We who oppose the system continue to call it apartheid.

There have been other searches for euphemism. You've probably heard about the pass laws, which means that black South Africans are required to carry passes at all times, specifying where they are allowed to live and work. In 1952, the government extended the pass laws to women for the first time. The law that did this was called The Abolition of Passes Act. This was because the documents were renamed, at least in official reference books. The Extension of University Education Act of 1959 forced the last few blacks to withdraw from white universities. Whole neighborhoods of Indian and so-called colored people have been bulldozed and their residents forced...
to move to bleak ghettos miles from the center of town—the agency responsible is called the Department of Community Development. You can understand why after a while I came to be suspicious when I heard President Botha describe his policies as reform.

When I first went to South Africa six years ago, I had already formed a mental image of the apartheid system. I imagined it to be like my picture of the American South before Dr. King and the Civil Rights movement. I pictured a backward, outmoded system of segregation with silly separate facilities. The rulers of South Africa also sounded familiar. I imagined odd primitives, variants of old backwoods men like former Georgia Governor Lester Maddox. But when I arrived there I learned at first hand that my image of apartheid was largely wrong. There was plenty of segregation and plenty of vicious primitive racism as well. But what I had not expected was an up-to-date computerized police state, a complex and sophisticated system of racial and economic domination. Since 1960, apartheid has forced three and one-half million black people to move into the overcrowded rural areas called Bantustans, places where poverty, disease and infant mortality approach genocidal proportions. Apartheid forces millions of black men to live as migrant workers, apart from their families for the entire year except for Christmastime. The violence of apartheid is not expressed primarily in the form of random street incidents, frequent as these are, but rather, officially, in the highest rate of imprisonment and judicially-sanctioned executions in the entire world.

KENNETH CARSTENS: I am a white South African, and during the twenty years or so that I’ve been in America I have felt like a prophet of doom, talking about the near-inevitability of violence and counter-violence escalating until it goes out of control in South Africa—unless the one thing that the first South African Nobel Peace Prize laureate asked for is implemented. He, as you will recall, was Albert Luthuli, and his successors ever since have been pleading with the western democracies to do something that counts, to bring about the kind of change that is necessary in South Africa.

Luthuli argued that if sanctions were not imposed on South Africa, that would leave the majority population no alternative but to resort to counter-violence. Not a complicated thought, not a complicated argument, something that could be simply grasped by simple minds. But Luthuli had the argument thrown at him that we still bandy about today. He was told, “We don’t want to hurt the black people of South Africa.” As Secretary of State George Shultz said again just a few days ago, the people we want to help will suffer first and most. Paraphrasing somewhat, let me tell you what Luthuli said in response. “Oh,” he said, “You’ve noticed that we’re suffering. You hadn’t noticed until we asked you to impose sanctions. We suffer more than you think, and moreover we are not convinced that we would suffer a lot more if sanctions were imposed. But if we should have to suffer more, we are prepared to suffer more in order that our children may have some hope, rather than leaving our level of suffering at the present level, and letting it go on into infinity.”
The arguments have not changed, except that there are additional data that can be brought to bear on the argument that blacks are going to suffer first if Harvard or Uncle Tom or anybody else should divest from stocks of companies operating in South Africa, and if sanctions, of which divestment is a preliminary part, should be imposed. That, as they say in the classics, just ain't so. If data count, let's look at South Africa in the Second World War, when conditions approximating sanctions and embargo were in effect. What happened to the economy? Did it turn over and die? Were blacks losing jobs? Were they starving in the streets? No. The economy flourished.

Let's look at a closer and better analogy. Let's look at Rhodesia after its unilateral declaration of independence in 1965. What happened when sanctions were imposed on Rhodesia, even though South Africa shielded it from the worst effects of those sanctions? Were Africans thrown out of work? Were the unskilled workers the first to lose their jobs? No. The Rhodesian economy boomed. Why? You don't have to be an economist to know the reason why. What happens if investment—especially capital-intensive American investment in high tech—is cut off or withdrawn? The economy doesn't roll over and die. It moves from capital-intensive to labor-intensive. It moves from high-tech to low-tech substitutes. More jobs are created for more unskilled workers.

It is simply not true that the black people we want to help will suffer first or last. I will not say they will remain untouched. Some jobs will be lost. The economy will be distorted as the economy is distorted by the high dollar or low dollar or the other strange things that governments do. Economies are made to be distorted. But for every job lost in the short-to-medium-term, more jobs will be created for the unskilled and semi-skilled. I trust and believe that there will not be a long-term, because the people that sanctions do affect are the elites who control the country and determine its policies. That's why they squeal so loud and long about divestment and how sanctions will hurt the people we want to help, because they are the ones who will suffer and they are the ones who I believe will be persuaded, if not by sanctions, then by their own business community and their own black population to come to the negotiating table and short circuit the spiral of violence and counter-violence that, without this rational intervention, can only continue to rise.
The Dollar’s Devastation

by Shirley Williams

Shirley Williams, co-founder of the Social Democratic Party of Great Britain and former Fellow of the Institute of Politics, delivered an address in the ARCO Forum on March 19, 1985, “Has The United States Dropped Out of Europe?” The following is an edited excerpt from her speech.

Why is it that the United States can run at one and the same time a profligate fiscal policy and, until recently, a relatively restrictive monetary policy and still see the dollar rise steadily against the other currencies of the world? The answer, I think, is simple. It is that the political strength of the United States is so great that she has been able to wipe out the economic consequences of her own actions. I don’t know how long that will last. I have a nasty feeling it may not last a great deal longer. But that it has lasted quite a few months, quite a few years, is itself astonishing.

Let me consider for a moment what the implications of this economic policy are. First, there has been a magnetizing effect on capital flows in the rest of the world. Allow me to bore you a moment with the figures. In 1982, in line with what had happened in the previous 35 years from 1947 onwards, the United States produced an outflow of capital of $24 billion. That the most powerful and richest country in the world would be exporting capital was very much what one would have expected to happen. In 1983, that position changed dramatically. Instead of exporting $24 billion worth of capital, the United States absorbed $33 billion worth of capital, most of it at that time from Western Europe. In 1984 the figure more than doubled. It reached $72 billion in the first three-quarters of 1984 alone. On an annual basis, that was $100 billion. The pattern of the exporters had changed a bit. It was still mostly Western Europe. Japan had made some appearance on the scene, beginning to export capital to the United States. And more tragically, the major Latin American continent appeared on the scene, despite the fact that it was the last place in the world capable of exporting capital: a continent with a nearly three percent rate of population growth exporting all its surplus to the United States. And so the United States by 1984 had become a major importer of capital, a strange reversal of history.

Europe is widely regarded in many parts of the United States as, to put it politely, a basket case, an aging, arthritic continent which is going graciously, at best, down the drain. Americans are not terribly historically minded and therefore it’s very easy to forget that in 1950 the United States produced just over 70 percent of the western world’s G.N.P. In 1980, that had fallen to just under 40 percent. In every decade from the 1950s onward until 1980, Europe had, in terms of productivity, in terms of growth of G.N.P., in terms of its capacity to increase its skill levels, outstripped the United States. In the 1970s, Europe invested heavily in labor-saving capital. Strikingly, in the ‘70s there was much more labor-saving investment than growth-
expanding investment. Europe already was beginning to suffer from a certain loss of confidence. Also striking was that up until 1980 the level of penetration of new technologies and specifically of micro-electronics into European industry was relatively rapid, and that as late as 1984 the penetration into medium and small European companies in Britain, in Germany and France was very nearly equal to that in Japan. That’s a fact that very few Americans know.

What happened was that the recession of 1979 to 1981 hit a number of European countries sideways. I will make a provocative statement. Mrs. Thatcher’s Britain and Helmut Kohl’s Germany have obeyed every single nostrum in the classical economist’s book. They are good Friedmanities which is more than can be said for President Reagan’s America. And they have suffered a tremendous recession in consequence. Between 1979 and 1981 the obedient British government sliced out 22 percent of British manufacturing industry. Some of it was very bad, inefficient, overmanned, ready for the knife. I accept that; it’s true. But some of it was very good, and it equally surely was slaughtered. Twenty-two percent! We won’t get it back again, because this time it hasn’t been mothballed, it has been sold off.

The secondary effect of the 1979-1981 recession was to discourage some of the most important initiatives that Europe needed to take. The training for skills fell disastrously. The penetration of new technologies into industry slowed down. The level of research and development was reduced. The science budget was cut back. All the things that Britain needed in order to grow, in order to move technologically up-market were as much victims of what happened in terms of orthodox Thatcherite financing as the good effects which, understandably, many American conservatives point to. There were both. But the price was terribly heavy.

In the last few years, that price has also been paid by the Federal Republic of Germany. Both Germany and Britain are rare among the countries of the West in that they share this characteristic with Japan. Like President Hoover’s America, uniquely they have moved towards a budget surplus, if one removes unemployment benefits from the calculation. They have become more and more contractionary against the background of one of the most serious recessions the world has known for fifty years. Frankly, I find it an extraordinarily masochistic policy.

It was not a policy the United States adopted. Instead it adopted a strange hybrid of Keynesianism and Friedmanism, a funny mixture of fiscal growth and some monetary restraint. Now I look at the United States and I see that what happened in 1979-81 to Britain and what happened in 1982-84 to Germany is beginning to happen to parts of the United States. And I mean by that, the devastating effect of too strong a dollar.

I, like most Europeans, have been fed a consistently optimistic story, part of it absolutely correct. The President, in some remarkable way, is able to present the United States to itself, as well as to himself, as an almost unqualified success story. It was therefore with some surprise that I discovered, at a national rally of 15,000 farmers in Ames, Iowa which I attended, huge posters saying the most unexpected things—in a state that voted solidly Republican. Like, “Down with the industries of war—up with the industries of peace.” Like, “If you’re hungry, eat Stockman,”
and like, “It’s time to turn swords into ploughshares.” Iowa radicalism had suddenly surfaced again, and I was surprised. I didn’t even realize there was Iowa radicalism. And then I sat through that rally of angry, rawboned, solid Republican American men and women, the kind that one would normally have thought was at the heart of the Constitution’s picture of what an American ought to be. I heard things like, “We’re going to stop any more bailiffs taking our farms over, and we’ll stop them with arms if we have to.” That was new. I hadn’t heard that since I read the history of the depression. It was a strange alteration from what I had been expecting to see.

I’m not saying that the picture of the United States that Europe has got is wrong, but rather that the picture seems to me much more patchy than we are normally led to believe. I don’t know how people can compete when the dollar goes through the roof. So it’s tough to be lectured on the one hand about how arthritic you are, and on the other hand to confront an economic policy that makes it very difficult to actually pay for avoiding arthritis.

But Europe must take some of the blame. Don’t let me give the impression, like Helmut Schmidt who eloquently denounces the United States, that I only regard the United States as the trouble. I believe that Britain and Germany have much to answer for. I don’t believe they should have followed contractionary economic policies. They allowed unemployment to rise to 13 percent, 14 percent, and today they face an explosive political situation. When you’ve got 14 percent unemployment, and of that 40 percent is under the age of 24, and when over half of it has been unemployed for over six months, you are translating the problem of the inner cities in the United States to the continent of Europe.

For the first time in my life, since I was a very young woman, I see people beginning to question whether the pluralist system and the democratic system any longer works for them. And I see the triumph of the 25 years after the Second World War, in which the West established an incomparable position, one which effectively destroyed the communist myth, being itself destroyed by our own selfishness and our own lack of imagination.

*****
After 1984
A Liberal Revival
by Tom Axworthy

Tom Axworthy, a fall 1984 Fellow of the Institute of Politics, was Principal Secretary and Senior Policy Advisor to Pierre Elliott Trudeau, former Prime Minister of Canada. The following is a portion of an article which first appeared in the November 1984 Canadian Forum following the defeat of the Liberal Party of Canada in September 1984. The issues addressed and the insights contained in the piece have relevance to and parallels in the Democratic Party of the United States.

Pierre Trudeau's package of traditional Liberal values on national unity and social welfare aided by the pan-Canadian appeal of strong national government and enhanced independence made a powerful electoral combination. Sixteen years of power in our media age attest to that. But each of these priorities rested on an essential precondition—the maintenance of prosperity. If the economy was creating wealth then the people were content to let the Liberal party redistribute some of it. Increased independence was vital—if it did not cause economic decline. Unity and the Constitution were crucial national issues as long as mortgage payments could be met and food put on the table. Active government intervention in the economy was fine—if it worked. Without a strong economy these priorities appeared frivolous, even destructive.

Liberals have always prided themselves on being the party of prosperity. Whether by luck or good management, the party has usually been in power during periods of expansion, and the Conservatives have been stuck with the recessions. This began to change in the 1970s. Economic expansion continued but not as fast as labor force growth. Slowly but steadily the Liberal party began to lose its reputation as a good manager of the economy. And as that reputation declined, so too did support from the upper middle income earners, the well-educated, and the economically adventurous.

The recession of 1981-82 was a turning point. As American interest rates soared, the Bank of Canada felt it had no option but to follow suit. The economy was brought to a standstill. Hardships began to threaten all classes and political support for the Liberal party plummeted. In a very real sense the powerful "time for a change" theme which overwhelmed the party in 1984 had its origins in the interest rate run-up of August, 1981. The lesson for the Liberal party is clear: it is much easier to put on the brakes than it is to accelerate the engine of growth.

Brian Mulroney has been more than a casual observer of Liberal successes. While the policy content of his book Where I Stand is thin, the political analysis is quite stunning. Mulroney's strategy has been based on three central propositions:
—The Conservatives should replace the Liberals as the party of growth and oppor-
tunity. No more "short term pain for long term gain." Downplay the deficit, emphasize tax breaks, and appeal to a spirit of enterprise and individual initiative.

—The Conservative party should never threaten social security. Frequent recitation of the "sacred trust" of Medicare would go a long way in dispelling the image of Sinclair Stevens, John Crosbie, and other slashers.

—The Conservative party should at least be on equal footing in fighting for the support of French Canadians. No longer could the Conservative party give Liberals the advantage of a solid core of safe seats.

Will the Liberal party be able to regain its traditional terrain? This is the essential question of the election. Will Mr. Mulroney's triumphs on September 4th be the start of a permanent realignment in favour of the Conservative party, or will it be a temporary outburst like the avalanche that elected John Diefenbaker in 1958? To repeat Mr. Pearson's success in rebuilding, John Turner will have to wage a two-front war: he will have to regain for his party a reputation for economic competence while competing with the NDP for the mantle of defender of the dispossessed. It will be a test of major proportions.

Beyond the fate of the Liberal party an even more critical question emerges: will the Conservative victory be one of party or ideology? Canada did not turn rightward on September 4th. Mr. Mulroney's success is based at least as much on his tactical ability to claim traditional Liberal ground as on growing disquiet with the practices of the welfare state. But progressives cannot take too much solace from this essential fact. Mr. Mulroney has a whopping majority. His party has a voracious right wing, well represented in caucus and cabinet, that will eventually demand to be fed. Conservative strength at the center is matched by Conservative strength in the regions. Conservative regimes run every province but two.

The imbalance in partisan strength in the country is duplicated when we look at other centers of influence. The business community now massively supports the Conservative party: over 80 percent of the CEOs, according to a survey in the Financial Post, voted for the Tories in the last election. With the exception of the Toronto Star, the vast preponderance of the country's newspapers echo the Conservative cause. Think tanks like the C.D. Howe Institute, and the Conference Board, not to mention the Fraser Institute, regularly command respectful attention for their conservative viewpoints. Keynesianism is a curious relic in most of the departments of economics in the country's universities. Professional associations, like the Canadian Bar, concentrate on corporate tax matters more than legal aid or civil liberties. In a word, the major institutional and intellectual centers of influence are all dominated by a small "c" conservative frame of reference.

Whatever their party affiliation, progressives in unions, cooperatives, environmental groups, the women's movement, or other spheres outside the established order will have to challenge this new conservative orthodoxy. While a federal electoral rematch is at least four years off, the battle of ideas can begin immediately. Everyone's agenda will, of course, differ. As a Liberal, I believe we need fresh approaches to the following six problems:
—How do we create wealth in our society? What are the characteristics that give firms, industries, or national economies competitive advantage over their adversaries?
—How can we broaden economic decision-making? Labour should not be asked to make sacrifices on wages while they are excluded from the centers of power. Is profit-sharing a useful means of distributing benefits to employees?
—If productive work cannot be found for all, can meaningful work be more equally shared? Should the work-sharing experiments of 1982 be made a permanent part of our manpower policy? Should we examine a massive new system of adult education, worker retraining, and industry-wide sabbaticals, both to better educate Canadians and free up spaces?
—What does meaningful economic independence require in 1984? If the key aspect to economic sovereignty is not shared ownership but the ability to resist American monetary policy, do we have to spend more effort strengthening our balance of payments? What does this mean for energy policy, tourism, and trade?
—In a world of special interests, how can we create a fairer society? What do we want our tax system to do and how can it be improved? Can we reform our pension system so that future generations of Canadians do not have to endure the indignities of today’s elderly? Women have now received legal equality of treatment: how is this to be implemented in the economic system?
—What is the modern role of the state? Do we need new means to achieve old ends? How can bureaucracy be made more flexible, responsive, and caring? Are there new types of instruments that can achieve social reform without extending the public service?
Liberals have suffered a grievous loss. Only by engaging in a battle of ideas will we ensure that our defeat is not permanent.

*****
Peace in the Middle East

by Queen Noor Al Hussein

Queen Noor Al Hussein of Jordan delivered an address, "Peace in the Middle East," in the ARCO Forum on April 23, 1985. The following is excerpted from her speech.

Since the separate peace between Egypt and Israel in 1979, Middle East diplomacy has been marked by stagnation, lost opportunities, and dashed hopes. Time after time, we have seen the Palestinian-Israeli issue spill beyond its physical and political boundaries—the war in Lebanon is only the latest and most vivid example. After almost four decades, marked by the tragedies and economic upheavals of five wars, we continue to live under the threatening cloud of conflict. We are now further endangered by the rising tide of popular frustration and radicalism. To emphasize the gravity of the situation and the potential for global destruction that exists, I need only remind you that during the October, 1973 Arab-Israeli War, the United States put its armed forces on a worldwide nuclear alert. The widespread concern in America today about nuclear proliferation is one that we in the Middle East share, perhaps with even more immediacy than you.

The choice is clear. We can accept further conflict and bloodshed, and risk the expansion of a regional conflict into a global conflagration, or we can join together in a major new effort to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict through negotiations, to achieve a peaceful settlement, coexistence, and justice for all peoples involved. War will never resolve this dispute. Force can never bring peace. There is an alternative.

If the peace process is to move forward, it is essential that the United States enter into a dialogue with the Palestinians. As the recognized, sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the P.L.O. must participate in the process that determines their future. There can be no effective solution to the Palestinian problem without the participation and final endorsement of the primarily injured party, the Palestinians. If the Middle East is ever to enjoy genuine and lasting peace, all the parties directly concerned must move closer to, and be mutually fortified by a middle ground that sees equal political rights as the only logical foundation for a lasting peace.

We do not ask you to put aside Israel's security concerns. Nor do we ask you to support only the Arab position. We ask you, rather, to work with the forces of moderation and realism in the Middle East, by seeking security for both Israel and the Arab states. We ask you to act on the knowledge that genuine security has never been achieved through the might of arms, but rather through the irresistible force of reconciliation and mutual trust between peoples.
It is essential to uphold the principle of reciprocity in recognizing and addressing the balanced rights and concerns of both parties to the conflict. Security is a state of mind brought about by a just and durable peace. It will never result from military occupation and control of other peoples territories and the denial of their rights.

We ask you to re-examine whether you have done everything possible for an Arab-Israeli peace. My own journey from America to the Arab world has reinvigorated my faith in the compatibility of the principles and goals we share. My life in the Arab world, as the Queen of Jordan and the wife of King Hussein, has given me a new perspective on the foreign policy application of America’s founding principles.

As a student in this country, I learned that the American government treats all people as equals before the law. As a Jordanian, I have seen America’s support for the application of international law in the Middle East become selective, hesitant, and vague. As a student in this country, I learned that the United States uses its vast financial resources to advance freedom, self-reliance, and human progress. As a Jordanian, I watch the United States sustain Israel’s occupation of Arab lands, and seemingly reward Israel for its belligerence. As a student in this country, I was proud to learn that in 1918, President Woodrow Wilson articulated for mankind the principle of national self-determination for all peoples. As a Jordanian, I grapple daily with the human tragedy and socio-economic consequences of an American Middle East policy that seems to deny the right of self-determination to the Palestinian people.

The past decade has shown that lack of progress towards a peaceful settlement breeds increasing extremism in both the Israeli and Arab camps. We have seen how diplomatic stagnation strengthens the hand of right-wing extremists and annexationists in Israel, while promoting corresponding anti-American forces in many parts of the Arab and Islamic world. Wasted time and diplomatic stalemate only fuel fanaticism, volatility, and instability. If the Arab-Israeli conflict is left unresolved, it will almost certainly spill over into new battlefields and generate a fresh cycle of bloodshed and suffering.

Absence of peace, in this age of nuclear threat and socioeconomic interdependence, endangers the stability and welfare of the entire world. Today, no nation is an island—isolation can no longer provide protection. We must all work together to address the vital challenge of peace in our time.

Will American policy continue to strengthen the ambitions of Israelis who covet a false security based on the occupation of Arab lands and the subjugation of Arab people? Or will the American people reaffirm their nation’s historic role as the champion of equal rights, the sentinel of liberty, and the guardian of the concept of self-determination for all peoples?
Social and Economic Issues

Family and Nation
by Daniel Patrick Moynihan

On April 8 and 9, 1985, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York delivered this year's Edwin L. Godkin Lectures, entitled, "Family and Nation," at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Following are edited excerpts from the first lecture delivered on April 8th in the ARCO Forum.

Twenty years ago in an article in America magazine, I proposed that the "formulation of a national policy concerning the quality and stability of family life could be the cornerstone for a new era of U.S. social legislation." The essence of family policy is that it focuses on the outcomes of other policies. The national, state and local governments carry on various social programs which are assumed to bring about desirable social results. But in and of themselves, these results are partial and inconclusive. Family welfare tends to be a summation of such results. In particular, assuming some general categories of well-being could be agreed on, it alerts us to trends that could be counterintuitive and otherwise hidden from view. Thus in 1965 we could note that the economy was flourishing and unemployment was low, yet argue from family data that we would be in trouble if existing trends continued.

That was in a previous political era. What of the present? Surprisingly perhaps, or perhaps not, there appears a strikingly parallel evolution. About three and one-half years into the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, the Policy Planning Staff of the Department of Labor, relying heavily on census data, began to investigate trends in family structure, and thereafter passed the findings on to the White House. Three and one-half years into the Reagan Administration, the Cabinet was presented with the findings of a White House task force, directed by a former head of the Census Bureau, Bruce Chapman, on exactly the same subject.

The task force report was entitled, "Why Not 'Fairness' For Families?" Its thesis was straightforward: "The poverty issue . . . would disappear almost entirely with the improved economy except that the rates of divorce and formation of single parent households remain high."

There was in fact at this time a growing sense within conservative intellectual circles that it was no longer sufficient simply to oppose liberal welfare policies. There was a need, as one essayist put it, for "an alternative, a conservative vision of the welfare state in America." Much attention is paid to the "mediating-structures approach," a concept which argues the need for modern societies to buffer encounters between the state and the individual.

The younger conservative writers, having in a sense "missed the war" and its awful simplicities, found themselves in a conservative Washington where it was obvious the State was not going to wither away, and began to ask how the State might
advance a conservative vision of society. A young political scientist, Peter Skerry, rediscovered Head Start, or rather, observing that it had survived even in the early Reagan budgets, asked why. He discovered that the Head Start program that had actually evolved was not at all what liberals had planned but, rather, many things that conservatives might very well have hoped for. Head Start was disorganized and decentralized. Excellent. As an educational process it had the advantage of not being compulsory. First rate. As an institution, a network of more or less autonomous institutions, it was in constant jeopardy. Better still. As a result, morale was high, and a great deal of work was done by volunteers. There was no stigma of welfare about Head Start centers, and even though the state had created them they were something more than a creation of the state.

And so conservatives learn, perhaps more readily, to value whatever it is that reinforces the elemental ties of family and neighborhood.

To say yet again, what emerges here is the realization that in the nature of modern industrial society, no government, however firm might be its wish otherwise, can avoid having policies that profoundly influence family relationships. This is not to be avoided. The only option is whether these will be purposeful, intended policies or whether they will be residual, derivative, in a sense concealed ones.

We like to see ourselves as individualists. "Root hog, or die," the Southerners will say. Yet we are a surpassingly generous people, not least one supposes because we are, in the end, so blessed, so well-off generally. This makes for anomaly. One such is that we have a reasonably comprehensive welfare state, but either don't know this or deny it. Almost the whole of the population is protected by Social Security insurance against such misfortunes as widowhood, orphanhood, and disability. Social Security is a superb instrument of family policy so far as it goes. Nearly 37 million Americans receive monthly Social Security checks on which most are largely or wholly dependent, and the elderly receive subsidized hospital and medical care. Yet in the main the Americans will not acknowledge that the insurance aspects of Social Security exist, and assert with great conviction that retirement benefits will not be available when their own turn comes.

Liberals tend to find this discouraging. Some expect gratitude, and what is there to say of that? But others, I would include myself, would like to think that, say, a 35-year-old father of three would know that should he die his wife and children will receive Social Security benefits. It appears to me that he has no business not knowing. But I detect in conservative friends rather a liking for the general indifference of the working-age population to the subject of social insurance. They approve the idea that Americans don't need to feel insured. Just possibly, this frees them to think outside our more traditional prescriptions.

Is it possible that conservatives will think their way through to a "conservative vision of the welfare state" that is much oriented to family welfare? Is it possible
that liberals might join, and something of a center be reconstituted? Surely it is. But first we must address the proposition that where government has tried, government has only made matters worse; indeed, that it is government programs that have brought about the present "alarming rate of family disintegration."

*****

**Pornography, Freedom and Community**

by Jean Bethke Elshtain

The following is an edited excerpt from a public address in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs, "Feminism and the Politics of Pornography," by Jean Bethke Elshtain, on February 6, 1985, co-sponsored by the John M. Olin Foundation. Ms. Elshtain is a professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Why is pornography so hard for us to deal with? Why does it create such divisiveness? Why does the debate get framed as it does—unlimited freedom of expression versus enhanced modes of social control and constraint? The answer lies in part in the complexities of our social history and the founding principles of our polity. Liberalism as such is indifferent to the ways of life individuals choose to pursue. Holding as self-evident a view of the person as the bearer of inalienable rights, he must be free to choose his own ends. The citizen is free from imposition upon him of a substantive political morality he may not share, and free as well from the intrusion of his neighbors into his private affairs. I should add that I'm using the masculine pronoun advisedly here, because women have been late-comers to some of the promises of liberalism that I'm setting forth.

This bracing ideal requires that politics touch only externals; behavior alone can be regulated, punished, approved only if it can be demonstrated that this behavior touches directly upon another. Our political morality then sets a particular context. Presuming a sharp cleavage between public and private, the political language of liberalism celebrates individual choice and rights but grants no similar status to principles of belonging or obligation. Aspects of our moral experience located in ties of friendship, family and community life fall through the grid of liberalism's regula-
The important point, as background to the current pornography debate, is that in the absence of a language of public morality, reformers feel compelled to make their case in and through a language of individual rights, consent, choice. They must in a sense prove damages to get the machinery of civil society moving in a punitive or positive direction. They must also attempt to break down the public-private divide, either by politicizing the private, or by claiming that privacy is being eroded and must be restored. The present phase of this old debate highlights the tensions inherent in our political morality and illustrates the exhaustion of the vocabulary of individual rights where matters of substantive morality are concerned. This may account for the rhetorical over-inflation the pornography issue invites. The language of rights and freedom from discrimination is pressed into service to bear an impossibly heavy burden.

Pornography's progress—if that's the word—from the twilight zone of major cities to the main street of many towns is a story of social change, of the spread of an esthetic, of mechanistic sexuality, and of profit. Its proliferation, its democratization, if you will, tells how ineffective any longer are the old unwritten rules of internalized constraint, reinforced by community censure, taboo, shame, the threat of scandal. In tossing off these constraints in the name of freedom, in ways that were genuinely liberating for many, we seem to have opened the floodgates to a new coarseness in our representations of human sexuality.

The ideas animating the current anti-pornography struggle in its most publicized forms are not new. They turn on a theory about male sexuality, indeed male nature, that sees that sexuality and that nature as depending for its pleasure and identity on the wholesale and remorseless victimization of women. Embracing the radical feminist argument that "pornography is the theory, rape is the practice," protesters in Minneapolis proposed an amendment to the city's civil rights ordinance that would classify pornography as a form of discrimination on the basis of sex, hence a violation of the civil rights of women and a denial of equal protection under the law of the Fourteenth Amendment. An alliance of radical feminists, conservative Reagan Republicans on the city council, and right-wing anti-smut activists worked together and got the ordinance passed. Specifically, this ordinance, passed by a 7-6 vote of the Minneapolis city council in December, 1983 and vetoed in January, 1984, defines pornography in the most wide-ranging terms. It defines pornography as "the sexually explicit subordination of women, graphically depicted whether in pictures or words that includes one or more of the following," and then we have a series of stipulations. Attempting to leave no stone unturned, the statute extends the notion of harm to encompass any situation in which a woman could claim she had been injured. Now this injury includes mental distress,—for example, a chance encounter with an offensive magazine cover in a supermarket. Harm to the person of the woman is assumed as a given, as that which pornography simply does as its intent. But the ordinance goes even further, combining the dramatic extension of the notion of harm with the proclamation that por-
nography constitutes a form of explicit sex discrimination, hence, comprises by definition a violation of a woman’s civil rights.

Predictably, the scope and language of the ordinance aroused the civil libertarians. The Minnesota American Civil Liberties Union entered the fray immediately in opposition to the proposal, vowing to fight it all the way to the Supreme Court, if necessary. To First Amendment absolutists or those who nearly share that position this latest anti-porn crusade confirms a world view that no doubt comes to them too easily: the belief that any attempt to curb, to regulate, or to restrict the new, more pervasive pornography invites censorship and threatens our liberties. By promulgating a definition of pornography so broad it might indict an Updike novel along with a smut film, protestors confirm the civil libertarians’ worst fears.

Although the pornographers did not enter the Minneapolis dispute openly, they are nonetheless, again, the somewhat unsavory silent partners of the civil libertarians. Similarly, feminist anti-pornographers find themselves at present in a sometimes tacit, sometimes open alliance with right-wing crusaders against pornography as the worst form of modern vice. Despite disavowals from both sides we see at the moment an implicit coming together of right-wing and radical feminist efforts in the political landscape. The arguments differ, but the ends sought—the total elimination of pornography as defined by each group—are identical.

We cannot tend democratically to the porn problem through language of total community or language of absolute (or nearly so) freedom of expression, freedom from constraint. But we can move toward reflection on available options by drawing from conservatives the insistence that the character of human beings matters, and that this character is related to the context in which people live. We can draw from feminist protest generally the imperative that women are or must be free to become full civic human beings. To the extent that pornography is symptomatic of and helps to further modes of social disintegration, creating contexts in which the least powerful—who are not women but children—suffer the most, it becomes an appropriate target for action and regulation and reproof. But with this proviso: knowing that we cannot return to a wholly harmonious way of life in which we share completely a set of moral values. This means communities must leave space for putting pornography in its place, rather than seeking to eradicate it altogether. Here the language and reality of First Amendment freedoms can chasten overly zealous efforts to create or demand a coerced consensus. If we move in this direction we might break free from the unacceptable alternatives our civil society seems to throw up with great consistency: freedom versus community, virtue versus vice, liberty versus constraint.
Deindustrialization: Myth or Reality?

by Benjamin M. Friedman, Charles L. Schultze, Barry Bluestone, Robert Z. Lawrence, and Bennett Harrison

The following are edited excerpts from a panel discussion, "Deindustrialization: Myth or Reality?" held November 1, 1984, in the ARCO Forum. Panelists were: Bennett Harrison, Professor of Political Economy and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Robert Z. Lawrence, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution; Barry Bluestone, Professor of Economics, Boston College; Charles L. Schultze, former Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors (1977-81) and Director, Bureau of the Budget (1965-67); Benjamin M. Friedman, Professor of Economics, Harvard University (moderator). The discussion also appeared as a Harper's magazine "Forum" in the February, 1985, issue.

FRIEDMAN: We are here to discuss whether the United States needs a so-called industrial policy. Proponents of such policies argue that our economy is currently undergoing a dramatic and largely negative transformation: a massive shift of resources and jobs, from manufacturing to a new "service" economy, that two of our panelists have called the "deindustrialization of America." Jobs are being eliminated in the Northeast and Midwest as factories in those areas close down or reduce production, while new jobs are being created elsewhere, primarily in the West and Southwest. At the same time, job opportunities are disappearing for traditional blue-collar groups and increasing for the more highly skilled and educated.

Those who advance these ideas claim deindustrialization is responsible for regional depressions, a lower standard of living for a large part of our population, and the shrinking of the middle class. They also argue that the government must intervene to slow or halt these harmful changes in the economy by protecting failing industries, helping depressed areas, and so on. Basically, an industrial policy is a coordinated program of such interventions, though specific proposals vary greatly.

SCHULTZE: The general point of all industrial policy advocates is this: major economic change, without new interventionist government policies, inevitably means workers lose their jobs, which cause hardship. Well, that is certainly true. But proponents of industrial policy also claim that this is a particularly serious problem now—and I think that is highly debatable. Between the early 1950s and the late 1960s, for example, eight important industries that employed 40 percent of America’s manufacturing production workers lost, on average, 14 percent of their work forces. That is, one in seven jobs were lost. In a dynamic economy, old factories close and new
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ones open, workers are laid off and then rehired. This process is always going on.

BLUESTONE: No one is claiming we have not had major changes in the American economy before. The pertinent questions are these: first, how fast are those changes now occurring? And second, can the country absorb them without suffering serious social consequences? The debate about the decline of American heavy industry really centers on the relationship between the speed of deindustrialization in different industries and regions and the ability of the economy to transfer the capital displaced from heavy manufacturing production jobs into new jobs that promise a decent standard of living for workers.

ROBERT Z. LAWRENCE: You speak about "a decent standard of living for workers," but I think what you're really worried about is that certain people are moving from high positions on the income scale to somewhat lower ones. If, for example, a steel worker or an automobile worker loses his job, it's very likely that he or she will suffer a substantial decline in living standard. The question is, is that something we should be trying to prevent? Should the state be guaranteeing people that it will perpetuate their current income levels by imposing import quotas or otherwise protecting certain industries? It seems to me the answer ought to be no.

BENNETT HARRISON: Look, the question we should be focusing on here is really this: what is happening to the American worker's standard of living? Between December 1982 and July 1984 almost as many jobs were created in the wholesale and retail trade industry alone as in all durable manufacturing industries put together. Last year McDonald's became a larger employer than U.S. Steel. What does this mean for the American worker? I'll give you a simple answer: last July the average wage of a manufacturing worker was $370 a week, while the average wage of a service industry worker was $248 a week. The conclusion is obvious. We are seeing a shift toward lower wages in new jobs in the United States.

Now, the United States is not a young, underdeveloped country, where generations of untrained people must endure miserably hard, dirty, low-paying work as the price for developing a strong industrial base. Our grandparents and parents already paid that price so we could enjoy a high standard of living. That standard of living is being threatened by structural changes in the world economy, and by the particular ways in which American corporations have chosen to respond to them.

SCHULTZE: But that doesn't mean that the proper way to deal with economic changes is to have government try to stop them. Industrial policy advocates argue that government should somehow "correct" the market's allocation of investment among industries and regions, that government ought to intervene massively and somehow force the economy to move in what they define as a desirable direction—a different direction, that is, from the one the market is providing naturally. Their basic assumption is that there's too much industrial change and that it's happening too quickly. Now, I don't believe you can deal with economic change by trying to stop it or slow it down. You can only try to maximize the positive side.

BLUESTONE: Contrary to received doctrine, a rising tide does not necessarily lift
all ships. The U.S. economic tide may be rising today, but it is bringing with it greater income inequality, greater regional differences in unemployment, and large increases in structural unemployment.

Why is this happening? First, the new jobs that our economy is creating are usually in very different industries, and require very different skills, from the jobs that are being eliminated in heavy industry. Second, the new jobs are often located in different parts of the country. That is why the most obvious consequence of deindustrialization is rising structural unemployment. In our growing economy, between 7 and 8 percent of American workers are unemployed, compared with less than 5 percent during periods of similar growth in the 1960s.

What about the new jobs? Well, they are predominantly in the service industries—not just waiters at hamburger stands and clerks in boutiques but a whole range of service occupations, from nurses’ aides to security guards to building custodians.

I think it’s obvious that we are witnessing an enormous change in the employment structure of our country, a kind of “occupational skidding.” Large numbers of workers are losing their jobs in basic industries and slipping down the occupational hierarchy. So when people say not to worry, that these laid-off workers are being “reabsorbed” into the economy, they are employing what I consider a rather disingenuous definition of that word.

SCHULTZE: It is true that an important part of America’s huge job growth in recent years has been in lower-skilled, low-wage jobs. But there is a simple reason for that: relative wages can change, and that is precisely what happened during the past fifteen years, when enormous numbers of inexperienced young people and women entered the labor force, and the economy created new jobs to absorb them. I think it’s fortunate that the United States has maintained a flexible wage system compared with Europe. The capacity of the American economy to produce new jobs is the envy of the world. Of course, it didn’t produce enough to absorb all of the new workers, or all of those who had been laid off. As you say, the result was that we had an increase in structural unemployment.

HARRISON: We’re not advocating a simple “conservationist approach”; we want to experiment with different kinds of industrial policies. These might include directing investment and technical assistance to economically troubled sectors of the economy and regions of the country; developing social contracts, or “planning agreements,” that require firms to modernize and reinvest in exchange for tax incentives, roads, sewers, and other assistance they now receive from the public; encouraging long-range planning by small committees of workers and managers and by elected representatives at every level of government to develop innovative products and manufacturing processes, to rebuild the nation’s infrastructure, and to design experiments to humanize the workplace.

We are not advocating growth for its own sake, nor competitiveness for its own sake, but growth with equity. That’s what the industrial policy debate is—or should be—about.
LAWRENCE: To claim that this debate is about "growth with equity" presupposes that the relatively slow growth we're seeing in manufacturing employment is going to have a major effect on the distribution of earnings in the American economy—that such shifts will shrink the middle class. I think this assumption confuses general structural change with a few special, highly visible cases.

In any case, if you're worried about what's happening to income distribution, then the way to change it is not through an industrial policy. If we want to correct what we believe is an inequality in income distribution, let's confront the problem directly, by redistributing income through the tax system. Why resort to inefficient intervention in whole industries if your objective is to redistribute income?

HARRISON: We simply want to develop a planning process involving all levels of the public that will help ease the pain of economic transition and replace the jobs that are lost while democratically choosing the shape of that transition. Production systems may become obsolete and commodities may lose their markets, but the solution is to find ways to replace them—and to put the power to do so in the hands of the people who live in communities that are affected. Industrial policy doesn't have to be solely the province of some bureaucracy in Washington. "Public" doesn't have to mean the big federal bureaucracy. It means us. We're the public.

Charlie Schultze says the government can't pick winners without objective criteria. Well, whether or not the criteria are "objective," the government makes winners every day. It regulates whole businesses in and out of existence. It creates new markets and capitalizes the physical plant of entire companies. We have to stop arguing about the ideal of the market versus the ideal of some central planning mechanism and face the situation we have.

SCHULTZE: In general, when government extends its control over the allocation of resources, monopoly and oligopoly interests are protected, prices are driven up, natural industrial change is impeded, and the consumer suffers. This process is not catastrophic in any one situation, but repeated year after year, in industry after industry, it slows the pace of economic progress and lowers the standards of living in this country.

*****
"No one can understand the feeling that comes to a Southern Negro on entering a federal court," wrote Martin Luther King, "unless he sees with his own eyes and feels with his own soul the tragic sabotage of justice in the city and state courts of the South. The Negro goes into those courts knowing that the cards are stacked against him. But the Southern Negro goes into the federal court with the feeling that he has an honest chance of justice before the law."

King's colleague, the Reverend Ralph David Abernathy, put the same sentiment more theatrically. When Judge David Holcombe Thomas lifted the legal barriers to King's march in Selma on March 15, 1965, Abernathy declared, "God spoke from the federal court."

From the late fifties well into the sixties, the federal judiciary was, if not quite the voice of God, then the voice of the United States Constitution in the former Confederate States. When all other avenues were closed, when sheriffs, cattle prods, hound dogs, and fire hoses stood between the black man and the rights he sought, the United States district courts were his last, best hope. Not all Southern district judges lived up to their responsibilities. Some were consistently hostile to civil rights suits. But they were generally overruled by the judges of the Fourth and Fifth Circuit Courts of Appeals, who, further from the political grass roots, were freer to challenge public resistance. Most members of the Southern federal bench ultimately put loyalty to the Constitution above loyalty to regional attitudes.

Yet a federal judge's order was not, at the start, sufficient to ensure compliance with the law. For years, Southern politicians routinely defied such orders, convinced that they could do so with impunity, and that even if they faced legal sanctions, those would only enhance their political fortunes. Only after Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy sent federal troops to enforce desegregation rulings in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama did the lesson begin to sink in. Governor Earl Long of Louisiana is said to have warned Leander Perez, the die-hard segregationist of Plaquemines Parish: "Look, Leander, don't you understand? The feds have the atom bomb."

But it was one thing to threaten force against the South, long regarded as the country's most benighted region, and quite another to marshal it against the North, home of the nation's leading banks and corporations, its most powerful media, and the very liberals who most passionately supported the civil rights movement. For more
than a decade, the federal government’s legal guns were locked into place, facing south. Only in the late sixties and early seventies did they begin to swivel and train their barrels on the hitherto exempt cities of the North.

In the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, cases are allocated among the judges by a complex lottery system whose purpose is to distribute the work load evenly and to preclude even a whisper of suspicion that a case had been intentionally assigned to a particular judge. At the start of each court term, a set of envelopes is prepared for each of the legal categories heard by the court: admiralty, bankruptcy, civil rights, habeas corpus, libel, patent, and so forth. In the spring 1972 term, each of these sets comprised fourteen small brown envelopes—two for each of the seven judges then sitting. In each envelope, a deputy clerk placed the typewritten name of one of the judges. The fourteen envelopes were then shuffled, secured by a thick rubber band, and placed with the other stacks in a blue card drawer on the clerk’s desk. At 10:30 on the morning of March 15, 1972, when the complaint in Morgan v. Hennigan was filed, the clerk reached for the “civil rights” stack, took the first envelope off the top, ripped it open, and retrieved from it the tiny slip of white paper. On it was typed the name “Garrity.”

*****

‘Color Blind’? Again?

by Elaine Jones

Elaine Jones, assistant counsel of the N.A.A.C.P. and former Fellow of the Institute of Politics, was a panelist at a discussion in the ARCO Forum, “The 1965 Voting Rights Act: Expectations and Realities,” on March 7, 1985, sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. The following is an edited excerpt from her remarks.

If we are serious about making change, real change, in this country, bringing blacks into the social and economic mainstream, we must first become color conscious before we become color blind. Otherwise, we lock people into generations of discrimination. That’s basic. This country has not been about the business of seriously dealing with this unhappy question of race for many, many years. We started with seriousness in 1969 during the Nixon administration, in terms of enforcement. It took the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations to get us the law, get it through the legislature. I believe that without President Johnson it would not have happened.
But getting laws on the books is just the beginning. Courts have to interpret those laws. States will challenge the constitutionality of everything Congress passes. It takes a while for the courts to determine what rights have been established, and then to determine what are appropriate remedies. Here we are now, at the remedy stage, and along comes the Reagan Administration saying we have to become color blind.

You know, Santayana is right. He who forgets history is doomed to repeat his worst mistakes. In 1865, at the end of the Civil War, slavery—that awful part of our history—was something this country had to work out. We’ve been working at it with some seriousness since 1969, but understand the legacy. In 1856, a few months before the Supreme Court decided ‘Dred Scott,’ George Straud, a white man, did an analysis of the basic fundamental concepts underlying slavery in all of the states. There were twelve propositions to slavery:

- The master may determine the kind and degree of time and labor to which the slave shall be subjected.
- The master may supply the slave with such food and clothing only, both as to quality and quantity, as he may think proper or find convenient.
- The master may, at his discretion, inflict any punishment upon the person of his slave.
- All the power of the master over his slave may be exercised not only by himself in person, but by anyone whom he may depute as his agent.
- Slaves have no legal rights of property in things, real or personal, but whatever they may acquire belongs in point of law to their master. [Now, that was unique to negro slavery alone—the Israelites, the Greeks, everybody could hold property when they were slaves.]
- The slave, being a personal chattel, is at all times liable to be so, absolutely, in moral issue or lease, at the will of his master.
- The slave may also be sold by process of law.
- The slave cannot be party before judicial tribunal in a species of acting against his master, no matter how atrocious may have been the injury.
- A slave cannot redeem himself, nor obtain a change of master, though cruel treatment may have rendered such changes necessary for his personal safety.
- A slave, being an object of property, if injured by a third party, the owner may bring suit to recover damages for the injury.
- A slave can make no contract.
- Slavery is perpetual.

Now that’s a serious legacy. That’s something serious to overcome. After the Civil War, the country did turn its attention to deal with this question and passed the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution. The Congress set up all kinds of affirmative action. President Andrew Johnson did veto a couple of things, but they got through anyway. And, the 1866 Civil Rights Statute was passed. But what happened? Nothing. Blacks had been enslaved for over two hundred and forty years, and we had a nine-year period of Congress trying to deal with it. In 1876, we got the Hayes-Tilden Deal. Federal troops were in the South
to protect the newly-freed blacks, and a deal was cut between the Southern Democrats and the Republicans who wanted Rutherford B. Hayes elected. The Southern Democrats offered to throw their support to Hayes if the troops were pulled out. That was the deal. Hayes became president, the troops came out, and that period ended.

From 1876 to 1965, this country not only did not do anything to help blacks, but through states' actions, all of the newly-gained rights were stripped away. The Klan came into existence, the institutionalizing of the at-large systems of the South, the Jim Crow laws and with *Plessey v. Ferguson* in 1896, a locking into place through law of the system. Then, in 1954, the first ray of hope, *Brown v. Board of Education*. That Supreme Court decision was the law of the land, but was it being enforced? It was a lofty, beautiful pronouncement, a hope, a dream, the law,—but, in 1954, it was empty. It was brave for the Supreme Court to do it, but the land was not ready for it. In 1965, this country spoke, for the first time through its representative bodies, in a loud voice and said that we will not tolerate racial discrimination.

If you had the Constitution, why did you need the Voting Rights Act? The Constitution means somebody has to find money, a lawyer and a plaintiff, people who have been harmed, and go to court to enforce the rights guaranteed under the Constitution. When one practice was abolished, another would spring up, and somebody would have to get the money, the plaintiffs, and go back to court, case after case. You needed some sort of federal enforcement, a monitoring of voting rights practices, something that wouldn't put the burden on people with nothing to enforce and hold onto their rights. That's the significance of the statute, because the Justice Department is charged with the responsibility for monitoring those cases.

With *Brown v. Board*, we had the same problem as with voting rights. Somebody had to litigate, go into all of these jurisdictions, school districts, find out if students were being segregated. Title VI under the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires the federal government not to fund school districts which discriminate. That puts the federal government into the business of enforcing civil rights.

But we've just begun. The concept of affirmative action came up under the Nixon administration. We've had twelve years of enforcing it, and along comes the Reagan administration saying we've had enough. If we don't watch it, we are going to go back and repeat what happened when we abandoned hope in the last half of the nineteenth century.
An evaluation of my experience as a Fellow of the Institute of Politics entails, of course, an attempt to reduce to words a uniquely fascinating and interesting period that even as it has ended seems only to have begun. Because it was such an enjoyable time, I find that I succumbed to the beguiling delusion that it would never end. Now, more than a month after the semester has come to a close, I sit here on a Mississippi afternoon looking past the flats of the Pearl River and imagining that it is really the Charles and that those long-leaf pine trees that I see on the horizon are the towers of Boston.

I should have been more mindful at the beginning that four months is really a very short time, especially when there are so many things that an IOP Fellow has an opportunity to do. Actually Elise, as she always has been, was better prepared to take notice of everything than I was. For instance, I attended several selected classes, but she maintained a regular schedule of class attendance and seldom missed any of the three courses that she had selected at the beginning of the semester.

In any event, for both of us it was precisely what we needed to help us recover our equilibrium. It was a refreshing interlude away from the political wars that for over thirty years had both satisfied and ravaged my soul. The emotional restoration has been accomplished, but in addition to that we have had a unique opportunity to reflect on where we have been and where we want to go. That process is particularly important for some of us who were at a critical decision point in our lives, when because of the vagaries and uncertainties of politics we were confronted with changes and choices that were difficult to make.

As a former governor, I found the IOP experience particularly helpful. As a matter of fact, I wish that it were possible for every ex-governor to have access to a program of this kind. I cannot overemphasize the drastic physical and emotional adjustment that is involved in moving from the governor's office to the status of private citizen. Literally at the stroke of the clock one goes from a position marked by all kinds of perquisites and deferential amenities to being just another person looking for a place to park. A sabbatical like this for all outgoing governors would do much to provide a more comfortable and satisfying transition for them.

As for the program itself, I regard the personal relationship with the other fel-
I cannot say enough about the support given us by the staff. For Elise and me to come in the middle of the winter, speaking a strange language, getting lost every time we ventured away from Harvard Square, making certain that our little dog, Toby, did not violate the health and safety ordinances of the City of Cambridge, and generally posing naive and even outlandish inquiries was more than a responsible staff should have to endure. But we were forever the beneficiaries of their tolerance and patience. As for the students, they served to refute for all time the perception which I once had that most Harvard students were arrogant and snobbish. The ones with whom I was associated went out of their way to be helpful and supportive. I only wish that I had made it a point to spend more time with them.

My closest student relationship developed for the most part out of the study group. Since I used the subject “The South and the Nation” as the focus for my group, I found most of the participants to be Southerners. Several had had fairly extensive political experience themselves. One, a former Mississippian, was a member of the Massachusetts legislature. Others aspired to political careers. I regarded the conduct of the study group to be the most important responsibility I had. I wanted it to reflect as accurately as possible the realities and changes which I had experienced in a life of Southern politics. My guests included Elise and some of my young political associates from Mississippi who were disparagingly referred to by some of my old adversaries as the “Boys of Spring.” Elise talked about Southern writers whom we had known—Faulkner, Welty, Percy, Styron and others. The Boys of Spring talked about the new breed of Southern politician. With Harvard and M.I.T. academic backgrounds, they had also won their political spurs. They included the elected state auditor and the elected state treasurer of Mississippi. All were in their thirties.

I cannot conclude these observations without a special word about the dinners, luncheons and forums. Because the guests were in almost every instance persons with rare and even unique insights into subjects of wide-ranging interest, I found these gatherings to be particularly informative and stimulating. One does not get to sit down to lunch or dinner every day for an informal chat with a Shirley Williams, a Robert Coles, a Harvey Cox, or a Robert Reich, to mention only a few.

My “spare time” was given to several diverse activities. Much of it, especially during the cold snowy days of February and March, was devoted to writing the beginning of what I hope will eventually turn into a book about Southern politics. With the spring thaw and a better understanding of the New England transportation system, I ventured off to speak, usually about the South and/or the Democratic Party, to fellow Democrats in Portland, Maine and South Boston, to students in Waltham and Bridgewater, to public forums at the Kennedy Library and Boston University.
All the time we were savoring the Boston Symphony, the Pops, a Leontyne Price concert, a Harvard-Princeton hockey brawl, the Red Sox, and the ultimate enjoyment—the week-end on Cape Cod.

And now that it is over, I reflect on what it is that I have brought home that I can keep. I believe that I can partly define it. It is a more vital understanding of and commitment to our common humanity that reduces geographical distances and removes ethnic and cultural biases. It is, for example, Symphony Hall in Boston on a February Sunday afternoon, where Leontyne Price, a black preacher’s daughter from Laurel in the Mississippi Piney woods, takes six curtain calls. It is a spring evening at Fenway, where Oil Can Boyd from Meridian, a few miles up the road from Laurel, has the Irish fans of South Boston cheering his strike-outs of those Yankee invaders from New York. It is a gathering of students at Adams House where sophomore Michael Minor of Coldwater, thirty miles south of Memphis, who would not have been admitted to Ole Miss a few years ago because he is black, says that he is going to get his Harvard degree in math and come home to Mississippi. It is Brattle Street, around the corner from where Elise and I lived, where Longfellow, the first truly national poet, extolled the breadth of our heritage, as he wrote not only of Miles Standish in New England, but of Evangeline in the brooding bayou country of South Louisiana and Hiawatha in the land of the Big-Sea-Water. It is Lowell and Emerson and Holmes and Thoreau, but it is also Tip O’Neill and Mike Dukakis and the two Kings, Mel and Ed. It is what American politics and education must continue to be about in our never-ending task of making life reasonable and rewarding for everyone in this fantastically rich and diverse land. It has been all of this and more for Elise and me, and we are grateful. We thank you all, you all.

*****
Does the Anti-War Movement Work?

by Scott Moore

Scott Moore ’83/’85, received a Research Grant from the Institute of Politics for a summer 1984 research project, “A Photographic Documentary of the Anti-War Movement in the U.S. and Europe.” He photographed protests and demonstrations, war memorials and defense institutions and interviewed movement activists and representatives from corporations and institutions involved in armaments production and defense-related activities. The following is a portion of his project report.

Most of us understand the implications of the nuclear threat yet remain passive and unable to respond to it politically or otherwise in a manner aimed at lessening or eliminating the threat. The problem just seems too vast, too entrenched to be effectively approached. We are encouraged to “leave it to the experts” to avoid nuclear holocaust, or as with President Reagan’s “Star Wars” plan, to pray for technological deliverance from our current dilemma. Neither of these alternatives inspires much confidence. “Experts” got us into Vietnam and Lebanon with disastrous consequences and they haven’t yet, in thirty-five years of effort, been able to negotiate an effective treaty with the Soviet Union or come up with a nuclear strategy more sophisticated than “Mutual Assured Destruction” (MAD). Modern technology has made possible the obliteration of civilization, and we are more and more inclined as we lose confidence in our own capabilities to turn to technology to save us from itself, yet there is no logical reason to believe that a breakthrough which eliminates the threat of nuclear war would not threaten us with a fate even more sinister than that one.

The anti-nuclear movement or “peace movement” in this country and in Europe grows out of a dissatisfaction with the explanations of experts and bureaucrats and is an expression of alienation from the forces—governments, corporations, and nuclear armaments—which make the individual seem insignificant and the pursuit of daily life trivial. Peace demonstrations serve as outlets for the venting of such alienation and provide a method to symbolically distance oneself from the perceived causes of that alienation. When protesters march to the gates of a plant that produces warheads or guidance systems for ICBMs they are saying, in effect: “I do not accept the need for these weapons, and I do not like what they imply about the value of life today.” As such, protest is an emotional response to the unacceptable conditions which elicited it. This is an important point and one which many observers of protests and demonstrations as well as demonstrators themselves miss. It is commonly assumed that anti-nuclear marches, rallies, and so forth are political actions whose aim is to change the political climate. In one sense they are, but in another sense their impact is blunted and dissipated in the very emotions they expend. Protests become media events and spectacles in their own right and take on a reality which is often unrelated to the issues being raised. Street theatre, music, parade-
like marches, die-ins, and civil disobedience all contribute to a carnival mood that often exists at organized protests. An entire sub-culture has grown up around such events which is accessible to the demonstrators themselves but which to outside observers can appear silly, or nonsensical.

Protests, marches, and rallies are claimed by members of the movement to be inspirational for those involved and "consciousness raising" for those observing, presumably the general public whose opinion must be influenced if any effective political change is to be effected. Yet, one cannot help but wonder whether the actual effect is draining to those involved and somewhat bewildering to the general public. The peace movement attempts to influence the political will of the populace to take action and change the conditions which prompted the protest in the first place. Yet, the most visible tactics of the movement have little result because they remain in the realm of theatrics and present no clear political alternative to the present problems.

The failure of the current tactics of protest make a strong case for looking to different approaches. Clearly, mass protest has a place within the political sphere, but if we expect to make meaningful changes in the structures which provide the impetus to protest, we must look for practical ways of changing those structures. If we are alienated by the lessening of local control in decision-making, we must seek to reassert our rights politically by motivating others to that cause. If we reject the absurdity of nuclear weapons, then we must seek ways to make their use less likely or impossible. In any event, political success depends on our ability to identify the wrongs in our world and on our commitment to setting those wrongs right. The political reality will not be changed by the outpouring of emotional energy which may serve to mollify us temporarily by distancing ourselves from the perceived evil, but which in the end will serve to change nothing. The first step to taking political action is the recognition of wrong within the political arena. In the case of nuclear weapons, the wrong is profound and inescapable. The next step is identifying practical means of effecting change. It is here, in the peace movement's infatuation with flashy, emotional protests, that it goes awry. Many who are in the movement shy away from traditional methods of political action because they associate them with "the system" which they seek to oppose. But that approach is irrational if it means the abandonment of the ultimate goal of lessening or eliminating the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. If the resources that are expended in confrontations with the police, manufacturers of weapons systems, and other such activities could be turned toward involving greater numbers of people in the movement and toward devising strategies which will do more than soothe one's conscience, then it might have a chance to succeed. The final step in effecting political change is committing the resources necessary to get the job done. Right now, the core of people who attend rallies and protests is far too small to be an effective force for change. Unless the movement can find a way to broaden its appeal, it will remain a social and political subculture of disaffection. The problem faced now by the peace movement goes beyond the question of style, it is less important how change is brought about, than it is that change is brought about at all.
Whenever Duty Calls, Listen!

by Thomas James McGuire

Thomas James McGuire, a member of the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics, delivered the Latin Salutatory Dissertation at the 1985 Harvard Commencement on June 6th. Following is his Latin oration and the English translation.

Salvete omnes! Vos primum saluto, o praesides clarissimi cum Harvardianae tum Radclifensis, qui huius universitatis gubernandae opere perquam difficili fungimini. Vos quoque salvere iubeo, o socii inspectoresque nec non te, o Dux Dukakis, qui "petis placidam sub libertate quietem" non tam ense quam viarum impedimentis. Salvete, o professores et praeceptores, quibus pro tot tantisque beneficis gratias quam maximas debemus. o liberalissimi alumni sine quibus nulli libri nulla aedificia et (horrible dictu!) nulli ludi essent, vos grato animo saluto. Et vos, o parentes carissimi, quorum amor cura atque opes nobis maximo auxilio erant, omnes salvere iubemus. Denique vos, o condiscipuli, quibuscum cenavi potavi certavi atque egis non paucas "totas noctes," quos postremum salutare mihi gravissimo dolori est.

o amici, per hosce quattuor annos diversi alii in loco studuimus: quidam sdenitiam in libris Bibliothecae Widenerianae quaesiverunt, alii sapientiam in auditoriis aedis Severi, Emersonis vel (di melius!) Vansergis ("Ubi?" rogatis; ego ipse non certus, sed puto alicubi ultra Officinas Biologicas); porro alii societatem et veritatem in vino Picadillii Fillii; deinde alii negotium quaestuosum in OCS/OCL, ubi multi quaerunt sed pauci inueniunt.

Usque adhuc studia nostra intra moenia huius universitatis plerumque exercimus. Quae nunc moenia nobis intrantibus in mundum qui dicitur verum rumpenda sunt, non ferro et igni, ut volunt isti iuvenes inconsuiti, qui se nomine Spartaci consociaverunt, sed ratione et prudentia.

Solon, artifex legum apud Graecos sapientissimus, quondam dixit:

\[\alpha\rho\chi\varepsilon \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon \alpha\rho\chi\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\nu\]

vel ut, Graecum ignorantibus subveniens, nostro sermone utar:

"si vis regere, prius parere disce."

Usque adhuc parentibus maioribus doctoribus iisque qui in re publica versatur plerumque paruimus. Ex hoc die beatissimo autem ducere potius quam sequi nobis necesse est. Non dubium est quin possimus nostras res gerere et ducere: excellimus quidem quisque in arte sua ut multi in musica apud Domum Dunsterianam vel multi in pictura apud domum quae Adams dicitur vel plerique in ludendo bibendoque apud domos Eliotensem et Kirklandensem vel omnino in ambulando sicut omnes qui in Quadrangulo habitant. Universi vero praesentes hodie arguimini magnum ingenium et animum et consilium habere.
Quae omnia profecto vestris umeris gravissimum officium imponunt, quod vos praepone rectum honestum utilitatem communem emolumento commodoque privato iubet. Nam Deus una cum ingenio concesso tanta necessitatem serviendi humano generi tantumque amorem ad communem salutem defendendam ingenuit ut blandimentis voluptatis otique nobis numquam oboediendum sit.

Fortasse quaeritis quomodo hoc officio fungi debeamus? Nempe in beneficiis faciendis patriae, familiae, amicis, pauperibus, aegris, ignorantibus. (Considerate, quaeso, meos parentes octies beatos liberos—Quod officium! Qui amor! Quae pietas Catholica!) Itaque id officium quod in vestrum ingenium cadit implendum est—quanto maius ingenium, tanto maius officium. Quod ad vos attinet, id de quo dicimus non quidem mediocre officium, nam non mediocris populus estis.

Vero stultissime consumere vestrum ingenium pro solo emolumento privato est, ut ait lex, "indignum Harvardiano discipulo," quod profecto in recto usu sui totum positum est. Ergo, postremum hoc iubeo, o condiscipuli, o amici, o omnes: quandocumque officium vocat, audite!

*****

All hail! First I bid you welcome, most distinguished presidents of Harvard and Radcliffe, who in governing this university carry out a most difficult task. You too, Fellows and Overseers, I bid welcome, nor do I forget you, Governor Dukakis, who have "sought peace under liberty" not so much by the sword as by roadblocks. Welcome, professors and tutors: to you we owe a great deal for your unselfish services. O most generous alumni, without whom there would be no books, no buildings and (dare I say it?) no athletics, you I thankfully salute. And you, dearest parents, whose love, concern and financial resources have been of the greatest help to us, we all bid you welcome. Finally, you, my fellow classmates, with whom I have dined, drunk, struggled and spent not a few "all nighters," it causes me the heaviest sorrow to salute you for the last time.

Friends, throughout these past four years we have all pursued different things in different places. Some have sought knowledge in the books of Widener Library, others wisdom in the lecture halls of Sever, Emerson, or even (God forbid!) Vanserg ("Where?" you ask: I'm not sure myself, but I think it's somewhere behind the Biological Laboratories); still others sought companionship and truth in the wine of the Picadilly Filly; finally, others sought gainful employment at OCS/OCL, where many seek, yet few find.

Up to now we have, more or less, conducted our pursuits within the walls of this university. Now, upon entering the "real" world, we must break those walls down, not with sword and fire as the rash, youthful followers of Spartacus would like to, but with reason and prudence, as knowing adults. Solon, the wisest lawgiver among the Greeks, once said:

"he who is to lead must learn to follow first!"
or, for the benefit of those who don’t know Greek, in our native tongue:

“si vis regere, prius parere disce.”

Up to now, we, for the most part, have followed—our parents, elders, teachers, and public officials. From this most blest day on, however, we must lead more and follow less.

There is no doubt that we can manage our own affairs and lead. Indeed, each of us excells in some art—whether it be in music, as many do who live at Dunster House, or in painting, as many do at Adams, or in athletics and drinking, as very many do at Eliot and Kirkland, or in walking, as all have to who live at the Quad. Indeed, your presence here today proves that you all have tremendous talent, spirit and judgment.

All of which places on your shoulders an enormous duty that bids you to put right, honesty and common utility before personal profit and convenience. For along with the talent he has granted you, God has implanted in you so great a necessity of serving humanity and so great a desire of defending the common safety that you must never be slaves to the allurements of pleasure and ease.

Perhaps you are wondering just how we are to fulfill this duty? Our duty must consist in performing services to one’s country, family and friends, to the poor, the sick and the ignorant. (Consider, if you will, my own parents—eight times blessed with children. What duty! What love! What Catholic piety!) Thus, we are morally obligated to fulfill that duty which falls within the range of our talent—the greater the talent, the greater the duty. In your case then, the duty of which I speak is no common duty, for you are no common people.

Indeed, to waste foolishly your talent on personal gain alone is, as the good book says, “unbecoming of a Harvard student,” for the existence of talent depends entirely upon its proper use. Therefore, I bid you this one last time, fellow classmates, friends, and all: Whenever duty calls, listen!

*****
E Pluribus Duo?

by Richard Kahlenberg

The following is an edited version of an article which appeared in the spring 1984 Harvard Political Review. It received honorable mention in the opinion/commentary category of the Student Advisory Committee's first annual Political Journalism Awards in January 1985.

The call for monolingualism may be less xenophobic and racist than it appears. This debate is not given to an easy liberal/conservative split. It raises important and difficult questions reaching far beyond the issue of language: to what degree do we value diversity? To what degree do we require loyalty? Should we encourage "cultural pluralism," or assimilation into a "melting pot"? Should we encourage people to act as individuals, or as members of ethnic groups? For liberals, bilingualism forces a vexing decision: should society encourage minorities to preserve their ethnic heritage even at the risk of accentuating the differences between groups, and dashing the dream for a brotherhood of man?

Though difficult, the bilingual question must be immediately addressed. In 1980, the Census Bureau put the number of persons in the United States over the age of four who do not regularly speak English at home at 23 million; the total number of non-English-speaking persons will be nearly 39.5 million by the year 2000. The Hispanic population, which makes up 75% of the students in bilingual education, has grown to 20 million, giving the United States the fourth largest Spanish-speaking population in the world. In fact, Hispanics now account for 30% of the pupils in New York City and Denver, and 50% of the Los Angeles school population. With a population growth rate six times the national average, Hispanics should soon overtake blacks as the nation's largest minority group; by 1990, their population may reach 40 million.

The movement towards bilingualism—in the classroom and the voting booth—gained momentum as the Hispanic population growth rate exploded in the 1970s. The federal commitment to bilingual education multiplied from $7.5 million in 1968 to $139 million today. In 1974, the movement gained judicial sanction as the Supreme Court called for schools to "take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency" of linguistic minorities to ensure equal educational opportunity. Later, HEW guidelines resulted in "maintenance" bilingualism, where students retain their native language, and in some cases, neglect the transition to English. The multilingual ballot, used in areas with large populations of linguistic minorities like New York, Florida, and much of the Southwest, was born with a Congressional amendment to the Voting Rights Act in 1975. Former California Senator S.I. Hayakawa's Constitutional Amendment aims both to restore the transitional emphasis of special language instruction and to eliminate the multilingual ballot.
Multilingualism need not tear a society apart. Dennis Hernandez, attorney for the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund points to well-functioning multilingual societies in Europe, like Switzerland, which has four national languages.

Opponents of bilingualism and the bilingual ballot in particular, emphasize the obligations of citizenship as well as the rights. Knowledge of English "isn’t much to ask," Executive Director of US English Gerda Bikales says, "as a price of full political participation." Past immigrants have gladly, if painfully, learned the language without any special help, she points out; it is ridiculous for immigrant groups coming to a new country to expect general public funds to be spent on special voting ballots and teachers. No special ballots exist for the estimated 23 million illiterates in the country, critics point out. Moreover, Bikales questions whether a real demand exists for bilingual ballots, pointing out that "only 1,000 Spanish ballots were used in the entire city of San Francisco" in a recent election.

Hernandez says bilingualism is not separatist and "need not create divisions." But Harvard sociologist Nathan Glazer disagrees. Glazer suspects that the underlying pressure for bilingualism in America is political; "it has a touch of nationalism," which is "antagonistic to the United States." In fact, any call for ethnic identification may have an element of separatism and hostility. As Harvard’s Daniel Bell notes, "social groups need some other group to hate." In its extreme form, ethnicity means Malcolm X, who for some time defined the white man as the devil, or the Berkeley public school system, which, for a while, segregated students into five separate high schools based on ethnic background. The Hispanic call for bilingualism is less strident in its separatism; nonetheless, bilingualism may entrench a permanent race-consciousness. Unlike affirmative action, which uses racial groups as a temporary means of bringing individuals into the mainstream, bilingualism aims at maintaining ethnic group identity, never getting beyond race-consciousness.

Minorities respond that ethnic separatism is forced on them by the white majority. If a black or Hispanic student sits only with other blacks or Hispanics in the college dining hall, he may do so for a very rational reason: the "black table" may be the one where he will be best received and most supported. Ethnic identification "becomes a rational interest," Nathan Glazer argues, if one is likely to receive support when turning to one's ethnic group: "The natural connection is a connection you can count on."

The melting pot is said to meld together diverse cultures—taking the best from each—and producing a new non-racial, idea-based culture, superior to any one of its parts. Assimilation is not supposed to mean that ethnic customs and ideas drown in the melting pot; Richard Rodriguez, an outspoken Hispanic critic of bilingualism, writes that assimilation "is reciprocal. As the immigrant is changed . . . the immigrant as surely changes the culture he enters." Culture does not survive by endogamy alone; cultures can grow and flourish when individuals are persuaded that to keep certain elements of a culture alive is worthwhile. Now, as never before, ethnicity can be divorced from ethics, "protective" race-consciousness may be unnecessary, and the melting pot has a chance to cook. The longtime liberal Democratic
dream of building what is now called a "Rainbow Coalition" of disadvantaged citizens, which rises above racial and ethnic differences, may be finally within reach.

Yet some fear that our nation is becoming increasingly segregated. Hispanics, who once wanted people treated as individuals, now value ethnic group pride above all else; race was to be irrelevant, now race is crucial. Black is beautiful, as is Spanish; segregation was bad, now it is necessary for group survival. The new race-consciousness, while certainly less noxious than the old white racism, still identifies people for what they are rather than what they do or believe—a most menacing notion; it’s what the founding fathers rebelled against when they eschewed aristocracy, what abolitionists fought against when they saw human slavery, and what Hitler thrived on when he embarked on the Final Solution.

Furthermore, in the United States, Gerda Bikales says, the common English language is "perhaps the only thing that holds us together." In the US, Bikales proudly notes, "we don’t take to the streets," but settle disputes with words—thus "it is essential to have a common language."

The movement against the multilingual ballot, then, is not simply another bigoted attempt to block minority participation, like the literacy test or poll tax. For policymakers aren’t "neutral" when they provide bilingual ballots or bilingual instruction in schools: both encourage ethnic identification and discourage assimilation. In debating the bilingual question, we must decide, once and for all, whether we consider racial and ethnic identification valuable, to be encouraged, or truly irrelevant.

*****
Reflections on the Media

Politics and the Press:
The Center Ring

by Frank Stanton

When Harvard established its new Center for Press, Politics and Public Policy, it did once again what this institution so often does so well: it focused attention on one of the key arenas of our public life. It’s an arena in which all of you, to a greater or lesser extent, are going to find yourselves players. That point at which press and politics interact, and where together they act upon public policy, could fairly be called today the central arena of American public life. If the political life of the nation is a three-ring circus, this is the center ring. It’s where ideas, information, and action all come together.

And it’s one in which I’ve been, and in which I’ve collected a few bumps and bruises. And it’s one in which all of you, in one way or another, will spend at least a part of your own time in the years ahead. Because the plain fact of the matter is that in our democratic system, what ultimately determines public policy is public opinion and public reaction. In the real world, it’s through the press, print and broadcast, that people get much of the information and ideas on which they base that opinion.

For many years now, this field on which press and politics meet has been a very troubled arena. Ask a political leader, and he’s likely to tell you that the press have arrogated to themselves the setting of the national agenda. He’s also likely to complain bitterly about the way he and his policies are portrayed, and about the way press accounts shape national impressions of events and set the limits of the politically possible. Ask an editor, and he’s likely to tell you that politicians can’t be trusted, that their goal is to manipulate the press by concealing or distorting information so as to make themselves look good and their opponents look bad. Dean Acheson, who was not often given to oversimplification, did oversimplify a little when he said it was the public official’s job to conceal and the press’s job to reveal.

But let’s look at it another way. Let’s accept the fact that the two will always enter this arena from different sides, with different perspectives and different priorities.
But let's also look at what the two share in common.

Their first and most important common interest is simply in making the public policy process work for the good of all. The stakes in the world today are enormous. And the two are like a couple waltzing together on a steel girder 40 stories above the ground. Whatever their differences, neither really wants the other to make that big misstep. And they both have a better chance of finishing the dance if each spends less time arguing and more time listening to the music.

Another important thing the two share is their dependence on information, reliable information, complete information, and the dependable dissemination of information. Each has often accused the other of being unreliable. Often these accusations, on both sides, have had merit. If each concentrated more on improving the reliability of its own information, each could spend more time rationally examining the merits of the issue instead of arguing about who said, and did, what to whom.

And a third important thing that most people on both sides share is a genuine desire to promote greater public understanding of the difficult and often complex choices that face us as a nation.

One of the most eloquent sons of Harvard, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, once argued that the need today is not for great simplifiers, but rather for great complexifiers: for leaders who would help us understand the often elusive nuances that so often are the key to sound public policy. This was a profound insight, and it applies both to politics and to the press.

We sometimes refer to a fence that separates press and politics. We should open a few more gates in that fence, through which each would seek a greater knowledge and understanding of what the other does, and what are the problems and constraints the other faces. Impatience is the enemy of understanding. Each has often been impatient with the other. More patience, more mutual understanding, would lead each other to view the other less in terms of cartoon caricature and bumper-sticker slogans. It would enable both to serve better the cause of public understanding.

For this is the business that we all are in, the business of helping the public reach an informed understanding of those often difficult choices that confront us as a nation. Few serious public choices are between clearly evident right and wrong. Most are choices among imperfect alternatives, each of which is imperfect in a different set of ways.

One of Harvard's greatest strengths is the wisdom and balance with which so many of its people, faculty and students alike, sort through subtle nuances, weigh conflicting values, seek new routes of intellectual discovery that can take us safely between the Scylla and Charybdis of all-or-nothing advocacy. What applies to the process of accommodating conflicting values in resolving particular issues can also apply to the accommodation of conflicting values in the process of exploring and debating those issues.

If we can ask Arabs and Israelis to talk with one another in the Middle East, press and politicians can talk with one another in the United States. By doing so with greater
sympathy and mutual respect, and with a heightened effort at mutual understanding, press, politics, and the process of public policy all will benefit. And so, too, will the public, the nation, and the cause of truth and reason.

*****

A 'Sea Change' in Press-Government Relations
by Martin Linsky

Martin Linsky, assistant director of the Institute of Politics, was project director of a three-year study funded by the Charles H. Revson Foundation, 'How the Press Affects Federal Policy Making.' The following is excerpted from his book, to be published in the fall of 1985, presenting the findings and conclusions of the study.

There has been a considerable evolution in the relationship between officials and reporters. Nearly all the journalists and federal officials with whom we spoke at length, whose involvement stretches back to the 1960s, shared that view, although they did not necessarily agree on the nature of the change and the reasons for it. The most compelling evidence, however, comes not from the specific answers to the question about change, but from a broader sense of the differences which are evident in the recollections of those whose service was primarily in the '60s or earlier, versus those whose major public responsibilities came afterwards. Talking with Robert Ball, Dean Rusk, John Gardner, Wilbur Cohen, or Richard Bolling about the role of the press simply elicits a very different picture than talking with Henry Kissinger, Elliot Richardson, Pete Peterson, or Zbigniew Brzezinski.
The contrast between Wilbur Cohen and Joe Califano, two cabinet members responsible for human services who served in different eras, reinforces this view. Cohen emphasizes his "rather close relationships" with a number of reporters; he attributes this to the fact that he had been around Washington and in the government for a long time before he came into a visible policymaking role but his characterizations of those friendships is still very different from the way his successors, including Richardson as well as Califano, talked about them. Cohen noted that there were only four or five reporters assigned to HEW on a regular basis. He felt himself to be very accessible to them. He could not remember a single instance of initiating a story with the press or of the press pressing him for information he had but did not want to give them. On leaks, he said that when he was called by a reporter with information that had probably been leaked from HEW, he would offer to check it out but presumed it was accurate. He talked about his own mistakes at not having completely thought through public relations strategies, but the mistakes caused him personal embarrassment more than any policy problem. His general idea, he said, "was not to use the press as part of legislative strategy."

Not so for Califano. He characterized the press that he had to deal with in HEW, as distinguished from the press during his first tour in the White House, as "aggressive." And he was equally aggressive in using the media to sell his policies, whether it was anti-smoking to the general public, or hospital cost containment to the Congress. He did not dwell on the personal friendships he has with members of the press as elements of his professional relationship with them. He was a policymaker with a conscious deliberate strategy for dealing with an important and difficult force that was both hard to control and able to be used. Richardson also took a much more hard-nosed view. He did not establish or try to rely on personal relationships with reporters. It was strictly business: "I dealt with the press on the assumption that they also had a job to do, and where I could help I did. But I tried to deal with them on the basis of the understanding that I know that you know that I know what you are doing and you know what I am doing."

Schlesinger spoke about the evolution in a way that characterized much of what others had to say as well: "Relations between the press and government have changed. We have an early period which ended with the Vietnam War in which basically the press took government handouts and reprinted them. I can well recall . . . watching Sherman Adams . . . guide the press during the Little Rock crisis. What he told The New York Times faithfully appeared the next day . . . That period ended sometime at the beginning of the Vietnam War, when the press became skeptical, not cynical but skeptical. For a period there of three to five years, it was inclined to take what the government handed out and sprinkle it with salt as it were, and not try to demonstrate that the government was wrong but on the other hand not accept its handouts . . . Then we had another period, which started basically with Watergate and ended only about 1980, in which the press took great delight in demonstrating that the government was wrong."
Schlesinger adds the insight that the relations between the press and government depend to a considerable degree upon the mood of society in general, lending credence to the notion that the Vietnam/Watergate era was one which coincided with a transition in that relationship. Schlesinger believes that the pendulum has started to swing back toward the sceptical from the cynical mode. Note that Schlesinger, like Califano and others, describes the relationship of reporters and officials in terms of the attitude of the press toward policymakers. That seems to be the variable that is most obvious, and to a considerable degree it is the variable that the journalists identify as well. Distinguished reporters with long-time Washington experience are even stronger on this point. For them, the Watergate/Vietnam period represented what Al Hunt called a “sea change” measured by him along the same lines as Schlesinger used, from healthy skepticism to unhealthy cynicism on the part of the press.

Jack Nelson pointed out that this breakdown in trust had two parallel but very different consequences for the conduct of officials. In some instances, “a lot of people within government became leery of the press. On the other hand, there were other people in government who maybe counterbalanced that, who saw [from Vietnam and Watergate] that the press could do a really good job of getting information out that those other people thought ought to get out.” The argument then is that the performance of government in Vietnam and Watergate contributed toward a cynicism on the part of the press which manifested itself in the attitude and actions of reporters toward government, and in turn had consequences for the way public officials conducted their business. The more cynical the reporters, the more wary and secretive the policymakers. This is also the same period of time when television emerged as a powerful instrument of news and public affairs. The inherent intensity of television reporting added momentum in the same direction, putting pressure on officials which they resisted and resented.

*****
The Washington Press Corp
by Hendrik Hertzberg

There was a time, not so long ago, when a reporter was an ill-paid, ink-stained, faintly disreputable character who took a perverse pride in wearing a snap-brim hat at his desk. Equipped with a pack of unfiltered cigarettes, a notebook and a battered portable typewriter, he could be dispatched anywhere—a fire, a war, an inauguration—with a reasonable certainty that he would get, write and file the story and be done with it. There was little danger of his being seized with an urge to be deep; and if he did get such an urge, he would write a novel, not a think piece. He knew that his social status and that of his fellows was close to that of jugglers, bail bondsmen and prostitutes. Furthermore, he liked it that way.

Such reporters may still be found, but in Washington the breed has developed along somewhat different lines. The Washington reporter, like the Washington lawyer (or the Washington hairdresser), is a smooth and practiced dealer in power. He or she is the beneficiary of the steady glamorization of Washington journalism, which began when young Walter Lippmann got off the train from New York after World War I, continued through Drew Pearson and Arthur Krock in the forties, got a gigantic boost from Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein in the seventies. The Washington press corps has now reached a comfortable, apparently permanent plateau of well-paid self-satisfaction. The revolving career door, once reserved for lawyers and academics, now makes room for the scribe; there is a brisk traffic back and forth between government offices and the carpeted suites of the Washington news organizations, where the naked bulb and the clattering teletype have given way to indirect lighting, glowing computer terminals and the purr of pushbutton phones. (When the White House switched parties, The New York Times national security correspondent Richard Burt and State Department policy planning chief Leslie Gelb switched jobs. Where Burt covered Gelb, now Gelb covers Burt.) The Washington journalist of today is often a bigger celebrity than the senator or Cabinet member he or she is interviewing. Elizabeth Dole is moderately well known, but she’s no Elizabeth Drew. As a senator, Dan Quayle is a member of the world’s most exclusive club, but Dan Rather’s club is actually more exclusive: the only other members are Tom Brokaw and Peter Jennings. George Shultz swings a lot of weight, but so does George Will.

Fame and influence, of course, are not the same thing, and neither of them necessarily has any relationship to merit. In the highly personal, thoroughly biased and
intermittently rude survey of the people and institutions of the Washington press corps that follows, influence counts for more than fame, and merit is purely coincidental.

THE PAPERS

*The New York Times*

*The New York Times* is the most important newspaper in the world, and therefore the most important newspaper circulated in Washington, for one overriding reason: *The New York Times* defines reality. Other newspapers may "break" stories, but only *The Times* has the ontological clout to define, for now and for all time, what is and is not news. *The New York Times* has gone to a good deal of trouble to find a large number of dependable, intelligent and unimaginative men and women. It has indoctrinated them into *The New York Times* way of thinking, a mental and spiritual discipline as demanding as the rule of any priesthood or monastic order. Finally, it has set the most adept among them to work every day creating one of the greatest expressions of Western civilization; the front page of *The New York Times*. The front page of *The New York Times* is a brilliantly accurate measuring device that establishes the exact importance, both absolute and relative, of the various events of the day. No other newspaper is capable of performing this service. Without the guidance provided by the front page of *The Times*, with its exquisite calibration of the placement and size of stories and headlines, the rest of the media would have no way of knowing what in the world was going on.

The individuals at *The Times* have nowhere near the importance of the paper itself. They are cogs in a machine—finely tooled cogs, beautifully polished cogs, but cogs. They are valued not for any individual qualities but for how well they embody *The New York Times* way of thinking.

The Washington bureau of *The Times*, which enjoys a certain degree of independence from the home office, is bigger than the entire editorial staff of most metropolitan newspapers. The bureau chief, Bill Kovach, is a southerner, as, traditionally, many top *Times* men have been. Kovach, whose parents were Albanian immigrants, is known for flinty integrity. His deputy, Howell Raines, is also a son of the South who won his spurs covering the civil rights movement. The top political reporter, Hedrick Smith, is known around town as "Bigfoot" because of his habit of stomping into other reporters' territory. The former star White House correspondent, Steven R. Weisman, was reassigned to New Delhi.

*The Times* traditionally permits one Washington reporter to "write"—that is, to produce prose that has a certain flair, that doesn't have the interchangeable-with-any-other-piece-in-the-paper sound to it. The Washington bureau's "writer" at the moment is Francis X. Clines, and a very good writer he is, too. (The foreign staff also has a "writer," Alan Cowell, a correspondent in Africa.) Clines is the brightest light of *The Times*, "Washington Talk" page, which was introduced four years ago.
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and which has given The Times a new significance in Washington as an outlet for ego-boosting personality profiles and gossip of a refined, well-mannered sort.

The Washington Post

The Washington Post dominates Washington journalism the way the government dominates Washington industry. It is a great newspaper, and it has helped make Washington a great city. Though The Washington Post lacks the selfless discipline that gives The New York Times its superior authority, The Post offers infinitely more scope for individual voices. The Times is a more influential paper, but Post people are more influential people.

Ben Bradlee, the swashbuckling, dashing executive editor, sets the tone; he has more animal magnetism than Jason Robards, the actor who played him in All the President's Men. Sally Quinn, his princess consort, exerts occult-like powers. Donald Graham, The Post's publisher, is a talented editor in his own right. He will name Mr. Bradlee's successor, and there are those who wish he would name himself. Failing that, speculation centers around Len Downey, the new managing editor; Bob Kaiser, the new national editor (also a brilliant writer and political analyst); and Jim Hoagland, the foreign editor. Meg Greenfield runs a quirky, wisecracking editorial page that's hard to classify ideologically, though ''neo-conservatism with a human face'' comes close. The key political writers include David Broder, who is No. 1; Dan Balz, a Broder-in-training; Lou Cannon, who will have to be sealed up in Reagan's tomb; and Sidney Blumenthal, whose unorthodox reporting about the role of ideas in politics is the sort of thing that makes The Post more amusing to read than The Times. Eleanor Randolph covers the media beat. Tom Shales, nominally the television critic, writes some of the most incisive political commentary in the paper.

The Washington Times

Washington has a second daily newspaper that is almost unknown to the outside world. Its jaunty red coin boxes may be found on any corner, it has a beautiful modern plant out New York Avenue and it has reporters and editors just like a real newspaper. However, it is not a real newspaper. It is a vanity press venture of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon, the Korean messiah currently serving time on a tax rap, who, for unknown reasons, has pumped tens of millions of mysteriously acquired dollars down publishing ratholes in New York, Tokyo and Washington. The Washington Times is his Washington rathole.

The Washington Times, usually known as The Moonie Times (when Washingtonians say simply ''The Times'' they mean The New York Times), has a small circulation (never audited, but thought to be well under 50,000) and almost no advertising. Still, the paper is not without importance. Its importance derives from the fact that it is read in the White House. President Reagan is said to prefer it to any other daily paper. The Washington Times has a better design than The Post and has a number of report-
ers and feature writers who are more than good enough to be on any paper. Most-
ly, though, *The Moonie Times* is an outlet for ultraconservative columns and for scare
stories about the Communist menace.

The current editor of *The Washington Times* is Arnaud de Borchegravre, whose
diminutive stature and purported title of Belgian nobility earned him the nickname
"The Short Count." Mr. De Borchegrave, a colorful, well-groomed ex-*Newsweek*
respondent with an extensive wardrobe of military uniforms from around the world,
is obsessed with the idea that the KGB controls the American press.

**ELECTRONICS**

*The Networks*

The average network Washington correspondent makes the same salary as the
average newspaper editor or reporter, except that the network salary has an extra
zero. Also, the TV person is almost always more famous. What the TV person is
not, is either (a) smarter or (b) more influential.

TV correspondents work very hard—that 45-second report on the evening news
probably takes Bob Blowdry and his crew 12 hours of backbreaking labor, much of
it extremely tedious—but the result, from the point of view of information, is no
different from a two-paragraph wire service story.

TV reporters tend to lack confidence in themselves as journalists. Often this lack
of confidence is very well grounded. As a rule, TV people are too timid, too afraid
of controversy, too ill-informed and too limited in terms of time on the air to be truly
influential. There are exceptions, of course.

The most respected television reporter in Washington, strangely enough, is ABC’s
Sam Donaldson. Many people think Donaldson is unorthodox, and there are many
stories that would tend to substantiate that theory. (At the White House, for exam-
ple when he is among a pack of reporters who have been herded behind a rope
to observe some ceremony or other, Mr. Donaldson sometimes delivers a sarcastic,
disrespectful "play by play" running commentary in a loud, cutting voice that is
plainly audible to guests or visiting dignitaries.) On the other hand, many of the
people who think Mr. Donaldson is eccentric also think he’s good. He has been just
as tough on Reagan as he was on Carter. Few correspondents, on or off TV, can
make that boast. Mr. Donaldson does not appear to be afraid of anybody.

Also at ABC, Ted Koppel has earned a reputation as the best interviewer on the
tube, while David Brinkley is television’s foremost sourpuss. At NBC, Ken Bode
is a crackerjack writer of his own nuts-and-bolts political pieces, Roger Mudd is a
tough interviewer and Barbara Cohen is a canny behind-the-scenes producer. At
CBS, Don Hewitt, producer of *60 Minutes*, has more clout than any of the talking
heads who front for him.

*****
II. Programs
Programs

CONTENTS

ADMINISTRATION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES
73 Administration and Staff
74 The Senior Advisory Committee
74 The Faculty Advisory Committee

THE STUDENT PROGRAM
75 The Student Advisory Committee
76 Student Study Groups
87 Summer Research Awards
87 Public Affairs Internships
92 Visiting Fellows
93 Harvard Political Review
96 Student Projects

THE FELLOWS PROGRAM
101 The Panel on Fellowships
101 Fellows' Alumni Advisory Committee
102 Institute Fellows

THE FACULTY STUDIES PROGRAM
105 Campaign Finance
106 Presidential Transition

PROFESSIONAL STUDY PROGRAMS
AND SPECIAL PROJECTS
108 Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress
110 Seminar for Massachusetts Mayors
113 1984 Presidential Campaign Decision-Makers Conference
114 Inside South Africa
THE PRESS-POLITICS CENTER

116 Press-Politics Center Advisory Committee
116 History and Rationale
117 How the Press Affects Federal Policy Making
119 New Communications Technology, Public Policy, and Democratic Values

121 THE FORUM
Administration and Advisory Committees

Administration and Staff

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

Ruth Ballinger, Media Services Coordinator, fall '84
Stephen Bates, Research Coordinator, Markle Project, summer '84
Carl Brauer, Research Fellow, fall '84
Elizabeth A. Coulter, Receptionist
Theresa Donovan, Fellows Program Coordinator
Sarah W. Farnsworth, Forum Coordinator
Miriam Ford, Forum Coordinator, fall '84
Sharon Keady, Forum Assistant
Anne Doyle Kenney, Internship Program Coordinator; Publications Coordinator
Stephen M. Kotran, Research Assistant, Markle Project, spring '85
Martin A. Linsky, Assistant Director and Project Director, Revson Project
William G. Mayer, Research Assistant
Mary F. McTigue, Assistant Director
Jocelyn Moore, Receptionist, summer '84
Wendy M. O'Donnell, Senior Research Assistant, Revson Project, fall '84;
Research Coordinator, Markle Project
Diane C. Pliner, Secretary to the Director
Andrew W. Robertson, Research Assistant, Presidential Transitions Project,
summer '84; Special Assistant to the Director
Karen E. Skelton, Research Assistant, Markle Project
Charles Trueheart, Associate Director
Sonia Wallenberg, Student Program Assistant
David Whitman, Research Coordinator, Revson Project, fall '84
Susan A. Wunderlee, Media Services Coordinator
Administration and Advisory Committees

The Senior Advisory Committee
Barber B. Conable, Jr.
John C. Culver
Mrs. Katharine Graham
Milton S. Gwirtzman
The Lord Harlech, K.C.M.G., Chair*
Vernon E. Jordan
Edward M. Kennedy
John Kennedy
George C. Lodge
Robert S. McNamara
Mrs. Jacqueline Onassis
Warren Rudman
R. Sargent Shriver

*The Institute is sad to note the death of Lord Harlech on January 26, 1985.

The Faculty Advisory Committee
Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy and Chair of
Public Policy Program Ph.D. Committee, Chair
Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, Emeritus
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert M. Coles, Professor of Psychiatry and Medical Humanities
Philip B. Heymann, Professor of Law
Stanley H. Hoffmann, C. Douglas Dillon Professor of the
Civilization of France
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics, Ex-Officio
Mark H. Moore, Daniel & Florence Guggenheim Professor of
Criminal Justice, Policy and Management
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration
Daniel Steiner, Vice President and General Counsel to the University
Robert B. Stobaugh, Professor of Business Administration
The Student Program

The Student Advisory Committee (SAC)

John Moore, Jr., Chair, fall
Joseph Freeman, Vice-Chair, fall
Peter Gelfman, Chair, spring
David Michael, Vice-Chair, spring

Committee Chairs were:

Communications
Christine Chambers

Fellows
Elizabeth Losos, fall
Trena Bristol, spring

Internships
Ann Heilman, fall
John Glazer, spring

Projects
Nadine Parker, fall
Lea Dickerman, spring

Study Groups
David Michael, fall
Gregory McCurdy, spring

Summer Research Awards
John Glazer

Visiting Fellows
Tony West

SAC Members were:

Jeff Bartel
Laurence Belfer
Eric Berman
Trena Bristol
Christine Chambers
Peter Clark
Elizabeth Contreras
Joseph D’Amico
Leah Dickerman
Jean Engelayer
Claire Fleming
Celeste Garcia
Peter Gelfman
John Glazer

Kim Gutschow
Mark Halperin
Ann Heilman
Mary Hennessey
LaVaughn Henry
Kris Kobach
David Laibson
Donney Leffall
Elizabeth Losos
Amy Mall
Gregory McCurdy
Thomas McGuire
David Michael
John Moore, Jr.
Kirk Nahra

Mari Nakachi
Nadine Parker
Jose Pierluisi
Regan Ralph
Cynthia Rice
David Schanzer
Jean Schiro
Juan Sepulveda
Sean Smith
D. Hannah Taylor
Rod Teeple
Nicole Walthour
Derek West
Michael Zubrensky
Student Study Groups

Fall 1984

"The Future of Liberalism: Progressive Politics in Canada, the U.S. and Great Britain"

Tom Axworthy, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Principal Secretary and Chief of Staff to Pierre Elliott Trudeau

Guests:
- Rt. Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, former Prime Minister of Canada
- James Flug, partner, Lobel, Novins & Lamont, Washington, D.C.
- Rt. Hon. David Steel, leader, British Liberal Party
- Sen. Michael Pitfield, former clerk of the Privy Council, Canada
- Hon. Lloyd Axworthy, former Minister of Transport, Canada
- Stephen Clarkson, Professor, University of Toronto
- Hon. John Roberts, former Minister of the Environment, Canada
- Paul Myles, partner, Goldfarb Consultants, Toronto
- Craig Oliver, correspondent, CTV News, Washington, D.C.
- Jeffry Simpson, senior columnist, Globe and Mail, Toronto

"Revolution in Central America: A Challenge to U.S. Policy"

Fr. Chris Brickley, Maryknoll missionary in El Salvador; Director, Maryknoll New England Center for Global Awareness

Elizabeth Donnelly, Maryknoll Lay Missioner; former Associate Editor, Latinamerica Press, Lima, Peru

Guests:
- Michael Skol, Deputy Director, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, U.S. Department of State
- Michael Jimenez, Instructor in History, Princeton University
- Rev. Cesar Jerez, S.J., Director, Planning and Research, University of Central America, Managua, Nicaragua
- Charles Clements, M.D., author, Witness to War: An American Doctor in El Salvador
- Lt. Colonel Lawrence Tracy, Coordinator of Public Diplomacy for Latin America, U.S. Department of State
- Beatriz Manz, Fellow, Bunting Institute, Radcliffe College
- Frank LaRue, Representative, Guatemalan Opposition, United Nations
- John Silber, President, Boston University
- Walter Astie, Deputy Chief of Political Affairs, Embassy of Mexico, Washington, D.C.
"The Arab-Israeli Conflict"

William H. Brubeck, former U.S. Department of State and National Security Council official; consultant on Middle East politics

Guests:
Bernard Avishai, Associate Professor, Writing Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Walid Khalidi, Professor of Politics, American University, Beirut, Lebanon
William Miller, Research Associate, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Richard Viets, former U.S. Ambassador to Jordan
William Stewart, correspondent, Time Magazine
Talcott Seelye, former U.S. Ambassador to Syria
Orna Ben Naftali, Lecturer in International Law, Brandeis University
Muhammed Hallaj, Director, Palestine Research and Educational Center, Washington, D.C.

"When Lobbyists Talk, Everybody Listens"

John J. Gunther, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors

Guests:
John E. Barriere, former Staff Director, Democratic Policy Committee, U.S. House of Representatives
H. Richard Mayberry, Attorney, Washington, D.C.
Leonard Simon, Assistant Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, D.C.
James Mooney, President and Chief Executive Officer, National Cable Television Association
Wayne H. Smithey, Vice President for Washington Affairs, Ford Motor Company
Barney Frank, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-MA)
Lee C. White, Esq., former Chairman, Federal Power Commission
Kenneth Young, Executive Assistant to the President, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.
Stephen Brobeck, Executive Director, Consumer Federation of America, Washington, D.C.

"Who Chooses What's News? The Massachusetts Senate Campaign"

Gail Harris, co-anchor, Ten O'Clock News, WGBH-TV

Guests:
Christy George, political reporter, WGBH-TV, Boston
The Student Program

Cheryl DelGreco, press secretary, Bartley campaign
Ken Swope, advertising consultant, Ken Swope Associates
Tom Vallely, Massachusetts State Representative
Michael Goldman, political consultant, Goldman & Associates, Boston
Michael Connolly, former candidate for Massachusetts Senate
Lynda Connolly, former treasurer for Connolly campaign
Martha Bradlee, chief news correspondent, WCVB-TV, Boston

"Money and Politics"
Patricia J. Keefer, Account Executive, Craver, Mathews, Smith & Company,
Washington, D.C.; former Vice-President, Common Cause

Guests:
Peter Fenn, President, Peter Fenn & Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
Roger Craver, President, Craver, Mathews, Smith & Company, Falls Church, Virginia
Joan Baggott, Political Director, Bricklayers Union, Washington, D.C.
Nannette Falkenberg, Executive Director, National Abortion Rights Action League
William Oldaker, former chief counsel, Federal Elections Commission
Robert Farmer, Chairman, Robert Farmer Group, Watertown, Massachusetts
Michael Ford, former Political Director, Mondale for President Campaign
Jeff Solender, Vice-President of Financial Planning, Craver, Mathews, Smith & Company,
Falls Church, Virginia

"The State Legislature: Backwater or Frontier?"
Mary Lou Munts, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Wisconsin State Representative

Guests:
Thomas Loftus, Speaker, Wisconsin House of Representatives
Susan McLane, former New Hampshire State Senator
Mary Kilmarx, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island
Patrick J. Lucey, former Governor of Wisconsin
James Schultz, former representative, California Common Cause
Michael Stinziano, Ohio State Representative
Irving Stolberg, Speaker, Connecticut House of Representatives
James Derouin, attorney and lobbyist, Dewitt, Sundby, Madison, Wisconsin
Molly Yard, consultant, Eleanor Smeal Associates, Washington, D.C.
Elizabeth Dunn, Legislative Director, Massachusetts National Organization
for Women (NOW)
Linda Reivitz, Secretary, Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services
Gerald O. Kleczka, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-WI)
Robert Lang, Director, Legislative Fiscal Bureau, Wisconsin Finance Committee

"The Contemporary Right in America"
Avi Nelson, Editorial Director, WEEI Radio, Boston

Guests:
Don Ernsberger, President, Society for Individual Liberty, Warminster, Pennsylvania
Ann Wortham, Assistant Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Uri Ra'anan, Director, International Security Studies Program, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Mark Frazier, Chairman and Director of Policy, Sabre Foundation/Free Zone Authority Services, Washington, D.C.
Sam Blumenfeld, author, Is Public Education Necessary?
Robert Pfaltzgraff, President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Cambridge, Massachusetts
William Bradford Reynolds, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice

"Issues in Gay and Lesbian Political Participation"
Eric E. Rofes, Chairperson, Boston Lesbian and Gay Political Alliance

Guests:
Joseph Interrante, Lecturer, Department of History and Literature, Harvard University
Elaine Noble, President, Noble Associates, Boston
Vic Basile, Executive Director, Human Rights Campaign Fund, Washington, D.C.
Urvashi Vaid, Director, National Jail Project, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
Richard Burns, President of the Board, Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders, Boston
Larry Kessler, Director, AIDS Action Committee, Boston
Kevin McConville, member, AIDS Action Committee, Boston
Cynthia Patton, Editor, Bad Attitude, Boston
Janet Ferone, President, Boston National Organization for Women (NOW)
Ann Maguire, Liaison to Mayor Flynn, Boston

"Social Welfare Policy in the 80's"
Audrey Rowe, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Commissioner of Social Services, Department of Social Services, District of Columbia
Guests:

Arthur Flemming, Chair, Citizen's Committee on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
Thomas Glynn, Deputy Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare
Patricia Matthews, Vice-President, Community Foundation, Washington, D.C.
Kenneth Clarkson, Director, Law and Economics Center, University of Miami
Sandra Matava, Commissioner, Department of Social Services, Boston
Reed Tuckson, Administrator, Commission on Social Services, Washington, D.C.
Janet Diamond, Special Projects Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare
Dale Mitchell, lobbyist, Meredith & Associates, Boston
David E. Rivers, Director, Department of Human Services, Washington, D.C.

"Political Advertising and Polling: Presidential Campaign Decision Making"
David M. Sparks, Fellow, Institute of Politics; political and communications consultant

Guests:

Alexander Gage, Vice President, Market Opinion Research, Detroit, Michigan
Steven Sandler, partner, Sandler & Innocenzi, Washington, D.C.
Will Feltus, Market Opinion Research, Detroit, Michigan
George Karalekas, Senior Vice President, D'Arcy, McManus & Masius, New York
Peter Broderick, independent film producer
John Morgan, consultant to Reagan/Bush campaign
Douglas Watts, Media Director, Reagan/Bush campaign

"Criminal Justice: A Law Enforcement Perspective"
Richard G. Stearns, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Massachusetts

Guests:

Mark Wolf, Deputy U.S. Attorney, Chief of Special Investigations Unit, Massachusetts
Robert S. Mueller, III, First Assistant U.S. Attorney,
Chief of Criminal Justice Division, Massachusetts
Charles J. Hely, Assistant District Attorney, Norfolk County, Massachusetts
Norma Murphy, Special Agent, Massachusetts Drug Enforcement Agency
Oliver C. Mitchell, Attorney, New England Narcotics Task Force
William Hogan, Jr., Judge, District Court, Dedham, Massachusetts
Richard Egan, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Rodney Rumble, Chief of Detectives, Police Department, Weymouth, Massachusetts
Judith Lindahl, Boston criminal defense lawyer
Ralph O. Gants, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Boston
Christine Nixon, Inspector, New South Wales Police, Australia
"Popular Movements: Worldwide Challenges to the Establishment"

William Sutherland, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Southern African Representative, American Friends Service Committee

Guests:
- David Dellinger, author, Revolutionary Non-Violence
- Zwelakhe Sisulu, South African political reporter, The Sowetan, Johannesburg
- Gene Sharp, Director, Program for Non-Violent Sanctions, Harvard University
- Mary Anderson, economist; former Director, Bunting Institute, Radcliffe College
- Robert Moses, MacArthur Fellow; former organizer in Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)
- Jack O'Dell, International Affairs Director and National Coordinator, Public United to Serve Humanity (PUSH)
- Vincent Harding, author, There is A River
- Robin Cappucino, Chairperson, Vermont Federation of Cooperatives

"Political Journalism—A Workshop"

Robert L. Turner, political columnist, The Boston Globe

Guests:
- Martin F. Nolan, Editor, Editorial Page, The Boston Globe
- Mary McGrory, columnist, The Washington Post
- Elliot L. Richardson, partner, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy, Washington, D.C.
- Ann Moritz, Assistant to the Editor, The Boston Globe

Spring 1985

"Limits of Dissent: The Press and Social Change"

Joelle Attinger, Fellow, Institute of Politics; correspondent, Time Magazine

Guests:
- Richard Gaines, Editor, The Boston Phoenix
- James Muller, co-founder, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
- David McCauley, Field Director, American Friends Service Committee
- Gregory Mitchell, Editor, Nuclear Times
- James Wallis, founder and editor, Sojourners
- Richard Cohen, Senior Political Producer, CBS Evening News

"Religious Strife in the Middle East and India"

Ronald J. Brown, Resident Graduate, Harvard Divinity School
Guests:

**David Pollach**, Visiting Lecturer on Government, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University

**Gurinder Singh Mann**, student, University of Kent and Harvard Divinity School

**William Worthy**, journalist; former Fellow, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University

**Paul Saba**, attorney; former Professor of International Relations, Boston College

**Moorhead Kennedy**, Director, Council for International Understanding, New York

**Jirai Libaridian**, Director, Zoryan Institute of Contemporary Armenian Research and Documentation, Boston

**Leo Saikisian**, member, Armenian National Committee, Washington, D.C.

**Christopher Van Hollen**, Director, American Institute for Islamic Affairs, American University, Washington, D.C.

**Elinor W. Gadon**, Lecturer in Art and Religion, Extension Division, Harvard University

"Issues in Health Policy"

**David R. Calkins, M.D., M.P.P.**, Instructor in Medicine, Harvard Medical School

**Julius B. Richmond, M.D.**, John D. MacArthur Professor of Health Policy and Management, Division of Health Policy Research and Education, Harvard University

Guests:

**George A. Lamb, M.D.**, Director, Family Health and Community Epidemiology, Department of Health and Hospitals, City of Boston

**David Blumenthal, M.D., M.P.P.**, Executive Director, Center for Health Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government

**Harvey Fineberg**, Dean, Harvard School of Public Health

**James J. Callahan, Jr.**, Commissioner, Department of Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

**Gerald L. Klerman, M.D.**, Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School

**John W. Rowe, M.D.**, Director, Division on Aging, Harvard Medical School

**Terrie Wetle**, Executive Officer, Division of Health Policy Research, Harvard University

**Jack Cook**, consultant, Blue Cross of Massachusetts

**Kitty Pell**, member, Rate Setting Commission, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

**Mitchell R. Rabkin, M.D.**, President, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston

**Joseph C. Avellone, M.D.**, President, American Health Care, Inc.

**Arnold S. Relman, M.D.**, Editor, New England Journal of Medicine

**Daniel Burnes, M.D.**, President, Managed Health Care, Boston

**Robert A. Berenson, M.D.**, former Assistant Director, Domestic Policy Staff, The White House
William C. Hsiao, Associate Professor of Management, Harvard School of Public Health
Nancy M. Kane, D.B.A., Assistant Professor of Management, Harvard School of Public Health
Thomas O. Pyle, President, Harvard Community Health Plan

"Politics of the American Banking System"
James Carras, President, James Carras Associates, Boston and Fort Lauderdale

Guests:
Robert Kuttner, columnist, Boston Globe, Boston Observer, The New Republic
Gerald Mulligan, Vice Chairman, Mutual Bank for Savings, Boston
Steven Roberts, Assistant to the Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C.
Roderick MacDougall, Treasurer, Harvard University
Alan Fishbein, Director of Neighborhood Revitalization, Center for Community Change, Washington, D.C.

"Politics in the Movies"
Art Cohen, producer, Neighborhood Network News, Boston

Guests:
Ted O'Brien, anchor, Neighborhood Network News, Boston
Pamela Constable, correspondent, The Boston Globe
Nancy Fernandez, producer, NBC News, Boston
Mark Mills, producer, Chronicle, WCVB-TV, Boston

"Trends in Political Realignment: Are Two Parties Enough?"
Lamond Godwin, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Political Director, National Rainbow Coalition, Inc.

Guests:
Barry Sussman, pollster, The Washington Post
Mel King, Professor of Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; former candidate for Mayor of Boston
Howard Zinn, Professor of Political Science, Boston University
Lee Atwater, former Deputy Director, Reagan for President Campaign
Dan Whitehurst, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Mayor of Fresno, California
‘Women and Political Participation’

Ann Hartner, Women’s Issues Director, Massachusetts League of Women Voters
Anne Rarich, Leadership Development Specialist, Massachusetts League of Women Voters

Guests:

Ethel Klein, Associate Professor of Political Science, Columbia University
Susan Shaer, President, Massachusetts League of Women Voters
Audrey Rowe, Commissioner of Social Services, Department of Social Services, District of Columbia
Mary Ann Hardenbergh, Chair, Citizens for Public Schools, Hyde Park, Massachusetts
James Walsh, Director of Community Organizing, Hyde Park, Massachusetts
Nancy Korman, partner, 760 Associates, Newton, Massachusetts
Arlene Stamm, Vice President for Communications, Massachusetts League of Women Voters
Margaret D. Xifaras, Esq., Special Assistant to the Governor of Massachusetts
Norma Shapiro, Legislative Director, Massachusetts League of Women Voters
Barbara Gray, Massachusetts State Representative (R-Framingham)
Joan Quinlan, Advisor on Women’s Issues to the Governor of Massachusetts
Florence Rubin, President, National Center for Citizen Participation in the Administration of Justice, Newton Centre, Massachusetts
Susan Tucker, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Andover)
Betty Taymor, Director, Program for Political and Governmental Careers, Boston College
Ruth Mandel, Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
Sharyn Styles, President, Massachusetts Organization for Women
Pamela Jones, Co-Director, Women for Economic Justice, Boston

‘The Opinion Industry’

Hendrik Herzberg, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former editor, The New Republic

Guests:

Christopher Matthews, Administrative Assistant to Speaker of the House
Thomas P. O’Neill, Jr.
Christopher Hitchens, Washington editor The Nation
Sidney Blumenthal, staff writer, The Washington Post
Murray Sayle, freelance writer
Nicholas von Hoffmann, syndicated columnist and author
Michael Scammell, Senior Research Associate, New York Institute for the Humanities
Patrick H. Cadell, President, Cambridge Survey Research
Jody Powell, Thomas P. O’Neill Professor of Government, Boston College
“Polls: The Legacy of George Gallup”
Karlyn H. Keene, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Managing Editor, Public Opinion

Guests:
- Burns Roper, President, The Roper Organization, New York
- Evans Witt, reporter and poll director, Associated Press
- Kathleen Francovic, Director, Polling Unit, CBS News, New York
- Seymour Martin Lipset, Professor of Sociology and Political Science, Stanford University
- Richard Bennett, President, Blake and Dickinson, Manchester, New Hampshire
- William Schneider, Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.

“The United States and Sub-Sahara Africa”
Donald R. Norland, Associate, Africa Research Program, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

Guests:
- Keith Wauchope, Deputy Director, Office of West African Affairs, U.S. Department of State
- M. Jacques Adande, Fellow, Mason Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Director of European Affairs, Foreign Ministry of Benin
- Donald Petterson, former U.S. Ambassador to Somalia
- Bernard Edinger, Fellow, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University; correspondent, Reuters News Service
- Ned McMahon, Country Officer for Zaire, U.S. Department of State
- Willard A. DePree, former U.S. Ambassador to Mozambique

“The Skills of Political Speechmaking”
Debra J. Saunders, Associate Director, Todd Domke & Associates, Weston, Massachusetts
John Kellogg, partner, Markarian and Kellogg, Boston

Guests:
- Jack Flannery, partner, The November Company, Boston
- Jill Fallon, partner, The November Company, Boston
- Todd Domke, President, Todd Domke & Associates, Weston, Massachusetts
- Howard Carr, political reporter, The Boston Herald
- Chuck Crouse, State House reporter, WEEI Radio, Boston
- Avi Nelson, Editorial Director, WEEI Radio, Boston
- Joseph Malone, Campaign Manager, Ray Shamie for U.S. Senate
- Carrie Richardson, former press secretary to Ray Shamie
- Robert Turner, syndicated columnist, The Boston Globe
- Andrew Hiller, reporter, WBZ-TV, Boston
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“Satire”
Paul Szep, syndicated editorial cartoonist, The Boston Globe

Guests:
Christopher Durang, playwright; author, Sister Mary Ignatius Explains It All For You
Larry Durocher, former publisher of Rolling Stone
Douglas Marlette, syndicated cartoonist, The Charlotte Observer
Dick Flavin, satirical commentator, WBZ-TV, Boston

“California Politics”
Daniel K. Whitehurst, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Mayor of Fresno, California

Guests:
Jacqueline Basha, Communications Director, Executive Office of Economic Affairs, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
William Endicott, Capitol Bureau Chief, The Los Angeles Times, Sacramento, California
George Skelton, White House correspondent, The Los Angeles Times, Washington, D.C.
B. T. Collins, Vice-President, Kidder, Peabody & Company, Boston

“The South and the Nation”
William F. Winter, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Governor of Mississippi

Guests:
Lamond Godwin, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Political Director, National Rainbow Coalition, Inc.
Elise Winter, author, Dinner at the Mansion
Guy Land, Legislative Assistant to U.S. Senator John Stennis
William F. Cole, Treasurer, State of Mississippi
Ray Mabus, Auditor, State of Mississippi
Andrew Mullins, Administrative Assistant to State Superintendent of Education, Mississippi
Jesse L. White, Director, Southern Growth Policies Board, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
Summer Research Awards

Each year the Institute offers a limited number of Summer Research Awards to Harvard undergraduates for fieldwork 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 1984 recipients and their topics were:

- **Ross Corson '83/'85 (Sociology):** "The Political Economy of State Business Climate"
- **David Finegold '85 (Social Studies):** "An Examination of the Elements Necessary for a Successful Quality of Work Life Program"
- **Simon Frankel '86 (History and Science):** "The Life and Work of Robert Maynard Hutchins"
- **Nancy Kates '84/'85 (History and Literature):** "The Federal Writers' Project"
- **Gregory Lyss '85 (Government):** "Presidential Relations with the Executive"
- **Scott Moore '83/'85 (Visual and Environmental Studies):** "A Photographic Documentary of the Anti-War Movement in the U.S. and Europe"
- **Rafael Antonio Ruiz '85 (Government):** "The Transformation of the Puerto Rican Party System, 1968-1984"
- **Arthur Solmssen, Jr. '84/'85 (History):** "Populism in Payne/Logan County, Oklahoma, 1890-1907"
- **Mark Tecca '85 (Government):** "The Military Interventions in Lebanon and Grenada as Case Studies for Congressional Involvement in U.S. Foreign Policy"
- **Norman Yamada '84/'85 (Social Studies):** "The Haitian Migration: The U.S. as Country of Mass First Asylum"

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 with financial need who might otherwise be unable to accept public sector internships.

• 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 for a variety of intellectual, social and athletic activities.

• Since the summer of 1983, the Institute has also been developing a Summer-in-Boston Program, arranging speakers, social events, and excursions to places of political interest for Harvard students in the Boston area during the Harvard Summer School session.

• Congressional Internship Workshops sponsored by the Institute draw on the expertise of congressional staffers with experience supervising interns. Fall Workshops focus on job-seeking; spring workshops focus on skills needed by the intern. Topics include congressional research methods, committee and floor procedures, legislative writing skills, and resources available in the Washington, D.C. area.

• The Institute's Externship Program provides opportunities for students to accompany public-sector professionals through an average work day during the week of spring semester break. Undergraduates are paired with people in government, media and independent public sector agencies to witness first-hand the daily mechanics and intricacies of the work life of such professionals.

Summer Internship Program

In 1984, the following students received Institute stipends enabling them to intern during the summer with a wide range of organizations, as listed:

Adam John Augustynski '86: Office of Senator J. Dixon (D-IL),
Washington, D.C.

Karen M. Brooks '86: Midwest Voter Registration Education Project,
Columbus, Ohio

Thomas Burke '87: Good Old Lower East Side Inc., New York City

Denley Chew '87: Chinese Methodist Center Corporation, New York City

Daniel Collins '85: Republican Study Committee, U.S. House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Stephen E. Davis '86/'87: The Brookings Institutions, Washington, D.C.

Chantaye V. Elmore '85: Massachusetts Commission Against
Discrimination, Boston, Massachusetts
The Summer-in-Washington Program

The 1984 Summer-in-Washington Program was coordinated by Mark Halperin '87. In addition to developing and compiling substantial information on housing opportunities for Harvard students spending the summer in DC, the program sponsored a wide-ranging series of activities which included:

- Discussions with:

  John Anderson, Attorney; 1980 Independent candidate for President of the United States

  Mark Talisman, director, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds; advisor, Summer-in-Washington Program; former Fellow, Institute of Politics

  John Sears, Attorney; Manager, Reagan's Presidential Campaign (1976 & 1980)

  Seymour Hersh, Pulitzer Prize winning journalist; author,
  The Price of Power: Kissinger in the Nixon White House

  David S. Broder, associate editor, The Washington Post; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
Jack Valenti, President, Motion Picture Association; special assistant to President Johnson (1963-66)
Audrey Rowe, Commissioner of Social Services, District of Columbia
John Kehiler, Legislative Assistant for Defense for U.S. Representative Dave McCurdy (D-OK)
Benjamin Bradlee, executive editor, The Washington Post
Eugene Zykov, specialist on U.S.S.R.
Anthony Beilenson, U.S. Representative (D-CA)
Paul Warnke, chief U.S. negotiator SALT (1977-78); Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (1967-69)
Nick Thimmesch, resident journalist, American Enterprise Institute; columnist, The Los Angeles Times Syndicate; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
Kenneth Duberstein, Assistant to President Reagan for Legislative Affairs
Charles Cooper, Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights
Edwin Dale, spokesperson, Office of Management and Budget, The White House
Mark Cannon, Administrative Assistant, Chief Justice Burger of the United States
Barber B. Conable, Jr. member, U.S. House of Representatives, (R-NY)
Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation
Nancy Leamond, administrative assistant, U.S. Representative Oakar (D-OH); and Christy Schmidt, U.S. Department of Agriculture
Morton Halperin, director, Center for National Security Studies; former advisor to the National Security Council
Casper Weinberger, Secretary of Defense

- Other activities included:
A wine and cheese reception with University of Pennsylvania students on the Hill, attended by U.S. Representative Barney Frank (D-MA) and U.S. Representative Thomas Foglietta (D-PA)
Softball games against teams from Speaker of the House of Representatives Thomas P. O'Neill's office, Youth Policy Institute, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, Princeton University, Democratic National Committee, Stanford University, Republican National Committee, University of Michigan, Senator Dale Bumper's office, University of Pennsylvania
A picnic at Montrose Park with students from Princeton, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, Smith, Wellesley and Harvard
A boat cruise on the Potomac with students from Princeton, Stanford, University of Pennsylvania, University of Michigan, Brown and Harvard
A barbecue with former Fellows of the Institute of Politics
Ride-for-Life, 60 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 Mimi Lucca '85 during the 1984 Harvard Summer School session. Program events included:
An introductory meeting and reception at the Institute of Politics
Viewing of a film, The KGB Connections, produced in Canada, originally televised by Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, distributed by the Committee for the Free World
A visit to the Museum at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School
A panel discussion on Human Rights with:
Kenneth Carstens, Executive Director, International Defense and Aid Fund for South Africa
Rene Valle, student-exile from El Salvador; affiliate of Casa El Salvador
Farabundo Marti
Joshua Rubenstein, Chair, Amnesty International Northeast Region
A meeting and discussion in his office with Governor Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts, followed by a visit to historic Faneuil Hall and supper at Boston’s Quincy Marketplace.

Internship Workshops

Two workshops designed to provide information for public sector interns were sponsored by the Internship Committee on November 29, 1984 and April 11, 1985. In November, Anne Doyle Kenney, Internship Coordinator of the Institute of Politics, Rick Howard, Counselor for Public Sector Careers at Harvard’s Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning and John Glazer, Internships Committee Chair and former congressional intern addressed such issues as the definition of an internship, how and where to apply, and provided useful tips for undergraduates interested in being an intern. 1984 Summer-in-Washington Program Coordinator, Mark Halperin, provided tips on life in summertime Washington, D.C.

In April, Judith K. Davison, Legislation/Policy Coordinator for U.S. Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) and former Fellow of the Institute of Politics and John Glazer addressed issues such as duties and responsibilities, necessary skills, expectations, and useful tips for congressional interns.
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Externships

During spring break 1985 one one-week externship and twenty-nine one-day externships were arranged pairing undergraduates and public sector professionals, giving each student the opportunity to observe and participate in the daily rounds of their sponsors.

Sponsors included:

James Reina, Director of Special Projects, ABC News, New York who arranged a week-long externship for Lydia Ward '85


Julia Chang Bloch, Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance

Martha Craver, congressional correspondent, Army Times Publishing

Peter C. Goldmark, Jr., Executive Director, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey

Gail Harris, TV anchor/reporter, WGBH-TV, Boston

Ellen Hume, political reporter, The Wall Street Journal

Ira A. Jackson, Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Revenue

Andrew S. Natsios, Massachusetts State Representative

Ellen Schall, Commissioner, New York City Department of Juvenile Justice

Robert W. Searby, Deputy Undersecretary for International Affairs, U.S. Department of State

Nick Thimmisch, resident journalist, American Enterprise Institute; columnist, Los Angeles Times Syndicate

Visiting Fellows

Visiting Fellows, selected on the basis of distinguished experience in active political life, are invited to Harvard for brief visits during which they meet with members of the University community, including interested undergraduates, faculty members and Fellows of the Institute of Politics. An address in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs of the John F. Kennedy School of Government is a customary highlight of such visits.

The Visiting Fellows this year were:

John Naisbitt, author of Megatrends (November 5-6, 1984). Mr. Naisbitt's address in the Forum was entitled "Reinventing the World We Live In."
Activities during his Fellowship included a meeting with campus media organizations, lunch with Quincy House students, guest of honor at the Institute of Politics supper, participation in an economics course section "Problems of the American Economy," a meeting with government and business student organizations and lunch with the Faculty Group in New Communications Technologies.

Theodore H. White, historian and author of The Making of the President series and America in Search of Itself (March 11-12, 1985). Mr. White’s address in the Forum was entitled "Is the Way We Choose Our Presidents Obsolete?" Activities during his Fellowship included a meeting with history and government students, lunch with the Fellows of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, participation in a government course section "Introduction to American Government," and a meeting with Asian concentrators.

Harvard Political Review

The Harvard Political Review is a quarterly journal of political analysis published by the Student Advisory Committee. Officers during the year (first semester, second semester) were:

- Theresa Amato, Associate Editor
- David M. Barkan, Circulation Manager, Managing Editor
- Susanto Basu, Book Reviews Editor, Associate Editor
- Andrew S. Buckser, Associate Editor, President
- John Chuang, Assistant Managing Editor
- Mark DePasquale, Circulation Manager
- Richard Kahlenberg, Managing Editor, Senior Editor
- Steven Kapner, Staff Artist, Circulation Manager
- Philip Katz, Associate Editor
- Brin McCagg, Circulation Manager
- Patrick Rivelli, Business Manager, General Manager
- Ronald Roach, Assistant Managing Editor
- Susan Ann Rofman, Book Reviews Editor
- Rebecca Rozen, Subscription Manager
- Ralph Sepe, Business Manager
- Ben Sparks, General Manager
- Janice Sue Wang, President, Senior Editor

The four issues of HPR published during academic year 1984-85 contained the following articles:
Volume XII/Number 1; Fall 1984
Cover Story: "The United Nations on the Brink"
"US vs. the UN," Richard Kahlenberg
"Third World Country Club," Ronald Roach
"World Without a UN?," Theresa Amato
"The World at War," Philip M. Katz
HPR Interviews:
Charles M. Lichenstein, "Lichenstein Lashes Out"
Yehuda Z. Blum, "Israel: Through Thick and Thin"
"War Games," Theresa Amato
"A Lethal Penalty," Susan Rofman
"Learning the Ropes," Rebecca Rozen
"A Day at the Races," Laura Leedy
Books of the Review:
Caveat: Realism, Reagan and Foreign Policy by Alexander Haig, Jr.;
reviewed by Susanto Basu
The Spot: The Rise of Political Advertising on Television by Edwin Diamond
and Stephen Bates; reviewed by Janice Sue Wang
Warday by Whitley Stieber and James Kunetka; reviewed by
Philip M. Katz
The New Politics of Inequality by Thomas Byrne Edsall; reviewed by
Robert Watts

Volume XII/Number 2; Winter 1984
"The Poor in America":
"The Politics of Poverty," Janice Sue Wang
"Who Are The Poor?," Andrew Buckser
"The Distribution of Poverty," Susan Ann Rofman
"Season's Greetings," Janice Sue Wang
"Dollars and Collars," John Chuang
"Wall Street Looks to Space," Rebecca Rozen
"Republican Roulette," David Barkan
"Keeping Secrets at the White House," Susanto Basu
"Harvard Heads of State," Ben Sparks
"2020: Vision of The Future," Theresa Amato
"Unplugging Blowdryers," Richard Kahlenberg
Books of the Review:
Technologies of Freedom by Ithiel de Sola Pool; reviewed by Ronald Roach
Volume XII/Number 3; Spring 1985
“Race in Higher Education”: 
‘‘Diversity or Division?’’ John Chuang 
‘‘The Great Balancing Act,’’ Erik Salovaara
HPR Interviews: 
Derek Bok on race and diversity 
Charles Willie on faculty hiring 
Archibald Cox on reverse discrimination

“Springtime for Afghanistan,’’ Andrew S. Buckser 
“Russian Roulette,’’ Patrick Rivelli 
“Science, Secrecy and Security,’’ Susanto Basu 
“All Quite on the West Bank,’’ Steven Rutkovsky 
“To Collude or to Compete?’’ David Barkan

Books of the Review: 
Life Was Meant To Be Lived: A Centenary Portrait of Eleanor Roosevelt by Joseph P. Lash; reviewed by Rebecca A. Rozen 
Survival Is Not Enough by Richard Pipes; reviewed by Randall Stone

Volume XII/Number 4; Summer 1985 
“Indian In Transition”: 
“India: East Meets West,’’ Susanto Basu 
“Dynasty or Democracy?’’ Susan Ann Rofman 
“Factions and Frictions,’’ Randall Stone

“The Welfare State Reexamined’’: 
“Shuffling Coalitions: A New Deal,’’ Peter Keating 
“A Lost Legacy of Liberalism,’’ Peter Vrooman 
“The Rightist Stuff,’’ Arti Srivastava 
HPR Interviews: 
Charles Murray and Robert Greenstein on the conservative critique of the welfare state

“A Tragedy of Errors,’’ Andrew Buckser 
“The Wall’s A‘Tumblin’,’’ David Barkan 
“The New Garbagemen,’’ John Chuang 
“What Energy Crisis?’’ Steven Kapner 
“Paradise Lost,’’ Brin McCagg 
“A Future for Black Colleges,’’ Philip Katz 
“Banks Buckle Down,’’ Steve Rutkovsky
"Who's in Charge Here?" Janice Sue Wang

Books of the Review:
Deadly Gambits by Strobe Talbott; reviewed by Peter Keating

Student Projects

During academic year 1984-85, the Projects Committee continued its educational programs on political topics, sponsoring such events as a nuclear war exercise to consider issues of security and human preservation, a continuation of the voter registration drive begun in 1983-84, a debate on the 1984 Presidential election involving Harvard and Yale Democrat and Republican student teams, panel discussions on domestic and foreign policy issues, and an intercollegiate one-day conference on South Africa.

The Visiting Fellows coordinator and the committee worked together in sponsoring two Visiting Fellows. Committee members also helped host the Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress and the 1984 Presidential Campaign Decision-Makers Conference.

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

A Voter Registration Fair, September 12, 1984, which provided information to undergraduates on registration procedures in all fifty states and assistance in securing absentee ballots. 200 Harvard students were registered to vote.

Viewing of All the President's Men, a major motion picture (1976) about Watergate directed by Alan J. Pakula.

"China and the U.S.: What Next for Relations?" September 25, 1984, a panel discussion with:
Zhao Jinglun, journalist, People's Republic of China
Leonard Unger, Professor of Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of China
Herb Levin, member, policy planning staff, U.S. Department of State
James C. Thomson, Professor of International Relations and Journalism, Boston University; research associate, Fairbank Center for East Asian Studies, Harvard University (moderator).
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A Nuclear War Exercise, September 29, 1984, which divided students into two teams to consider issues of national security and human survival. The exercise utilized a computer program designed by Abt Associates, Inc. of Cambridge, Massachusetts, enumerating the arsenals and potential targets of the United States and the Soviet Union.


"Domestic Policy: The 1984 Campaign," October 16, 1984, a panel discussion with:

John K. Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard University

Robert Kuttner, contributing editor, The New Republic; author The Economic Illusion

Charles Fried, Carter Professor of General Jurisprudence, Harvard Law School

George Gilder, author, Wealth and Poverty.


"Reagan Re-election: The View From Abroad," November 13, 1984, a panel discussion with:

Viktor Isakov, Minister-Counselor, Embassy of the U.S.S.R.

David Mizrachi, editor, Mid-East Report

Carlos Sosa, President, CYPECA, Venezuela; Fellow, Mason Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Kamalesh Sharma, Minister, Embassy of India; Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

Wiprecht von Treskow, Deputy Head of Section for East European Affairs, Federal Republic of Germany

Stephan Haggard, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University (moderator).


"The 1965 Voting Rights Act: Expectations and Realities," March 7, 1985, a panel discussion with:
Wiley Branton, former Director, Voter Education Project;  
former Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General
Nicholas Katzenbach, former Attorney General of the United States
Elaine Jones, Assistant Counsel, N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and  
Educational Fund
Michael Carvin, Special Assistant to the Assistant Attorney General  
for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Justice.

"The Future of the Democratic Party," March 14, 1985, a panel discussion  
co-sponsored by the Democratic Club, with:
Ann Lewis, National Director, Americans for Democratic Action
William Schneider, Fellow, American Enterprise Institute
Charles Bennett, U.S. Representative, (D-FL)
Lamond Godwin, Fellow, Institute of Politics, co-founder of the  
National Rainbow Coalition, Inc.
Richard J. Margolis, Director, National Rural Voter Project;  
former Fellow, Institute of Politics (moderator).

"The Deficit Dilemma: Prospects, Impacts and Solutions," April 3, 1985,  
a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Economic Association, with:
Frank E. Morris, President and Chief Executive Officer,
Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Allen Sinai, Chief Economist and Managing Director,
Shearson Lehman Brothers, Inc.
Benjamin Friedman, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
James Verdier, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School  
of Government (moderator).

"Inside South Africa," April 20, 1985, an intercollegiate conference.  
For more information, refer to Special Projects section of this book.

"The Fall of Saigon: Ten Years Later," April 30, 1985, a slide presentation  
followed by a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Kennedy School Student  
Government and the Vietnamese Student Association, with:
Dinh-Hoa Nguyen, Director, Center for Vietnamese Studies,  
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale; former Director of Cultural Affairs,  
Ministry of Education, Republic of Saigon
George Esper, special correspondent, Associated Press; author  
The Eyewitness History of the Vietnam War
Dau T. Le, general practitioner, Rosengard Clinic, South Boston;  
former President of the Medical Student Association, Saigon Medical School
Undergraduate Presidential Straw Poll

On October 24, 1984, the Student Advisory Committee conducted a computerized poll of undergraduate preferences in the presidential election. Tom McGuire '85 oversaw the planning and coordination of the poll, drawing on the help of Projects Committee and more than 150 associates of the SAC and the data-processing services of the university's Office of Information Technology. Nearly two-thirds of the undergraduate population—4,134 students—cast ballots in the campus poll, and the results were announced the following day at a press conference at the Institute of Politics. The Democratic ticket of former Vice President Walter Mondale and Representative Geraldine Ferraro received 61 percent of the vote; the Republican ticket of President Ronald Reagan and Vice President George Bush received 28.3 percent.

For the breakdown by category—gender, ethnic affiliation, year of graduation, and undergraduate house affiliation—please refer to the "Readings" section of this book.

Political Journalism Awards

In January, 1985, the Student Advisory Committee named two Harvard Political Journalists of the Year, implementing last year's proposal to encourage an awareness of campus political journalism. The committee established eligibility, advertising, submission and judging guidelines for two award categories: news/feature and opinion/commentary. Twenty-three opinion/commentary submissions from seventeen authors and eleven news/feature submissions from eight authors were judged. Award winners were presented with certificates and week-long externships at politically-oriented publications were arranged for both recipients.
Winners were selected by a committee of five judges: Edward Chen, Fellow of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism of Harvard University and legal affairs writer for The Los Angeles Times; Nancy Costello, reporter for the Harvard Gazette; John Noble, media counselor and associate director of the Harvard Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning; Martin F. Nolan, editorial page editor of The Boston Globe and former Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Charles Trueheart, Associate Director of the Institute of Politics and former editorial page editor of The News American in Baltimore. Winners were:


Honorable mentions were also given to Amy Dockser '87, "Israel: Unexpected Election Results," in the Harvard International Review (news/feature) and to Richard D. Kahlenberg '85, "E Pluribus Duo?" in The Harvard Political Review (opinion/commentary).
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The Panel on Fellowships

Trena Bristol, *spring*
Lawrence S. DiCara
Archie Epps
Dan Fenn
Joseph Freeman, *fall*
Peter Gelfman, *spring*
Lance M. Liebman
Richard J. Light
Michael Lipsky
Elizabeth Losos, *fall*
A. Douglas Matthews
Ernest R. May
Gregory McCurdy, *spring*
David Michael, *fall, spring*
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos
John Moore, Jr., *fall*
Jonathan Moore
Richard E. Neustadt
Don K. Price
Ann Ramsey
Charles Trueheart, *Ex Officio*
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
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Institute Fellows

Fall

Thomas Axworthy, Principal Secretary, Senior Policy Advisor to Pierre Elliott Trudeau. While a Fellow, Mr. Axworthy worked on an examination of liberalism. He led a study group entitled "The Future of Liberalism: Progressive Politics in Canada, the United States and Great Britain."

John J. Gunther, General Counsel and Executive Director of the United States Conference of Mayors. For his project Mr. Gunther continued to work on a history of federal/city relations. He led a study group entitled "When Lobbyists Talk, Everybody Listens."

Mary Lou Munts, Wisconsin State Representative (D-Madison). For her project Mrs. Munts studied utility regulation and the economics of energy. She led a study group entitled "State Legislatures and Legislators: Backwater or Frontier?"

Audrey Rowe, Commissioner of Social Services, District of Columbia. As a Fellow, Ms. Rowe looked at the role of colleges and universities in urban communities. She led a study group entitled "Social Welfare Policy in the 80's."

David M. Sparks, Political and Communications Consultant. As a Fellow, Mr. Sparks analyzed data and polls from various congressional campaigns. He led a study group entitled "Political Advertising and Polling: Presidential Campaign Decision Making."

William Sutherland, Southern Africa Representative, American Friends Service Committee. While a Fellow, Mr. Sutherland worked on a book of his memoirs. He led a study group entitled "Popular Movements: World Challenges to the Establishment."

Spring

Joelle Attinger, Correspondent, Time Magazine, Boston Bureau. For her project, Ms. Attinger began a study of the decline of popular movements including the nuclear freeze movement. She led a study group entitled "Limits of Dissent: The Press and Social Change."

Lamond Godwin, Co-founder and National Political Director of the National Rainbow Coalition, Inc. As a Fellow, Mr. Godwin began work on a book on Jesse Jackson's presidential campaign. He led a study group entitled "Trends in Political Realignment: Are Two Parties Enough?"

Karlyn H. Keene, Managing Editor, Public Opinion, American Enterprise Institute. For her project, Ms. Keene began research for a project on women in the workplace. She led a study group entitled "Polls: The Legacy of George Gallup."
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Hendrik Hertzberg, Editor, The New Republic (1981-1985). While a Fellow, Mr. Hertzberg wrote numerous newspaper and magazine articles on current issues and began research for a piece on the Carter Presidency. He led a study group entitled “The Opinion Industry.”

Daniel K. Whitehurst, Mayor, Fresno, California (1977-1985). While a Fellow, Mr. Whitehurst wrote on city and community issues. His study group was entitled “California Politics.”

William F. Winter, Governor of Mississippi (1980-1984). As a Fellow, Mr. Winter began writing a book on his experiences in Mississippi politics. He led a study group entitled “The South and the Nation.”

Fellows Luncheon Speakers

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

Fall

The Fellows of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University

Harvey Cox, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard Divinity School

Sidney Blumenthal, political writer

Carl Brauer, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics

Paul Samuelson, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Stephen Gould, Professor of Geology, Harvard University

Larry K. Smith, Studies Director, National Security Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Daniel Yergin, President, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts

John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Walburg Professor of Economics Emeritus, Harvard University

Carlos Fuentes, Visiting Professor of Romance Languages and Literature, Harvard University

Breakfast with Kathryn Whitmire, Mayor of Houston, Texas

Dinner with the Senior Executive Fellows, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Spring

The Fellows of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University, with guest speaker Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy and Academic Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Robert Conway of South Africa, former Fellow, Center for Foreign and International Affairs, Harvard University

Christopher Matthews, Administrative Assistant and Spokesperson for Massachusetts Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Speaker of the United States House of Representatives

The members of the Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics

Anthony Lewis, columnist, The New York Times

Glenn Loury, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

John Pinney, Executive Director of the Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Sidney Blumenthal, political writer

Harvey Cox, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard Divinity School

Daniel Yergin, President, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts

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

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

Robert Manning, Editor, The Boston Publishing Company

Robert Coles, Professor of Psychiatry and Medical Humanities, Harvard University

The Boston Globe Editorial Board, hosted by Martin F. Nolan, Editorial Page Editor, The Boston Globe and former Fellow of the Institute of Politics

Dinner with Roger Porter, Deputy Assistant to President Reagan and Director of White House Policy Development

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 “How the Press Affects Federal Policy Making,” funded by the Charles H. Revson Foundation, and “New Communications Technology, Public Policy, and Democratic Values,” funded by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation.

Campaign Finance

The Campaign Finance Study Group, under a grant from the U.S. Senate Rules Committee, earlier investigated the impact of the federal election campaign laws upon the conduct of presidential campaigns. While in many respects the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) has fulfilled its stated objectives, major problem areas have developed as a result of the outright failure of the Act, circumstances that could not be foreseen when the Act was drafted, or changes in the law due to the actions of institutions beyond the scope of congressional authority. The most troublesome problems, the study group found, are related to the attempt to restrict the spending of money by those seeking to influence the outcomes of presidential campaigns, and the study group proposed a multipoint package for legislative change.

The study group is now planning to refocus its efforts in three areas:
- the kind of regulatory agency necessary to implement campaign laws on the federal level, its structures and authorities, and the political and institutional mechanisms of presidential selection;
- the problem posed by Political Action Committees (PAC’s);
• an overall review of campaign finance practices and policy in light of the experience of the 1984 election campaigns, including analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of policy proposals circulating in the Congress, looking to 1988.

Members of the Study Group are:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science and Management, Yale University; Chair
Joel L. Fleishman, Director, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University
Gary Jacobson, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California at San Diego
Xandra Kayden, political consultant; author; The Party Goes On (forthcoming)
David Keene, President, Keene, Monk & Associate, Alexandria, VA
Susan B. King, Vice President and Director of Corporate Communications, Corning Glass Works, Corning, NY; former Chair, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Executive Director of Personnel, Massachusetts
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
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 ten to twelve weeks after the election and in the first six months or so after the inauguration, a newly-elected president makes a series of critical choices about personnel, organization, and policy. During this time, the new chief executive chooses the highest officials of the executive branch, sets internal lines of communication and authority, determines a policy agenda, and begins working with Congress, the press, foreign governments, and career officials. This is a time for new presidents to set a tone for what they hope to achieve and how they hope to achieve it. Never again will the slate be so clean. What new presidents decide—or fail to decide—during this time fundamentally shapes their ability to govern during the next four years.

The Institute of Politics has long been interested in presidential transi-
tions and has prepared advisory reports for the last several incoming presidents. In 1982 the Institute engaged an historian, Carl M. Brauer, as a research fellow to write an analytical history of presidential transitions since 1952. No such reference work exists, and it is hoped that his book, to be published in 1986, will become a useful tool for new presidents and their appointees, and an informative guide for the press and the public.

Dr. Brauer is being assisted by the Faculty Study Group on Presidential Transition chaired by Ernest R. May, Charles Warren Professor of American History, Harvard. The project has been funded by grants from the Ford and Sloan Foundations. Andrew W. Robertson was research assistant for the project.

Members of the Study Group are:

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Phillip E. Areeda, Langdell Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Don K. Price, Weatherhead Professor of Public Management and Dean, Emeritus, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Professional Study Programs

Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress
December 6-12, 1984

The Institute and the Committee on House Administration of the U.S. House of Representatives co-sponsored the seventh week-long educational program for twenty-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 social security, the budget deficit, economic competitiveness, nuclear weapons, the judicial system, defense spending, and foreign policy.

The participants were:

Tommy Robinson (D-Arkansas)
John G. Rowland (R-Connecticut)
Richard H. Stallings (D-Idaho)
Harris W. Fawell (R-Illinois)
John E. Grotberg (R-Illinois)
Terry L. Bruce (D-Illinois)
Peter J. Visclosky (D-Indiana)
James Ross Lightfoot (R-Iowa)
Jan Meyers (R-Kansas)
Chester Atkins (D-Massachusetts)
Helen D. Bentley (R-Maryland)
Paul B. Henry (R-Michigan)
William D. Schuette (R-Michigan)
Thomas Joseph Manton (D-New York)
Joseph J. Dioguardi (R-New York)
Fred J. Eckert (R-New York)
James A. Traficant (D-Ohio)
Paul E. Kanjorski (D-Pennsylvania)
Barton J. Gordon (D-Tennessee)
Joe Barton (R-Texas)
Albert Bustamante (D-Texas)
David S. Monson (R-Utah)
Jamie Fuster (D-Puerto Rico)
Vincente Blaz (R-Guam)
The faculty included:

**Graham Allison**, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government

**Stuart Altman**, Dean, Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University

**Les Aspin**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-WI)

**Robert M. Ball**, former Commissioner, Social Security Administration

**Francis Bator**, Professor of Political Economy,

John F. Kennedy School of Government

**William E. Brock III**, United States Trade Representative

**Albert Carnesale**, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

**Barber B. Conable, Jr.**, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-NY)

**Douglas Costle**, Research Fellow, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government

**Martin Feldstein**, Professor of Economics, Harvard University

**Ray A. Goldberg**, George M. Moffett Professor of Agriculture and Business, Harvard Business School

**Marshall Goldman**, Professor of Economics, Wellesley College

**Stephan Haggard**, Assistant Professor of Government,

Harvard University

**William Hogan**, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

**Craig Johnstone**, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs

**William Kaufmann**, Lecturer in Public Policy,

John F. Kennedy School of Government

**Lawrence Korb**, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics


**William Leogrande**, Associate Professor of Political Science,

The School of Government and Public Administration,

The American University

**Richard Lyng**, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture

**Charles McDowell**, Washington correspondent, Richmond Times-Dispatch

**Roderick L. MacFarquhar**, Professor of Government,

John King Fairbank Center for East Asian Studies,

Harvard University

**Charles F. Meissner**, Vice President, Chemical Bank, New York

**Bijan Mossavar-Rahmani**, Research Coordinator,

International Gas Study, Energy and Environmental Policy Center,

John F. Kennedy School of Government
Roger Mudd, Chief Political Correspondent, NBC News
Richard Pipes, Professor of History, Harvard University
William Quandt, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
Robert Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert Rubin, former Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services
Milton Russell, Assistant Administrator for Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency
Dallas L. Salisbury, Executive Director, Employee Benefit Research Institute
Antonin Scalia, Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Allen Schick, Visiting Scholar, American Enterprise Institute
Laurence H. Tribe, Ralph S. Tyler, Jr., Professor of Constitutional Law, Harvard Law School

Administrative staff for the program included:

Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Charles Trueheart, Associate Director, Institute of Politics, and Program Coordinator
Theresa Donovan, Administrative Coordinator
Andrew Robertson, Curriculum Coordinator
Miriam Ford, Press Coordinator
Sharon Keady, Press Coordinator
Nadine Parker '85, Notebook Coordinator
Pamela Gagnon, Administrative Assistant

Seminar for Massachusetts Mayors
February 28-March 1, 1985

The third annual Seminar for Massachusetts Mayors was attended by twenty-four mayors, a city manager, an assistant city manager, and a city representative from across the Commonwealth. Designed to be both a training session and a forum for the exchange of ideas, the seminar allows municipal chief executives to talk candidly, in an informal environment, 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 program included speeches by Hon. Michael S. Dukakis, Governor of Massachusetts; Amy S. Anthony, Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development; and James B. King, Vice President for Public Affairs, Northeastern University; and workshops on leadership, press relations, negotiations and mediations, and financial management led by Dr. Ronald Heifetz, Martin Linsky, Howard Raiffa, and Mary M. O'Keefe. Sponsors were the State, Local, and Intergovernmental Center of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, the Institute of Politics, the Massachusetts Municipal Association and the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development.

The participants included:

John Barrett, North Adams
Eugene C. Brune, Somerville
John J. Buckley, Lawrence
Bernard F. Chartrand, Fitchburg
Robert J. Ciolek, Boston (City Representative)
George V. Colella, Revere
Edward G. Connolly, Everett
Paul J. Donato, Medford
Thomas H. Fallon, Malden
Raymond L. Flynn, Boston
Richard J. Girouard, Leominster
Robert W. Healy, Jr., Cambridge (City Manager)
Richard Johnson, Taunton
Richard S. Lak, Chicopee
Brian J. Lawler, New Bedford
Theodore D. Mann, Newton
Brian J. Martin, Lowell
Charles R. Matthews, Lowell (Assistant City Manager)
Francis X. McCauley, Quincy
F. John Monahan, Beverly
David B. Musante, Jr., Northampton
Ernest E. Proulx, Holyoke
Brenda L. Reed, Attleboro
William H. Ryan, Haverhill
Richard R. Silva, Gloucester
Peter Torigian, Peabody
Carlton M. Viveiros, Fall River
The faculty included:

Ronald L. Heifetz, M.D., Lecturer in Public Policy,  
John F. Kennedy School of Government

James B. King, Vice President for Public Affairs,  
Northeastern University

Martin Linsky, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics and  
Adjunct Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Mary M. O'Keeffe, Assistant Professor of Public Policy,  
John F. Kennedy School of Government

Howard Raiffa, Frank Plumpton Ramsey Professor of Managerial  
Economics, Harvard University

The Seminar Committee consisted of:

State, Local and Intergovernmental Center

H. James Brown, Director

Arnold M. Howitt, Curriculum Coordinator

Jan Lent, Administrative Assistant to the Director

Institute of Politics

Jonathan Moore, Director

Charles Trueheart, Associate Director

Massachusetts Municipal Association

James Segel, Executive Director

L. Thomas Linden, Administrative Services Director

Executive Office of Communities and Development

Amy S. Anthony, Secretary

Richard Kobayashi

Marilyn Contreas
Special Projects

1984 Presidential Campaign
Decision-Makers Conference

On November 30-December 2, 1984 the Institute hosted its fourth post-election conference with the major decision makers from each of the Presidential candidate’s campaign organization to review with each other their actions and perceptions of the 1984 campaign. A transcript of the conference, Campaign for President: The Managers Look At ’84, edited and with an introduction by Jonathan Moore, will be published by Auburn House Publishing Company in the fall of 1985.

Session topics and moderators were:
“Before the Primaries,” Kenneth Bode
“The Democratic Primaries,” Howell Raines
“Republican Activity During the Pre-Convention Period,” Judy Woodruff
“The Conventions,” Judy Woodruff
“The General Election I,” Albert Hunt
“The General Election II,” David Broder

Participants included:
Lee Atwater, Deputy Director, Reagan Campaign
James Bacchus, Press Secretary and Issues Coordinator, Askew Campaign
Kenneth Bode, Network News Political Correspondent, NBC News
David Broder, National Political Correspondent, The Washington Post
Richard Darman, Assistant to the President of the United States, Reagan Campaign
Thomas Donilon, Deputy Campaign Manager, Mondale Campaign
Frank Fahrenkopf, Chairman, Republican National Committee
Lamond Godwin, Political Strategy Advisor, Jackson Campaign
Peter Hart, Pollster, Mondale Campaign
Oliver Henkel, Campaign Manager, Hart Campaign
Maxine Issacs, Press Secretary, Mondale Campaign
James Johnson, Chairman, Mondale Campaign
Mark Kaminsky, Press Secretary, McGovern Campaign
William Keyserling, National Campaign Director, Hollings Campaign
Richard Leone, Senior Advisor, Mondale Campaign
Preston Love, Deputy Campaign Manager, Jackson Campaign
Dotty Lynch, Pollster, Hart Campaign
Charles Manatt, Chairman, Democratic National Committee
Howell Raines, National Political Correspondent, The New York Times
John Reilly, Senior Advisor, Mondale Campaign
Edward Rollins, Campaign Director, Reagan Campaign
John Russonello, Press Secretary, Cranston Campaign
Greg Schneider, Communication Director, Glenn Campaign
William Shore, Political Director, Hart Campaign
Roger Stone, Regional Campaign Director for Eastern Region, Reagan Campaign
Robert Teeter, Senior Consultant/Marketing Director, Reagan Campaign
Richard Wirthlin, Director of Polling and Planning, Reagan Campaign
Judy Woodruff, Correspondent, McNeil-Lehrer NewsHour

Mary McTigue served as principal coordinator for the conference and in the production of the book. Other Institute staff members who contributed to the project were:
Charles Trueheart, Associate Director of the Institute
Anne Doyle Kenney, Internships Coordinator
Diane Pliner, Secretary to the Director
Susan Wunderlee, Media Services Coordinator

Peter Gelfman '85/86 was coordinator of student assistance for the conference and provided important support and manpower.

Inside South Africa
April 20, 1985

The Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics conducted a one-day educational conference to provide Boston-area students with information on conditions in South Africa and its history, and to examine some controversial issues and proposals for change.

Conference sessions and participants included:
An address on South African history by Dunbar Moodie, Professor of Sociology, Hobart and William Smith Colleges
An address on the current political situation by Fikile Bam, Visiting Fellow, Southern Africa Research Program, Yale University
Afternoon workshops led by:

Jonathan Leape, Department of Economics, Harvard University;
co-editor, Business in the Shadow of Apartheid

Adam Klein, Harvard School of Business Administration; former
deputy vice president of the Trades Union Council of South Africa

Preston Noah Williams, Houghton Professor of Theology and
Contemporary Change, Harvard Divinity School

Donald Norland, associate, Africa Research Program, Center for
International Affairs, Harvard University; former
United States Ambassador to Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Chad

A panel discussion on personal perspectives with:

Kenneth Carstens, Executive Director, U.S. Committee of the
International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa

Michael Mcethe, former member, Transport and Allied Workers
Union of South Africa

James North, author, Freedom Rising

Donald Norland (moderator)

Coordinators of the conference were:

Peter Gelfman '85/86
David Michael '87
Leah Dickerman '86
Cynthia Rice '87
Claire Fleming '88
The Press-Politics Center

Press-Politics Center Advisory Committee

Robert M. Bennett, Senior Vice President, Metromedia
David S. Broder, National Political Correspondent and Associate Editor, The Washington Post
Otis Chandler, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board, Times Mirror Company
Hedley W. Donovan, former Editor-in-Chief, Time magazine
Stephen H. Hess, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
James Hoge, Publisher, New York Daily News
J. Anthony Lukas, journalist and author
Robert J. Manning, Editor-in-Chief, Boston Publishing Company
Peter S. McGhee, Program Manager for Public Affairs and Special Education, WGBH-TV Boston
Alan L. Otten, Senior National Correspondent, The Wall Street Journal
Dan Rather, Anchorman and Managing Editor, CBS News
Richard S. Salant, former Vice-Chairman, NBC, Inc.
Frank Stanton, President Emeritus, CBS, Inc.
William O. Taylor, President and Publisher, The Boston Globe

The Institute of Politics is taking the lead on behalf of the School and the University 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 for a free press in our political system.

The Center’s 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 Center’s 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 ex-
ectives 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.

The Press-Politics Center by the end of the 1984-85 academic year had raised over $4 million of a projected $5 million initial endowment in money received and formal pledges. A partial list of contributors include The Boston Globe, Field Enterprises, Cox Enterprises, the Philip L. Graham Fund, the Jesse B. Cox Charitable Foundation, Dow Jones, CBS, RCA, ABC, General Electric, ITT, Chase Manhattan Bank and IBM.

With space available for the Center, adjacent to the Institute, in the Belfer Center addition to the Kennedy School, its conceptual and institutional design completed, advance program activity growing, and the raising of additional endowment and the appointment of full-time personnel anticipated in the near future, we are looking forward to the formal establishment of the new Center in 1986.

How The Press Affects Federal Policy Making

Although it is generally agreed that the press has increasing influence on the formation of public policy and the performance of political institutions, we know very little, either anecdotally or systematically, about precisely how it makes its influence felt. How are the behavior and the decision-making processes of public officials influenced by the press? What specific policy content is particularly subject to change because of press influence, and in what direction? What inhibitions, if any, does the press accept so as to avoid interfering with the flow of information within government, and what inhibitions, if any, are placed on government decision-making by the role of a free press? Who uses whom? In what ways and with what explicit knowledge? What is the appropriate interest of the government in enforcing centralized dispensing of information? At what points in the policy-making process does the press play its various roles of influencing policy process and content, informing one part of the government about the activities of another, creating public awareness, and shaping public opinion? How does that public opinion affect government?

A three-year research project funded by the Charles H. Revson Foundation began its work in July, 1982, with the goal of increasing understanding about the impact of the press on the people, policies, processes,
and institutions of the federal government. Early in 1984, the project completed the research and data collection phase of its work; several case studies, a lengthy questionnaire sent to the 1000 senior federal policymakers from the past twenty years, and interviews with fifteen journalists and twenty-five policymakers nominated by a panel of their respective peers.

During the past year, the work of the project was devoted to synthesizing the results of the research and presenting the findings and conclusions in a book authored by Martin Linsky to be published in 1986.

Members of the Faculty Study Group which directed the project include:

Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Chairman
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Vice-Chairman
F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science and Management, 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
Mark Moore, Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Eileen Shanahan, Senior Assistant Managing Editor, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
James C. Thomson, Jr., Professor, School of Public Communication, Boston University; former Curator, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University
John William Ward, President, American Council of Learned Societies
Lewis W. Wolfson, Professor of Communication, American University; former Washington Bureau Chief, Providence Journal
New Communications Technology,
Public Policy, and Democratic Values

Scholars and commentators have been heralding the advent of an "information revolution" for some time. Although the extent of such a revolution has been widely debated, one need only look at the effects of both large satellites in outer space and small computers in our offices and homes to know that the ways in which we receive and transmit information are changing rapidly.

The project on New Communications Technology, Public Policy, and Democratic Values was undertaken two years ago by the Institute of Politics, with funding from the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation, to examine how these new methods of communication are affecting how we are governed and how we, as citizens, choose to participate in our democracy.

The project has developed material on such topics as the fundamental conceptions of democracy in the United States and the properties which are shared by the new technologies—increase in the speed and volume of transmitted information, increased control exercised by both the senders and recipients of information, and capacity for receivers to interact with senders via the news media.

The project is supervised by a faculty study group composed of both political and media practitioners as well as academic experts. The final product of the group's efforts will be a book on which work will be completed by January of 1986. It is anticipated, in addition to outlining the ways in which these new technologies have affected our communications, that the work will examine how such aspects of democracy as elections, citizen participation and governance have been or may be changing in response to them. These expositions will lead to a series of recommendations regarding policy issues requiring serious consideration as we move further into this new era.

The draft chapters of the book will be completed for presentation to a conference of scholars and professionals to be held in the coming year. Professors Gary Orren, Jeffrey Abramson and Christopher Arterton are the three principal authors of the work.

Members of the Study Group include:

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Professor of Government and Public Policy,
John F. Kennedy School of Government, Chairman
Jeffrey Abramson, Assistant Professor of Politics, Harvard; Assistant
District Attorney, Middlesex County, Massachusetts
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
John Deardourff, Chairman of the Board, Bailey, Deardourff and Associates
Henry Geller, Director, Center for Public Policy Research, Washington, DC
Winthrop Knowlton, Director, Center for Business and Government, 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
Roger Mudd, Chief Political Correspondent, NBC News
W. Russell Neuman, Assistant Professor of Political Science and Co-Director, Research Program on Communications Policy, MIT
Richard M. Neustadt, Senior Vice President, Private Satellite Network, New York
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael Sandel, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard

Research Coordinator for the project is Wendy M. O'Donnell, with assistance from Stephen M. Kotran and Karen E. Skelton.
The Forum

The ARCO Forum of Public Affairs 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 "crossroad 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."

Selected Forum events (as indicated by asterisk (*) below) were carried as part of a thirteen-week radio series on stations of the American Public Radio network. The series of selected events taped during 1984 was made possible by a grant from the Atlantic Richfield Company, and was produced in cooperation with WGBH Boston Radio.

The Institute administers all formal programs held in the Forum, including the following events:


"Choosing a Running Mate," July 10, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School with:

Evelyn Murphy, Secretary of Economic Affairs, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Bert Lance, Chairman of the Georgia Democratic Party
Morris Fiorina, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Christopher Lydon, Anchor, Ten O'Clock News, WGBH-TV Boston.


"The Future of the Olympics," July 24, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School with:

Boris Djerassi, member, 1980 U.S. Olympic Track and Field Team
Robert Lipsyte, Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Sport and Society, Northeastern University
Allan Guttmann, Professor of English and American Studies, Amherst College; author, The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement
Patricia Miller, Associate Director of the Athletic Department, Harvard University (moderator).

"The Uses and Abuses of Political Polling," August 2, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School with:

Rep. Al Swift, Chairman of the Task Force on Elections of the Committee on House Administration
Roy Wetzel, general manager of the election information unit, NBC News
Wilma Goldstein, research director, Smith and Haroff, Washington, D.C.
William Schneider, Fellow, American Enterprise Institute;
   political analyst, Los Angeles Times.


The Canadian National Election, September 4, 1984, on the big screen.
Co-sponsored by the University Consortium of the Center for International Affairs for Research in North America.

Convocation for students of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, September 11, 1984, with remarks by:
Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy and Academic Dean,
   John F. Kennedy School of Government
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert Blackwill, Associate Dean for Administration,
   John F. Kennedy School of Government.

A Voter Registration Fair, September 12, 1984, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee.


Massachusetts Primary Election results, September 18, 1984, on the big screen.

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 19, 1984, a panel discussion with the Fall 1984 Fellows of the Institute of Politics:
Thomas Axworthy, former Principal Secretary, Senior Policy Advisor to
   Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada
John Gunther, General Counsel and Executive Director of the
   United States Conference of Mayors
Mary Lou Munts, State Representative, Madison, Wisconsin
Audrey Rowe, Commissioner of Social Services,
   Department of Social Services, Washington, D.C.
David Sparks, political and communications consultant, National Field Director for George Bush (1980)

William Sutherland, former Southern Africa Representative, American Friends Service Committee

Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics (moderator).

"China and the U.S.: What Next for Relations?" September 25, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee.

"The African Development Bank: The Road Ahead After Twenty Years of Service," October 2, 1984, an address by Wila Mung'Omba, President of the African Development Bank, with respondents:

John M. Cohen, Fellow, Harvard Institute of International Development

Raymond Vernon, Clarence Dillon Professor for International Affairs Emeritus, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

(* "U.S. Foreign Policy: The Next Four Years," October 8, 1984, a debate between:

Richard Pipes, Professor of Government, Harvard University; Director, East European and Soviet Affairs, National Security Council (1981-1982)

Richard Gardner, Professor of Law, Columbia University; U.S. Ambassador to Italy, (1977-1980)

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator).


Vice Presidential Debate, October 11, 1984, on the big screen, preceded by a Student Debate with representatives from Harvard University and Yale University, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee.

A Celebration for the Opening of the Belfer Center, October 12, 1984, hosted by Graham T. Allison, Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

"Domestic Policy: The 1984 Campaign," October 16, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee.

The Presidential Debate, October 21, 1984, on the big screen.

"Foreign Policy and the 1984 Elections," October 23, 1984, an address

"Paradoxes of Political Liberty," the Tanner Lectures on Human Values, October 24-25, 1984, delivered by Quentin Skinner, Professor of Political Science, University of Cambridge, England:
I: "Beyond the Contemporary Debate"
II: "Toward the Classical Ideal."

"The Politics of Culture," October 30, 1984, an address by William Bennett, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, co-sponsored by the John M. Olin Foundation, with respondents:
Judith Sklar, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Peter Berger, University Professor, Boston University.

(*) "Deindustrialization: Myth or Reality?" November 1, 1984, a debate with:
Bennett Harrison, Professor of Political Economy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Barry Bluestone, Professor of Economics and Director of the Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College
Charles Schultze, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
Robert Z. Lawrence, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
Benjamin Friedman, Professor of Economics, Harvard University (moderator).

"Alternatives to War," November 2, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard-Radcliffe International Development Forum with:
Dennis Brutus, exiled South African poet and social activist
Bereket Habte Selassie, exiled Eritrean lawyer, former Attorney General of Ethiopia
Nubar Hovesepian, Middle East scholar and author
Dan Connell, Executive Director, Grassroots International; former Lebanon Project Officer, OXFAM America (moderator).

"Adovocates '84 Debate: Who Should be President?" November 3, 1984, produced by WGBH-TV Boston, in cooperation with the Institute of Politics, with:
William Rusher, publisher of The National Review, advocate for the Reagan team
Barney Frank, U.S. Representative (D-MA), advocate for the Mondale team
Jeane Kirkpatrick, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Reagan witness
Jack Kemp, U.S. Representative (R-NY), Reagan witness
Michael Dukakis, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Mondale witness
Christopher Dodd, U.S. Senator (D-CT), Mondale witness
Judy Woodruff, PBS “Frontline” Correspondent (moderator).

“The Best and Worst of the 1984 Campaign Commercials,” November 5, 1984, a videotape presentation on the big screen followed by a panel discussion with:
- Ceci Cole, Communications Director, National Republican Senatorial Committee
- Jack Flannery, political consultant
- James B. King, Senior Vice President for Public Affairs, Northeastern University
- David Sparks, Fellow, Institute of Politics (moderator).


“Analyzing the Returns,” November 7, 1984, an address by Daniel Yankelovich, author, New Rules; Chairman, Yankelovich, Skelley and White.

“Reagan Re-election: The View From Abroad,” November 13, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee.

Post Harvard-Yale Game reception, November 17, 1984, hosted by Graham T. Allison, Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government.


“The Homeless Mentally Ill,” November 27, 1984, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Mental Health Policy Working Group of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, with opening remarks by Michael Dukakis, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Participants were:
- H. Richard Lamb, M.D., former Chairman, National Task Force on the Mentally Ill
Philip Johnston, Secretary of Human Resources, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
James Callahan, Commissioner of Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Gerald Klerman, Chairman of the Mental Health Policy Working Group, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator).

"Lesbian and Gay Perspectives on the 1984 Elections: Where Do We Go From Here?" November 28, 1984, a panel discussion with:
Virginia Apuzzo, Executive Director, National Gay Task Force
Gil Gerald, Executive Director, National Coalition of Black Gays
Chris Riddiough, Director, Lesbian Rights, National Organization for Women
Robert Ebersole, Town Clerk, Lunenburg, Massachusetts
Eric Rofes, Chairman, Boston Lesbian and Gay Political Alliance; Study Group Leader, Institute of Politics (moderator).

"Canadian-U.S. Relations," November 30, 1984, an address by Jean Chretien, Member of Parliament, Canada, sponsored by the University Consortium of the Center for International Affairs for Research on North America.

"The Secret Agent," December 4, 1984, a Green Mountain Films documentary on Agent Orange, followed by a panel discussion with:
Robert Baughman, Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School
Joseph Bangert, Massachusetts Advisory Committee on Agent Orange; Vietnam veteran
Joseph Ellis, Professor of History and Dean of Mount Holyoke College; Vietnam veteran
Charles Light, producer, "The Secret Agent" (moderator).

"Reinventing the World We Live In," December 5, 1984, an address by John Naisbitt, Visiting Fellow, Institute of Politics; author, Megatrends; Chairman of The Naisbitt Group.

"Shout Youngstown," December 11, 1984, a documentary film about steel plant closings, produced by Carol Greenwald and Dorie Krauss, followed by a panel discussion with:
Michael Verich, Ohio State Representative
Thomas Gallagher, Massachusetts State Representative
Robert Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
John Brouder, former Staff Director, Joint Taxation Committee of the Massachusetts State Legislature (moderator).
"Women in the U.S.S.R.," December 12, 1984, an address by Tatyana Mamonova, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee and the Radcliffe Union of Students.

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," January 31, 1985, a panel discussion with the Spring 1985 Fellows of the Institute of Politics:
- Joelle Attinger, correspondent, Time, Boston bureau
- Lamond Godwin, co-founder and National Political Director of the National Rainbow Coalition, Inc.; Political Strategy Coordinator, Jesse Jackson for President Campaign
- Karlyn Keene, Managing Editor, Public Opinion, American Enterprise Institute
- Daniel Whitehurst, Mayor of Fresno, California (1977-1984)
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics (moderator).

"Feminism and the Politics of Pornography," February 6, 1985, an address by Jean Bethke Elshtain, Professor of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, co-sponsored by the John M. Olin Foundation with respondent: Michael Sandel, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University.

"One Year A.D.: Telecommunications After Divestiture," February 12, 1985, a panel discussion with:
- Morris Tanenbaum, Executive Vice President, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
- Paul F. Levy, Chairman, Department of Public Utilities, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
- Jeffrey Blumenfeld, Attorney; former Chief of the AT&T Trial Staff; former Assistant Chief of Special Regulated Industries, U.S. Department of Justice
- John J. Coleman, Vice President-Massachusetts, New England Telephone
- Anthony Oettinger, Gordon McKay Professor of Mathematics; Chairman, Program on Information Resources Policy, Harvard University (moderator).

"Capitalism's Mixed Blessings: The Bishops' Letter and the U.S. Economy," February 21, 1985, a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard-Radcliffe Catholic Student Center with:
Peter Flanigan, Managing Director, Dillon, Read & Co.;
former Assistant to President Nixon for Economic Affairs

Donald Warwick, Consultant to the Bishops' Committee;
Fellow, Harvard Institute for International Development

Jane Redmont, Social Justice Minister, The Paulist Center, Boston

Harvey Cox, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity,
Harvard Divinity School; author, Religion in the Secular City (moderator).

"Violence Revisited," March 5, 1985, a panel discussion co-sponsored
by The Eisenhower Foundation with:
Sister Falaka Fattah, founder, House of Umoja, Philadelphia

David Ginsburg, former Executive Director, National Advisory Committee
on Civil Disorders; senior partner, Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress

Hubert Williams, Director, Newark Police Department;
President-elect, The Police Foundation

Lynn A. Curtis, President, The Eisenhower Foundation (moderator).

"The 1965 Voting Rights Act: Expectations and Realities," March 7, 1985,
a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee.

"Is The Way We Choose Our President Obsolete?" March 12, 1985, an
address by Theodore H. White, Visiting Fellow, Institute of Politics; historian
and author, The Making of the President series, America In Search of Itself, and
In Search of History.

"The Future of the Democratic Party," March 14, 1985, a panel discus­sion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee and the Harvard
Democratic Club.

"Has the United States Dropped Out of Europe?" March 19, 1985, an
address by Shirley Williams, co-founder of the Social Democratic Party of
Great Britain; former Fellow, Institute of Politics.

"The Deficit Dilemma: Prospects, Impacts and Solutions," April 3, 1985,
a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee and
the Harvard Economic Association.

"Family and Nation," the Edwin L. Godkin Lecture Series, April 8-9,
1985, delivered in three parts by Daniel Patrick Moynihan, U.S. Senator
(D-NY).

"None of the Above: The Myth of Scholastic Aptitude," April 9, 1985,
an address by David Owen, author, None of the Above and High School: Undercover With the Class of '80.

"Equality in Action," April 11, 1985, an address by J.R. Pole, Rhodes Professor of American History and Institutions, Oxford University, England, with respondents:

Nathan Glazer, Professor of Education and Social Structure, School of Education, Harvard University

Christopher Edley, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator).


"U.S. Policy Towards Africa," Part I of the Fifth Annual Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series, April 17, 1985, co-sponsored by the Black Caucus of the John F. Kennedy School of Government. A panel discussion with:

Henry Jackson, Chair, African Studies Department, Hunter College; author, From the Congo to Soweto: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Africa Since 1960

Jean Sindab, Executive Director, The Washington Office on Africa

Michael Warr, journalist, contributor to The Economist, BBC, The Guardian (London), Africa Now, African Business and other journals

Herschelle Challenor, Director, UNESCO Liaison Office; former Staff Director of the Subcommittee on Africa, U.S. House of Representatives.

"Blacks in Politics," Part II of the Fifth Annual Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series, April 18, 1985, a panel discussion with:

Roland Burris, Vice Chairman, Democratic National Committee; Comptroller, State of Illinois

Lamond Godwin, Fellow, Institute of Politics; co-founder and National Political Director of the National Rainbow Coalition, Inc.; Political Strategy Coordinator, Jesse Jackson for President Campaign
Garcia Hillman, Executive Director, National Coalition on Black Voter Participation

J. Kenneth Blackwell, member, City Council, Cincinnati, Ohio; former Mayor of Cincinnati; former Fellow, Institute of Politics

"Inside South Africa," April 20, 1985, an intercollegiate conference, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee

"Development Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Role of International Aid Institutions," April 26, 1985, the opening of the Seventh Annual Third World Conference, co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School Student Government, a panel discussion with:

Mark Edelman, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa, U.S. Agency for International Development
Wilfried Thalwitz, Vice President, West Africa Region, World Bank
Nurul Islam, Assistant Director General, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations
John Hammock, Executive Director, OXFAM America
Patrick Rayen, Visiting Scholar, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University (moderator).

"Peace in the Middle East," April 23, 1985, an address by Her Majesty Queen Noor Al Hussein of Jordan.

"Strategic Compact," April 29, 1985, an address by the Honorable Amata Kabua, President of the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

"The Fall of Saigon: Ten Years Later," April 30, 1985, a slide presentation followed by a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, the John F. Kennedy School Student Government and the Vietnamese Students Association.

"The Dynamics of Change in South Africa," May 1, 1985, Part I: The South African Perspective, a panel discussion with:

Abe S. Hoppenstein, Consul General of South Africa, New York
David Ndaha, Administrative Secretary, International Department, African National Congress, New York
John Matisonn, South African journalist; former Washington Bureau Chief, Rand Daily Mail
Donald Norland, Research Associate, African Research Center, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University; former U.S. Ambassador to Chad, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland (moderator).
"Can Nuclear War Be Avoided? How a Nuclear War Might Begin, and How the Risks Can Be Reduced," June 5, 1985, a presentation and discussion by the editors of Hawks, Doves, and Owls: An Agenda for Avoiding Nuclear War:

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Albert Carnesale, Academic Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Harvard.

*****