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The year 1986-87 has been a time of transition at the Institute of Politics with the departure of director Jonathan Moore in September 1986, the arrival of new director Dick Thornburgh in June 1987, and the departure of six members of the staff including two of the longest-serving who are on leaves of absence—fellows program coordinator Theresa Donovan and student program coordinator Sonia Wallenberg. As we go to press, three staffmembers—associate director Paul G. Bograd, assistant director Mary McTigue and special assistant to the director Wendy M. O’Donnell—prepare to go on to new responsibilities elsewhere.

This year has also been an exciting and productive one under the leadership of Mary McTigue who as acting director from September through May conducted the affairs of the Institute with wisdom, grace and efficiency, and with a sensitivity and sense of humor that never failed even on the most trying of days. It has been a pleasure to have worked under her guidance and it is with sadness that we see her depart. We wish her success in her future endeavors.

This ninth edition of Proceedings contains the 1986-87 selection of readings excerpted from speeches, articles, panel discussions, books and reports and a complete roster of 1986-87 programs and participants. The selected readings provide a sense of the actors encountered and the issues discussed; the programs section identifies both the scope and the personnel of the Institute’s yearly undertakings.

Participation in the democratic process continues through the variety of educational programs the Institute sponsors—fellowships and study groups, conferences and debates, internships and research projects—and by providing a setting for formal and informal political discourse. Students, politicians, teachers, activists, theorists and policy makers come together to break bread, study and debate public policy issues at informal luncheons and suppers, faculty study groups, training programs and seminars and in the public affairs forum.

Institute programming this year included sponsorship of two symposia in early September 1986 during the celebration of the 50th/350th anniversaries of the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Harvard University. Late September saw the culmination of the Institute’s efforts under the direction of Jonathan Moore toward the development of a press-politics center at the School with the dedication and opening of the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy in the School’s Belfer Center adjacent to the Institute. On May 8-10, 1987 the Institute sponsored The Lord Harlech Memorial Conference on Ideals and Values in Politics and Public Service and 20th Anniversary Reunion. About 350 colleagues—former and current directors, fellows, senior advisory and student advisory committee members, study group leaders, faculty study group members, congressmen, mayors, staff and friends—came together from near and far for the weekend conference and reunion events.

The Institute also sponsored a conference for high school students on community leadership, brought together newly-elected Congressmen for the biannual training program, co-sponsored with the Twentieth Century Fund the Theodore H. White Conference on Presidential Debates and sponsored its first pre-election conference for campaign managers and strategists in anticipation of the 1988 presidential elections. Forum programming included an appearance of The Capitol Steps, a political drama about the early days of the AIDS epidemic, public addresses and panel discussions on topics relating to Central America, China, the Middle East and the Soviet Union, and economic policy, careers in public service, the nuclear test ban treaty, women in election 1988, foreign aid, and press coverage of the presidency.

Special thanks to Mary McTigue for her assistance and guidance in compiling this issue of Proceedings and also to Albert H. (Tad) Cantril, fall 1986 and spring 1987 Institute fellow who during summer 1987, while completing the editing of a book of his father’s essays, also provided invaluable advice and assistance on the readings selections.

Working with my colleagues at the Institute and on this project has been a privilege and a pleasure—Proceedings 1986-87 is the fith edition produced under my editorship. A special note of gratitude to all those who have provided assistance and support over the years.

Anne Doyle Kenney
Editor
Proceedings 1986-87 stands as a testament to the leadership of Jonathan Moore and to the skilled staff who capably continued Institute programs during the interim between permanent directors.

Taking up my post here in June, I found great enthusiasm for the Institute’s programs among students, fellows and faculty, and that has been a source of inspiration and strength to me as I begin my new duties. I believe strongly in Dean Graham Allison’s characterization ten years ago of the Institute’s role “as a bridge to the real world of elective politics and a vital link to the undergraduate population.”

I will seek to dedicate the coming year to strengthening these two vital roles of the Institute, and I solicit the support and suggestions of all of our friends. My commitment is to provide programs and opportunities that are exciting, educational, and challenging; that bring to the Harvard Community the broad perspective of those who hold or seek public office.

After serving eight years as governor of one of the nation’s largest and most diverse states, I welcome this opportunity to share my experiences and insights within the academic community. Many of our most innovative programs in Pennsylvania had their seeds on the campuses of our colleges and universities, and I truly believe that not only can politicians learn from the academic community, but that the academic community can learn from practical politicians as well. My door is open. Please come in.

Lastly, the celebration of the 200th anniversary of our country’s Constitution provides us all with a renewed opportunity to dedicate ourselves to greater involvement in the politics of this great nation. The high ideals, the integrity and the hopes of those who assembled in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787 can well inspire the next generation of leaders. In this, we at the Institute of Politics can surely participate in a most effective way.

Dick Thornburgh
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In celebration of the joint 50th/350th anniversaries of the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Harvard University, the Institute of Politics sponsored a symposium on "DeTocqueville Revisited: Views of American Politics from Abroad," on September 5, 1986. Participants included Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics who left the Institute a few days later to take up his post as Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs; Stanley Hoffman, C. Douglas Dillon Professor of the Civilization of France and Chair, Center for European Studies, Harvard University; Tommy T. B. Koh, Ambassador to the United States from Singapore; Shirley Williams, Founder and President, Social Democratic Party, Great Britain; Thomas S. Axworthy, Visiting Professor of Canadian Studies, Harvard University who is now Vice President, La Foundation CRB, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Following are the edited remarks delivered by panelists Williams and Axworthy.

WILLIAMS: When I first came to the United States, sticking in the back of my head was a very short phrase from the works of poet Archibald MacLeish, "America was promises." My first encounter with the United States, which was in Minnesota during the Second World War, was one which abundantly bore out that description of this great Republic. Indeed I felt, time and again, those words that Wordsworth penned about the French Revolution, "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive and to be young was very heaven."

There is a sense in which even today the United States sees itself as being—and is to some extent—a special place, a happy country, a relatively invulnerable land, compared to the rest of us. You were fortunate enough throughout your history, with the exception of some of the great domestic challenges, to constantly confront challenges from abroad that were well within your compass. Indeed, you could be described as the Fortinbras of international politics, always coming on the stage littered with corpses in time to take over.

When I compare Western Europe with the United States, I think of two cars. The first car has a tremendously powerful engine and a lousy braking system. The second car has the engine of a tiny two-piston motorbicycle combined with the most sophisticated braking system. The first is the United States; the second is Western Europe.

You are, as DeTocqueville said, the most serious people on the face of the earth. You have an appetite for improvement, an appetite for self-examination, an amaz-
ing appetite for self-castigation, and your chosen instrument of castigation is, almost invariably, a stick made in Japan. You flagellate yourselves with fears about your health, worries about your motivation, and concern about your relationships. The strange thing is that at the very end of the day you don’t really quite believe it—you do believe still that you are a special place, a happy country. Are you? Well, there’s a question.

I don’t know whether the President is the most brilliant bargainer among Presidents of many generations past or whether he is a kind of Pangloss president. You may remember Pangloss, a figure in Voltaire’s Candide, who said that this was the best of all possible worlds in the best of all possible times. I’m afraid that I find it hard to believe. It is as if President Carter went around looking terribly worried, being responsible for everything, and President Reagan stands one step aside as if some divine laissez-faire would bring about a more perfect world.

You are a country still half in love with your youth. One of the strangest things about the United States is that it sees itself—and is—a country of the future but it’s terribly in love with its past, much more in love with its past than the rest of us are or, some of you may acutely say, can be. You are now moving from your youth to your middle age. You find it very hard to accept being middle aged. Your middle age dates from the war in Vietnam, from discovering that the United States was after all vulnerable, was after all capable of being defeated, was after all—dare I say it to my old friends—just occasionally morally ambivalent like all the rest of us.

Your system is different and better than most other systems. You are the most democratic of democracies, and you are the most free from secrecy and from the kinds of controls that still exist in many parts of Europe. But American exceptionalism, which has been such a characteristic of this country, has been imported into your attitude towards foreign affairs. That is what Europeans find it hardest to accept. We do not in the end believe that the United States is uniquely more moral than all the rest of us in the way she conducts her foreign affairs. We don’t see such a difference between the way the United States behaves in the world at large, as distinct from her system at home of which I’ve expressed great admiration, and the way in which other great powers at other times have behaved.

What I admire is the effectiveness of your legislature. I think it’s marvelous that your legislature puts the Executive through what it puts it through. I admire your freedom of information. In Britain, Watergate would have almost certainly led to the incarceration of both the journalists responsible and to the Official’s Secret’s Act/Part II.

I admire what you’ve done about race relations. You are still not a country without prejudice, but you are the only major country in the world to have tried to tackle race relations and for that I express great admiration. I admire the vigor of your states and localities, which especially in the last few years, have taken up the challenge of dealing with the question of equity in the American scene.

I don’t admire politics as a commodity. I’m amazed by the way in which all your candidates look so very much alike. Each one a grey-suited, handsome chap follow-
ing another grey-suited, handsome chap indistinguishable except to those trying to arrange dating through computer. I don’t admire some elements of the military-industrial complex; I think it’s real and I think it’s sometimes rather frightening. I don’t admire single issue politics. I don’t admire early Victorian sanctimoniousness. Yes, we thought that the Empire was uniquely free, civilized, and something the rest of the world should accept with open arms and—forgive me—so do you. And I don’t admire the rise of lawyers who I understand have been one of the fastest rising—God help us—groups in the employment pattern, jumping by 43 percent between 1977 and 1982. If Gulliver is ever strangled, it will be by Lilliputian lawyers.

I believe you are heading into a very difficult period. I agree with Ambassador Koh about the balance of trade, about the budget deficit, about many other indications which suggest a very stormy time in the next few years. I believe that for you, it is not the presence of a serious internal crisis that you need most to worry about. It is having no crisis at all and doing what we did, gently and gracefully declining.

AXWORTHY: There are three main points that DeTocqueville makes in the first ten chapters of his first book, the book that impresses me most—three points about American politics that DeTocqueville found compelling in the 1830s which were subjects of enormous debate in Canada at that time. Subsequently we accepted them all in my country and today they are areas which are still under debate in this country.

First, DeTocqueville talks about diversity and pluralism. He begins his analysis not with the federal government, not with the national government, but with the township, the county, with the state. Beginning with federalism, with the view that the United States was composed of a variety of units and accepting the analysis of Madison and Jefferson that one had to accept the conflict and the diversity in mankind and develop a governmental system around that—ambition to counteract ambition, faction to counteract faction. It was on that basic principle that the United States Constitution was formed. And what a different principle it is, unique to the United States.

The subject of the State is to have a variety of interests, not a single good—not the supremacy of Parliament that Shirley Williams and I are used to; not the national interest, but a diversity of interests that will contend—a unique American contribution finding its expression not only in separation of powers and checks and balances but in federalism itself. It took two to three generations to adopt the innovation; Canada did so in 1867.

So what do we see today about the United States and this concept of diversity, sectionalism, and factions? Well, I find it alive and well. A foreigner is astounded and pleased to see the openness, the diversity, the contending views that abound in this country. The diversity of the United States is still perhaps the single most exciting element about it, that and its openness. Just look at tax reform. In my country, and in Shirley’s, tax reform would have come about from a group of public servants with no one knowing about it until it was released from the Minister of Finance.
In our nations if there is a leak from the Department of Finance or the Treasury about a budget, the Minister of Finance must resign. To have a budget and tax reform done in the open with every little nuance reported in *The Boston Globe* and *The Wall Street Journal* is, to a foreigner, an unbelievable and I think an absolutely admirable aspect of your system.

But if diversity and plurality of interest forms one pole of a very exciting dynamic in your system, the second element and the worry is, what about consensus? What about coordination? What about the national interest? And here when we look at Congress, for example, one sees that diversity represented in some four hundred subcommittees of the Congress, a staff of five thousand Congressional assistants, not to mention the hundreds and millions of executive public servants. A foreign power trying to contend with what has been called by a colleague at Harvard "the government of strangers" is constantly amazed at not only the diversity of interests but at the diversity of view expressed by the same government.

There is an incident which perhaps you've never heard of, called shakes and shingles, which sounds like an old lyric from rock and roll, but is actually part of a trade dispute between Canada and the United States. At exactly the same moment that Mr. Reagan and our Prime Minister were announcing a free trade agreement between our two societies—that we would work to reduce trade barriers and have a unified common market—the Congress was bringing out extended new tariffs against shakes and shingles which are part of the wood industry in British Columbia. Now, Canada being Canada, we instantly retaliated. We put massive tariffs against Vermont Christmas trees and teabags. It is not quite Libya and the United States, but Canadians were somewhat perplexed to find that the President could be speaking with one voice and the Congress operating with another. Assuredly DeTocqueville would recognize today, as I do, that that is a very representative government—but is it a Government?

At the second point is democracy and universal suffrage. The United States had that by the 1830s when DeTocqueville wrote his work. Canada did not approach universal suffrage until the 1880s. What is perplexing to democrats around the world is that the very society that invented mass democracy now has so few people participating in the system—only in the 50 percent range. In my country it's 70-75 percent. Now that is a particular burden for the United States because no society places such stress upon the democratic process. You have so many elections. There are primaries, there are off-year elections. People begin to campaign for President two months after you have an election. No other society is like that. No other society has democracy as such a legitimizing device.

When there are so few, relatively, participating, it leads to a major problem of democratic theory. Can you ask citizens across this nation to make sacrifices when 50 percent of them don't participate in the process, don't have any stake in the outcome? Can you really talk to them about issues, about raising their taxes, about
sacrificing their children to a draft, and so on? Citizenship implies privilege and responsibility. The problem with democracy in the United States today is that you are facing a problem when so many of your own citizens are opting out at a time when you may need all their energy and effort.

The last point is that of parties and the national party system. The technique of mass democracy is an American invention. I noticed in the last election in Great Britain we saw Margaret Thatcher with a variety of funny hats and headdresses; well that’s Calvin Coolidge from the 1920’s. Jacques Chirac in the last election had his coat thrown over his shoulder with his hair flying; that was John Lindsay in 1965. All of us adapt American techniques of mass democracy because you invented them first. Nuclear war demonstrates the revolution that the technology has brought to our whole concept of warfare.

I submit that we are in a similar revolution in the development of practical politics—of which I was once a practitioner and about which I am now a commentator—the revolution of television, of money and of polling in particular. All of politics, since the Greeks first invented democracy, revolved around the intuition of the leader—his ability to persuade—and the follower. Now, with polling, one doesn’t need intuition, one doesn’t need organization, one doesn’t need unions, one doesn’t need apprenticeship. One needs resources to buy the polsters to find out what the people want. And once one can buy that intuition then one, with the same resource through television and direct mail, can buy the persuasion. So we are turning from a politics of participation to a politics of manipulation.

The whole concept of politics, as Aristotle talked about—that the rich have land and the poor have numbers—now the rich can buy the numbers and therefore the whole dynamic between reform and conservatism has been changed dramatically and irrevocably because of the invention of technology that your country has promoted.

When Benjamin Franklin left the great Constitutional Convention in 1787—and there they had kept it secret, probably the first and last time anything was kept secret in American politics—as he walked out of that convention, a woman said, ‘Pray, Dr. Franklin, are we to have a Republic or a Monarchy?’ ‘A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it.’ Well you’ve kept it for 200 years and despite what we have said, you’ll probably keep it for at least that time longer.

*****
Three Myths of Terrorism

by Benjamin Netanyahu

The following is excerpted from "Invisible Enemies in the Middle East: Three Myths of Terrorism," a public address in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs on July 29, 1986, by Benjamin Netanyahu, Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations.

I want to talk about terrorism, about three particular aspects of terrorism which I think are essential to understanding international terrorism, and I stress that word and will come back to it. I want to talk about what is it, who stands behind it, what to do about it. The title, "Three Myths of Terrorism" is not accidental. Terrorists have taken pains to give answers to every one of these questions. It's important to understand that terrorism, aside from whatever else it does in terms of violence and bloodshed and fear, seeks to confuse. There's a deliberate strategy to confuse and obscure the answers to these fundamental questions.

The first question is, "What is terrorism?" The terrorist answer is immediate. You've all heard it time and again, not only from the terrorists themselves or their spokesmen, but from people of good will who adopt it uncritically and repeat it again and again. They say you can't really define terrorism because, well, it depends on whose ox is gored. One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. If I heard that in the United Nations ten times a day, you probably hear it three times a day in Cambridge.

Can you set up objective standards that determine if somebody is a terrorist? If you can't define it, its very hard to fight it. Terrorists understand this. They work night and day to tell us that we can't define it. Let me give you an example from World War II. In 1944 the British Royal Air Force took off on a bombing mission. The target was the Gestapo Headquarters in Copenhagen. The bombers got on top of the target, loosed the bombs, and missed. Instead of the Gestapo, they hit a children's hospital nearby and dozens of children were horribly burned and killed. That's not terrorism. That's an accident, a tragic accident of war, in fact the kind that occurs in every war, but it is not terrorism. Terrorists don't accidently hurt children or, for that matter, innocent subverters; they hurt them deliberately. Indeed, the more innocent the target, the better. The innocent are the object of the attack, not the accidental bystanders.

Therefore, the best definition that I can give to terrorism is the deliberate and systematic murder and maiming and menacing of the innocent to inspire fearful political ends. That's a long definition but it really compresses what we're talking about: politically motivated attacks on innocent people. I use the word systematic; I use the word deliberate. Because it's done as a method—Modus Operandi—not done by accident but by design. Not once but repeatedly, consistently.
Now having said that—and before we move on to the second question—who perpetrates terrorism, where does it come from—you can’t just pass off and say we’ve defined it, so what? There’s something much deeper here. I think it encompasses the danger that terrorism poses to us. We recently calculated the chances of getting hurt by terrorism and the probability of any one of you getting on a plane and going to Europe or wherever and getting struck by a terrorist attack is one-fourth the risk of your being struck by lightening. I am chagrined because I always thought it was about the same as being struck by lightening. Well, it’s one-fourth so it’s not really the number of people who are killed; or the extent of property that is involved, which is not that much although it’s growing in the case of tourism, it’s the spreading of fear to many people—the “kill one, frighten 10,000” idea of the Chinese. In the case of modern terrorists, you kill one, frighten 10 million, 100 million, maybe many more. But even that doesn’t say what the problem is, what the real danger is.

The kind of world that we’ve been living in has been one that has had no ethical standards for conflict for most of our existence as a civilization, as human beings. Over the last few centuries, particularly the last two, there emerged an attempt, a feeble, fragile attempt, the first attempt in history, to draw clear ethical limits to the way we wage wars. We’re imperfect human beings, imperfect creatures, and maybe the millenium will come one day and there won’t be any war, but until we come to that day, we try to delimit the fashion in which we wage these conflicts. What we try to do is draw a line right through the center. We say on one side are soldiers, combatants, people who wear uniforms and fight other people who wear uniforms. It’s a crazy system but we designate some people as soldiers on the chessboard, on the field of battle. On the other side of that imaginary line are non-combatants, civilians, people who are not directly party to the conflict. And you do not cross that line deliberately.

Now, have they not crossed that line deliberately? The Nazis didn’t cross that line deliberately? In every war don’t people cross it deliberately? Of course they do. But when you do, you have committed a moral transgression. When you deliberately target civilians, go after them for no reason, just attack them, you are committing something that is morally offensive, a transgression. What terrorism does is condition us. See, it’s not only the violence, it’s the conditioning. We begin to accept the idea that these people have a grievance, their jailed terrorists or their hostages. We create certain symmetries and we begin to lose sight of the fact that this is something horrific, something that cannot be allowed. And we become conditioned to the idea that the attack on tourists, on children, on non-combatant civilians yanked from the street, yanked from the plane, yanked from the suburb, anyplace, is a legitimate thing.

Once we begin to tamper with that fragile line that we have labored so, in such a difficult way in the form of the coda of the 19th century and the 20th century, in various conventions, in perfect documents, to give some sort of estimate for justice and for ethics, we begin to open a Pandora’s box that could only mean a regression
in the progress of humanity away from unbridled conflict. It is not an accident that in the 1930s the rise of Nazism was accompanied by a gradual shedding of lawfulness first inside Germany and then in the environs in Germany where terrorism was rampant. It’s not accidental because one leads to the other. If I were to summarize not only the definition of terrorism—the deliberate and systematic attack on the innocent, on non-combatants—I would also add that the greatest threat that terrorism poses to us is its capacity to murder man’s sense of sin.

The second question is, who stands behind it? The terrorists and their spokesmen and the people who hear it again and again and don’t think about it and they repeat it. They say you can’t ask who stands behind it. You have to ask what stands behind it. Where does it come from? The terrorists immediately offer an answer to that shift of the question. They say it’s obvious, terrorism comes from certain root causes, root grievances, poverty or social dislocation or national aspirations that have been denied or frustrated. That’s what causes terrorism. And until you solve these grievances, you’re not going to get rid of terrorism.

I think we should discuss where it comes from. But first I want you to pause for a second and think about this particular formulation. Just think about it logically for a second. Because there’s a logical problem here. It’s true that all terrorists have grievances but not all grievances have terrorists. Well why not? Maybe it’s the extent of the grievance. If you have a real tough oppressive situation, a real fearless, potent, terrible foe oppressing people, that’s when people resort to terrorism for lack of an alternative. But if that were the case we would expect to see rampant terrorism in the conditions of the direst oppression, at least when people have the possibility to resort to terrorism. And yet if I took a poll in this room, and asked what do you think is the worst oppression in this century, several hundred hands would immediately rise up in complete unity, I think, and people would say obviously the Nazi occupation of Europe in World War II, there’s no question about it. On any scale of horrors in this century, and we’ve had quite a few, this was the worst instance of oppression—millions slaughtered, gassed, burned, and so on, the innocent, non-combatants.

****

These two ideologies [totalitarianism and religious nationalism] by themselves are the great founts of international terrorism, but having said that, I don’t really explain the phenomenon enough because of course we see other kinds of terrorism, Irish terrorism, terrorism of various kinds. The thing that we see in the world, and the reason that terrorism has grown to where it’s grown is because these two ideologies have given rise to two sets of states since World War II. You didn’t have independent Arab states before World War II. You didn’t have a Soviet Block aggressively seeking to promote its interest, to roll back the West, before World War II. And after World War II, these countries begin to espouse terrorism for a very simple reason. If you were a superpower like the Soviet Union, the risks of nuclear war
are horrific and you don't engage in it unless you're crazy. The Soviets, whatever else you can say about them, they are not crazy people. Far from. And if you have conventional power, like Syria, the risks of conventional war are quite great. You can lose, lose your army, and in those countries, if you lose your army you're close to losing your head. It's a pretty good incentive not to do that too often.

What you have is a general trend in the world to wage war by proxy. Each level tries to find others to fight their wars for them. The lower countries, the lower powers, try to find others still lower to wage their wars for them. Hence we find these proxy shadow wars of which terrorism is merely an instance. It's a very convenient thing to do, because it's never me. It's never "I." It's someone else. "I" condemn terrorism. ... You cannot begin to appreciate how important international terrorism is for territory. We're not discussing merely isolated instances here, we're talking about terrorism that crosses the border, one country helping terrorists or launching terrorism across its borders against another country. You just can't do that. You need surveillance, money, weapons, documents, safe houses, to sustain yourself.

What do you do about it? You refuse to give in. You fight back. ... The minute you expose and you fight back, it has a ripple effect on everyone, on every one of these regimes—which brings me to my final point. We can spend a good part of this evening and other evenings talking about measures against terrorism, but none of them ultimately amount to much if you don't have the courage, that indispensable commodity, to back them up. I think you need three types of courage: first, political courage. Statesman and political leaders, government leaders have to have the courage first to tell their citizens the truth. Once you tell them the truth, you have to act on the truth, and that requires the summoning of a certain resolve. And they have to be willing at times to engage in actions that might end in disaster, that might even cost them personally. The second kind of courage is the courage of the military ... the willingness of some people to simply put themselves on the line. The third kind of courage, and the most important, is civic courage, civic valor, the courage of ordinary citizens in a society attacked by terrorism.

Cowardly societies do not produce courageous leaders, courageous statesmen, courageous soldiers. Brave ones do. If citizens see themselves as soldiers in this common battle, if they refuse to pressure the government to make capitulations, to surrender, if they back their government and their leaders, then I think that they are well on the way toward success. The Romans had a saying that courage is not the only virtue but is the single virtue without which all the others are meaningless. I think they were absolutely right. I think that confusion and vacillation facilitated the rise of terrorism and that courage and clarity will ensure its defeat.
As recently as this past September, Henry Kissinger asked, "How can one go on, decade after decade, telling a democratic public that its extermination is the best guarantee of its security? It is a nonsensical proposition," he said.

If it is accepted that the threat of mutual suicide is not a credible deterrent, what are the consequences in practical terms? NATO's answer so far has been to find ways of making nuclear weapons usable by offering variations on the theme of limitation. The purpose has been to make nuclear deterrence more credible. The result has been to make nuclear weapons more usable. The paradox is that the genuine effort to make nuclear war less likely has made such a war more likely. The result is that nuclear strategy veers between the incredibility of the threat of massive use and the unreality of a strategy of limited use.

It is considerations such as these which have, as you know, led a number of distinguished American analysts, many of them having held senior offices in this country, to sagaciously conclude that the strategy of First Use is fundamentally flawed and must be rejected in favor of a NATO strategy of No First Use. The case for change in NATO policies rests in part on their exposure of such flaws and I share that view. But there are other considerations too.

I am far from alone in considering that NATO's strategic doctrines have not responded sufficiently to the great changes in the political and economic condition of Europe which have taken place since the founding of NATO in 1949. It is those very considerations of ensuring that our policies for security and defense relate to the modern conditions of the modern world which produce the dual elements of the Labour Party's policy that will be implemented when we form the next government in Britain.

That policy is to get rid of British nuclear weapons—to cancel Trident, to decommission Polaris, to withdraw tactical nuclear weapons—and instead to be able to make qualitative and quantitative improvement in our conventional forces and, consequently, our NATO contribution by land, sea and air. The policy is to deliberately combine nuclear disarmament with increased conventional force credibility. It will be put into full effect.

The moral arguments against nuclear weapons are familiar and widely understood and accepted even amongst those who cannot yet bring their political action to conform with their moral persuasion. Those arguments do not, therefore, require extensive repetition here. Suffice it to say that the conviction which I and many others
share embraces not only the political and the religious and the philosophical but also those in the military who consider that the mass annihilation of life and the very means of life for the infinite future is not any more morally acceptable for the honorable profession of arms than it is for any other.

Of course, if the moral and practical arguments contradicted each other, we who seek and gain the responsibility for governing and defending our countries might be faced with a dilemma. But the moral and practical arguments are not in conflict. The scientific and strategic fact is that, whatever is claimed for nuclear weapons, in terms of balance, or deterrence, nuclear weapons cannot be used to defend Britain. The size and location of our country means that using nuclear weapons would be either pointless or self-destructive or both.

It needs to be understood that there is a common sense consensus that goes far wider than my Party. Indeed there are some who don't yet hold that view; they assert the view of the basic maxim of our security considerations in Britain. Lord Carver, formerly Chief of the United Kingdom Defense Staff, said eight years ago in the House of Lords that he had read all the arguments over the years without ever encountering a scenario in which independent British use of nuclear weapons made sense, whether first use or retaliation.

At the end of my recent discussion with some senior and respected American politicians, one of them said to me that whilst he could appreciate the serious and systemic nature of our approach and could, in his own words, "digest the individual slices," he said he "could not accept the whole loaf." He explained his attitude by saying that it was based on, again in his words, the "emotional" feeling that other Americans would, like him, conclude that somehow a British non-nuclear policy would be an attempt to evade responsibility and would produce the sentiment that the U. S. A. cared more for the defense of Britain than we did ourselves. I appreciated both his attitude and the candor with which he put his view, but I was obliged to say that he should further examine his emotions and take account of four realities.

First, a country spending five percent of its gross national product on defense and 95 percent of that defense budget in NATO, a country that fully sustains non-nuclear intelligence and communications facilities vital for the defense of the United Kingdom, NATO, and specifically the U. S. A., a country that adopts a policy which increases its defense competence, is a country that could not justly be accused of "evading responsibility" even by the most paranoid stretch of imagination.

Second, that the current defense policy in Britain is, at base, constructed on the view that an "independent" British nuclear weapon system is necessary as a "trigger" to guarantee U. S. involvement in nuclear war if, by any chance, America was reluctant to engage despite a Soviet threat to or launch against allies. That is a strategy of insecurity, not appropriate to a partnership of common security. It is a strategy, to put it in those "emotional" terms, of political mistrust not of alliance solidarity.

Third, the comparisons must be between the defense policy which accepts two
Alliance tasks and can fulfill neither satisfactorily because the expense and emphasis of one depriving and weakening the other, and the Labour policy which takes on one Allied job and does it fully, effectively and convincingly. There is more trustworthiness in that than in all of the claims of commitment that are emptied of meaning by the failure to fulfill a promised task properly.

Fourth, such a policy of proper quantitative and qualitative involvement in Alliance and commitment to the defense of our own country is certainly not evidence of complacency or neutralism but of sturdiness, dependability and practicality—a patriotism that owes nothing to vainglory and everything to the values which gradually gained, subsequently kept and will stoutly maintain the liberty of our country.

That conversation that I had with a few of your senior politicians will undoubtedly continue. For such an exchange and the understanding which it builds is yet another component of common security. At the United Nations General Assembly of May 1978, in his speech renouncing Canada’s possession, use or stationing of nuclear weapons, Pierre Trudeau, then Prime Minister of Canada said,

...it is hardly credible that nations that have learnt that their destinies are linked, that national aims can no longer be wholly realized within national boundaries, that beggaring our neighbors is the surest way of beggaring ourselves, should have discovered no better alternative to assuring their security than an escalating balance of terror. And it is even less credible that, in a world of finite resources, in so many parts of which basic human needs remain unsatisfied, nearly $400 billion in resources should have to be spend year by year for purposes of security.

Security, even absolute security, is not an end in itself. It is only the setting that permits us to pursue our real ends: economic well-being, cultural attainment, the fulfillment of the human personality. But those ends are all incompatible with a world of neighbors armed to the teeth.

I do not quote that speech to suggest that there are absolute parallels between the position of Canada then and Britain now—obviously there are not. I do quote that speech to draw attention to the fact that the $400 billion of which Trudeau spoke in 1978 is now, eight years later, $850 billion, and the odious and obvious fact that more than doubling arms expenditure has patently not added to security. I quote the extract because the urgency of taking consistent and coherent measures to defeat world poverty, to advance human rights, to prevent proliferation, to build down nuclear armaments, is now even more pressing, more urgent than when Trudeau spoke.

Faced with that, the task of finding alternatives to the “escalating balance of terror” must head every agenda of our time. And it must bring action for common security of the people, by the people, for the people. In the British Labour Party which I lead we will work for that purpose. It is the role which, for ourselves and for others, we can fulfill and it is the responsibility which, for ourselves and for others, we must discharge when we lead modern Britain in a modern world.

*****
Refugees: A Global Tour

by Jonathan Moore

On April 6, 1987, Jonathan Moore, Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U.S. Department of State, and former Director of the Institute of Politics, returned to the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs to deliver a public address, "Refugees and Foreign Policy: Immediate Needs and Durable Solutions." Following are the opening and closing segments of his address.

I have an irritation and a dilemma which have distracted me into this speech, so to speak. For a long time it has bothered me to hear people talking about how important it is to keep their favorite cause out of politics—currently, as in: "We can't let humanitarian assistance to refugees be dominated by foreign policy interest." Both in my political experience before coming to the Institute and the Kennedy School and in my reflection while here I have come to be extremely wary of single issue, special interest groups—but what do I do now that I'm involved with one? Even though I know what is meant about politics corrupting goodness and the value of concentrated advocacy, I have tended to view politics as a necessary way of getting from here to there and to be more comfortable approaching public policy as the reconciliation of a variety of contending needs.

I've been trying to work out in my own mind what refugee policy should be, if there is such a thing, and more particularly what role it plays within larger international contexts, what the relationship is—reciprocally—between refugees and foreign policy. But before laying out even some elementary propositions, in order to have an idea what we're talking about let's first explore the anatomy, the topography, of refugee phenomena in the world and review responses and remedies pursued by the international community, including the United States, to deal with them. In doing this, we can start to test two principles which I have in mind at the outset: first, that the commitments we engage and the insights we gain from attending to some of the urgent needs of refugees and enriching our society by bringing some of them here can help enlighten our foreign policy as a whole; second, that there can be found more affinity and mutual reinforcement than conflict or contradiction among the various components constituting a comprehensive U. S. approach to the world's challenges.

So I will take a quick yet exhausting global tour of refugee problems, causes, characteristics, programs and trends; then consider the efforts undertaken to address the immediate needs of refugees in place and the three so-called "durable solutions" to deal with refugee populations over the longer run; and finally examine what needs to be done to get at the root causes which generate and perpetuate refugees—where the refugee-foreign policy relationship is fully revealed and challenged.

Currently, there are over 10 million refugees across the globe—and millions more.
who are displaced or "at risk" in "refugee-like circumstances." For example, in Mozambique approximately 5 million people, one-third of the entire country, have been placed at risk by a savage civil war which is currently tearing that country apart, yet only one-tenth of that population is outside of Mozambique.

Malawi is host to some 150,000 Mozambican refugees, with expectations there will be over 200,000 by this year's end; the Republic of South Africa has within its borders approximately 200,000. All of the countries surrounding Mozambique are impacted, as are those countries which abut Angola. In Ethiopia, warfare, repressive government policies such as forced resettlement, and tribal persecution have forced well over one million people into exile. There are some 450,000 Ethiopian refugees in neighboring Somalia. Sudan is host to some 650,000 refugees from Ethiopia, plus several hundred thousand more from Uganda and Chad. In Africa especially, refugee movements driven by insurgency wars have been exacerbated by drought, famine, and economic frailty.

The biggest single generator of refugees has been the invasion by the Soviet Union of Afghanistan. Almost one-third of that country's pre-1979 population has sought asylum, some 2.8 million of its citizens in Pakistan and almost 2 million in Iran—almost twice the number of refugees as in all of Africa.

In Southeast Asia, the turmoil following the Vietnam War has sent 1.3 million refugees out of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. The flow of boat people leaving Vietnam continues today, averaging some 20,000 people annually, and smaller numbers of refugees continue to leave Cambodia and Laos. Thailand is the most heavily impacted country in the region with some 130,000 refugees in first asylum, and a population of some 260,000 Cambodian "displaced persons" located in camps near the Thai-Cambodian border fleeing from and warring against an occupying power.

The longest existing refugee situation in the world, of course, is that of the Palestinians in the Middle East, refugees since 1948. There are now more than 2 million refugees residing in Lebanon, Israel, Jordan and Syria, caught stateless, fleeing and fomenting violence, some seething, some captive in their own land, now starting a third generation.

Refugees from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union including Jewish emigres continue to seek asylum and are received through well-established procedures in both Western Europe and in the other major resettlement countries: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Israel and the United States. Since 1975, 185,000 of these people have sought a new life in this country. The flow continues, held in check by restrictive emigration policies of the Communist Bloc countries. As new influxes to Europe from Africa and the Near East—Iran, Iraq, Ethiopia and other parts of Africa—seek asylum, the question of how to process their requests and what to do with those rejected from asylum status is becoming increasingly difficult and politically disruptive.

In Central America, the total number of acknowledged refugees in first asylum within the region is 230,000, fleeing persecution and war, economic and social dislocation, insurgency-intricated in various ways.
It has been said that refugees are "human rights violations made visible." They live in dislocated, deprived, marginal, ambiguous circumstances with bleak futures. Most remain victims of violence—in the countries they have fled and the wars they sometimes bring with them, from hostile local populations and their own incipient factionalism. They usually go to countries which are extremely impoverished themselves—the average per capita Gross National Product for the primary nations of first asylum is $822.

An ambitious international system of multilateral and bilateral programs utilizing a huge far-flung array of collaborators administers crucial assistance to refugees. These services include life-sustaining support, food, water, shelter, medical supplies and health aid, education, protection and security, development and impact assistance, representation and negotiation to improve immediate and future treatment of refugees, and resettlement. The partners in the effort include multilateral agencies led by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees; international organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Intergovernmental Committee for Migrations; a multitude of non-profit, non-governmental, voluntary agencies with enormous commitment and skill; and nation-states who receive refugees in first asylum, donate money, resettle refugees, and even in some instances facilitate their return. The United States has sustained its leadership in providing humanitarian assistance across the globe through a traditional, bipartisan commitment as a major donor and resettlement state, having welcomed well over a million refugees since 1975. This international enterprise has saved and continues to save millions of lives, and supports the continued provision of first asylum. It is heroic, absolutely essential and inadequate.

What are the root causes which our foreign policy would have to address in order that refugee phenomena be radically alleviated? It is an intimidating list, particularly if you even pause to consider what might actually be done about its entries, which essentially divide into three clusters, each threatening, constant, and widespread:
1. war and violence—a huge number of continuing armed conflicts in various areas of the world;
2. the brutal violation and abuse of human rights, systematic and particular, in most of the countries of this planet; and
3. the ruthless disparity or rich and poor, or more precisely, grinding poverty brought on by various natural and manmade causes, again suffered by most of the world’s peoples.

As a hypothetical exercise, calculatingly if not redemptively indulgent of refugee needs, if foreign policy could work magic, what would it effect? What if those of us seized with refugee issues could have our druthers and behave as if they were the only problems we had to worry about? What if we did not have to contend with conflicting policy interests, if foreign policy was in fact refugee policy, which of course
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2. the brutal violation and abuse of human rights, systematic and particular, in most of the countries of this planet; and
3. the ruthless disparity or rich and poor, or more precisely, grinding poverty brought on by various natural and manmade causes, again suffered by most of the world’s peoples.

As a hypothetical exercise, calculatingly if not redemptively indulgent of refugee needs, if foreign policy could work magic, what would it effect? What if those of us seized with refugee issues could have our druthers and behave as if they were the only problems we had to worry about? What if we did not have to contend with conflicting policy interests, if foreign policy was in fact refugee policy, which of course
is not so, and what other interests might be served and problems lessened in doing so?

We would try to bring to an end insurgencies and military occupations—in Afghanistan and Cambodia, in Mozambique and Angola, in Nicaragua and El Salvador. We would try to terminate the traffic in arms around the world. We would press closed societies harder for legal emigration accords eliminating the need for dangerous flight and for agreements providing safe voluntary repatriation. We would greatly increase our economic development aid to help remove the seeds both of economic migration and the kinds of disequilibriums that bloom into refugee-generating situations.

Radical efforts would focus on aiding those countries wallowing in economic morass to build viable economies capable of providing opportunities for their people, starving off both the specter of true hunger and the hunger for a better life elsewhere. If this, our Panglossian mission, were successful, citizens in all countries would be provided access to the political institutions which influence their destiny, fear of persecution and repression would have no place in the human condition, and true democracy, religious tolerance, and economic freedom would reign.

So much for dreaming—although it does reveal the profoundness of our problems, the near daunting challenge even of how to begin to address them, the commonality of refugee and other less esoteric aspirations, and how improbable it is that all this will come about. In order to advance refugee policy not at the expense of but within the pluralism of foreign policy, what is required is elevation and integration.

Refugee values should play a more influential role at the higher levels of macro-policy making and in the competition of forces which determines its shape. Refugees are just one facet in the multi-faceted competition among legitimate interests which must be coordinated and reconciled in the molding of foreign policy. To move toward affecting those conditions so as to bring relief to the world refugee situation, refugee interests should become more, not less, political, more relevant and less isolated, if they are to influence the scale of foreign policy decision making in their favor.

Specifically, this must be achieved in deliberations with those officials responsible for regional and bilateral relationships in the State Department and with the National Security Council staff; in representations with nations abroad and with multilateral agencies; in program design and budget planning across the executive branch; in intensive consultations with Congress; in public education; and finally, in relations with voluntary agencies, churches, state governments, resettlement communities, and ethnic organizations. Accepting the narrow view or the narrow management of refugee interests is self-defeating in two ways: it denies reality and falsely inflates expectations, and it locks into a parochialism where you are constantly chasing your tail and losing ground.

To come back from where we started tonight, we must seek affinity and mutual benefit—this is both idealistic and sophisticated, and it had better be both. The task is extremely arduous, almost futile, requiring affirmation and resoluteness, rejecting complacency and cynicism. First, by actively inserting refugees into the fray of
competing interests with influential actors, there is a higher possibility of arriving at a policy that will be less likely to generate or exacerbate refugees. Second, if a policy is decided upon which has refugee consequences, it will be with foreknowledge, and responsible officials will be better prepared to deal with the results. Third, engagement with these humanitarian concerns will serve to enlighten policy makers generally at a level where critical decisions are made, presumably to the benefit of other interests as well.

*****

Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics

by Li Miao

On October 9, 1986, a panel discussion, "China: On the Road to Capitalism?" with Roderick McFarquhar, Professor of Government, John King Fairbanks Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University and Founding Editor of China Quarterly; David Aikman, former Beijing Bureau Chief, Time magazine; Li Miao, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics, Head, Division for U. S. Government, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and former Administrator, World Bank Division, Ministry of Finance, People's Republic of China; and Anita Ramastery, Associate, Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics (moderator) was held in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government. Following are Mr. Li's edited remarks.

From my personal experiences and observations, I don't think China is on the road to capitalism. Before I go into the reasons, I would like to offer some background. The Communist Army, or the People's Liberation Army, entered Beijing in January of 1949, and the People's Republic of China was founded on October 1st of that year. The 37 years from 1949 to 1986 can be roughly divided into four periods from an economic development point of view.

Period one started with the founding of the People's Republic in 1949 and ended in the mid-50s. China copied the Soviet model of economic construction and was developing normally along the line of a planned socialist economy. However signs of leftist or ultraleftist thinking, which China would be suffering from for the coming three decades, had started to appear. All private enterprises, large and small,
were turned into so-called public and private jointly-owned enterprises. In reality, they were state owned with the private partner a titular representative. Farm land also became state property. Private economy as a sector of the national economy was wiped out. This was Mao Tse-tung's interpretation of the Marxist principle of the public ownership of the means of production.

Period two started in 1958 when the rural people's communes were set up all over the country and the Great Leap Forward took place ending on the eve of the so-called Cultural Revolution. The initiation of the people's communes and the Great Leap Forward, no matter what good they might have done, was a further manifestation of the leftist thinking on the part of Mao. The whole countryside, which constituted over 80 percent of the population, was organized into a three-tiered system consisting of production teams, production brigades, and at the top the people's communes. The communes were at the same time production units and grass-root governments. This plus the Great Leap Forward produced such horrendous effects that it was quietly modified in the beginning of the '60s. The authorities started picking up the pieces, and as they were doing so, the third period started.

Period three lasted from 1966 to Mao's death in 1976. Mao unleashed the so-called Cultural Revolution in 1966. At first it was a national upheaval which quickly degenerated into virtual civil war. I consider this period the culmination of Mao's ultraleftist thinking. The personality cult of Mao was at its peak and the sufferings of the Chinese people peaked with it. This was probably a classic example of absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Period four began after the death of Mao and the arrest of four of his cohorts, including his wife Jiang Qing, commonly known as the Gang of Four. Deng Xiaoping who was in disgrace since 1966 came back to power and started pulling the country back from the brink of disintegration. From then on, changes for the better started taking place.

During the seventeen years prior to the Cultural Revolution, China did make major efforts in economic construction despite the continuous harassment of political movements. She did lay an industrial base which she is still relying on for further economic growth. She made achievements in other fields as well, such as education, health, child and maternity care, and to some extent, improving the living standards of the people.

Well, so much for background. The outside world, including America, is witnessing many changes that are taking place in China and some construe them as signs of China embarking on the road to capitalism. This is a mistaken notion. With the above background in mind let us examine a few of the changes.

The communes have been disbanded and with them the production teams and brigades. The grass-root production unit is now the peasant household whose income is closely tied to what and how much it can produce. The peasants now can engage in production activities they feel they are good at, and many have taken up industrial production, commerce and the transportation of goods, etc. Such a change was and still is a tremendous incentive to the peasants and they have responded by producing a lot more farm products than under the commune system. More changes are on the way.
However all this has nothing to do with building capitalism. What the authorities and in particular Deng Xiaoping were doing was to correct the past mistake of regimenting the whole countryside which produced devastating results. In return he was rewarded with the present achievement of China being able to feed its one billion people without grain imports.

Better prospects seem to be emerging on the horizon but one fact should be kept in mind. Farm land, forest, lakes, ponds and pastures are owned by the state. They cannot be bought or sold. The peasants use them only through contracts with the authorities. I don’t think this will change despite all the other changes. China has three kinds of ownership now, public ownership, collective ownership and individual ownership. This was not the case before Mao’s death in 1976. Mao’s leftist dogma regarded public ownership as the best ownership for China and all other types of ownership should be eradicated or transformed into public ownership as quickly as possible.

After Deng Xiaoping came back to power, collective ownership was expanded and individual ownership resurrected. Enterprises owned by individuals can now employ workers. Collective and individual ownership seems to be proliferating and though the percentage they occupy in the Gross National Product of China is small, yet it is on the increase. China has even started to experiment with allowing enterprises to sell shares and even permitted the transaction of shares in a certain city. A certain kind of private economy might appear in the not-too-distant future.

Another thing that should be mentioned is that Mao eradicated market economy and promoted bartered trade. Furthermore, quotas were set for every conceivable product and production was carried out according to quotas and not according to the needs of the market. He stressed high accumulation, high speed of development. The result was low efficiency and a very slow rising of the living standards of the people. Large inventories, a common phenomenon in other socialist countries, appeared in China as well. The lofty target of serving the people was set on the one hand for production and management but on the other hand the needs of the people were largely unmatched.

I am sure that Deng Xiaoping realized that such a state of affairs could no longer continue or the whole country would go down the drain. He therefore decided to develop China’s suppressed and underdeveloped market mechanism, namely by starting with the establishment of a consumer goods market to develop a market of the means of production, which has already appeared. And by developing a commodity market to develop a money market, which has also made its debut.

Another point which is very important is that the old price system neither reflected the real value of goods nor supply and demand. It was centrally planned and reflected only the wishes and sometimes the whims of the authorities. The old price system is at present undergoing fundamental reforms though the steps taken are cautious and small for the time being.
Despite all, these are not signs that China is embarking on the road to capitalism. The reasons are obvious. First, the mines, railway, ports, communication, large, medium and most small factories, shipping and nearly all buildings are in the hands of the state. Second, the state is determined to maintain public ownership as the leading force, so that it can guarantee the socialist orientation and play a decisive role in the development of the entire economy. The major goal of the government in restructuring the ownership system is to establish viable public ownership enterprises which operate with a high degree of economic efficiency. Allowing collective and individual ownerships to exist and develop is for the better fulfillment of this goal.

The state has no intention whatsoever of letting the reforms get out of hand, of allowing some kind of capitalism to appear, though it is making use of and will be making more use of certain theories and mechanism of capitalist market economy. The socialist state will always be in control of the branches that make up the national economic lifelines.

But China is also not following in the footsteps of the Soviet economic model as was the case in the past. It is not only making policy changes, it is making major structural changes. The official phrasing of what China is doing now is “China is building socialism with Chinese character".

There are over 40 million Communist party members, and most of the leading government posts from top to bottom are manned by party members. Apart from that, the public enterprises, starting from the large factories to the department stores, are mostly headed by party members. I view this as another guarantee that the party will be in a dominant position to see to it that China will not turn capitalist.

In conclusion I want to say that there is a general liberalization of the political atmosphere in China. People no longer feel the threats of a sword hanging over their heads as was the case during the Cultural Revolution. To a large extent, the people can speak their minds now. The vogue among the intellectuals in Beijing and other large cities before I left China 24 days ago was debating the political reforms that China should undertake. That such a topic is being discussed in China represents a tremendous change, unimaginable even a few years back. I end by saying that I hope my people will enjoy a better life and greater freedom in the years to come, because having undergone inhuman suffering and having made unbelievable sacrifices for the past century, they deserve it.
Media and Politics

Serving Society, Not Government
by Benjamin C. Bradlee

On September 27, 1986, the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy of the John F. Kennedy School of Government was dedicated at ceremonies held in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs. Benjamin C. Bradlee, Executive Editor of the The Washington Post delivered the keynote speech. The following is excerpted from his remarks.

I got lucky, I became a journalist, I got to know John Kennedy, I got to be the executive editor of The Washington Post and as a result of all of that I got totally absorbed in what this new Center is all about, the wonderfully complicated, diverse, vital, creative and very misunderstood interaction between the press and politics and public policy.

Let me say right away that I have no specific convictions about how that interaction should work in an ideal world, and I’m very wary of absolutes. I know some of the ingredients of an ideal interaction from a journalist’s point of view, maximum access to honest public officials, for starters, and to the documents that accompany them through history. But I realize also that such access and such documentation are not always fairly used. I know some of the ingredients of an ideal interaction from the politician’s point of view, maximum sympathy and understanding by the press of the complexities of governance, but I realize that sympathy and understanding lie often in the eye of the beholder.

I’m not convinced I know just how the public is best served as these two equations are worked out. It’s not enough, it seems to me, for the public to wait for the truth, unless the public understands, with Camus, that there is no truth, only truths, and unless the public really understands what Walter Lippmann meant when he talked about the truth emerging, that it isn’t there in the morning’s newspaper or the evening’s newscast. Only a slice of it is there on any one day and you’re going to have to wait, maybe years, if you want the whole salami.

The exploration of this infinitely variable interrelationship and the teaching of lessons learned is of course what this Center is all about. It is wonderfully exciting to think about the many areas that need the light that you all will shine. Manipulation, for instance, fascinates me in all its intricate forms. Ethics, for instance, in all of its forms. Disinformation, for instance, as practiced by our own government as well as by foreign governments, and so much more. But nowhere is the fragile interrela-
tionship between the press, the public and the political system more complicated, I've found, than in the field of national security.

National security means protection or defense of the country against attack, sedition, espionage or other forms of hostile interference. That isn't a very complicated concept. It isn't hard to be against national security; it's almost inconceivable. And yet why is the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency trying to get various news organizations indicted for the treasonous disclosure of information classified in the interests of national security? Why does the Director of the National Security Agency threaten to prosecute news organizations if they publish information he feels threatens the national security? What does the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs have in mind when he joins the battle with such relish? And why does the Secretary of Defense agree with television reporters that The Washington Post, among others, gives aid and comfort to the enemy by writing stories that have appeared in other journals? What's all the fuss about? Do these men really think the people who run The Washington Post would betray their country? What reporter, or what editor, could betray this trust and look even the owner of the newspaper, never mind himself, in the eye? It sounds so simple, but it isn't.

The newspaper that I'm lucky to work for has been at the center of some stormy national security debates in the last twenty-one years. One of those debates, the Pentagon Papers, went all the way to the Supreme Court in 1971, before it was resolved more or less in favor of the press. The most recent and the most anguishing of these debates surrounds the story published in May about the Ronald Pelton spy case, after eight months of internal discussion and six months of conversations with the highest government officials, more damn conversations with higher government officials than I ever want to do again. As usual, outsiders have seemed fascinated and mystified by how newspapers handle this kind of story.

The Pelton case illustrates two important points about one newspaper, and how we deal with national security issues. First, we do consult with the government regularly about sensitive stories. We do withhold stories for national security reasons far more often than the public might think. The Post has withheld information for more than a dozen stories so far this year for these reasons, although this is hard to document, obviously.

Second, we do not allow the government, or anyone else, to decide what we should print. That is our job and doing it responsibly is what a free press is all about. The trouble starts when people try to sweep a lot of garbage under the rug of national security. Even the most highly placed people, like President Richard Nixon in 1969, when he described a New York Times exclusive report on the secret bombing of Cambodia as an egregious example of national security violation. That's right out of Kafka when you think about it. The Cambodians certainly knew that they were being bombed. And since only the United States was then flying in those skies, they certainly knew who was bombing them. If the Cambodians knew, the Viet Cong knew. And if the Viet Cong knew, their Soviet allies knew. So what was all that
about? Well, the American people didn’t know, and in fact the American people had been told that we were not bombing Cambodia and would not. Here national security was used to cover up a national embarrassment. The President of the United States had lied to the American people and to the world.

This led us to Watergate, of course. Is there anyone in this audience who remembers Nixon looking the world in its television eye and telling us he couldn’t tell the truth about Watergate because national security was involved? The worst lie of all.

All of this is not to say that there is no such thing as a legitimate claim of national security. Of course there is. Ever since World War I a shorthand example of what not to publish for reasons of national security has always been the sailing times of troop ships leaving American harbors for foreign battles. But of course that isn’t how they get there any more and that really doesn’t do. A good rule, perhaps—and this is something I would love to see explored—for when not to publish involves the risk of American lives, though that has been used in cases where the risk was all but impossible to conceive.

In any case the Post does keep information, networks keep information, all news organizations keep information out of print, for reasons of national security, even if a list of this information would obviously violate the national security interests that lead us to withhold it in the first place. In addition to stories that are withheld for reasons of national security, there are, above all, the close calls. Stories that probably will be run, maybe not, but only after long discussions where opposing views are vigorously defended.

Such a story appeared in our newspaper on February 18th, 1977 under the headline, “CIA Paid Millions to Jordan’s King Hussein,” under reporter Bob Woodward’s byline. Millions of dollars of walking-around money, as distinct from economic or military aid had been paid to the King by the CIA under the codeword project named “No Beef.” (Have you ever wondered who invents those code words?)

Jimmy Carter had been President for less than a month. He agreed to see the Post after we had sought White House reaction to our story before publication. The President totally disarmed us by admitting that the story was true. You don’t run into that every day in my line of work. He said that the payments had been stopped, and then he stunned us most of all by saying that he had known nothing about it until the Post had sought White House reaction, despite the fact that he had been briefed time and time again during the preceding months by the Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, and by the Director of the CIA, Mr. George Bush.

The President never asked that the story not be printed, although it was perfectly clear he hoped it would not. He told us the story, if printed, might make the progress he hoped for in the Middle East harder to achieve. The argument over whether to print or not to print was spirited, to understatement it. Some of us felt that the national interest would best be served if the world knew that the CIA had a King on its payroll and that neither the outgoing CIA Director, nor the outgoing Secretary of State felt that fact important enough to share with the new President. Others felt that anything that might make resolution of the problems of the Middle East more difficult
was not worth the candle of publishing it. There are no absolutes in these discus-
sions, rightness or wrongness ends up by lying in the eyes of the editors. Our deci-
sion was to publish. Hussein is still King. Bush is the Vice President, and may go
all the way, as we say, and Carter is the former President.

*****

The role of a newspaper in a free society is what is at issue here. Governments
prefer a press that makes their job easier, a press that allows them to proceed with
minimum public accountability, a press that accepts their version of events with mini-
imum questioning, a press that can be led to the greenest pastures of history by per-
suasion and manipulation. In moments of stress between government and the press,
and these moments have come and gone since Thomas Jefferson, the government
looks for ways to control the press, to eliminate or minimize the press as an obstacle
in the implementation of policy or the solution of problems. In these moments
especially, the press must continue its mission of publishing information that it, and
it alone determines to be in the public interest in a useful, timely, responsible man-
ner, serving society and not government.

*****

Playing to the Gallery
by Marvin Kalb

The following is an edited excerpt from the Question and Answer session following a public address,
"The Quest for Sanity: U. S./Soviet Relations," by Marvin Kalb, Chief Diplomatic Correspondent,
N. B. C. News and Visiting Fellow, Institute of Politics, October 21, 1986, ten days after he returned
from covering the Reykjavik summit meeting between U. S. President Ronald Reagan and U. S. S. R.
General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. On June 1st, 1987, Mr. Kalb became the Director of the Joan
Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of
Government.

Q: You spoke of how the [Reykjavik] summit had negative connotations and yet
Reagan’s White House crew managed to give it a positive public relations slant. What
is your feeling about the disinformation that seems to be coming out of the White House? I mean I've read the term "disinformation" in The New York Times.

A: Well there are two things we are talking about here. One is too much information, designed to overwhelm the mind, and that is what we witnessed in the last ten days. As I said, every White House, State and Defense Department official was made available for non-stop briefings. We reporters were all simply overwhelmed by the amount of information we got. The problem was we didn't know if we got all the information and we didn't know if what we did get was accurate, because we weren't there. The intent was to take a negative spin, which [Secretary of State] Schultz and the President's face [following the summit] had given to the meeting at Reykjavik and turn it into a positive outcome.

One could say cynically that the reason for this was the upcoming elections. But I don't think it was just that. I think that the President probably, on reflection, felt he had done better than he thought the first night. Schultz the same. The U. S. side changed its line on Monday, and the Russian side changed its line on Tuesday. It was almost at the same time that both sides, looking across a widening chasm of misunderstanding based upon the way in which the summit ended, decided that it was too dangerous to live in that kind of a world, and they decided to pull back. So, both sides have put a positive spin on what happened at Reykjavik. Both sides are playing to the gallery.

The word "disinformation" that you used came out of the White House in reference to a different issue. It was in reference to the deliberate use of the press to put out false information in order to pursue the Administration's policy against Libya and against Khadafi. That is a different issue.

Q: You speak of the agreement as creating a world in which we'd all be much better off or I don't know what your phrase was...

A: No, I said that the President believes in that kind of an agreement.

Q: Well then, you just said that you thought that the President backed off because he felt that such a world would be much more dangerous. I was wondering if you could speak...

A: No, I said that the President backed off because in the final analysis he did not trust the Russians to live up to the agreements.

Q: Right, okay. If such an agreement were to go through, could you speak to the implications of that for U. S./Soviet relations?

A: Sure. If that kind of an agreement had gone through, it would have been historically the most important arms control agreement ever. It would have affected all of our major arms systems in a very major way. The implications would have been staggering. First of all, we have been raised, all of us, whether you're my age or
Media and Politics

your age, we’ve all been raised on an assumption that peace rests on a balance of terror, where both sides have enormous nuclear arms. Neither side wants to use them against the other, and therefore you have the threat of mutual assured destruction that holds off war between the superpowers. We would have had a whole new strategy that would have evolved in the aftermath of that kind of an agreement. That’s one.

Two, the European members of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO) depend on the United States’s nuclear strength to hold off superior Soviet conventional strength. So if the West Europeans depend on us to use our nuclear power against a conventional Soviet attack and as a result of this agreement we don’t have that kind of nuclear power, then the Russians are left in a superior position vis-a-vis conventional strength.

It would have meant an enormous increase in the military budgets on both sides for conventional arms, but because both would have been saving so much money on nuclear arms, both probably would have ended up saving money in the long run. In any bilateral agreement that the United States has, with countries like Japan, South Korea, again based on the presumption that the United States would use its nuclear strength against Soviet conventional might, all of those agreements would be thrown out the window. We would be involved in a massive renegotiation of our relations with all of our allies all over the world. So you’d have first a major strategic change in doctrine and a major diplomatic effort to rework all of our alliances.

Q: Mr. Kalb, there was a report that was issued right before Reykjavik that talked about how profoundly flawed the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] is. It was recently reported in The Boston Globe and several other places as having been the only report presented by people who were universally respected for their opinions on the workability of SDI. This is related to my larger question. What do you see as your role as a journalist in the peace-making process in the way that, say, Edward R. Murrow did during World War II? He is said to have felt that he was actually influencing history from the way he reported it, and I’m wondering if you feel you’re doing enough, or your profession is doing enough, to talk about the background, to report that people who are very quietly working in academia are generating these reports that are being widely ignored by people in government. Do you feel that you’re just covering the things that are more or less flash and dazzle or do you think you’re doing enough about the background work that these people should really be paying attention to?

A: I think that’s a very good question, and if I had planned it, I couldn’t have done it any better. I do not believe that we are doing a good job in the coverage of complicated issues. I think that television news is superficial, episodic, generally poorly written. No, I don’t think we’re doing a good job at all. Now, you mention Murrow. I immediately have to pull back because he was my idol when he lived. The coverage of World War II (I mean I didn’t do it—nor the War of 1812) was us
against them. It was clear evil on the other side. We presumed that we were virgini-
ally pure. And reporters could have the feeling—did have—that we were on the 
side of the U. S. government in fighting Hitler and Fascism.

I remember, when I was a very young Foreign Service staff officer at the U. S.
Embassy in Moscow in 1956, that we at that time, even then, had the feeling that 
we were part of a grand alliance, press and the government against the communists. 
Then in the '60s and in the '70s, first with the Vietnam War (and the credibility gap), 
then in the '70s with Watergate and then the Iranian hostage crisis, we became alien-
ated from the government and many of us to this very day don’t trust the govern-
ment and don’t trust what it says. And that is because, from very sad experience, 
we have learned that governments don’t always tell the truth, and certainly create 
an image, which while not composed of a tissue of lies, is composed of enough false-
hood and half-truths that the total impression is misleading, and we don’t like that.

I am very proud to say that my brother, at the first whiff of a program of disinfor-
mation in the U. S. government, quit. That was a very hard decision to make. But 
he did. Because he represents those of us in this business who simply won’t toler­
ate it.

So we are now in an era of distrust between the government and the press, and 
we don’t feel that we’re in the same alliance together against a known evil. The world 
is so complicated now that evil takes many shapes and forms and sizes and it’s hard 
to spot what is truly good at all times. We have seen so many blemishes in our 
national character. With everything I’ve said plus the radical changes in the 
technology—we’re living through a communications revolution—we become much 
more important that we have any right to be.

I don’t consider that I cover a story any differently today from the way I covered 
it 20 and 30 years ago. But I know that I have much more clout today than I had 
20 or 30 years ago because I can get to you all much faster and you are much more 
hooked into us than you’ve ever been before. Television news is now an integral 
part of our lives. There is no divorce that is possible. So the responsibility on us 
is enormous. I often think we don’t live up to that responsibility well enough. But 
quite often we do. I think there are times when we’re terrific. Unfortunately I think 
there are many times when we’re dreadful and as I said, very shallow.

I’ve thought about this problem a great deal, as you can see. I really don’t think 
that there’s a way out of it anymore. I would like very much for people to go into 
journalism today who have something to say. When they sit down and they have 
a microphone given to them by a network, that they know how to use that micro-
phone. Murrow asked in 1958 in one of his big speeches whether when we have 
all of this wonderful technology, will we know how to use it? Will we use it well? 
I think we do, but we don’t use it well enough by far. Thank you very much for 
your question.

*****
Faith and Presumption
by John Buchanan

On September 6, 1986, as part of the joint celebration of the 50th/350th anniversaries of the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Harvard University, the Institute of Politics sponsored a symposium, "Religion, Politics and Television." Participants included Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics who became Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs in September 1986; John Chancellor, Senior Commentator, NBC News; Harvey G. Cox, Jr., Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard Divinity School; Cal Thomas, nationally syndicated columnist and former Vice President, Moral Majority; and John Buchanan, Chair, People for the American Way. The remarks delivered by panelist Buchanan follow.

I did learn a few things as the son of a Baptist minister, growing up in a minister's home. And he, in typical Baptist fashion, used to preach sermons with three points and a poem. And one of his sermons was the importance of distinguishing the things that differ. I don't remember the poem, but the three points were distinguishing between conviction and prejudice, between beauty and desire, between faith and presumption.

But what I would like this morning to ask you to consider is to distinguish the difference between the religious tradition of which Cal Thomas has spoken and the fact that people of faith do bring their faith into their political life, into the totality of their life, and ought to do so. From the prophets of old to the ministers of today, people who are in positions of religious leadership do speak out on questions they believe to be moral questions, and do speak out to presidents and kings and nations as they do to churches and synagogues. The Judeo-Christian tradition especially has been a mainstream of influence in the life of this Republic, in this institution and in all our institutions, and I don't think we can escape the fact that there is an involvement of religion in politics and politics in religion.

But distinguishing the things that differ, one of the most important things that leaves us free as individual citizens, to believe or not believe, believe one way or to believe another, that leaves us free to know that precious liberty of freedom of conscience, is what Thomas Jefferson called "the erection of a wall of separation between church and state."

Now it is one thing in a diverse and pluralistic society for people of varying faiths to bring their faith with them into their politics, to express it on the powerful medium of television. It is quite another for us to reenter an era in which we do not honor and cherish that separation of church and state that guards our heritage of religious liberty.

People like Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, should consider that in their Virginia, people who had fled to these shores during the colonial period seeking relief from
religious persecution in Europe and in England, seeking a place to live and work and worship in freedom, found that our forefathers in their wisdom in setting up the American colonies had set up state churches in those colonies. For example, in the colony of Virginia, Baptist ministers like Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson were beaten, imprisoned and run out of town for proclaiming their dissenting faith, while Anglican ministers were paid with tax funds. In other colonies it was Quakers or Catholics or other dissenters that were the objects of persecution where religious groups used the power of the state and the arm of the law to impose their way, and to punish or persecute dissenters. It was this set of historic circumstances that caused Baptist Christians in this country and many others to join together to press for the passage of the First Amendment.

And I must say in this time in which we stand on the eve of a celebration of the 200th birthday of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, one of the truly great political achievements of human history, we ought to recommit ourselves to those basic tenets of our country, including First Amendment rights and liberties of American citizens, and cherish our wonderful heritage.

The problem is that in very recent years we have had a powerful new medium grow up. As a young Baptist minister serving the church in suburban Birmingham, we had our church field laid out, as I found later, much as a political organization. We did regular surveys. I had captains for every block. We knew everyone who lived there. We knew which ones were Baptist, or Methodist, or unchurched people. We knew when anyone got sick or there was a death in the family. And we tried to minister to that community through that system of organization. But as television came more and more into vogue, and more and more people had television sets, I found that people no longer appreciated a knock on the door in the middle of prime time television or a telephone call to talk about church right in the middle of their favorite television program. It began to hamper our work somewhat.

Another set of religious leaders were increasingly, however, beginning to use this medium with great effect—Billy Graham, Pat Robertson, and more and more of the televangelists, until it became a powerful tool for getting out their message to the world. But in 1979 a group of new right politicos in Washington, D. C., Richard Viguerie, direct mail fundraiser Paul Weyrich and others, began to look at the electronic church, and to think what a powerful instrument it could be for their purposes, if they could somehow put it to work for their new right political cause. They conceived the idea of Moral Majority, went down to Lynchburg, presented it to Jerry Falwell. He liked it and agreed to become its leader. And thus was born the religious right.

Combining the power of television, the fervor of charismatic evangelists and those who followed them, reaching out to people who are indeed hungry for strength and purity in public life, who are indeed concerned about traditional values, although I have to add a footnote—growing up in Birmingham in the days of Bull Connor and segregation and discrimination and White Supremacy, I get a little nervous when people talk about the good old days. Those good old days were days when we may
have wasted some of the most precious resources of this society. I don’t know that a society that is not just can be moral, or a society that is not compassionate can be Christian. As a Christian, I might feel we still live in a pre-Christian era, certainly not a post-Christian era.

But in any event, the putting to work of the televangelists to build a new political machine proved to be a highly successful venture because the hungers were there. The concerns were there. And they could build upon the fervor and the honest simple faith of millions of American people. So in recent years we’ve had a new force to arise in American politics, and I do believe it is a serious force that has not yet reached its full potential, a force that has a right to exist. But I am concerned about the agenda and nature of that force that is, week after week, day after day, carried forward on television by televangelists.

First of all, what these folks have done is take their concept of errancy, that they apply to the scripture, and apply it to their political agenda as well. So they sincerely believe they speak for God in American politics. They are the Lord’s political action committee. Their way is God’s way, and their position is scripturally sanctioned. Now if I disagree with someone because I may be a more progressive Republican rather than a conservative Republican, and that disagreement earns me the title of being satanic or against God or against morality, then that’s an unhealthy political climate.

The second thing is they have as targets certain very fundamentally important institutions of our society. If you listen, you will hear repeated attacks upon public education because of the demon of secular humanism they believe pervades public education. Now if your mindset is that everything anybody tells you in a history class or a science class that argues with the fact that the earth is only five thousand and something years old [a figure reached] by counting up the “begats” in the Bible, if you believe that you have to choose between science and religion, if you believe that any kind of history that doesn’t say that God did it on every other page is secular humanism, then of course you’re going to find the schools filled with secular humanism. At a time when we need excellence in public education, when 85 percent of the young people still rely upon public education for their chance in life, we have this sustained attack upon public education. We in People for the American Way go into community after community, and are now twice in court trying to defend the schools against these charges against secular humanism and trying to combat censorship in many forms.

The other institution under sustained attack is the judiciary, that which has guaranteed our rights and is so important to the life of this society. Finally, the concept of this as a Christian nation. This is a nation in which there are many Christians and Jews and others of faith. But we should really thank God, those of us who have faith, that it is also a nation in which we are left free, as God leaves us free, to say yes or no. We are left free to believe or not believe, to believe one way or to believe another because we are protected by the First Amendment, and by the separation of church and state.
Finally I, as a Christian person, hunger for Republican leaders who will march to the distant drum of an Abraham Lincoln, the signer of the Emancipation Proclamation. I, as an American citizen, hunger for Democrats who will say to this country, "Ask not what my country can do for me, but what can I do for my country." And I will not yield the turf of caring about ethical things, of caring about traditional values, to one particular set of people who happen to be on the far right politically and in an advantageous position of being possessors of a powerful medium with which to proclaim their message. The antidote is not cutting off their voices, but adding ours.

*****

Justice, Peace, Morality
by Wesley G. Pippert

The following is an edited version of a segment of Chapter 4 of An Ethic of News: A Reporter's Search for Truth, by Wesley G. Pippert, (Georgetown University Press, forthcoming spring 1988). Mr. Pippert completed the manuscripts for this book and another on Israel during his tenure as a Fellow at the Institute of Politics, spring term and summer 1987. He is the former senior Middle East correspondent for United Press International in Jerusalem, Israel.

The ethical reporter who is committed to truth will inevitably be drawn to covering issues of justice, peace, and morality, for the dynamic of truth yields justice and peace. This does not mean that the typical reporter plays an advocacy role on a day-to-day basis. It does mean, however, that the journalist is alert and sensitive to stories involving justice or injustice, stories that if only noticed would meet the traditional standards of newsworthiness and legitimacy. It also means that the mass media journalist must take note of wrong and oppressive conditions in our society and write stories for the express purpose of bringing about change. Obviously this must be done with careful discernment and judgment.
Walter H. Brovald, acting chairman of journalism at the University of Minnesota, has written, "It is interesting that in every extended discussion I have had with groups or individual students, a discussion of journalistic ethics as a practical matter has ended up in terms of justice, fairness, and a concern for others." Even a reporter "covering the facts" can become an agent of justice.

One may say that many beats do not involve issues of justice and peace, such as sports or agriculture or society. But what about violence in sports, the effect of competitive athletics on children, the merit of super salaries in professional sports? Surely these involve issues of fairness. What about the future of the family farm, the growth of agri-business, and the psychological trauma caused by rising farm costs and lowered farm prices? And, is it right that in some major cities with a predominantly black population, most of the social items are still about whites?

My three-year assignment in the Middle East [1983-86] brought truth, justice and peace together into a profound triumvirate. There was a confluence of the main currents of my life—a concern for justice, the Judeo-Christian tradition with its origins in the Land of the Bible, the excitement of covering one of the biggest on-going news stories of our time. There were the issues of the endless quest for peace between the Arabs and the Jews, of justice for Palestinians who find themselves living under Israeli control, of finding truth in a Mediterranean culture in which exaggeration and emotion often obscure the facts.

During the three years, my staff and I did between one and two enterprisers or special reports each week. There was a certain symmetry in the 125 or so total features. About 25 dealt with foreign policy and military issues, including the Israeli occupation of Lebanon; 15 with Israeli politics; 10 with the volatile Israeli economy; 15 with life in Israel; 25 with religious or archaeological matters, always a fertile subject in the Holy Land; but the most, about 30, dealt with the Jewish-Palestinian conflict, often from the standpoint of justice.

There were stories about the unevenness of punishment for the Jewish and Arab offender on the Occupied West Bank (an Arab boy who throws stones at an Israeli bus would get several 20 years in prison; a Jewish settler who was convicted of a systematic reign of terror against Arabs on the West Bank got as little as four months to seven years; an "anatomy" of a West Bank incident from the time Palestinians demonstrated until Israeli troops arrived; the first-person account by former Nablus Mayor Bassam Shakaa, a militant Palestinian, whose legs were blown off by a militant Jewish settler; the Palestinian non-violent movement. These stories did not just happen. Each was selected. Sensitivity to issues of justice must be developed. One foreign correspondent, not an American, told me that his principal concern in covering Israel was to do travelogues.

As a newly arrived reporter in South Dakota in the late 1950s, I soon discovered the state had one of the largest Indian populations in proportion to the general population of any state in the Union. One in 28 South Dakotans was an Indian. Many lived on reservations. Since reservations are federal land, offenders on the reserva-
tions were sent to federal prisons. Considering that 34 percent of the population at the state penitentiary were Indians who had committed off-reservation crimes, one can begin to comprehend the problem of law enforcement among the Indians. I wrote a broadcast story for national distribution pointing out these facts and citing examples of several Indians who had committed crimes. The main problem, as I quoted the U.S. attorney as saying, was that "90 to 95 percent of the crime on the reservation is traceable to intoxicating liquor." I concluded, "The penalty comes stiffer for Indians than it does for the white man. Most Indians ... penniless ... waive hearings, enter a plea and are sentenced within a short period of time. Seldom does one have sufficient funds to post bond or hire a lawyer to defend himself."

During my six years in the Dakotas, the plight of the Indians never left my awareness. When I went there, Indian traffic victims were identified as such; whites were not racially identified. When this practice is repeated scores of times, the strong implication is that Indians are bad drivers; I stopped the practice of racial identification. Homicides on Indian reservations were treated with only a few paragraphs while coverage of white slayings was blown up. This implied that lives of Indians were not as valuable as those of whites. Barring other factors such as the victim's or suspect's fame, I handled homicides of Indians and whites the same way.

When the U.S. Civil Rights Commission held hearings on the Rosebud Reservation, I covered them personally, wrote in detail about them, and followed up later with analytic stories. Having wire service access to newspapers throughout the nation, I continued to publicize the plight of the Indians. In 1963, as a UPI Chicago editor, I filed in our "editor's schedule" a dispatch about the South Dakota attorney general who had called hearings to determine whether policemen chained Indian prisoners and took liberties with Indian women. Later, in Washington, although it was not my beat, I tried to write stories on what was happening at the seldom-reported Bureau of Indian Affairs. All of these were newsworthy stories. They did not violate traditional journalistic standards. But they added a critical dimension of justice.

About nine years after I halted the practice of racial identification of traffic victims, the UPI Log, which was distributed weekly to UPI staffers, stated the rule: "If you identify a person as to race, color or creed, have reason for it." One exception might be a crime where "there seems to be no question that the identification of a wanted suspect as black, white or yellow is as much a part of his description as whether he is short or tall, fat or slim." Another exception was the Middle East, where Jews and Arabs visit so much injustice on each other for no other reason than their racial identities. Here, I believe, the publication of the racial identities can help expose this injustice. Numerous groups in our society are underprivileged or oppressed: blacks, Hispanic Americans, small religious colonies such as the Hutterites in South Dakota, migrant workers, patients in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded, the poor, and prisoners. Beyond our shores are the developing nations. The list is far from complete. All ought to compel the journalist's attention.
The mass media often cover only a breaking development, a congressional hearing, a news conference, a new study, and drop the story there. We need to keep going back to the story again and again. More will be accomplished through ongoing stories, even small ones, than by one big takeout. H.L. Stevenson, former UPI editor-in-chief, once remarked to me that perhaps it was more important in Chicago's South Side slums to go back the second and third day to find out why a riot occurred than merely to report that it occurred. The word itself has the power to bring justice. Proponents of advocacy journalism often suffer the fatal flaw of writing in an advocacy style that is strident. Rather than being effective, they lose credibility and perhaps even harm their cause. Even without being an advocate, merely by reporting the situation the journalist becomes an agent of justice.

*****
Critical Issues

Whose Care Is Child Care?
by Dana Friedman, Christopher Dodd, Jay Belsky, Elinor Guggenheimer, and Nehama Jacobs

The following are edited excerpts from the May 5, 1987 panel discussion, "Whose Care is Child Care?: Public and Private Responsibilities," with Jay Belsky, Professor of Human Development, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University; Christopher Dodd, U. S. Senator (D-Connecticut); Elinor Guggenheimer, President and Founder, Child Care Action Campaign and Chair, Senior Citizen Centers, and former Commissioner, New York City Department of Consumer Affairs; Nehama Jacobs, author, Success and Betrayal: The Crisis of Women in Corporate America; and Dana Friedman, Senior Research Associate, The Conference Board (Moderator).

FRIEDMAN: We must put child care into the context of the social and economic forces that have conspired to refashion the familiar fabric of our major institutions. There are many interwoven strands of change that tie together the family, the workplace and the community into a close-knit weave. We have a strong foundation of knowledge about how children can develop their full potential. We may debate various strategies but child care is and will continue to be a reality for a growing number of American families. We are well past the point of asking whether; we ask how.

The current child care situation takes on greater meaning with the realization that child care will never be an inoculation against poor housing, poor home life or overly-stressed parents. It's being asked to solve a host of other social problems: reducing welfare dependency, alleviating the pain of child abuse and neglect, economically revitalizing depressed communities, increasing corporate competitiveness, and developing the next generation of productive members of society.

If I had to paint a picture of the child care system today I would leave a pallette of inadequacy and inefficiency with splashes of innovation and excellence. The patchwork system that has been struggling for years on bake sales is difficult for parents to find, afford, or extol. Only recently has there been attention paid to the subject which has helped us celebrate some of our proudest achievements. Legislators who five years ago wouldn't touch child care with a ten foot pole are now fighting over who is going to cut the ribbon at the ground-breaking ceremony at the nearest daycare center.

Employers have realized that if they are to attract and retain baby-producing baby boomers they had better have some child care policy in place. There has been about a 400 percent increase in the number of employers providing child care support,
but that still leaves only about 3,000 currently providing that support—when there are nearly 6,000,000 employers nationwide.

The public schools are opening their doors to four year olds, getting involved in after-school care, and helping to intensify the debate on whether the schools might be the appropriate fiscal administrative unit for the child care system. Women's groups, looking for new constituents and fund-raising issues—the Equal Rights Amendment is virtually dead and abortion is too highly controversial—are finally allowing child care and family issues to become a priority. The media is having a field day with the subject, although that could be because of pregnant journalists—self-interest motivates us all.

But the hard questions remain. Will the combination of direct government subsidies to low income families, tax credits to middle income families, and flexible benefits for higher income families solve the problem of affordability? Can availability be solved with empty school buildings and industrial parks and space requirements for developers? Do we set standards that create quality or that permit affordability? Do we maintain diversity, the strength of the system, at the risk of remaining fragmented? Do we advocate for infant care programs, or parental leave, or both? For indirect long-term programs like information and referral or direct service to those in greatest need? Finally, do we advocate this as a gender issue? Is this just a woman's issue? I hope not.

DODD: Politically, child care has become very popular. It is hard to hear anyone in Congress give a speech without talking about the family. The difficulty is in translating those speeches into legislative action. There are, of course, substantive realities. We are an economy in transition—it changes before our very eyes—and more and more people in and out of Congress are beginning to take cognizance of that. One out of every four children under the age of six is growing up in poverty. Among industrialized nations we are tied for 20th place in infant mortality and are the only one whose children are the poorest sector of its population. It is hard to recognize, with the great wealth and affluence we see and with all of the rhetoric we hear about national security, about the United States maintaining its dominant position, that there is a generation coming along hardly equipped to grapple with the problems that this nation will face. One of my strong hopes is that we can begin to meld the budget debate in Congress, begin to talk about national security in terms that go beyond just military needs.

There is also occurring a change in family structure. About 70 percent of adult women—50 percent of women who have children under the age of one—are in the work force. By 1995, about 80 percent of all new employees will be minorities, women and immigrants. We must focus our attention on how to make it possible for children to grow up relatively healthy and also make it possible for women and men to be able to have families and provide for their economic needs. Families face a terrible quandry—choosing between the needs of their children and the economic needs of the family in a crushing economy where housing costs, and food costs,
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and health-care costs are escalating at an incredible rate. Statistics on child abuse, alcoholism among teenagers, drop-out rates, violence among teenagers and under-teenagers correlate with the condition of the family, with the economic choices facing the family.

There has been tremendous opposition to the parental leave bill I introduced in the Senate this year. I am having a very difficult time getting co-sponsors despite the fact that we know the staggering problems facing families, particularly at the time of new birth, adoption, terribly ill children. I have tried over the past year to reach the business community. It’s not a women’s issue, a family issue—it’s a business issue. Smart employers who have adopted parental leave policies and child care policies generally will tell you that it has been tremendously beneficial to them.

In February, on my first hearing on the matter, the National Chamber of Commerce announced all across the country cost estimates in excess of $16 billion for 18-week parental leaves; by March 10th they apologized and announced it would be less than $2 billion—they had made an error. But businesses all across this country had received the information and were very effective in reaching their members of Congress andconvincing them that this was a cost that business could not afford. By the end of this summer the general accounting office will show that the $2 billion figure is very very high—the number is not anywhere near that.

We will move to child care issues in June. Sixty-three million children who have no lawyers and no lobbyists and no accountants, nor other things essential to lobby Congress effectively, have had no voice. Now many in the Congress are anxious to claim jurisdiction over the issue. Private sector involvement is absolutely vital but frankly they have been very slow to move. Without some initiative of the federal government they will continue to move slowly. Our hope is to encourage them to move more expeditiously.

BELSKY: I’ve been asked to discuss my new reading of the research evidence pertaining to the functioning of children in day care, particularly non-parental care initiated in the first year of life. After ten years of closely scrutinizing the database, it is clear that there are risks associated with more than 20 hours a week of non-parental day care initiated in the first year. Order begins to emerge from what at first appears to be empirical chaos only when distinguishing care initiated in the first year from that initiated thereafter. The evidence does not point in any consistent way to risks to the child of day care initiated after the first 12 to 18 months. In fact, a sizable body of evidence suggests that high quality pre-school day care can influence child development positively.

The risks, with all too much consistency to be ignored, involve insecure relations with parents in the first year of life, and increased aggression, non-compliance, and even social withdrawal in the pre-school and elementary school years. No one knows what such risks portend for the development and functioning of adolescents, young adults, future workers and family members. These risks ought to be a source of concern, though by no means a cause of alarm. The risks discerned are not realized by all infants exposed to 20 or more hours a week of non-parental care in the first
year and are realized by some, though apparently fewer, cared for exclusively by their parents at home. They do not seem to be associated with any particular care arrangements—they are chronicled in studies of infants from impoverished, middle class, and affluent families cared for by relatives and non-relatives in their own homes and in the homes of other people and in day care centers.

While quality care may determine who succumbs to the risks and who does not, the available data are by no means consistent nor heartening in this regard. Risks seem to be greater for boys and may have as much to do with what goes on at home as to what goes on in the child care setting. It is important to distinguish between the effects of day care and the correlates of day care. Since we cannot be sure that day care causes increased risk for insecurity and later social difficulties the best we can say is that it is associated with behavior patterns which many would consider less than desirable, and derivatively, as cause for concern.

The question that arises involves policy concerns. As societies change, institutions emerge to meet emergent needs and these feed back to affect the development of a community, a society, even a nation. We can all imagine some such changes in the past—the establishment of public schools readily comes to mind. But child care policy and corporate responsibility is an infrastructure issue. Let's think of water, sewers, law enforcement, transportation. Much of our infrastructure, bridges and roads, is literally crumbling; other, like hospital and medical services, are transforming. What has not been sufficiently recognized is that other infrastructures, e.g., child care systems, are emerging. The recognition, consolidation, and even institutionalization of emerging infrastructure is at the heart of social change and progress.

The nascent successful experiments that are taking place around the nation involving information and referral services, supervised family day care networks as well as experimental employment policies must be incubated, nurtured, disseminated. Not until child care is seen as an infrastructure issue can discernible progress be made in serving families, parents, children and employers in a way that lubricates the gears of social and economic life rather than, as occurs too often currently, breeding friction, burn-out, limited productivity and genuine concerns about the future.

GUGGENHEIMER: In 1924 our class at school adopted the Manhattanville Day Nursery in New York City, the first such program I ever saw, and that is what got me started. We went there and there were about thirty or more children at long tables all dressed exactly alike in little blue and white checked outfits. There was only one rule: none of them were allowed talk—an interesting concept. Fortunately, we did outgrow that particular concept. In the 1930s child care was developed for Works Project Administration (WPA) teachers because they needed jobs.

Then came World War II and all of a sudden we had funds because the government wanted to get women into the labor force. When the country was stretched to the breaking point producing a defense machine we had rather good day care
programs around the country. It is amazing that we seemed to have the money when we absolutely needed to get women to work. In 1948, after the war, the programs ended except for New York and California.

We put up a terrific fight in New York to hold on to the 91 centers that had been developed with money from New York State. Governor Dewey commissioned a study which proved conclusively that women were all going to return to the home, that there would be no further use for day care. In the next ten years, the number of mothers in the labor force in my state increased by 80 percent so that particular piece of research has never been enshrined.

In the 1950s, we went back to considering child care as a welfare type of program and in the '60s we began to get a good deal of focus on women and women's need to work, the feminine mystique rising, a little more emphasis on the needs of women. It's a national issue but it has almost always been a woman's problem to find child care.

In '48 when we were trying to save child care in New York there was a group that called itself the Communist Party and they had a newspaper, The Daily Worker. The paper and this small communist group fought very hard and organized the parents of existing child care programs to fight for day care. One Sunday they marched up to Governor Dewey's summer place and paraded around this quiet, peaceful little area protesting the fact that he was withdrawing the funding for child care. He called it "that communist program" for the rest of his life. I ran into him many years later and apologized about that uproar and he again assured me that he resented it very deeply and that it was a communist program. That has haunted us to some extent, and I think we have given very little thought to it. Nixon vetoed a comprehensive child care bill in the '70s and again brought up the specter of communism.

I'm not so sure that it hasn't stayed with us, that aura which meant that liberals were virtually communist when they talked about child care and that the conservative point of view was that the mothers should stay home. There never should have been that political division. It has nothing to do with liberalism, with communism, with socialism, but with a reality. Mothers were leaving their homes to go into the labor force—not seeking careers, 85 percent were the major or sole support of their families. The second income had become so extremely important and government had an obligation to deal with the needs of families. Somehow we failed to sell that in the '70s to our government and we fail to sell it again today.

I am very excited about the unpaid parental leave bills that have been proposed in the Senate by Senator Dodd and in the Congress by Congresswoman Schroeder. I can assure you that they don't have to worry about $16 billion; they don't even have to worry, perhaps, about 16 million because the women of this country cannot afford to accept unpaid parental leave for very long; that's not a reality. They're not going to be able to afford a whole year on welfare, not today, not in cities where rents are so high that welfare can't possibly cover the cost of living.

About four years ago we formed the Child Care Action Campaign, a coalition which includes experts in child care, heads of most national agencies, editors-in-chief of very prominent magazines, some government officials, some C.E.O's of
corporations—they were the hardest to induce to come in. One of the heads of one of our own major organizations, Eleanor Smeal, at the very first meeting held on forming the Child Care Action Campaign said, "Child care is pretty boring." That's very tragic. It's the future of our country. If it's boring we'd better make it glamorous in some way. It's going to be a long time before a national system of child care is in place so we're working state by state, going to governors and to their wives to appoint task forces to begin to assess the needs.

We need sick child care, infant care, every sector of society—local, state, and federal government, the private sector—to be involved in trying to resolve what I consider to be the single major problem in our country today—we are bringing up a generation of children at risk.

JACOBS: Among women managers day care is the most immediate, tangible and actionable of a whole host of potential rewards that corporations can offer women to keep them in the system. A recent American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) poll showed that 74 percent of women want government licensing standards, 42 percent say day care services are not available where they are wanted, and 28 percent—over one in four!—have given up a job or a promotion due to a lack of child care. So the pressure is on and it's growing.

Women who have deferred child bearing as long as possible in order to achieve maximum seniority in the system now find that instead of being more expendable they are less expendable, that critical mass that is finally going to push corporations over the top. But the problem with corporate day care is still more attitudinal than structural. As a result of some of the legislation that has been introduced there is now a new organization, Concerned Alliance of Responsible Employers (CARE). To quote Business Week, "Through intense lobbying on Capitol Hill, CARE has slowed progress of the family and medical leave act and has sworn to fight other mandated benefit bills as they come up." In other words, this stuff is scaring the hell out of corporations and they are responding.

Corporations are unwilling to acknowledge that they have not only hired the woman in sex-blind hiring but they have hired her child as well. One corporate lawyer in a sexual discrimination and promotion case was quoted as saying, "We just have to face the fact that there will always be fewer women in top jobs because of the fact that they have children." One C.E.O. said to us, "One of the two spouses in a two career marriage is going to have to give up the opportunity to be top dog in the company if they're going to give enough time to the child. I don't know that day care can substitute for somebody spending time with a child." When that is the attitude at the top there's very little that you can do pushing from the bottom. We talked with C.E.O.'s about equity issues and heard that you can't give special benefits to special segments. But what about the corporate gym, not everybody uses that either. It costs about $250,000 for Southland Corporation (7-11 stores) to maintain their day care center, about the cost of producing one television commercial.
If corporations won’t change to allow dependent care in terms of child care, they may be forced to do it for adult and geriatric care. Women have traditionally been the caregivers for elderly adults. As husbands realize their wives are no longer on the premises to care for a sick mother, it’s going to be another pressure on the system. When we think about dependent care, we have to think about that too.

Women are redefining the values and rewards associated with success. If they are going to have the impact we expect in the next 10 years, they can only do it with C.E.O.’s who realize that there are real incentives for change. Each of the C.E.O.’s we interviewed had a personal anecdote about day care and productivity to relate. One pointed out that change has to start at the top and cannot be delegated and then commented, ‘‘We must accept and live with the sexual revolution and give full meaning to the notion that there is total equality of opportunity within the corporation.’’

The AIDS Dilemma

by C. Everett Koop and Loretta McLaughlin

On February 10, 1987, a public address, ‘‘AIDS: An Agenda for Action,’’ by C. Everett Koop, Surgeon General of the United States, was co-sponsored by the Kennedy School Student Government, the Black, Hispanic, and Women's Caucuses, the Gay and Lesbian Students’ Association, the Executive Council of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, and the Institute of Politics. Dr. Koop's address was commented on by Loretta McLaughlin, deputy editor/editorial section and former medical news specialist, The Boston Globe. Following are edited excerpts from Dr. Koop's address, from Ms. McLaughlin's commentary, and from Dr. Koop's rebuttal to Ms. McLaughlin.

KOOP: I’d like to first touch lightly on the recent history of AIDS and then to explore some of the key questions it poses to society. In June 1981 the Public Health Service, through the Center for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta began to get some alarming reports—five cases of pneumonia in Los Angeles, a lethal disease so rare
that just a handful of cases in a single year is like an epidemic. Soon reports trickled in of other cases in other cities as well. The trail led us to people who for some reason were sick and their bodies were not fighting back. As a result they were dying from this very dangerous form of infectious pneumonia and no one seemed to know why. Otherwise healthy people were acquiring some kind of bug, a virus most likely, that attacked and apparently destroyed their natural immune system. The virus itself was not killing people. People were dying instead of extremely virulent diseases because something prevented the body from fighting them off. We had never come upon a syndrome like this before and so we gave it a somewhat awkward title—we called it the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome. We soon just settled for the initials A.I.D.S.; them we called it “AIDS,” and it has been AIDS ever since.

First, we are talking about a disease that is spreading. The number of victims is doubling in little more than a year. As of January 1986 we had a cumulative total of 16,000 reported cases; today that total is 30,000. Over half of them have died and the rest will. Last year we had over 13,000 new cases and this year we expect 23,000. By the end of 1990 the cumulative total will be close to 270,000 with 54,000 deaths in that year. AIDS is spreading and it is fatal. Dr. Otis Bowan, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has likened the AIDS situation to the arrival and spread of smallpox and the bubonic plague in Europe several centuries ago.

Second, even though scientists have had a look at the AIDS virus, we really don’t know what it is and unless we know we have no way of stopping it. We’re making progress in the research effort but it’s very slow going. In 1984 the search was narrowed down to something called a human retrovirus. Our scientists at the National Cancer Institute were even able to pinpoint a specific one which they called Human T-cell Lymphotropic Virus-Type III or HTLV-III. The same virus showed up in the work of the Pasteur Institute in France where it became known as Lymphadenopathy Associated Virus or LAV. Scientists have now agreed by consensus to call it by the single common name Human Immunodeficiency Virus or HIV.

Once we knew where the virus was we were able to recognize the presence of antibodies specific to the AIDS virus in an individual’s blood serum. Of course those antibodies aren’t very effective but they’re present nevertheless. Since 1985 we’ve had a test which can detect the presence of these antibodies. On the basis of such testing plus other epidemiologic studies we believe there are between a million and a million-and-a-half Americans with the AIDS virus in their systems. I believe that is on the low side. They have AIDS but they aren’t yet sick with an AIDS-related disease. One major complication is the length of the incubation period. It apparently can be anywhere from a year or so to ten years if our computations are correct. We still can’t predict which HIV carrier will or will not get an AIDS-related disease but the risk is very, very high. Some researchers feel that anyone with the AIDS virus will eventually contract an AIDS-related disease and the mortality rate appears to be 100 percent.

There is other research going on as well. The media for example have given much coverage to one drug, AZT, that seems to prolong the lives of some AIDS victims dying of pneumonia. But that’s all that AZT does; it prolongs some lives—it does
not save them. I don’t see an effective vaccine in the foreseeable future. Vaccine
development is a very difficult scientific achievement. It took 19 years to develop
the Hepatitis B vaccine and that was a comparatively easy virus to understand. If
not produced with great care a vaccine can cause as much illness and death as the
disease it is supposed to attack.

Third, we don’t know very much about AIDS but we do know with complete cer­
tainty that the virus is transmitted either in blood or in semen. This is one of the
most important pieces of information we have so far. It explains why the initial alarm
about AIDS was sounded among homosexual and bisexual men. Some homosexual
sex practices not only produce semen but they also cause some bleeding. And again,
blood and semen are the only two body fluids that carry the live AIDS virus in
quantities sufficient to be transmissible. It also explains why 17 percent of all AIDS
cases are intravenous drug abusers who often borrow dirty needles from other
addicts.

At first, the people at highest risk were homosexual and bisexual men; they still
are. Two of every three cases involve these men even though they have become
much more cautious about their sexual practices. Now four percent (and climbing
rapidly) of reported cases of AIDS in this country are among heterosexual men and
women who are not IV drug abusers, whose heterosexual activity appears to be their
only risk which means that we need to direct our information and education efforts
to society at large. That’s very hard to do in so large and diverse a society. The cost
of sending a message to everyone would be astronomical if it could be acheived.
Government has a difficult time because Americans do not want their government
to be a Big Brother regardless of how worthy its objective. So we have to set some
priorities and make some tough choices.

I think we made the right choice when we decided to focus on informing young
people about the dangers of AIDS. Heterosexual young people are now at high risk
and their sexual activity over a long period of time will actually determine whether
our society can survive this devastating disease or not. What we’re doing is sorting
out all the information that can be life saving for sexually active people, almost any
male or female between the ages of 12 and 80, and focusing on those pieces of infor­
mation that are especially pertinent to and can be readily understood by young peo­
ple. That was the underlying plan for the Surgeon General’s Report on AIDS written
on the instructions of President Reagan and released in October 1986.

There is much scientific and public health information in the report but there are
essentially just two messages that I hope reach every one of this country’s young­
sters.—First, find someone who is worthy of your love and respect, give that per­
son both, and stay faithful to him or her. In other words, short of total abstinence,
the defense against AIDS is to maintain a faithful monogamous relationship in which
you have only one continuing sexual partner and that person is as faithful as you
are. My advocacy of monogamy may sound like a morality lesson but this is a situa­
tion in which morality and science happen to walk hand in hand toward the con­
tainment of this epidemic.—Second, for people who don’t yet have a faithful
monogamous relationship for whatever reason, the message is caution. It’s impor-
tant that you know with absolute certainty that neither you nor your partner is carrying the AIDS virus. If you are not absolutely certain then you must take precautions because—strictly from the point of view of epidemiology—when you have sex with someone you’re also having sex with everyone else with whom that person has had sex for ten years back—it could be in the thousands.

There will always be people who won’t abstain and won’t achieve a faithful monogamous relationship and may expose themselves to others with the AIDS virus. To such individuals I offer the following advice: don’t have sex with somebody who already has AIDS, or who could be carrying the AIDS virus, someone who practices high risk behavior—that includes homosexuals, intravenous drug users, prostitutes and other persons who have many different sex partners. Finally, if you do have sex anyway with such a person, then if you’re a man, use a condom from start to finish, and if you’re a woman, make sure that your male partner uses a condom, again from start to finish. A condom will not provide 100 percent protection, but so far it seems to be the best protection available.

Some people object to the advice because it sounds too much like a lesson in morality and I guess it does but my job as Surgeon General is not to make everyone a moral person. I’m offering my advice to help you protect your lives because that is my job.

MCLAUGHLIN: I have followed the AIDS outbreak and written many editorials and stories about it since 1984, 1983. I am positively obsessed with the subject of AIDS. I check it every day—the first thing I do—on all the wire services. I have been to the major meetings and I am frankly surprised to come here and hear the Surgeon General of the United States sit and talk to an audience of this sophistication as if we were discussing the pros and cons of sex education. Sex education is not the issue before America. This Administration are sort of hoist on their own petard. They’ve opposed sex education. They have opposed many programs for better rights for homosexuals. We have limited programs for treatment of drug addicts. This forum does not take place in a vacuum. We have not had a day or two or a month or two or a year or two of AIDS—we have had six long difficult years of AIDS.

I think that it is terribly important that Dr. Koop now takes the stand that he takes with his primer. It comes late because his primer comes late and the National Academy of Sciences report comes late and Congress coming around comes late. It isn’t that no one has been saying anything about this. People ask what could have been done, what can we do now? A great many things could be done now.

The problem from the very beginning has been the nature of this disease. Very early it was said that if this had first appeared in members of a U. S. Olympic team rather than in a homosexual community the President of the United States would have had a very different response. We would have had a great marshalling of medical forces and a great marshalling of money. The money has come very slowly. And even now they do not become convinced of how serious a matter it is. They would
so easily be convinced if we were talking about a new polio. It is because it is a sexual disease that we are so slow to face up to this one. And because for a long time the government thought they could get away with it, that it would stay limited to very socially undesirable groups.

We have had an almost unbroken silence by the President himself. To my knowledge there's only been three times that he has spoken out. Once was when he sent his condolences to Rock Hudson; one was an oblique reference to the value perhaps of banking ones own blood, and the last time I remember was when he called for Dr. Koop's report and said he wanted a full and thorough report and one that was understandable to the people. On the same day however the President also asked that several tens of thousands of dollars in funds for AIDS research be rescinded.

Where has the leadership been in the Cabinet? We actually had Margaret Heckler who did call AIDS the number one health priority in this country way back in 1984—and now she is a visitor in Ireland. We did have Dr. Brandt who was a physician as Dr. Koop is and who very early recognized the seriousness of this threat and who sought very large budgets for AIDS. But there was no help and Dr. Brandt resigned from the United States Public Health Service. I just don't think its good enough to come along in October of 1986 with a report and suddenly appear as if you have been supporting funds and programs for AIDS for three or four years when that is not the case.

Dr. Otis Bowen also has made a major statement on AIDS, one of the first and he made it after Dr. Koop's report. He talks about a virtual apocalypse in Africa and he's right. But where has he been? We are diagnosing AIDS now at the rate of 500 to 600 new cases a week. We really didn't pay much attention until we had seepage into the heterosexual population. Even Center for Disease Control, an organization that I admire so much and do not wish to say one word against, was slow in putting out the statistics it had collected for three or four years that showed that AIDS was a terrible problem for poor ethnic minorities in major cities who are an underclass bearing the burden of this disease. And the CDC has been really slow to accept the idea of heterosexual spread.

Now Dr. Koop's report is really excellent. It says what you should do, and it says how you should do it; but why is there no great call for funds as the National Academy of Sciences has done? The President this year has asked for $100 million more than last year. This paltry amount of money is being sought in the presence of an approaching epidemic that the National Academy of Sciences, not exactly a hysterically emotional group, says is catastrophic. If Dr. Koop, Dr. Bowen really want to reach the American public, if the President does, if this is a national health emergency, why doesn't he commandeer three hours on ABC, NBC, CBS?

One problem is the definition of AIDS. We still only mandate the reporting of the end stage of the disease—acute, lethal AIDS. Most AIDS experts now feel that this definition has lost its original usefulness and we should be reporting all cases of people who are showing any mental or physical symptoms of AIDS so we could have an accurate count, to see where it's going. We don't separate any other dis-
ease as to who has mild or severe manifestations of it. Are we doing this with AIDS because by clinging to an overly strict definition we keep the count down and therefore minimize it as a political issue?

I predict that AIDS will be a major national political issue in 1988. By then we will have 120,000 cases, more than 60,000 dead—the old Vietnam War analogy. All of this will have happened on the watch of this administration. While no one certainly can blame the administration for the outbreak of AIDS, we shall see how the public judges the way it was handled and whether the challenge is being met or not. The whole problem isn’t whether we tell the kiddies or we don’t tell the kiddies. It is that the disease spreads and time is the enemy and the pool of virus grows in the society.

We keep telling everybody that this is an unprecedented disease in modern times and then we go on behaving like it was some unusual form of measles. We’re still arguing about the niceties of TV condom ads. We’re still worrying about the cost to the health care system. We wonder what it’s going to do to the insurance system. We don’t know what we really want to tell the people about AIDS. Do we want to tell them to do safe sex or to do no sex? What is it we really do want to tell the folks?

I burn with questions that probably aren’t yours. I’m not an academician. I’m not a medicine person so for now I represent the public curiosity and I would like to know what and how often has the President been told? What does he say? Does the President worry about his own status as a high risk person for AIDS? He has had multiple blood transfusions since the AIDS outbreak began. Does he worry about his children? Young adults who surely have the same sexual urgings that all the rest of the people in this room have. Does he really understand that one in ten adults in New York is probably carrying the AIDS virus? One in 25 in Boston? Do we all really understand that doomed means doomed? There will be no medicine in a year-and-a-half or two years and there will certainly not be a vaccine.

Does Caspar Weinberger or George Schultz really get the picture about AIDS? The threat to the national military, to the international world, to the State Department, to the Peace Corps? Does Jerry Falwell understand what is going to happen to the world missionary when now in certain cities in Africa between 10 and 30 percent may be positive for AIDS? Do the companies of America understand their workers are going to these countries and the blood supply is not safe or even tested? Do you know that members of the State Department in Ruanda are allowed to go to Europe to have their teeth cleaned to protect them from the threat of AIDS? I don’t think we’ve begun to do enough. There’s no war on AIDS going on. I ask my grownup children every day, “Have you seen a poster anyplace about AIDS?” No. In Europe they can send pamphlets to every household. We just put through a new income tax. Are we so lacking in imagination that we couldn’t have printed on the back of one of those forms how to protect yourself against AIDS? Wouldn’t cost any postage.

Dr. Koop calls us to follow him, and indeed we should—go get the Great White Whale and do him in. But I keep wondering as the epidemic grows larger and more
ferocious about whether it is already too late to beat him with the meager weapons we have at hand?

KOOP: I wish that I had the power and the authority that most of my detractors think I have. The Surgeon General has neither power nor money. Anything that I have done in the five years I have been Surgeon General has been done by moral suasion and with borrowed money or money that I have convinced other people that they should spend. My responsibility for AIDS has been limited to one thing and that is the writing of the report. My responsibility for that began in February 1986. Before that time by fiat I was not associated in any way with the AIDS effort.

I say those things because although the commentator criticized the administration more than she criticized me I want you to understand my role. We don’t all have the ability to sit in a position of editorial power and to criticize things that men of good will try their very best to accomplish in a very complex federal government. I would not want you to think that the people in CDC or the Public Health Service are mindless. We are as frustrated as you are about many of the things that happen not just with AIDS but with other things that government is responsible for.

Our government is huge. I’ve been there only five years but it reminds me of a freight train going down a track and you are told by your superior, “Do anything you want with it.” It’s almost impossible because the driver is hermetically sealed in the cab. I didn’t come here to defend either myself or the administration but I would think it unfair if you went away from here thinking that all the accusations you’ve heard tonight are true and that we aren’t attempting to do some of the things that the commentator thinks should be done. I think we will accomplish them. Indeed the white whale may very well be too far away to catch in which case we will all certainly suffer very seriously.

*****
Q: I am from Alaska and am a student here. I’d like to have you focus for a moment on public sector unions. Oil-dependent economies recently went through something that city governments faced a couple years ago—tremendous reductions in revenues. And it meant layoffs. I was talking with a colleague today in Texas who reported that they’re laying off fully one-third of the state employees in Texas, and of that number 30 percent have worked for five or more years in state government. When they went to look at that and when we looked at potential layoffs in the state of Alaska, we found that fully 70 percent of the people that were projected to be laid off met the criteria of affirmative action. That had to do with an underlying problem that I hope that you’ll talk about—which comes first, progress or seniority?

What kinds of creative things are you doing in unions to protect people who are being brought in, who are members, who are moving up in the membership? It was ironic that in two of the locals in our state capital, two of the local presidents were laid off. They were both women. I think it’s a critical problem and something that I’d like to hear you comment on.

HUTCHINSON: I think that legally, technically, seniority comes first. We’ve all tinkered around with it. We’ve talked about it, talked about what we can possibly do. On a legal basis, it’s still seniority first. One of the approaches that we have taken is to deal with it through our contracts, through upward mobility programs and setting aside slots, training slots. Those slots are committed for a certain period of time so those people are not caught in the layoff, they’re in a set-aside group on a separate layoff schedule because it’s a training program.

You do have the adverse impact upon women and minorities because they are still on the lower rungs of the ladder. They are usually the last hired and the first fired. Everybody’s tussled with the problem. I myself, when I was in private practice and worked for the Equal Opportunity Council, the issue was to structure an affirmative action program for an employer making a settlement. Can I demand that he waive that seniority? I couldn’t. I could demand it if he was discriminating in
laying off people, but not if he was fair and square.

You're really taking away a person's interest. They put in their time. Can you say that should be set aside, that the interest that they've accrued should be set aside? No. On the issue of promotion, people say, well, it shouldn't be set aside there either. The fact of the matter is, generally, in most of those instances, the people who were being advanced or fast-paced had been held back by some [discriminatory] pattern or practice. Another person might have progressed at the normal rate but to the detriment of someone else.

Everybody has tussled with that issue. It is the most tragic side of affirmative action, but it is a fact. It is something I accepted at least ten years ago. Unless we do a legislative change in this country, and then you would have to study the impact such a change would have, I would not recommend that we tinker with it on a day-by-day basis except through an upward-mobility set-aside situation.

WALKER: Well, you said a few mouthfuls there with your question. I was just trying to jot down some points to focus in on. For instance, I think that it's incumbent on any state or any company to have a vision for the future. You know, for years, for the last 15 or 20 years even, I remember people talking about oil not lasting and that there should be some other fuel in the future. I think that's one of the things that many of the states have not focused in on, some vision for the future should their oil resources run out or circumstances change.

The other thing that I think has to be focused on is retraining for these workers. I think that along with the vision for planning for the future, those same workers who are working in a particular field, any field that has been fazed out, could be retrained and given enough education to help the state or any particular company look to the future. I think those two things coupled together would make a big difference because a lot of workers, particularly women, have a lot of great ideas, if those ideas could be channeled, for example, to legislatures. Some legislatures have a brainstorming division, like in— I can't remember the name of the place, I think it's in Oklahoma. Workers also have ideas because of what they themselves see. If managers and management would listen, I mean truly listen, not just give them a snow job, they would be able to avert some of these problems with layoffs and provide some sort of retraining in related fields or even in different fields.

One of the things that I see going on also is that a lot of clerical work is being sent out of the country to be done in Central America. That means that there's going to be a loss of work for a lot of clerical people here, for instance, women who work in banks, keying in the checks as they pass through their stations. That type of work is being contracted out and sent to foreign countries where workers receive a dollar a day. What are these clerical workers here in the United States going to do? What are these keypunch operators, or whatever the terminology is for that particular position, supposed to do? Those are the types of things that have to be looked at and planned for the future. I think that's important.
TROY: I feel, going along with what Ms. Hutchinson said, that fair and equitable treatment is a foundation for unions. That's what attracts people, the knowledge that they're secure in the contract, the language [of the contract]. Seniority must be the ultimate decision when layoffs take place.

*****

Reforming Welfare
by Max Rovner

The following is an edited version of an article which first appeared in the spring 1987 issue of the Harvard Political Review, a journal published by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. Mr. Rovner is a member of the HPR staff.

Everyone from the president to liberals such as Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York agrees that America's controversial welfare system, the subject of bitter public debate for decades, is finally due for an overhaul. Senator Moynihan has said that the present situation is similar to a "rare alignment of the sun, the moon, and the earth that causes all manner of natural wonders."

Why this sudden push towards reform in a system that has been creaking along in the same condition for decades? Conservatives have long been concerned with a program that they believe gives people incentives not to work. Governor James Thompson of Illinois cites the fact that in some areas, unemployed people have access to better medical care than many of the working poor and says that "the present system . . . is immoral. It encourages a life of dependency on government."
Moreover, many conservatives have watched with alarm as the number of welfare recipients has skyrocketed over the last twenty years. The number of families receiving support from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program has jumped from under a million families in 1960 to almost four million in 1981. It was only as a result of President Reagan's spend-less initiatives of the early 1980's that the spiraling costs of the AFDC program were finally curtailed: payments grew to their highest levels in 1981 and have fallen slightly since then. Presently 3.7 million families receive more than 17 billion dollars a year in federal and state income support payments.

At the other end of the spectrum, many liberals decry the failure of the system to do what it was originally intended to do—keep the poor above the poverty line. Under the present system, average AFDC monthly payments, which have not kept pace with inflation, have actually fallen below their 1960 levels. Families in 1960 received an average of a little over 150 dollars a month in 1960 dollars. Today they receive just under 150 dollars a month in 1960 dollars. As a result, there are about 33 million U.S. citizens below the poverty line (for a four-member family the poverty line is presently at $10,989). This is roughly the same number that were below the poverty line in 1965 despite the fact that since President Johnson initiated the Great Society reforms of the 1960's the number of federal programs aimed at curbing poverty has grown to 95. Many liberals have thus come to decide that direct transfer payments from the government to the poor are not the ultimate solution to getting rid of poverty in the United States.

Now that there is a consensus that the present system must go, the next question is what type of system will replace it? Policy makers do have a number of successful programs to serve as models. Illinois, California, and Massachusetts all have instituted successful reforms that have led to more welfare recipients going back to work and have also led to substantial savings for state governments. Massachusetts and California both use variations of "workfare" programs. Massachusetts, using a voluntary system called FT as an option to welfare, spends roughly $3,400 per person to place participants in jobs. That same person, on average, would have incurred a cost of $7,940 under the old system. Michael Dukakis, the governor of Massachusetts, says that the ET program has cut the number of long-term AFDC recipients in Massachusetts by 25 percent and the voluntary program is so popular that there is actually a waiting list to be enrolled in it. Welfare recipients in California's mandatory Project GAIN system must sign a contract in which they promise that they will either join a job training program, look for a job, or go back to school.

Thompson says that Illinois' Project Chance program goes one step beyond because it uses an intermediary, a private organization, that the government contracts with. In the first year of its implementation, Project Chance exceeded its goals. It targeted 30,000 welfare recipients participating in the program a year for the next three years and is approaching 40,000 in the first year of operation.

In addition to these states, nine others are taking the first steps towards implementing new welfare reforms. Pennsylvania is awaiting federal approval to start a pro-
gram that would give welfare recipients who take full-time jobs one year's worth of medical insurance, money for day care, and direct cash transfers equaling the difference between the salary received at work and what would have been received under the old welfare program. North Carolina's proposed plan calls for those welfare recipients who are capable of working to meet certain base work requirements before they can receive their money.

The most tangible benefit of such programs is that they are very cost effective. Politicians like that not only because it makes it a lot easier to balance budgets, but because it also makes the welfare system easier to sell to voters. However, just because the new reforms are popular with policy-makers and tax payers does not mean that everyone is hailing the pilot programs as great successes. Many welfare advocacy groups complain that these job-training programs simply garner jobs for the most employable segment of the welfare recipients and that this group would have been employed soon anyway. Meanwhile, they argue, in areas of the country where unemployment is extremely high, less employable recipients will be expected to find jobs that simply aren't there.

The most significant controversy, however, is yet to come. For while there may be consensus on the idea that the system must be changed, with everyone scrambling to jump on the welfare-reform bandwagon, there is little agreement on whose plan is going to be implemented. In Congress, Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, has introduced a bill which proposes that the savings that the federal government would gain from not having to give direct transfer payments to welfare recipients be used to give bonuses to states that have efficiently removed people from the welfare rolls and put them to work.

Under Kennedy's proposal, if a state is able to move a welfare recipient from welfare to employment and can keep him employed for a year, the next year the state would receive 75 percent of what the federal government would have had to pay for that recipient as a bonus (75 percent of the federal government's matching share which is usually 50 percent). The next year, if the former recipient is still working, the federal government would give the state 50 percent of what it would have previously been forced to spend, and the next year half of that.

However, Senators Kennedy and Moynihan are likely to co-sponsor an even more drastic reorganization bill. Moynihan is known to support a plan in which mothers who are able and whose children are above age three would have to find work of some sort. He would also revamp the current child support procedures so that fathers would be forced to pay for child support and single working parents would receive child care assistance from the government. Furthermore, Moynihan is calling for federal aid to those families not able to maintain an established national standard of living. Moynihan chairs a subcommittee that has been holding hearings on welfare and he hopes to get the new bill out of committee sometime in March.

Meanwhile, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois has just published a book entitled Let's Put American Back to Work. He is calling for a Guaranteed Job Opportunity Program that would pay recipients the minimum wage for a maximum of 32 hours per week.
This would be for recipients who simply could not find work at all in the private sector. Simon says that the makeshift jobs could be “helping with day care centers, planting trees, cleaning graffiti of the walls of subways.” It has been estimated that Simon’s proposal would cost the government around $8 billion and would employ 3 million Americans. He insists, however, that, in the long run, the government would save money because federal welfare spending would decline as more and more people found jobs. This is similar to the plan that presidential aspirant and former Governor of Delaware Pete du Pont has proposed.

Many expect that if President Reagan submits to Congress the GROW (Greater Opportunities through Work) program that he has talked about it would focus on trying to initiate broad reform-type programs at the state and local levels by doing away with certain federal rules that presently stand in the way of such a scheme.

On February 17, however, Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton, the chairman of the National Governors’ Association’s plan for overhauling the welfare system, said President Reagan’s plan was not satisfactory. Referring to the way Reagan’s plan puts off any decision about how the new system will work until programs have been tested, Clinton said, “We don’t need any more tests. The states have conducted extensive testing and we think we know what needs to be done.”

Whose plan will be implemented and who, after all of the smoke has cleared, will claim the credit is not clear. Many of the programs that have been proposed are very similar to each other save for certain small details here and there. Since both liberals and conservatives agree that something has to be done however, the old welfare system of direct transfers for nothing in return is on the way out. And, like tax reform, all that remains to be seen is who will take the credit for revamping an ailing welfare system that taxpayers knew was obsolete years ago.

*****
Q: I have a question which is a little less lofty in terms of Republican politics, but I think by anyone's account your vision of the Republican party, looking at the conservative/moderate/liberal continuum, is much to the left of the structure of the Republican party, whether it's foreign policy—particularly pertaining to South Africa—or aid to urban areas—the definition of federalism—or your position on civil rights. I'm not suggesting your candidacy, but is it possible for a candidate who holds those values to convince the Republican party structure or to bypass it and attain a national nomination?

KEAN: I think it's very likely for somebody who holds those views to obtain a national nomination if they want to go after it and raise the necessary money—really go after it. First of all, the kind of views that I'm talking about—not necessarily my views—are the views which are held by the majority of people in this country who happen to call themselves Republicans. Not necessarily some of the leaders but the majority of the people who call themselves Republicans. I think the opportunity [for the nomination] is very, very much there.

Secondly, a lot of the things I'm talking about spring quite naturally out of ideas that are historically rooted in the Republican party. The terms conservative/liberal/moderate are really outdated. They don't have an awful lot of meaning anymore. As I talk to governors, both Republican and Democratic governors, they reject all those terms. At its finest, the Republican party is, and always has been, the party of opportunity. Let's say the Republican party wants to do something particular—take for instance the homestead act. Lincoln ran not on the idea he was going to fight the south or free the slaves, he ran on something called the homestead act. You probably know that what he said to people was we're going to give you a piece of land in the west. If you want to go there and if you work it you can make it yours. There was no government bureaucracy attached and it didn't matter if you were man or woman, or black or white, or old or young—if you wanted to work the piece of land you could get it. It was, in modern terms, a Republican philosophy. It was really quite a Republican program.
Now if you believe in opportunity, I could trace that [idea] historically through Teddy Roosevelt's presidency and Eisenhower's and so on. That is one of the touchstones of Republican belief, the creation of opportunity. But that only works if you're willing to also say that everybody starts at the same place. If they don't start at the same place then you've got to do whatever it takes to get people who haven't made it another way up to the starting line. I don't care if that's 'affirmative action.' I don't care if it's transforming schools. I don't care any number of things but until you get somebody up to the starting gate you can't say they have a fair chance in the race. You can't say that you are really practicing a politics that allows everybody to compete. From then on, once they're up to the starting gate, it's up to them. I don't mean government ought to help them. I don't think anybody ought to help them. They either succeed or they fail. But you have to get them up to the starting gate.

While the results of that philosophy would in some ways be characterized moderate, liberal or what have you, the genesis of it is from a very conservative idea and that is that this country is all about—opportunity. If we're going to guarantee opportunity to people, then government has got to move in occasionally to do that.

Q: A few short weeks ago Jerry Falwell was speaking at Harvard Law School and he gave a slightly different view of the Republican party than you did this evening.

KEAN: I suppose.

Q: As you might guess he suggested that the Republican party, if they were smart, would remember the role of the religious right in setting the agenda for 1988. [Would you respond?] You might refer specifically to the social issues of school prayer and abortion.

KEAN: Well, first of all you obviously welcome anybody who wants to come into the party. You don't set barriers and try to reject people or throw them out as long as they believe generally in the beliefs of the party. But anybody who thinks that they're going to make a touchstone of a social issue, a moral issue, a religious issue, and say if you don't believe this you can't run for office, is not going to be successful. A party that believes that is not going to be successful. A prime issue is abortion. People's beliefs on abortion are deeply personal. To say somehow that if through a religious conviction or moral conviction, or what have you, you believe strongly about abortion one way or the other, that somehow one of the great political parties is going to deny you the right to run because of that, is not only wrong it's crazy politically. Doesn't make any sense. On those kind of issues, people have got to be allowed their individual beliefs recognizing the fact that across party lines the country is deeply divided on those subjects.
Politics in Action

If somebody asks, you have to say what you believe. But don't make those touchstones. The touchstones are historic. The touchstones are things that have made Republicans or made Democrats for a long, long time and have made them over a number of years. It's not something you suddenly invent and say all right you're not going to be nominated or we're never going to support you unless you believe exactly with us on this particular issue.

Historically now, there were great coalitions the Republicans built after the Civil War that they kept really together—with the single exception of a few Democrats in the way—almost right up until the New Deal. And then Franklin Roosevelt built a great coalition in the New Deal which lasted for another long, long time. And now we're in a watershed. I don't think anybody understands yet whether or not another coalition has been built or is in the process of being built. We're going to find that out in the 1988 election. But this is the opportunity.

All those coalitions were built by including people, not excluding people. You won't find the Republican or the Democratic coalition ever had a touchstone like that, that said you can't run for office if you don't believe in one of these social issues. If they try to do that, they're going to destroy the party, I believe.

Q: You mentioned, and I agree, the importance of the political leadership at the state level, and that the governors are taking their place in that. Now, such a thing as a black Republican state legislator is almost non-existent. I'd like to know what the Republican party is doing or can do to increase that. It's terribly important because when the Republican caucuses meet in the state legislatures across the country, there is absolutely nobody there to express the needs and concerns of the black community.

KEAN: That is exactly the kind of tragedy I'm talking about. Tragedy. I mean for both the Republican party and the black community. I can tell you what some of us are doing. Like everything else, you have to build from the grassroots up. We are trying to build and are building a very vigorous black Republican community in the state of New Jersey. Granted, we've had a lot of people who were recently Democrats cross over to join it but that's the way you build coalitions. That's the way you get people and be a party but we have not yet got a black Republican legislator. I hope that is going to come very soon but we've got blacks in almost every other high position you can imagine in the Republican party, from party positions to, now, a black Republican mayor. You know it's hard to think of another position that blacks haven't emerged in and my hope is we'll certainly be in the state legislature. I think, again, you've got to build from the bottom up.

The black community, the Republicans in New Jersey, are a very proud group now. When I ran for office they raised, $150,000 in the black Community for my election. It's that kind of community that's going to produce the kind of black legislators you're talking about.

Q: My question relates to the upcoming election. I'd like to know from the perspective of yourself and from the perspective of the leadership of the Republican gover-
nor's council, who do you think is the strongest candidate the Democrats can field and why?

KEAN: Right now I suspect—you’re always in danger when you answer these kind of questions—a lot depends on name recognition. I don’t think people in the country on the whole know too many of the Democrats. Today it’s Gary Hart because he’s the one people know, he’s run before. Potentially I think it’s somebody like Sam Nunn because it’s very hard for the Republican Party to run against a Sam Nunn or a Chuck Robb. Mario Cuomo is the the ace in the hole because I think he is the only potential Democratic candidate who might be able to put the old Roosevelt coalition back together. He’s got that potential. Now whether he’s got the personality for a long campaign and all the questions and everything else, I really don’t know. But he’s the only one who has the potential of putting that whole coalition back together again and he might do that but barring that I think it’s one of the so-called Democratic moderates who would be very difficult for the Republican party to mount a really good campaign against.

*****

Local Issues in the Hoosier State
by Carolyn B. Mosby

Indiana State Senator Carolyn B. Mosby (D-Gary) was an Institute of Politics fellow during the fall 1986 term. She continued to produce regular editions of the "Mosby Report," a newsletter sent regularly to her constituents. The following is a representative sample of items from the newsletter discussing issues of concern to Senator Mosby and to her third district constituents.

OCTOBER 1986: South Shore Railroad.
I sincerely appreciate the interest and participation of the Gary and Merrillville commuters who attended my public forum at Gary’s Adam Benjamin Transportation Center on Saturday, September 13th to discuss proposed service cuts and fare increases which have been approved in recent weeks by state officials, South Shore Railroad officials, and the Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District (NICTD), managers of the commuter operation. Riders in Gary, Hammond and East Chicago will be greatly inconvenienced by the proposed changes.
The Indiana Transportation Coordinating Board approved a NICTD proposal which reduces weekday service and eliminates weekend service to and from Chicago on the commuter line from Gary, Hammond and East Chicago. The committee made its decision in spite of the needs of a majority of its most loyal riders—who live in Gary, Hammond and East Chicago. NICTD has also approved a gigantic fare increase which is inequitably borne by Gary, Hammond and East Chicago riders.

NICTD could enhance its resources by exercising more prudent fiscal and managerial decision-making. For example, empty trains must travel to a neighboring county to be serviced; a maintenance facility located closer to the hub of ridership would result in substantial savings on fuel and manpower.


My first flight back from Cambridge was to participate in continuing deliberations by the Sunset Evaluation Committee at its September 24th meeting on several issues related to Indiana's educational policy. The committee chairman recently rejected my request to have the committee examine several areas of concern to Indiana's minority community. Senator Julia Carson (D-Indianapolis) and Representative William Crawford (D-Indianapolis) joined me in requesting examination of enrollment of Indiana minority students in graduate-level professional schools: admissions at the entering freshmen level contrasted with out-of-state admissions of non-minorities; and a discussion of the number of minority faculty and administrators and their career ladder experience. We also requested a review of investments by the state's colleges and universities relative to holdings in South Africa.

OCTOBER 1986: Medical Personnel Grant Exemptions.

The Sunset Evaluation Committee has approved my request to exempt municipalities and private sector matching grants to nurses and physicians who practice their profession where shortages of those professionals occur in economically distressed areas or locations with a large medically indigent population.

The grants help attract qualified nurses and physicians to underserved areas. Under existing law, a state fund offers partial grants to student nurses and physicians. I am co-authoring a bill since nurses are in short supply in many areas, including Gary, and this program would serve to decrease the pressure on hundreds of overworked nurses at area hospitals. In meetings and discussions with Gary hospital administrators, nursing directors and physicians, I have been assured that medical groups are pursuing ways to increase the supply of medical personnel in Gary and surrounding communities. Local government cannot be expected to pick up costs given drastic changes in federal and state fiscal matters. The nursing shortage in Gary is dramatically demonstrated by classified ads in local papers seeking more nurses.


In a special one-day session on April 30, legislators approved a comprehensive
education package and tax increase. I opposed the tax increase and some of the provisions of the education package. It is important to point out to taxpayers that the cost of the education provisions in HB 1360 is $450 million while the tax increase in HB 1360 will raise $550 million. Funding and appropriation mechanisms for the education package are complicated and interested citizens should monitor their use. Although there is general agreement that Indiana public education is underfunded, the tax increase and education provisions of HB 1360 do not adequately address or prioritize funding for real education reform.

House Bill 1360 sets up accountability measures, including new standardized tests for students which will be used to determine if students need summer remediation. Other provisions are school accreditation based on student tests and attendance; a raise in the present 175-day school year to 180 days; performance rewards for schools improving in standardized test scores, student attendance rates, and educational proficiency; expansion of the PrimeTime program; increased state tuition support for local schools; textbook reimbursement for needy parents, and special funding for students considered educationally "At-Risk."

Many legislators believe this education package is acceptable. I think it falls short. Historically, Indiana has neglected education standards. Many educators are unsure whether or not the highly expensive testing and accreditation procedures and performance rewards will actually improve education standards. It is indeed ironic that the dollars contained in "At-Risk" which specifically address the severe education problems in the state will be postponed until July 1988 while the standardized testing and accreditation processes will be funded immediately. It is apparent the drafters of the legislation put a greater emphasis on the more abstract provisions such as performance rewards and outcome-based accreditation than they do on the concrete educational problems facing Hoosiers. The sad thing is that this program will cost taxpayers, and may in the long run delay the full implementation of education reform.


As part of a legislative compromise worked out in the General Assembly in 1985, which allows banks to compete for the customer's money across county lines, Indiana banks have given $6 million to buy stock in the Indiana Community Business Credit Corporation (ICBCC). The ICBCC makes loans to support high-risk businesses without charging the high interest rates associated with venture capital.

The ICBCC is comprised of 38 Indiana banks. Loans from the ICBCC range from $150,000 to $750,000. In order to qualify for a loan, a member bank must agree to match one-half of the loan. Entrepreneurs may use the capital for up to five years. In this time investors are expected to find more conventional financing to support their enterprises.

In spite of this program, too many Indiana businesses find it difficult to obtain seed capital for start-up costs and expansion. I made an unsuccessful attempt to
amend banking legislation this session which would have permitted Chicago banks to bank-branch in Gary. Perhaps additional competition could complement existing programs, particularly in Northwestern Indiana. In a subsequent newsletter, I will discuss further Gary area banks’ participation in the ICBCC loan program.

*****

Florida Moves Right
by Arnetta Girardeau

The following article first appeared in the spring 1987 issue of the Harvard Political Review, a journal published by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. Ms. Girardeau is a member of the HPR staff.

The image conjured up by the mention of the word “Florida” is one of sun-drenched beaches, Miami Vice, and everyone’s grandparents wearing funny shorts. To the student of politics, however, Florida is an anomaly; a deep South state influenced by national trends, most recently the shift towards conservatism. While other Southern states continue to elect primarily Democratic candidates, Florida voters have abandoned Southern traditions, electing a legislature with a power base composed of moderate Republicans and conservative Democrats.

The most striking evidence of this shift came in the November 1986 elections. A Republican gain of five seats in the state Senate sparked a coup that placed a coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans in power, replacing the President-designate with a politician of their camp. The same voters that sent two-term Democratic governor Bob Graham to the U.S. Senate also chose Republican Bob Martinez as his successor to the Governor’s office. Martinez, from Tampa, is only the second Republican to serve in that office since Reconstruction; the first was Claude Kirk, whose incumbency was so ignominious and corrupt that Democrats in the state were determined that no Republican would be elected governor again. The new trend in Florida politics proved them wrong.

To the casual observer, this voting pattern might seem bewildering, but given Florida’s peculiar history of partisan politics, it is not surprising. Although the South has been solidly Democratic since before the Civil War, Southern Democrats have refused to support the activist platform of the party since the late 1940’s. Southern Democrats of the time, labeled “Dixiecrats,” gained control of the Florida political
machinery. When these politicians became more and more disillusioned with the national party platform, many began to switch allegiance, and the Florida Democratic party began to lose its once-assured party majorities in state and local offices.

Florida's politics is also divided geographically between north and south. The north, which includes the industrial center of Jacksonville, state capital Tallahassee, and the University of Florida, is mostly rural and agricultural, an extension of neighbors Georgia and Alabama. The south, extending from Orlando to Miami, is tourist- and business-oriented, and many of the inhabitants are retirees and other people who have moved to the Sunbelt. The area also boasts a great number of blacks and Hispanics, many recent emigrees from the Caribbean. Politicians from the two areas have rarely seen eye-to-eye on social action and business issues. The sophisticated minority populations—Tampa's Ybor City, Miami's blacks—and the big business concerns of south Florida politicians seldom mesh with the rudimentary needs for improved educational and agricultural programs in rural northern Florida. In the state capital there is, at best, an uneasy coexistence between these disparate constituencies.

In the November 1986 elections, Bob Graham was supported by both conservative allies in the north, made from his years in Tallahassee as state senator and Governor, and by "the home crowd" of his native south Florida. In contrast, north Florida detractors of Democratic gubernatorial candidate Steve Pajic criticized his Yankee education (Princeton BA and Harvard JD) and big business ties, while his south Florida support was usurped by Martinez, whose hispanic heritage appealed to the recent influx of staunchly anti-communist Cubans.

In the State Senate, Republicans now hold fifteen of the forty-two seats. The liberal President-designate was ousted by the conservative coalition for an indigenous Dixiecrat, who promptly placed his political allies (including both Republicans and old style states' rights Democrats) in the important chairmanships including Rules Committee, Corrections Committee, and Budget Committee. Unlike past administrations, no female or black senators received major chairmanships among the Senate leadership.

Only time will tell whether Florida's shift to the right is simply a fluke or the sign of things to come. Physically situated in the deepest South, Florida had been a member of the Union for less than forty years when the Civil War broke out.

The majority of Florida's politicians supported laws to circumvent federally-mandated school integration; and until the mid-1970's, which brought changing growth patterns and organized voter registration to Florida, the presence of female and minority legislators was very limited.

It is clear, given the tenuous nature of gains made by minority groups, that there will be struggle and capitulation by liberals while a new breed of conservatives—monied, youthful Republicans and politically entrenched Dixiecrats—are once again in power around the state.
EHRLICHMAN: The presidency is, of course, a constitutional institution, but it is also a baggy suit of clothes that molds itself to the man who is sitting in the chair and the kind of staff he has. The kind of process that is adopted for him has got to fit him like a suit of clothes. If it doesn’t fit, it isn’t going to work.

I think it’s instructive to look at Ronald Reagan’s first four years because there was an attempt to take advantage of Ronald Reagan’s strengths and protect him from his weaknesses. And it was carried out by men, two out of three at least, who had worked with him practically all of his political life: Ed Meese and Mike Deaver. They knew what Ronald Reagan would and would not do, could and could not do. They knew the parameters of the family situation, and they responded to that in the way that they scheduled Reagan, in the way that they presented him advantageously, in the way they shielded him from issues and from scheduling opportunities which would have been disadvantageous to him.

And so he came through the first four years as the Teflon president. We were all going around saying: This guy is the luckiest president we ever saw. But it was a great deal more than luck. It was that the people who were on the staff managing his White House knew him so well that they knew what he could and could not do well, and they protected him beautifully.

Now, in the second regime, in this White House, he has not had the advantage of that kind of help, and things have gone successively wronger and wronger as the months have gone along—finally to the point that they’re in deep trouble, obviously. When one is “managing” the White House, probably the people best able to do it—and I know there’s a lot of disagreement in the press about this—but the people best able to do it for a brand new president coming in are the people who have campaigned with the man, who have grown up with him politically, who know how he can and cannot work, and who can respond to his likes, his dislikes, his
interests, his areas of disinterest—and, believe me, not any president that I know anything about is interested in everything that comes through the door of the White House.

Richard Nixon had these great blank areas on his map, subject matter areas that he just didn’t care to know anything about, they didn’t translate into anything interesting politically, they didn’t translate into anything from a public-policy standpoint to him, they didn’t matter. So, what to do? And he said look, you handle this. Basically, it doesn’t make any difference around here. So you fellows do what you think you should.

When I read about Nancy Reagan and Don Regan, that comes to mind because she’s saying, you know, he’s had an operation, he’s 76 years old, you can’t force him into a press conference. She had a pretty good idea of just how far he could go effectively, and the chief of staff apparently was less than sensitive to this, but the president’s energy is a very, very important ingredient in all of this.

So I would just say the role of the senior staff in the White House is, number one, to know their man and to act accordingly, and if I had any advice for Howard Baker, it would be that. He doesn’t know Ronald Reagan very well. He knows him “How do you do.” But I don’t think he knows how much stamina the man’s got, what it takes to get him ready for a press conference—some of those things that he’s got to know to be an effective chief of staff. So, that’s the first project, it seems to me, for Mr. Baker: to talk to a lot of people, including the first lady, and find out as much as he can about his president so that he gets a feel for how that White House has to run, given his man’s proclivities.

CHENEY: Let me begin in terms of a hypothetical piece of advice to give Howard Baker and tell just a brief story that happened to us in the Ford administration. As an undergraduate, like many undergraduates 20 years ago, I was taught there were two ways to organize the White House. One way was the old FDR model that had eight or nine senior aides, all of whom reported to the president; but it was kind of a loose organization, a happy band of brothers doing good things for the president, no one individual really in charge, no gatekeeper, no strong centralized disciplined staff system. The other model was the Sherman Adams model. The Sherman Adams or the Eisenhower model is a strong chief of staff.

I would argue that the lesson of modern presidencies is that the Roosevelt model is absolutely irrelevant. It won’t work in the 1980s and the 1990s. I know because we tried it in the Ford administration, and it didn’t work. When Jerry Ford became president, the conventional wisdom in Washington—of course Watergate was a dominant feature of the political landscape at the time—was that somehow the way the White House had been organized in the Nixon administration had contributed to Watergate. And the chief of staff, strong-centralized-staff system was to be avoided.

So when Jerry Ford was asked what his philosophy was for managing the White House shortly after he became president, he said, well, he didn’t believe in a chief
of staff, he had a brand new concept called the spokes of the wheel. That there would be eight or nine senior aides, all of whom would report to the president, but there wouldn’t be any one guy in charge, no gatekeeper. Well, we operated that way for about six months, and then it was clear that it wouldn’t work, that nobody was in charge, that there were certain basic functions that had to be performed that didn’t get performed; and so we very quietly, without any great fanfare, moved back to adopting the same system that the Nixon folks had used.

The fascinating thing was that when Jimmy Carter got elected, he was asked one day down in Plains, Georgia, what his philosophy was going to be for managing the White House, and he said, well, he didn’t believe in the chief of staff concept; he had a brand new concept called spokes of the wheel. When I got ready to leave the White House in January of 1977, the staff had a going-away party for me. They have me a bicycle wheel mounted on a piece of plywood. And the bicycle wheel had the rim and the hub, and every spoke was bent and twisted and snarled and severed except for that one spoke running from the hub out to the rim; and there was a tag on the bottom of the plaque that said: the spokes of the wheel, a rare form of management artistry as conceived by Jerry Ford and modified by Dick Cheney. And when I left the White House on January 20, 1977, I left that bicycle wheel mounted on that piece of plywood with a note pinned to it that said: beware of the spokes of the wheel. And if I had some advice to give to Howard Baker, it would be that exactly the same warning is appropriate.

JORDAN: Any new president, any old president, needs a sense of objectives and goals. He needs a process that will develop policies to pursue those goals. He needs people around him in his government, certainly in the White House, to implement those policies and ultimately, and not unimportantly, he needs a mechanism to review this process, to monitor the development and implementation of the policy. I would guess that if you looked at any of the mistakes that were made in any of our respective administrations or any of the successors, they probably met or failed to meet the test of those criteria that I have presented.

Every president is different, every president’s personality, his style of management, his interest in issues, so there is no right or wrong way to manage the White House. I went in without the title of chief of staff and had the worst of both worlds. People assumed that I had that responsibility when, in fact, I did not have the authority to function as a chief of staff in the sense that Haldeman did or Dick Cheney did or that Jim Baker has more recently or Donald Regan.

President Carter insisted on understanding the issues, keeping up with the development and implementation of policy and being well informed. Ironically, those traits that he exhibited that were disparaged then are now coming back into vogue because of the problems facing President Reagan. So every president is different, and what worked for one would probably not work for the other.

It’s my strong view that President Reagan—and this is an observation from a great distance, I have no more insight into this than any of you do—my sense is that he
is the same person, the same president that he was in 1981. The difference is the team of people that he has around him, and I would submit to you that if Jim Baker were still there and Dave Gergin were still there, and if he had the same group with him for the last two years that he had for the first four years, he would not be undergoing, and we would not be undergoing, this sad situation that's unfolding in Washington.

GERGEN: There's another aspect about the second term, and that is when there is a massive landslide there is a problem of hubris setting in. And I can tell you that what happened here to a very large extent in the second term is with the staff—they began to have a different attitude toward Reagan. They no longer challenged him in the way they once did. They no longer actively engaged him in a dialogue about options and what possibilities and what consequences might flow from certain policy decisions, and, in effect, they began to treat him like a sort of living national treasure. Whatever wish or whatever whim automatically was assumed to be right, and I think they misunderstood what the whole notion was of let-Reagan-be-Reagan, and it came to hurt them very badly.

I think there are some other aspects of the situation that conventional wisdom sometimes overlooks. First of all, I think it's important to understand one of the things that's happened in recent White Houses is a growing cult of secrecy. And with this secrecy, the less important the decision, the more people who are brought into it to make the decision. If it's a really puny decision, you'll have half the State Department wrapped up in it. The more important the decision is, the fewer the people who are consulted. This is an obsession with secrecy which I think has been carried to a high degree, and we have to come to deal with.

The final thing I would just mention: there has been enormous change in the kinds of people and the power that individuals have within the staff. If you go back to the Eisenhower days, you find that the White House staff talk about a passion for anonymity, and that was really important. People were supposed to serve a president and keep their head down. That has changed dramatically. And I think it's partly changed because of television. We create celebrities on the White House staff. We create independent power centers on the White House staff, and I think that, you know, we've gone all the way from a passion for anonymity to a member of this White House staff running for president on his lunch hour. Now that is a measure of how far things have changed.

I think all of us on this panel have been deeply distressed by what's been happening to the presidency, by what's happened with a series of failures we've had, and by the fact that no one can seem to govern for any length of time without enormous frustration, without disappointment on the part of the public. And I think all of us have an interest now in seeing if we can't somehow put this office right.
TRIBE: I would identify six illicit uses of original intent and I'm curious about Senator Hatch's response to them.

—First, it seems to me clearly illegitimate to use original intent to rewrite the Constitution's text the way Judge Bork does. For instance, the First Amendment says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. He looks, Judge Bork does, at evidence of original intent and says well really, though they said speech, they meant political advocacy and they were particularly concerned with censorship of political advocacy and it's therefore wrong, he says, to use the First Amendment to protect nonpolitical film, for example. That's an illicit use.

—Second, it seems to me illicit to use original intent to condemn practices that the text quite clearly permits. Recent events suggest one example. Both Senator Hatch and I both believe that immunity should be granted to Poindexter and North and a number of others in order to force them to testify. The language of the Fifth Amendment permits that. But if you were serious about original intent you would find strong evidence that the framers would be aghast at the idea of compelling someone to be a witness against himself simply by the device of giving him immunity. Using original intent in order to condemn the practice of giving immunity would be wrong and there are other similar examples.

—Third, I think it is wrong to use original intent to condone practices that the most principled readings of the text would forbid. For instance, racial segregation. Clearly a form of subjugation incompatible with the concept of equal protection. It shouldn't matter that the framers thought it was a terrific idea or entirely acceptable. Another example, clergy disqualification. Jefferson and a number of the other framers thought that clergymen should not be allowed to hold public office. A fair reading of the religion clauses would bar that practice. The court was right to bar it. I'm curious how those who advocate a jurisprudence of original intent however
would reconcile that with the fact that many of the framers, some of the most notable, thought clergy disqualification was just fine.

—Fourth, I think it’s illegitimate to use original intent jurisprudence to turn principles into rules. Justice Rehnquist again provides my text. He said about a decade ago, "When the framers used general language they deliberately gave latitude to those who would later interpret it." The equal protection clause provides general language. Those who would read in it a specific hard and fast rule, like no race-specific affirmative action except to make whole the victims of proven race discrimination—the Reagan administration’s position on affirmative action—would have to justify transforming the general principle of equal protection into any such rule. Transforming the deliberate choice of general language into a hard and fast rule is an illicit use of original intent.

—Fifth, using original intent to obscure the Constitutional forest by focusing on a few trees strikes me as wholly illegitimate. If you look at the Constitutional plan as a whole, evidenced among other things in the language of the Ninth Amendment, it is designed to affirm a principle of limited government. That’s original intent at an appropriate level of generality. Many who advocate a jurisprudence of original intent would cover that up by focusing on the fact that the framers didn’t have any specific idea that they were outlawing restrictions on contraception, restrictions on abortion, restrictions on consensual sodomy. That focuses on the trees, misses the constitutional forest, and is illegitimate.

—Sixth and finally, I think it’s illegitimate to use original intent to cover up the need for constitutional argument and constitutional choice. That is to use reference to original intent as though somehow that could settle the matter and eliminate the need for the hard normative judgements that Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justice White rightly conceded or required. That’s at the heart of the Meese agenda, the pretense that it can be a devise for eliminating the need for judicial struggle and judicial choice.

Now when you rule out those six illicit uses of original intent you do leave in place the range of quite legitimate and quite vital uses. I think evidence of intent has to be used to shed light on specific terms of art, like the ex post facto clause. And it has to be used to illuminate what Chief Justice Rehnquist, again, called the tacit postulates of the Constitutional plan, postulates that he’s interested in searching out in states rights cases but not quite so interested in searching out in cases about individual rights.

My greatest concern is that original intent like other good intentions will be used to pave the road to a kind of constitutional hell, an oppressive vision of greed in the corporate boardroom, jingoism in the White House basement, and government as Big Brother in every bedroom of the land. I don’t say original intent has to be used that way but the challenge for those who advocate a jurisprudence of original intent is to dispel that danger by moving beyond slogans and joining in the search for criteria to separate sound from unsound appeals to the original intentions of the framers.
HATCH: Near the outset of our republic John Marshall stated in Marbury vs. Madison that the government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws not of men. Based on this sound footing he concluded that the power of judicial review springs from the obligation of the courts to adhere strictly to the actual text of the Constitution. No man or women, whether president, senator, congressman, governor or even federal judge was to be permitted to flaunt the written law of the United States, particularly its foundational document, the Constitution.

Implicit in this concept is the duty of the judiciary to protect those minority rights recognized within the Constitution. If the judiciary failed in this duty it would facilitate majority tyranny. The judiciary however has an equally, and I might add an equally competing, compelling constitutional duty. It must also protects those portions of the Constitution which authorize the majority to govern dramatically and democratically. If the judiciary failed in this duty it would then facilitate minority tyranny. So there are two real issues, not just to protect the minority but to protect the rights of the majority too, as enunciated in the Constitution. This requires judges to continually maintain the balance of the constitutional structure. They must define the bounds of minority freedoms and majority power.

For most of our history this was not perceived to be a great difficulty. Great jurists like John Marshall and Joseph Story considered the Constitution to be law, a legal contract requiring special handling and care, but a law which contained the guidelines for defining freedoms and powers. Only in the last several decades really have theorists suggested seriously that the courts have the power and duty to create new freedoms which are not in any real sense to be found in the Constitution. These theorists generally conclude that the majority protects itself well enough in Congress and the judiciary must assume the guardianship of insular minorities. This new breed of jurists posits that the interpretation of the Constitution may be impossible in many cases and is inadequate to protect minorities and others.

These value-creating theorists are generally called noninterpretavists. They suggest that judges must "extract fundamental presuppositions from the evolving reality of our tradition" or must seek a "fusion of constitutional law and moral theory" or must protect a "higher law" of unwritten "natural rights" or must respond to the sublime notions of human dignity, to Justice Brennan.

These various theories ignore the framework of the Constitution and the real duty of the court system. [They argue that] through the Constitution our society consents to be ruled undemocratically within certain defined areas. These areas are basic human rights beyond the reach of majority alteration. Outside these preserved freedoms the majority can adapt national policies to the "various crises of human affairs" to use another phrase from John Marshall. The statues and policies of the nation are the tools of evolution and adaptation. The framework of the Constitution and the balance that it strikes remains anchored unless changed by the amendment process prescribed under Article Five of the Constitution. Judges, once again, are not given the responsibility of protecting solely minority rights or solely majority rights. They are to police the balance which should be found in the Constitution....
The first casualty [of such an interpretation] is the right of individuals to make
democratic choices. As Lord Chesterton put it, "What is the good of telling the com­
munity that it has every liberty except the liberty to make laws. The liberty to make
laws is what constitutes a free people."

The second casualty is the constitutional power to adjust policies to meet chang­
ing circumstances. Once a policy is locked into the Constitution it cannot be adjust­
ed by simple statute. Thus in each of those areas mentioned above and others the
people in the states are disabled from making changes to account for—in the case
of Roe vs. Wade, for example, new medical techniques—evolving circumstances.
This means that unelected judges assume the primary governing role in areas that
ought to be subject to review and revision as circumstances require instead of as
cases arise.

The third casualty is a dilution of the most valued individual liberty of all, the liberty
intended to preserve all other liberties, namely the right to vote. Individuals in our
republic expect and deserve to have their votes shape the laws by which they are
governed. Individuals in the states are disenfranchised from voting on grave and
important national questions when judges sweep more and more policy making
within the ambient of the Constitution.

Article Three commits to the judiciary the resolution of cases and controversies
arising under the Constitution. Accordingly, when one set of rights clashes with
another, judges must define the realms of minority freedom against democratic
incursion and the realms of inappropriate majority freedom to legislate. This requires
construing the balance ordained by the 2800 or so words of the Constitution.

This brings into focus the key question, namely what standards are to govern judges
when they execute their responsibility of protecting all constitutional rights? To bor­
row from our First Amendment example, the right to speak on political subjects as
well as the right to maintain order in courtrooms or even to protect national securi­
y. The only place really the judges can look for a resolution of these dilemmas is
the Constitution itself not the subjective intent of a few of its authors. Because authors
sometimes disagree; historical records are sometimes incomplete.

*****
The societal disease of our time is, I am convinced, America's obsession with short term success. Its fixation with the proverbial bottom line—give me a profit statement this quarter larger than the last and everything else be damned—is, I think today's predominant business ethic. It took root in the business community, but has since spread beyond business and insinuated itself into every aspect of our culture. In this climate a quiet revolution in values has occurred and I don't think it's been for the better. Short term thinking, corrosive individualism, fixating on economic man at the expense of the human spirit has taken an alarming toll.

I focus on the business community not just for starters, not to scapegoat it, but because I believe business has become a fountainhead of values in our society. If the church was the focal point for personal values and public mores in medieval and other times, that role in our time has been assumed, perhaps unwittingly, by the modern corporation—unwittingly, and with the help of the media. For better or worse, traditional institutions such as the family, church, education are no longer as influential in molding moral cultural values. There are, I suppose, dozens of reasons one could find: the disruption of urbanization; the alarming rise of single parent households; the rise of the mass media, especially television; the dizzy mobility of our car culture; the telecommunications revolution and the altered sense of time and distance that it has created.

At the same time, our nation has learned to acknowledge its real diversity, the many racial groups, ethnic cultures and religious heritages that increasingly make up this nation. The myth of a conformist, white, suburban American way of life has been entirely shattered. I mention these many factors to underscore one point, that as traditional families have come under stress and have splintered, as education has come under siege, as churches and synagogues have become less influential in daily life, the modern corporation, with the help of the media, has stepped into the breach.

Mythologist Joseph Campbell has said that in medieval times when one approached a city one saw the cathedral and the castle. Now one sees the soaring towers of commerce. People build their lives around these towers, communities take shape, work skills are learned, social responsibilities are formed, attitudes and aspirations are molded. A dense matrix of values grow up around the towers of commerce and they spread beyond—way, way beyond.

Never before has the business of business been such a cultural preoccupation. In recent years a dozen new business programs have burst forth on commercial televi-
tion, public television, and on cable. There are business news updates, talk shows, panel shows, news magazines, and even a business news quiz show, not to mention a flurry of new business magazines on a regional basis. Americans once found their heroes for the most part in Congress or the entertainment world or sports. Now more and more people are finding them in business: Lee Iacocca, T. Boone Pickens, H. Ross Perot, until 10 minutes ago Ivan Boesky, until a minute and a half ago Martin A. Siegal.

If you grant me the possibility that American business is the preeminent force in shaping our culture and its values, what examples are its leaders setting? What attitudes and behaviors do they endorse and do they foster? The Wall Street Journal recently took an overview of the American corporation and concluded: “Gone is talk of balanced long-term growth; impatient shareholders and well-heeled corporate raiders have seen to that. Now, anxious executives, fearing for their jobs or their companies, are focusing their efforts on trimming operations and shuffling assets to improve near-term profits, often at the expense of both balance and growth.”

Not much later The New York Times took the pulse of America’s corporate leadership as it pursues the bottom line. The Times wrote, “They eschew loyalty to workers, products, corporate structure, business, factories, communities; they eschew loyalty even to the nation. All such allegiances are viewed as expendable under the new rules. With survival at stake, only market leadership, strong profits and a high stock price can be allowed to matter.”

Now to me there are no two-legged villians in this “get while the getting is good” atmosphere. No villians really, only victims. The villian is a climate which like living in a house with a leaking gas pipe is certain to see us all dead in the morning never knowing what hit us. Daniel Bell has argued that in promoting an ethic of what he called materialistic hedonism, the free enterprise system tends to subvert the very values that help to sustain it. If American business insists upon defining itself solely in terms of its market share, profitability, and stock price, if its short-term material goals are allowed to prevail over all else, then business tends to subvert the moral cultural values that undergird the entire system, such values as social conscience, pride in one’s work, commitment to one’s community, loyalty to one’s company—in short, a sense of the commonweal.

When we speak of the decline of public morality and personal values of the “me generation” or of the “culture of narcissism,” of impulsive marriages and facile divorces, when we speak of a hundred social ills, I think we may be talking about a trickle-down value system originating with this short-term mentality that has come to consume everyone. This ethic breeds in a climate where leadership everywhere—in business, in the Congress, in federal agencies and state legislatures, organized labor, the university, leadership everywhere—refuses through greed or myopia or weakness to make provisions for the future.

In this climate with this kind of short-sighted leadership we have been raising generations of children who believe that there is nothing between winning and losing. If you are not a winner today, you are a loser. The notion that life has anything to do with succeeding at the level of doing one’s best, or that some of life’s richest
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rewards are not monetary is lost to these kids in this short-term, bottom line climate. America has become a game show. Winning is all that matters, cash prizes, get rich quick. We are the captives of a culture that celebrates instant gratification and individual success no matter the larger costs. George Will, in his book *Statecraft as Soulcraft*, argues that the country's future is imperiled unless, as he says, our leaders can cultivate in citizens a deeper commitment to the commonweal yet rather than heed that admonition we are turning the commonweal into the common wheel of fortune.

*****

Morally Adrift

by Marian Wright Edelman


The survival and quality of our children, youth, and families are the single most-important determinants of the quality of the national future. Of the four and five-year-olds in today's America who are the potential students and workers in the year 2000, one in four is poor, one in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent, one in six has no health insurance, one in six is also living in a family where no parent has a job, one in seven is at risk of dropping out of school, one in two has a mother in the work force, but only a small minority have quality affordable child care. No moral or sensible nation can dare write off such a significant portion of its human assets. To ignore these facts is to jeopardize our nation's future and undermine the competitiveness and productivity of our economy in the 21st century.
Young people between 16 and 24 years of age will constitute only 16 percent of the U. S. population by 1995. One in three of these potential workers will be a minority. As the number of young workers steadily declines, business and industry and the military will have to depend upon the skills of potential workers and soldiers who are today disproportionately poor, minority, undereducated and untrained, and in whom we have traditionally failed to invest. This human development deficit is a major piece of the urban and rural crisis those of you who are going to go back into public service will have to face and for which you will have to help find solutions. The principle challenge in the next American decade, within and without government, is the protection of our children from death by arms, want and neglect.

The nation must mount a carefully conceived, comprehensive human investment effort in all of our young and in all of our families, in order to prevent and alleviate the debilitating effects of decades of poverty, racial discrimination, neglect and eroding employment, and budget and tax thefts from the weak by the military and wealthy. We must begin with a national commitment to ensure that every child has basic health, nutrition, and early childhood services and thus the capacity and opportunity to develop strong, basic skills. For the level of a young person's basic skills, academic skills, has a powerful effect on his or her prospects for future achievement, teenage parenthood, welfare dependency, employment and eventual self-sufficiency.

Youths who by age 18 have the weakest reading and math skills compared with those with above-average skills are eight times more likely to have children out of wedlock, seven times more likely to drop out of school before graduation and are four times more likely to be both out of work and on welfare. Nearly half of all poor youths have reading and math skills which place them in the bottom fifth of the basic skills distribution and more than three-fourths of all poor youths have below average basic skills.

When we look at the combination of poverty and weak basic skills, we see that it accounts for nearly all the racial disparities in teen child-bearing rates. Young women 16 to 19 years of age with below average basic skills who live in poor families, whether white, black, or hispanic, are six times more likely to have children than young women with above average basic skills living in non-poor households. If we are serious as a nation about preventing teenage pregnancy, infant mortality, welfare dependency, unemployment, and enhancing national competitiveness, we must invest now in upgrading the basic skills of all of our children. And it must be a continuum of supports working with families and a range of community institutions that begins at birth. And by calling for more effective and sustained governmental action, I am not negating the importance of these parental and community supports. We have got to begin to find a way to help the media and more politicians hold more than one idea or strategy in their heads at the same time. Otherwise we are going to have a very hard time solving complex social problems which are like a seamless web, which require multi-faceted interventions and strategies sustained over time.
Not just poor children are casualties, however, of our loss of moral bearings. All of our children are casualties regardless of class because of the despair and driftlessness that a hollow society promotes. The poor black youths who hang out on street corners and the rich white youths who abuse drugs are all victims. We see despair in the teen suicide rate and the out-of-wedlock birth rates which are rising among whites, in anorexia, in cocaine usage, in the joining of cults, and the fatalism or amorality that preys on so many of our young people.

I don't know if any of you have read Less than Zero, a recent novel about the teenage children of the superrich in Los Angeles. It portrays vividly, indeed horrifyingly, the wasted lives that I am suggesting. John Levy of the Jung Institute says that many of the American children of privilege are afflicted by "affluenza," with symptoms of boredom, guilt, low self esteem, and a lack of motivation. In some ways, he and other psychiatrists and psychologists say, the children of the urban rich most resemble the children of the urban poor. Both groups often suffer from broken homes and absentee parents, often develop hard, streetwise skills to belie gaping emotional holes and move amid easily accessible alcohol, drugs, and sex.

A healthy society has common goals that tie its people together and give its youths a sense that they are engaged in enterprises that add meaning to life. It tells children that they live in a purposeful, social, ethical, and historical context. There are many possible causes that tie a society together: demolishing slums; dealing with the drying up supply of housing for low income and middle income families; abolishing child poverty and homelessness; eliminating racism; strengthening the family; rebuilding the cities; combatting AIDS; bolstering public health; attaining full employment for the millions who want to work and can't find work or who are unskilled and unqualified for the changing jobs in our economy; giving youth hope; caring for the elderly; whipping inflation now; stopping the arms race; achieving peace in the Middle East; creating equal opportunity; fighting sexism; abolishing world hunger. The list can go on, obviously.

But I suggest that you cannot name a single, overarching, domestic goal or peace-related foreign goal for which our society and government stand today with any sense of common purpose and determination. In the absence of any such national purpose there should be no surprise that many public officials, including many young ones, are morally adrift. They see their peers in college or law school or business school or even from this school pursuing only money and status. In the absence of a substitute purpose to pursue, they begin to wonder why they too should not seek only those goals. A BMW with a vanity license plate may be only a shallow goal but our society today offers too few substitutes for our youths unless they have extraordinary inner direction. This is the real meaning of the Reagan era in my view. But I submit that that era is rapidly ending and I am going to end on an up note. A society with any sense of self-preservation will not indefinitely tolerate the kind of hollowness that is infecting our core. Any great nation must have great undertakings and I believe very deeply that we have the potential to be a very great nation.

The sparks of commitment occurring on our campuses about American complicity in South Africa, the growing concern for the poor, the emerging if not focused
peace movement, are all manifestation of a need for meaningful social goals. They also reflect a growing recognition ... that the future belongs not to those who have the largest numbers of weapons of mass destruction but to those who can best solve their own economic and social problems and can provide a beacon of hope for the rest of humanity, that all nations’ problems can be similarly solved.

I can’t predict the particular shape of enterprises our nation will undertake in the coming cycle of communal enterprise. I am convinced that the country is post-Reagan, that the pendulum is beginning to swing back in our direction. I am determined however that part of it will be renewed to the needs of our poor and our children. It would take a wiser and perhaps more foolhardy woman than me to prophesy the details, though we are working hard as one group in one area to get our policy menus and community networks ready to seize and seed greater national responsiveness to poor children and a preventive investment in families.

I think it is going to be an exciting time for you to become and remain public servants. Our nation, and our federal and our state and local governments, will be embarking on enterprises that will give your careers meaning and fulfillment and the resurgence of public life will demand of you the best that you can give with the highest ethical standards. As you depart for government service at all levels, or for agencies that influence governments and public policies, I hope you will struggle to develop some larger vision within which to view your role and task. I hope you will view your job as a mission rather than just as a career. I hope you will set criteria for accomplishment that go beyond your next promotion. I hope you will regularly ask yourselves will I leave something behind that is more just, more efficient, and more responsive to citizen needs than I found it? Have I contributed to enhanced opportunity for the weak and not just for the strong? Have I fostered policies that include, rather than exclude?

I hope you will not be afraid to risk failing for things that matter. And understand that good service is not synonymous with winning all the time but is the rent each of us pays for living on the earth in whatever role and way we choose.

*****
A Reunion Welcome
by Edward M. Kennedy

Following are the remarks of Senator Edward M. Kennedy at the Friday evening opening session of "The Lord Harlech Memorial Conference on Ideals and Values in Politics and Public Service" and Twentieth Anniversary Reunion of the Institute of Politics, May 8-10, 1987.

I know you are all looking forward to the weekend; I'm delighted that spring has finally arrived in New England just in time for this anniversary so if you find it difficult to keep from straying from the conference and drifting to the river bank or the coffee houses, we'll understand because that's what reunions are for. All of us have our memories here and I remember things like being the mystery guest for all those years at Helen Keyes' Study Group on Nuts and Bolts [of political organizing] and trying to stay awake at all those Senior Advisory Committee meetings during the passionate presentations of Jonathan Moore.

The only sad note on this occasion is that two extraordinary individuals who contributed so much to the Institute are no longer with us: the first chairman of the Senior Advisory Committee, the Renaissance man of 20th century government and diplomacy, Averell Harriman, and the chairman for many years of the committee who’s grace and wit, talent and high principles were a special inspiration to my brother Jack and to all of us in the Kennedy family, David Harlech. If any two people on Earth symbolized the highest tradition of public service they were Averell Harriman and David Harlech. I also want to acknowledge one other good friend whose special generosity has made this memorial conference possible in David’s honor, Marshall Cogan.

In the endless sad days after November of 1963 a small group of Jack’s friends in the White House met with my brother Bob and me and others in our family to discuss a memorial to the President. After the outpouring of sympathy and sorrow for him we knew that the planet would not lack for physical monuments. There would be schools and squares and avenues and airports and theaters named John F. Kennedy.

But we wanted something that would make him come alive to those who came after him but never knew him. One of my brother’s unique contributions to public life was the flare he had for linking the academy to the world of policy. Many of those who personalized Jack’s extraordinary relationships with the university, Arthur Schlesinger and Ken Galbraith and McGeorge Bundy and Carl Kazan were the people who counseled us best on ways to remember him. With their help we conceived the Institute, it’s purpose as "Mac" Bundy said was to enlist young Americans and young people everywhere in the understanding and practice of democratic political institutions.
Twenty years ago the dream came true and in that wonderful little yellow house on Mount Auburn Street the Institute of Politics was born, our living memorial to John F. Kennedy. It was a new kind of institution within a university setting and its history is really the story of your achievements. I rarely visit any city in this country without meeting someone who has come here as a fellow or as a study group leader or attended a newly-elected mayors conference or spoke in the Forum, or served on the student advisory committee or who in some concrete way has been touched and changed by this Institute. There’s no political campaign of any consequence today that does not have a stable of academic advisors. And there’s no level of government—federal, state or local—that does not have student interns and faculty consultants. When a Massachusetts governor begins a campaign for President, he leaves the State in charge of a Harvard dean.

The Institute has been cloned by other universities and even by the libraries of other presidents, but no one does it as well as you. As at so many other times in the history of education in America, Harvard has not just led the way, but you’ve lapped the competition. You’ve fulfilled and surpassed our founding mandate and you’ve made the task and art of government rewarding for practitioners, compelling for scholars, and attractive to young people, even as they were for John F. Kennedy, who saw in them the highest calling of free men and women. To President Bok and former President Pusey, to Dick Neustadt and Don Price and Jonathan Moore, and their colleagues I say this: despite our occasional differences and despite my bent for treating your board like our Senate hearings, I admire the way that you’ve built the Institute and kept the faith with Jack.

I also want to commend the loyal and overworked and underpaid, unsung people who staff the Institute and who are probably still at work preparing tonight’s reception and tomorrow’s program. I think they all deserve a hand for their hard work—and perhaps they’d stand up.

Lastly I want to say a special word about the members and alumni of the student advisory committee. As chairman of the Labor and Human Resource Committee in the Senate, I’m working to raise the minimum wage. Harvard does it differently. We love you for many things not the least of which is your passion for slave labor. You may have joined the SAC to meet the stars of politics or more likely these days the stars of the media. But the reality for you is different. It’s the endless meetings, balance sheets, logistics, clean ups, and all those bumper-to-bumper trips to Logan to pick up speakers. Actually that’s why Congress decided to build a third harbor tunnel.

The Institute could not operate on its modest budget without student help and frankly what we get from you is more satisfying than anything you’ll ever get from us. I would not trade a minute of the hours I spend talking to the SAC members and the inspiration that you give me in seeing the next generation come alive with interest in politics and government. And knowing you, it’s easy to refute the suggestion all too prevalent today that when young Americans count their blessings these days, they say, “Thank You, Paine Webber.”
From the newest freshman to the oldest statesman, what is it that attracts people into public service? What is it that persuades them to accept the pressure and the frustration, the sacrifice of privacy and income that are sure to follow? Ambition perhaps, excitement certainly, but it's also something more, an ideal that takes its seed into youth and flourishes all our lives, the enduring challenge and commitment to give something back to America in return for all that it has given to us.

The core challenge for the Institute is to seek out the thousand ways to plant those seeds, and I for one have always found that it is the students themselves who know what ways are right for their own day and generation. It was not just my grandfather or my father who triggered Jack's interest in public life. It was not just the loss of my brother Joe. It was something in Jack's own youthful life that took root, that guided him towards public service, and that kept his rudder true. I like to think that through this Institute the seeds are germinating here that will produce the John Kennedys and David Harlechs and Averell Harrimans of the coming generation.

We don't know what really reaches or involves you so we cast out our nets to the broadest possibilities. Is it a Harvard course or lecture, a speech at the Forum, the student-faculty study program, a seminar with a visiting fellow from abroad, an event in the community, the chance to participate in the campus radio program, or join an anti-apartheid demonstration on the doorstep of Derek Bok? We love the Institute all the more for its evolving ways and our own constant rediscovery of how the heart of politics beats. And at each step it is you the students who have done the most to guide us, persuading us to test a new approach or pull the plug on an idea that fails to click.

In a sense, through this Institute Jack has come back to Harvard and he will never leave. And to each of you I say, "Well done, my brother would be proud of you." For the Institute it has been a great twenty years and my wish for all of you is this: may the next twenty years be even greater than the first.

*****
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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, summer 1986
Mary McTigue, Acting Director, Institute of Politics
Richard L. Thornburgh, Director, Institute of Politics, summer 1987

Christopher Arterton, Director, Project on Public Opinion Polls and Policymaking
Elizabeth Bartle, Assistant, 20th Anniversary Conference/Reunion
Lisa Belsky, Financial Assistant; Research Assistant, Project on Public Opinion Polls and Policymaking
Paul Gary Bograd, Associate Director
Ronn Davids, Receptionist, spring
Theresa Donovan, Fellows Program Coordinator, fall
Scott Eblin, Curriculum Coordinator, Congress Program
Sarah W. Farnsworth, Forum Coordinator, fall/winter
Anne Doyle Kenney, Internship Program and Publications Coordinator
Lydia T. Krek, Forum Assistant
Yin Man Lam, Assistant Receptionist
Leslie A. Martin, Receptionist, fall
Li Miao, Research Associate, fall/winter
Wendy M. O'Donnell, Special Assistant to the Director; Research Director, Project on Public Opinion Polls and Policymaking
Diane C. Pliner, Secretary to the Director, fall
Sonia Wallenberg, Student Program Coordinator
Susan A. Wunderlee, Media Services Coordinator
The Senior Advisory Committee

Ronald H. Brown
Barber B. Conable, Jr.
John C. Culver
Mrs. Katharine Graham
Milton S. Gwirtzman
Edward M. Kennedy
John Kennedy
George C. Lodge
Robert S. McNamara
Warren Rudman
Shirley Williams

The Faculty Advisory Committee

Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy and Chairman of the Ph.D. Committee of the Public Policy Program, 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
Mary McTigue, Acting Director, Institute of Politics
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
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The Student Advisory Committee (SAC)

David Michael, Chair, fall
D. Hannah Taylor, Vice Chair, fall
Claire Fleming, Chair, spring
Jill Neptune, Vice Chair, spring

Committee Chairs were:

Communications: Annor Ackah, fall; Jeffrey S. Bartel, spring
Fellows: Gregory McCurdy
Internships: Claudia Cummins
Heffernan Visiting Fellows: John de Figueiredo
Projects: Cynthia Rice, fall; Laurence Belfer, fall
Study Groups: Eric Mindich, fall
Summer Research Awards: Eric Mindich, spring
Journalism Award Program: David Laibson, spring

SAC Members were:

Annor Ackah '89
Allen Adler '89
Matthew Baldwin KSG
Jeffrey Bartel '88
Laurence Belfer '88
John Bender '89
Eric A. Berman '88
Anne Bonaparte HBS
Ralph P. Brescia KSG
Trena Bristol '87
Christine Chambers '87
Claudia Cummins '88
Justin Daniels '89
John DeFigueiredo '88
Charles Dupree '89
Rosa Eckstein '89
Claire Fleming '88
Chris Ford '89
Kim Gutschow '88
Mark Halperin '87
David Hsu '87
Kathy Keough '89
Kris Kobach '88
Michael Labson '89
David Laibson '88
Gregory McCurdy '87
David Michael '87
Jonathan Miller '89
Eric Mindich '88
Gerald Mongelli '89
Kirk Nahra HLS
Mari Nakachi '87
Jill Neptune '88
Jose Pierluisi '88
Mark Pine KSG
Regan Ralph '87
David Rettig '89
Cynthia Rice '87
Don Ridings '89
Edwin Rodriguez KSG
Arthur Rublin '89
Peter Sidebottom HBS
Alexander Slusky '88
Dane Smith '88
D. Hannah Taylor '87
Rod Teeple '88
Carmen Torruella '87
Tony West '87
Michael Zubrensky '88
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Student Study Groups
Fall 1986

"The Modern Corporation: Does It Really Influence American Public Policy?"
Catherine Bertini, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Manager/Public Policy,
Container Corporation of America

Guests:
J. Kemp Hannon, Minority Leader pro tempore, New York State Assembly
Jon Margolis, National Political Correspondent, The Chicago Tribune
Frank Mauro, Secretary, Committee on Ways and Means, New York State Assembly
Ann McBride, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Senior Vice President,
Common Cause, Washington, D. C.
Gordon McKay, Senior Vice President, The New England (formerly New England
Mutual Life Insurance Company), Boston
James Ryan, Partner, Condello & Ryan, Albany, N. Y.
Herbert Schmertz, Vice President/Public Affairs, Mobil Corporation
Dennis Whitfield, Deputy Secretary, U. S. Department of Labor

"Political Rhetoric and American Public Opinion: Presidential Politics After Reagan"
Albert H. Cantril, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former President,
Bureau of Social Science, Inc.

Guests:
Tom Cashman, Media Coordinator for Ohio, 1984 Hart for President Campaign;
Masters in Public Administration degree candidate, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Neal E. Cutler, Professor of Political Science and Gerontology,
University of Southern California
William R. Hamilton, President, William R. Hamilton & Staff, Chevy Chase, Maryland
Peter D. Hart, Chair, Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc., Washington, D. C.
Paul Jensen, Director, Project 500, Washington, D. C.
Al May, Fellow, The Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University;
Political Correspondent, Raleigh News and Observer
Arthur H. Miller, Professor of Political Science, University of Iowa
Kirk O'Donnell, President, Center for National Policy, Washington, D. C.
Paul Tully, Executive Director, Fund for a Democratic Party, Washington, D. C.

"Terrorism: Challenge to the Open Society"
Mark D.W. Edington, Research Associate, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc.,
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Guests:
Jim Angle, White House Correspondent, National Public Radio
Parker W. Borg, Ambassador and Diplomat in Residence, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University

Alfred Rubin, Professor of International Law, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Richard H. Schultz, Assistant Professor of International Politics, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

"Speechwriting in the Real World"
Paul D. Erickson, Writer in Residence, Quincy House, Harvard University; speechwriting advisor to former Senator and presidential candidate Gary Hart

Guests:
Mark Davis, Speechwriter, Republican National Committee
Hendrik Hertzberg, Partner, TK Publications, Cambridge, Massachusetts; former Fellow, Institute of Politics; former speechwriter for President Jimmy Carter
Adam Pertman, Reporter, The Boston Globe

"Women's Issues in the 80's: Beyond Equality"
Nancy Gertner, Partner, Silverglade, Gertner, Baker, Fine, Good & Mizner, Boston

Guests:
Mary Joe Frug, Professor of Law, New England School of Law
Ellen Goodman, Syndicated Columnist, The Boston Globe
Marsha Hams, former member, Local 201, International Union of Electrical Workers
Ruth Hubbard, Professor of Biology, Harvard University
Judith Lindahl, Attorney, offices of John F. Palmer, Boston
Karen Mclaughlin, Executive Director, Massachusetts Office for Victim Witness Assistance

"Organized Labor: Coping with Crisis and Change"
Robert Howard, writer on labor and work-related issues; author, Brave New Workplace

Guests:
Domenic Bozzotto, President, Local 26, Hotel Workers' Union
Frank Emspak, member, Executive Board, Local 201, International Union of Electrical Workers
Winthrop Knowlton, Director, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Marty Manley, former International Representative, International Association of Machinists.
Charles McDonald, Director of Organization and Field Services, AFL-CIO
Ray Rogers, President, Corporate Campaign, Inc., New York
Lynn Williams, International President, United Steelworkers of America

Michael C. Janeway, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Editor, The Boston Globe

Guests:
Michael Arlen, Television Critic, The New Yorker
Charles Guggenheim, political filmmaker, Washington, D. C.
Dottie Lynch, director of polling, CBS News
Walter Robinson, Washington Correspondent, The Boston Globe
David Sawyer, President, Sawyer Miller Group, New York

"The Democrats' Dilemma"

Bob Kuttner, Correspondent, The New Republic

Guests:
Ira Arlook, Director, Ohio Public Interest Campaign
Sidney Blumenthal, Correspondent, The Washington Post
Walter Dean Burnham, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Thomas Edsall, Correspondent, The Washington Post
David Osbourne, freelance journalist
Bill Welch, Political Director, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
Ralph Whitehead, Professor of Journalistic Studies, University of Massachusetts/Amherst
Linda Williams, Fellow, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D. C.

"Congress: Policy, Pressures and Politics"

Ann McBride, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Senior Vice President and Chief Lobbyist, Common Cause, Washington, D. C.

Guests:
Ken Bode, National Political Correspondent, NBC News
Dick Clark, former United States Senator (D-IA)
Jim Leach, U. S. Congressman (R-IA)
Susan Manes, Former Director, Senate Democratic Policy Committee
Wayne Thevenot, Lobbyist, National Realty Committee
Fred Wertheimer, President, Common Cause
"The Presidential Debates"
Newton N. Minow, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Partner, Sidley & Austin, Chicago

Guests:
Jonathan Alter, Senior Writer, Newsweek
Henry Geller, Director, Center for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.
Lawrence Grossman, President, NBC News
Ben W. Heineman, Partner, Sidley & Austin, Washington, D.C.
Nancy Neuman, President, League of Women Voters
Sander Vanocur, Special Correspondent, ABC News

"Emerging Trends in Regional Government: Political, Economic and Social Empowerment in the Midwest"
Carolyn B. Mosby, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Indiana State Senator and former State Representative

Guests:
John Bass, Missouri State Senator
Webster L. Brewer, Presiding Judge, Marion County Criminal Court, Indianapolis
Robert Catlin, Chairman and Professor, Minority Studies, Indiana University
Ronald F. Ferguson, Assistant Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William Harader, Professor of Political Science; Director, Center for Governmental Services, Indiana State University
Glenn C. Loury, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Clarence Mitchell, Maryland State Senator; President, National Black Caucus of State Legislators
N. Atterson Spann, Jr., Commissioner, Lake County, Indiana
James I. Threatt, Assistant City Manager, Kansas City, Missouri

"Superpower Relations in the Gorbachev Era"
Carol R. Saivetz, Fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard University

Guests:
David Anderson, Professor of International Relations, Simmons College
Peter Clement, Senior Analyst, Office of Soviet Analysis, Central Intelligence Agency
Mark Kramer, Kukin Scholar, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Wayne Limberg, Chief, Foreign Policy Division, Office of Soviet and East European Analysis, U.S. Department of State
David Powell, Fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Stanley Roth, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Foreign Affairs Committee, U.S. House of Representatives
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"The Politics of Popular Culture"
Steven Stark, Lecturer, Harvard Law School

Guests:
David Marc, author, Democratic Vistas
Brian Rose, writer and critic
Ralph Whitehead, Professor of Journalistic Studies, University of Massachusetts/Amherst

"The Politics of AIDS"
Robert P. Wheatly, member, City of Cambridge Human Rights Commission; consultant, Lesbian and Gay Concerns, Unitarian Universalist Association

Guests:
Allan M. Brandt, Assistant Professor, Department of History of Medicine and Science, Harvard University
Paul F. Cronin, AIDS community activist, Boston
George Grady, Assistant Commissioner of Public Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Larry Kessler, Executive Director, AIDS Action Committee, Boston
Benjamin Lipson, Insurance Columnist, The Boston Globe
Loretta McLaughlin, Deputy Editor/editorial pages, The Boston Globe
Cindy Patton, author, Sex and Germs: The Politics of AIDS
David Scndras, member, Boston City Council

Spring 1987

"What If Women Ran the World? Women and Political Power"
Bella Abzug, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former New York State Congresswoman

Guests:
Naomi Chazan, Professor of Political Science, Hebrew University
Carol Cohn, Senior Research Fellow, Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Vivian Derrick, Program Director, National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, Washington, D.C.
Cynthia Enloe, Professor of Government and Women's Studies, Clark University
Randall Forsberg, Executive Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament, Brookline, Massachusetts
Catherine Kelleher, Director, Maryland International Security Program Project, University of Maryland
Claudine Schneider, member, U. S. House of Representatives (R-RJ)
Angela E. Stent, Director, Russian Area Studies Program, Georgetown University
Nina Tumarkin, Visiting Professor of Russian History, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Susan Ziadeh, Program Director, Arab American Institute, Washington, D. C.

"Clean Drinking Water: Is It a Luxury of the Past?"
Julie Belaga, Fellow, Institute of Politics; 1986 Republican candidate for Governor of Connecticut

Guests:
Steven Angelo, Massachusetts State Representative; Chair, Natural Resources Commission, Massachusetts House of Representatives
Karen Blumenfeld, Environmental Consultant, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Michael Deland, Regional Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency
Ira Rosen, Fellow, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University
Alan Van Arsdale, Staff Member, Division of Air Quality Control, Department of Environmental Quality Engineering, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

"China After Mao: A New Revolution?"
Jacques deLisle, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Government, Harvard University

Guests:
Don Clarke, J. D. candidate, Harvard Law School; Lecturer in Law, School of Oriental and African Studies, London
Timothy Gelatt, Attorney, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, New York
Hu Ping, former candidate, Local People's Congress elections, Beijing
Huan Guocang, Olin Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Huang Yasheng, contributor to World Bank study of Chinese foreign trade system, Beijing
Jing Jun, journalist, China Daily
Kevin Lane, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Government, Harvard University
Li Miao, Head, U. S. Government Section, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing; former Research Fellow, Institute of Politics
Meng Hsuan, Editorial Page Editor and Columnist, United Daily News, Taiwan
Pei Minxin, former Special Correspondent, China Daily
Qian Yingyi, President, Young Chinese Economists Association
David Zweig, Assistant Professor of International Politics, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

"Criminal Justice: Law Enforcement Versus Liberty"
Nancy Gertner, Partner, Silverglate, Gertner, Fine, Good & Minzner, Boston

Guests:
Kevin Burke, District Attorney, Essex County, Massachusetts
William D. Delahunt, District Attorney, Norfolk County, Massachusetts
Janet Eustis, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Social Services, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Robert Fein, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Forensic Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Robert Mueller, First Assistant United States Attorney, Boston

Francis Roache, Commissioner, Police Department, City of Boston

"Political Speechmaking"

Eric Kristensen, Associate Director, Teaching Lab, Harvard Danforth Center for Teaching and Learning

Guests:

Olivia Golden, 1986 candidate, Massachusetts State Senate
Kevin McFadden, 1986 candidate, Massachusetts State Senate
Joann Shotwell, 1986 candidate, Massachusetts Attorney General
Alice Wolf, City Councillor, Cambridge, Massachusetts

"Ethical Dilemmas in U. S. Health Policy"

Robert S. Lawrence, M.D., Davidson Associate Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School

Guests:

David Calkins, M.D., Instructor, Health Policy and Management, Harvard Medical School
Rashi Fein, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Department of Social Medicine and Health Policy, Harvard Medical School
David Himmelstein, M.D., Assistant Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School
James Hooley, Chair, Board of Trustees, Boston City Hospital
Edward Hundert, M.D., Clinical Fellow in Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School
Howard Hyatt, M.D., Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School
George Lamb, M.D., Director, Community Health Services and Epidemiology, Department of Health and Hospitals, City of Boston
H. Richard Nesson, M.D., President, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston
Julius B. Richmond, M.D., Professor of Social Medicine and Health Policy, Harvard Medical School
Michael Rie, M.D., Director, Respiratory Intensive Care Unit, Massachusetts General Hospital
Terrie Wetle, M.D., Instructor, Division of Health Policy and Division of Aging, Harvard Medical School
"The Black Office Holder in America: The Challenge of Partisan Politics"
William Lucas, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former County Executive, Wayne County, Michigan

Guests:
Spence Abraham, Chair, Michigan Republican Party
Xernona Clayton, Vice President/Public Affairs, Turner Broadcasting Company
Walter DeVries, Consultant, DeVries Associates, Wrightsville, North Carolina
Samuel Riley Pierce, Jr., Secretary, U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Wayne Sulfridge, former Wayne County Research Director
George Weeks, Columnist, The Detroit News

"The Thirty Second War: Making Political TV Commercials"
Larry McCarthy, Fellow, Institute of Politics; political media consultant

Guests:
Roger Ailes, Ailes Communications, New York
John Ellis, Political Producer, NBC News Election Unit
Madeleine Grunwald, Vice President, Miller-Sawyer Group, New York

"The Politics of Education"
Joseph J. McCarthy, teacher and administrator
Marina C. McCarthy, teacher and administrator

Guests:
Nicholas Paleologos, Massachusetts State Representative; Chair, Joint Committee on Education, Massachusetts State Senate
Robert Peterkin, Superintendent of Schools, Cambridge, Massachusetts
David Riesman, Superintendent of Schools, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Rosemary Salomone, Associate Professor of Law, St. John's School, Jamaica, New York
Theodore R. Sizer, Chair, Coalition of Essential Schools and Department of Education, Brown University

"The Siesta is Over: The New Hispanic Awakening in America"
Camilo Perez-Bustillo, Associate Counsel, Multi-Cultural Education Training and Advocacy, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Guests:
Luis Garden Acosta, Executive Director, El Puente, New York
Felix Arroyo, Education Advisor to Mayor Raymond L. Flynn, Boston
Martin Espada, Puerto Rican poet; Minority Outreach Coordinator, Massachusetts Artists Foundation

Jose Angel Gutierrez, Director, Texas Mutual Legal Assistance Foundation, Dallas

Matias Pasos, Mexican singer, songwriter, essayist

Luis Prado, Executive Director, Alianza Hispana, Roxbury, Massachusetts

Alex Rodriguez, Chair, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination

Miren Uriarte-Gaston, Professor, College of Public and Community Service, University of Massachusetts/Boston

Josefina Vasquez, Director, Central American Refugee Program, American Friends Service Committee, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Rene Velasquez, Member, Comite El Salvador, Boston

William C. Velasquez, President, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, San Antonio

Tino Villanueva, Chicano poet; Professor of Spanish Literature, Wellesley College

"The Ethics of the News Story"

Wesley G. Pippert, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Senior Middle East Correspondent, UPI, Israel

Guests:

John Dancy, Correspondent, NBC News, Washington, D. C.

Martin Linsky, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; author, Impact: How the Press Affect Public Policy Making

Don McNeill, Correspondent, CBS News, York Harbor, Maine

"Independent Voices: The Role of Independent Observers and Thinkers in a Democratic Political System"

Jonathan Schell, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Staff Writer, The New Yorker; author, The Fate of the Earth, The Abolition

Guests:

John Gross, Professor of Political Science and Sociology, Emory University

Thomas Hayes, Instructional Laboratory Associate, Physics Department, Harvard University

William McKibben, former Staff Writer, The New Yorker

Wally Shawn, playwright

George W. F. Trow, Staff Writer, The New Yorker

"The Indian Subcontinent: a Contemporary Assessment"

Terence Wood, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

Guests:

Vijay Kumar, Political Counsellor, Embassy of India, Washington, D. C.
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Robert Lucas, Professor of Economics, Boston University
Babar Malik, Political Counsellor, Embassy of Pakistan, Washington, D. C.

"America's Constitutional Bicentennial: Celebration and Cerebration"
Howard Yourow, Visiting Researcher, Harvard Law School

Guests:
Janet Brown, Director, Presidential Debates '88, Washington, D. C.
Lloyd Cutler, Partner, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Washington, D. C.
Robert A. Goldwin, Resident Scholar and Co-Director, The Constitution Project, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D. C.
William Lucas, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former County Executive, Wayne, Michigan
Nancy Altman Lupu, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Thomas H. O'Connor, Professor of History, Boston College
Linda Rogers-Kingsbury, Director, Citizens to Protect the Constitution, Washington, D. C.
Kathleen Sullivan, Assistant Professor, Harvard Law School

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 relating to American politics and public policy issues.

The 1986 recipients, and their topics were:

Victoria Bassetti '87 (Social Studies): "Communism as a Rhetorical Device Limiting the Marketplace of Ideas"
Camille Caesar '87 (Social Studies): "The Internationalization of U. S. Law Enforcement Policy"
Charlotte Chiu '87 (History and Science): "Political Input of University Professors Into Public Policy"
Linda Crixell '87 (Government): "Political Participation of Mexican-Americans in the United States"
Clayton Fossett '87 (Government): "Foreign Policy Decision Making in the Eisenhower Administration: Case Study - 1958 Intervention in Lebanon"
Jacquelyn Geier '87 (Government): "Effect of Gentrification on the Poor in Boston and Atlanta"
Thomas Halpern '86-'87 (Social Studies): "Restructuring a Municipal Agency: the Cambridge Neighborhood Health Centers"

Leland Leachman '88 (Economics): "Natural Resource Management under Self-Determination by American Indians"

Steven Smith '87 (Government): "Political Campaigns: Are They Like Any Other Organizations Described in Academic Literature?"

Catherine Tse '87 (Sociology): "The Effects of Schooling and Family Structure on the Academic Performance of Asian-Americans"

Public Affairs Internships

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

- In conjunction with the Harvard Office of Career Services, the Institute provides information for students about internship and employment opportunities in many aspects of American politics and public affairs.
- Each year the Institute provides supplementary funds for summer internships—stipends which enable a number of students with financial need to accept unpaid or underpaid public sector positions at all levels of government and in many different public affairs agencies.
- The Institute sponsors an annual Summer-in-Washington Program which during the spring provides help for students seeking summer housing in the District of Columbia area, and during the summer brings together many Harvard students working and living in Washington for a variety of intellectual, social and athletic activities.
- The Institute Summer-in-Boston Program arranges—during the Harvard Summer School session—a speakers’ series, social events and excursions to places of political interest for students and others studying, working or living in the Boston area.
- Institute internship seminars for undergraduates interested in public sector internships feature several panelists familiar with internships—availability, requirements, hiring practices—including undergraduates with previous internship experience.
- Institute internship workshops focus on skills needed by the intern drawing on the expertise of Institute Fellows, Congressional staffers and others with experience supervising interns. Topics include expectations of the employer and of the intern, writing skills, office protocol, opportunities for job enhancement and advancement, tips about resources available and summer living in the Washington, D.C. area.
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• The Institute's Externship Program, during the week of Harvard's spring semester break, pairs professionals in government, independent public sector agencies and media with undergraduates, providing an opportunity for each student to "shadow" for a day and thus to witness first-hand the mechanics and intricacies of the work life of a public affairs professional.

Summer Internship Stipend Program

The following students received Institute stipends enabling them to intern during summer 1986 with public sector organizations, as listed:

Ian Condry '87: Japan Economic Institute of America, Washington D. C.
Maya Fishkin '87: Office of Patricia Schroeder, Member,
    U.S. House of Representatives (D-CO), Washington, D. C.
Peter J. Keating '88: District Office of Thomas J. Downey,
    Member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-NY), Islip, New York
Richard E. Malone, Jr. '87: International Defense and Aid Fund
    for Southern Africa, Boston, Massachusetts
Mylene Moreno '87: United Farm Workers of America, La Paz, California
Claudia Polsky '87: Colorado Wildlife Federation, Denver, Colorado
Maria Christina Rodriguez '88: Office of Jim Bates, Member,
    U. S. House of Representatives (D-CA), Washington, D. C.
Alexander Robert Slusky '89: District Office of John R. Miller,
    Member, U. S. House of Representatives (R-WA), Seattle, Washington
Louisa A. Smith '88: Mental Health Law Project, Washington, D. C.
Douglas A. Stiffler '89: Western Kentucky Legal Services,
    Owensboro, Kentucky
Michael Tarazi '89: American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee,
    Washington, D. C.
Karen Blair Thomson '88: Health Research Training Program,
    Department of Health, New York City
Peter Hendrick Vrooman '88: New York State Office For The Aging, Albany
Derrick Kahala Watson '88: Office of Daniel K. Inouye,
    Member, U. S. Senate (D-HI), Washington, D. C.
Evan C. Williams '87: Office of Jim Slattery, Member,
    U. S. House of Representatives, (D-KS), Washington, D. C.
Faith Wong '88: Migrant Farmworkers Division, Legal Aid Bureau, Inc.,
    Salisbury, Maryland
The Summer-in-Washington Program

The 1986 Summer-in-Washington Program, coordinated by Shawn MacDonald '88, provided extensive information to Harvard undergraduates about summer housing in the District of Columbia area and sponsored the following events:

- Discussions with:
  - Joseph Biden, Member, U. S. Senate (D-DE)
  - Benjamin Bradlee, Jr., Executive Editor, The Washington Post.
  - Cynthia Field, Chief Architectural Historian, Smithsonian Institution and Richard Butwinick, Director, Corcoran Gallery of Art
  - Thomas Dine, Executive Director, American-Israel Public Affairs Committee
  - David Emery, Deputy Director, U. S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, U. S. Department of State
  - Alan Keyes, former Assistant Ambassador to the United Nations for the Social and Economic Councils, U. S. Department of State
  - Joseph Montville, Director, Center for the Study of Foreign Relations, U. S. Department of State
  - Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH) and Patricia Schroeder (D-CO), Members, U. S. House of Representatives
  - Mark Talisman, Director, Council of Jewish Federations and Charities; Vice Chair, U. S. Holocaust Memorial Council; Advisor, Summer-in-Washington Program; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
  - John Trasvina, Legislative Attorney, Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
  - James Tyson, Accuracy in Media and Accuracy in Academia
  - Caspar Weinberger, Secretary, U. S. Department of Defense
  - Ralph Whitehead, Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts/Amherst; author, The New Collar Voter

- Other activities included:
  - Picnic in Montrose Park
  - Softball games with teams from:
    - UCLA/Berkeley
    - Brown University
    - University of Michigan
    - University of Pennsylvania
    - Princeton University
—Day trip to Rehobeth Beach, Rehobeth, Delaware
—Special tour of the U. S. Department of State including a special briefing by Tom Donihi
—Tours of several embassies and of the National Zoo
—Reception hosted by Edward M. Kennedy, Member, U. S. Senate (D-MA)
—A special tour of Dumbarton Oaks with Robert W. Thomson, Director, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection; Member, Faculty of Arts & Sciences, Harvard University
—Concert of the National Symphony Orchestra at Wolf Trap with the Harvard Club of Washington preceded by a reception hosted by the Harvard Club
—College Boat Cruise on the Potomac with students from eight other colleges and universities
—Reception hosted by Washington, D. C. Harvard Alumni

The Summer-in-Boston Program

The Summer-in-Boston Program, coordinated by Robert Mascola '86 during the Harvard Summer School term, arranged the following discussion meetings and activities:

• Discussion meetings:
  "U. S. Policy towards South Africa: A Reappraisal," with:
  Kenneth Carstens, Executive Director, International Defense and Aid Fund for South Africa
  Donald Norland, former U. S. Ambassador to several African nations, including Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland; former leader, Institute of Politics Study Group
  William L. Jacobsen, Jr., Counselor, Foreign Service, U. S. Department of State
  Viewing of "Visions of Star Wars," a PBS "Nova" television special, followed by a discussion with Peter Clausen, Director of Research, Union of Concerned Scientists
  "The Prospects for Democracy in Chile," with:
  Claudio Duran, Chilean native; Harvard Summer School student
  Marcy Finck, Washington, D. C., Chilean opposition
  Jennifer Schirmer, Visiting Scholar, International Legal Studies Program, Harvard Law School
  "Reflections on Pornography and American Political Culture," with
  Jean Bethe Elshtain, Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts/Amherst
"The Future of the Democratic Party," with Nanette Falkenberg, former Director, National Abortion Rights Action League; former Fellow, Institute of Politics

"The Role of the Press in Political Campaigns," with James B. King, Senior Vice President for Public Affairs, Northeastern University

"The Role of the State in Education Policy and Education Reform," with Nicholas Paleologos, Chair, Committee on Education, Massachusetts House of Representatives


• Other activities:
  —Introductory meeting and reception hosted by the Institute of Politics
  —Tour of the Massachusetts State House followed by a meeting with Mary Jane Gibson, Member, Massachusetts House of Representatives (D-Belmont/East Arlington)
  —Tour of the Museum at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library
  —Visit to Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts to attend a forum featuring candidates for U. S. Congress/Massachusetts Eighth Congressional District

Fall Seminar and Spring Workshop

The internship program sponsored a fall seminar on December 9, 1986 in Land Hall/Belfer Center and a spring workshop on May 4, 1987 in Starr Auditorium/Belfer Center, John F. Kennedy School.

The fall seminar, designed to provide general information on public sector internships, was moderated by seminar coordinator Justin Daniels '89 and featured Ann McBride, Institute of Politics fellow and Common Cause senior vice president and chief lobbyist; Richard Howard, Harvard Office of Career Services associate director and internship counselor; and Claire Jean Kim '87, summer 1985 intern at the Mayor’s Coordinating Council in Criminal Justice in Baltimore, Maryland. The seminar addressed issues such as the definition of an internship, how and where to apply, provided tips for undergraduates interested in interning and information about the
activities and resources of the Institute’s internship program. 1986 Summer-in-Washington program coordinator, Shawn MacDonald ’88, provided insights on life in summertime Washington, D. C. The formal presentation was followed by a reception and an opportunity for participants to meet individually with the panelists, several former student interns and members of the Institute staff.

The spring workshop, designed to provide advice and information for students planning to intern in government and public sector agencies in Washington, D. C., in their home communities or elsewhere during summer 1987, was moderated by newly-elected internship committee chair, Justin Daniels ’89, and featured Albert H. Cantril, Institute fellow and former president, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.; William Lucas, Institute fellow and former Wayne County, Michigan chief executive, each of whom, calling on extensive experience supervising interns, addressed different aspects of the duties and responsibilities, necessary skills, expectations of the intern and of the supervisor, and office protocol. Shawn MacDonald ’88, the 1986 coordinator, and Susanna Kim ’87, the 1987 coordinator, provided information about the Institute’s Summer-in-Washington program, tips on housing for interns in the District of Columbia and its environs and on summer living in Washington. Claire Jean Kim ’87 provided insights on the similarities and differences of interning in a city or state agency versus interning in Washington.

Externships

The Institute’s 1987 Externship Program paired 25 public sector professionals in Boston, Houston, New York and Washington, D. C. with Harvard undergraduates for one day during Harvard’s spring break week. Each extern “shadows” a professional through a normal work day to witness first-hand the daily worklife of her/his host.

Externship hosts included:

Joanne Adams, Director of Communications, Office of Mayor Whitmore, Houston
Stephen Berger, Executive Director, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
Bill Blakemore, Correspondent, ABC News, New York
Eric Brettschneider, Acting Deputy Commissioner, New York Family and Children’s Services Agency
Joseph C. Carter, Superintendent, and Francis M. Roache, Commissioner, Boston Police Department
Chuck Crouse, State House Reporter, WEEI Newsradio, Boston
Marilyn J. Flood, Executive Director, New York City Commission on the Status of Women

David Gasson, Intern/Volunteer Coordinator, Gephardt for President Committee, Washington, D.C.

Gail Harris, Anchor/Reporter, “10 O’Clock News,” WGBH-TV Boston

Grady Hedgespeth, Deputy Commissioner, Child Support Enforcement Division, Massachusetts Department of Revenue

Ellen Hume, White House/Political Reporter, The Wall Street Journal

Lee Jones, Assistant Press Secretary, Office of Mayor Ed Koch, New York City

Ted Koppel, Anchor/Managing Editor, ABC News, Washington, D.C.

Katherine S. Legg, Executive Deputy Administrator, New York City Human Resources Administration

Sander M. Levin, Member, U.S. House of Representative (D-Michigan)

John R. Lewis, Deputy Administrator for Labor Relations, New York City Human Resources Administration

Barry E. Lipman, Deputy Commissioner/Management and Budget, New York City Police Department

A. David Mazzone, Judge, United States District Court, Boston

Ruth Messinger, Member, New York City Council (D-4th District)

Frank E. Morris, President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston

Edward M. Rogers, Deputy Campaign Manager, George Bush for President, Washington, D.C.

Robert W. Searby, Deputy Undersecretary for International Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Mark Talisman, Director, Council of Jewish Federations Washington, D.C.

Judy Woodruff, Chief Washington Correspondent, The MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour, Arlington, Virginia

Visiting Fellows

The Dennis B. and Elizabeth B. Heffernan Visiting Fellows Program brings distinguished people in public life to Harvard for brief visits. The program is designed to provide maximum contact with the University community—undergraduates, faculty members, Institute of Politics fellows, graduate students and members of other University constituencies. An address in the Public Affairs Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government is one of the highlights of such visits.

The Visiting Fellow this year was:
Marvin Kalb, Chief Diplomatic Correspondent, NBC News, (October 21-22, 1986). Activities during Mr. Kalb’s fellowship included a meeting with heads of student media organizations, an interview with the Harvard Political Review, lunch with members of the Russian Research Center, participation in a section of a Department of Government course, “American Foreign Policy,” and in a class meeting of a Kennedy School of Government course, “Media, Government and Society.” Mr. Kalb’s address in the Forum was entitled “U.S./Soviet Relations: The Quest for Sanity.”

Harvard Political Review

The Harvard Political Review, a journal of political analysis, is published by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute.

1986-87 officers were:

Linda Bagley, Circulation manager, fall/winter
Anne Beal, Cover Story Editor, fall/winter; Staff, spring
Mark Bodnick, Staff, winter; Cover Story Editor, spring
Karla Delgado, Staff, winter/spring
Christopher A. Ford, Departments Editor, fall/winter; Managing Editor, spring
Arnetta Girardeau, Staff, winter/spring
Meredith Golomb, Staff, winter; Outside Submissions Editor, spring
Francisco Gonzalez, Business Manager, fall/winter; Staff, spring
Ozan Gurel, Staff, spring
David C. Hsu, Editor-in-Chief, fall/winter; Editor Emeritus, spring
J. Keith Joung, Managing Editor, fall/winter; Staff, spring
Peter Klibanoff, Staff, winter; Departments Editor, spring
Patrick Long, Composition Director, fall; Staff, winter/spring
Amos Meron, Advertising Manager, fall/winter; Business Manager, spring
Jonathan Miller, Staff, winter; Assistant Managing Editor, spring
Christine Nakatani, Staff, fall/winter
Ram Neta, Staff
Ellen Noonan, Book Reviews Editor, fall/winter; Staff, spring
W. S. Michael Park, Production Manager
David Rettig, Outside Submissions Editor, fall/winter; Editor-in-Chief, spring
Maxwell Rovner, Staff, winter/spring
Carmen Toruella, Staff
Mike Zubrensky, Publisher
Three issues of HPR were published during the 1986-87 academic year with the following articles:

VOLUME 14/NUMBER 1: FALL 1986
Cover: China: The Middle Kingdom in Transition
‘‘China’s Regional Foreign Policy: Seeking to Recast Its International Role,’’ Christopher A. Ford
‘‘The China Card,’’ Anne Beal
‘‘China’s Foreign Investing: Paradise Lost?’’ Francisco Gonzalez

HPR Interviews:
‘‘Interview with Robert McFarlane,’’ spring 1976 Institute of Politics Visiting Fellow; former National Security Advisor to President Reagan
‘‘Interview with Marvin Kalb,’’ fall 1986 Institute of Politics Visiting Fellow; Chief Diplomatic Correspondent, NBC News

Departments:
‘‘A Dead Head Start? An Embattled Program Has Proven Itself a Success,’’ David Rettig
‘‘Trading Places: An Evaluation of Israel’s Rotation Plan,’’ Amos Meron

Books of the Review:
Presidents and the Press, The Nixon Legacy, by Joseph Spear;
Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984, reviewed by Ellen Noonan

Opinion:
‘‘What, Me Worry?,’’ essay addressing the public concern over the AIDS epidemic, J. Keith Joung

VOLUME 14/NUMBER 2: WINTER 1986
Cover: Health Care in the U. S.
‘‘DRG Related Complications,’’ Max Rovner
‘‘Doctors in Debt,’’ Meredith Golomb
‘‘Foolish Trust: Medical Malpractice and Incompetence,’’ J. Keith Joung
Departments:
"Fighting for the Horn: US/USSR Rivalry for Somalia and Ethiopia," Christopher A. Ford
"Power of Influence: Media and Elections," David Rettig
"Crisis On the Farm," Peter Klibanoff
"Prophets For Profit," Jonathan Miller

Features:
"On the Front With the New People's Army," Karla Delgado

VOLUME 14/NUMBER 3: SPRING 1987
Cover: The State of the States: America's Governors Speak Out
"Ending the Free Ride: Welfare Reform on the Nation's Agenda," Max Rovner
"In Search of Excellence: America's Governors and Education Reform," Peter Klibanoff
"Industrial Dis-Ease: The States try to Cope with Competitiveness," Meredith Golomb

Interviews with the Governors:
Thomas Kean (R-NJ), Jonathan S. Miller
Madeleine Kunin (D-VT), Mark Bodnick
James Thompson (R-IL), Max Rovner
Richard Celeste (D-OH), Christopher A. Ford
George Deukmejian (R-CA), Scott Frewing
Martha Layne Collins (D-KY), Jonathan S. Miller

Departments:
"Serious Summitry: Reagan's Challenge in Venice,"
Christopher A. Ford
"Realignment Revisited: The Myth of the Conservative Revolution,"
Mark Bodnick
Interview with Edward M. Kennedy, U. S. Senator (D-Massachusetts),
David Rettig and Mike Zubrensky
"An Old New Look: Florida Politics Are Moving Right,"
Arnetta Girardeau
Student Projects

During academic year 1986-87, the Projects Committee continued its sponsorship of educational programs such as a conference on community leadership for secondary school students; events in the Forum on current political topics, including panel discussions on China's new economic policies and on the U.S. tobacco industry; public addresses on U.S./Soviet relations and on gay rights; political drama, "The Normal Heart," about the early days of the AIDS crisis; airing of old government propaganda films from the U.S. and Nazi Germany; and such projects as a nuclear war simulation exercise, a Campaign '88 database project, and political journalism awards for student writers.

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

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 17, 1986, a panel discussion with the 1986 Fall Fellows of the Institute of Politics:

**Catherine Bertini**, Manager/Public Policy, Container Corporation of America; former Director, Youth Outreach Program, Republican National Committee

**Albert H. Cantril**, former President, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. and National Council of Public Polls

**Michael C. Janeway**, former Editor, The Boston Globe

**Ann McBride**, Senior Vice President and Chief Lobbyist, Common Cause

**Newton N. Minow**, partner, Sidley & Austin, Chicago; former Chair, Federal Communications Commission; former Co-chair, League of Women Voters Presidential Debates Project

**Carolyn Mosby**, Indiana State Senator (D-Gary); Member, Executive Committee, National Black Caucus of State Legislators

**Lawrence S. DiCara**, Member, Panel on Fellowships, Institute of Politics Partner, DiCara, Selig, Sawyer & Holt (Moderator).

"China: On the Road to Capitalism?" October 9, 1986, a panel discussion with:

**Roderick MacFarquhar**, Professor of Government, John King Fairbanks Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University founding Editor, China Quarterly; author, The Forbidden City and The Great Leap Forward 1958-60

**David Aikman**, former Beijing Bureau Chief, Time magazine

**Li Miao**, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics; Head, Division for
U. S. Government, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; former Administrator, World Bank Division, Ministry of Finance, People's Republic of China

Anita Ramastery, Associate, Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics (Moderator)


"The Economic Reform of China," November 6, 1986, an address by Han Xu, Ambassador to the United States from the People's Republic of China, with an introduction by Dwight Perkins, Director, Harvard Institute for International Development; Associate Director, East Asian Research Center, Harvard University; co-sponsored by the Chinese Student Association, Harvard University.

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," February 4, 1987 a panel discussion with the Spring 1987 Fellows of the Institute of Politics:

Bella Abzug, President, Women USA; feminist; women's rights activist; author; former New York Congresswoman

Julie Belaga, 1986 Republican candidate for Governor of Connecticut

Albert H. Cantril, author; public policy analyst; former President, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.

William Lucas, 1986 Republican candidate for Governor of Michigan

Larry McCarthy, former Senior Vice President, Ailes Communication; Emmy Award-winning television writer

Wesley Pippert, former Senior Middle East Correspondent, UPI, Jerusalem, Israel

Jonathan Schell, former Staff Writer, The New Yorker; author, The Fate of the Earth, The Abolition

Lawrence S. DiCara, Member, Panel on Fellowships, Institute of Politics; Partner, DiCara, Selig, Sawyer & Holt (Moderator)

"The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty: A Debate," February 9, 1987, co-sponsored by the Harvard Republican Club and Perspective magazine, with:

Kris Kobach '88, Chair, Harvard Republican Club; member, Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics

Rob Hurford '90, Member, Harvard Republican Committee

Sean McKenna '88, Staff, Perspective magazine

Justine Harris '90, Staff, Perspective magazine
Paul Doty, Mallinckrodt Professor of Biochemistry, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator) (Starr Auditorium/Belfer Center)

The Status of Gay Rights," March 12, 1987, an address by Barney Frank, Member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-MA), co-sponsored by the Gay and Lesbian Association, John F. Kennedy School of Government. (Starr Auditorium/Belfer Center)

World War II Propaganda Films: The Triumph of the Will (Nazi Germany) and Prelude to War (United States Army), April 16, 1987, co-sponsored by IMPACT (student organization), John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Nuclear War Crisis Simulation Exercise (developed by William Martel, Rand Corporation), April 25, 1987, a 7-hour exercise involving 54 Harvard undergraduates in the roles of top-level U. S. and U.S.S.R. government officials using computer analysis to aid in strategic decision-making. (Belfer Center)


Campaign '88 Database Project

The Student Advisory Committee has developed a resource for Harvard students interested in working on a 1988 presidential campaign. Questionnaires, completed by candidates, list such information as addresses and telephone numbers of national campaign headquarters, field headquarters, names of principal campaign staff in areas such as media relations, policy development and field coordination, availability of paid and volunteer positions, time commitment required and application procedures. Position papers and other useful information provided by candidates are also available to potential student campaign workers.

Posters, widely distributed throughout the Harvard campus, provide information about the availability and location of Campaign '88 materials as well as listing names and telephone numbers of candidates.
1986 Voter Registration Project

The Student Advisory Committee provided information for students on absentee ballot voting procedures in all 50 states and successfully registered over 550 Harvard undergraduates for the fall 1986 elections. Booths set up at various student activities across campus provided state by state binders containing standardized voting procedures and listings of names and addresses of election officials.

Conference on Community Leadership

On October 24-25, 1987, 128 high school students in their junior year from 60 Boston-area schools attended the "Harvard Conference on Community Leadership" at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. The Conference, designed to inspire and educate students about public service, brought together the attending high school students, Harvard undergraduates from Phillips Brooks House and the House and Neighborhood Development program (H.A.N.D.), graduate students from the Kennedy School of Government and political and community leaders. Arrangements were made for the high school students to stay overnight in Harvard student housing as guests of the conference organizers and other undergraduates.

The Conference opened on Friday evening, October 24, with an address by United States Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts. Senator Kennedy's address was followed by the first of several workshops designed to convey practical leadership skills, such as how to negotiate and discuss community issues. The Friday evening program closed with a viewing of the film, Robert F. Kennedy Remembered, made available by the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library, and segments from "Chronicle," WCVB-TV Boston news and public affairs program.

On Saturday, October 25, several workshops were conducted in the morning. Lunch was followed by a discussion in the Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government on "Career Paths in Public Service," with:

William B. Golden, Massachusetts State Senator (D-Norfolk/ Plymouth)

Mary Jane England, Associate Dean and Director, Mid-Career Masters in Public Administration Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Commissioner, Department of Social Services, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
The final session of the conference was an address on public service—need, obligation, and ability—by Charles Stith, Pastor, Union United Methodist Church, Roxbury, Massachusetts; Director, Organization for a New Equality.

Political Drama

On March 19-22, 1987, the Student Advisory Committee presented, through special arrangement with Samuel French, Inc., The Normal Heart, a play written by Larry Kramer, an explosive political drama which explores the reactions of individuals, organizations and local and national government officials during the early years of the AIDS epidemic. The play, presented in the Public Affairs Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, was co-directed by Ralph P. Brescia, a member of the Student Advisory Committee and a second year candidate for a Master of Public Policy degree from the John F. Kennedy School of Government; and Abby E. Cohen, chair, Marketing Committee of the Board of Directors for the New Ehrlich Theater and an advertising executive at HBM/Creamer Design Group. The play was produced by Eric A. Berman '88, member of the Student Advisory Committee.

Cast of Characters (in order of appearance):
Craig Donner .............................................................. Larry Nash '89
Mickey Marcus ......................................................... Kerrington Osborne HLS
Ned Weeks ............................................................... Matthew Baldwin KSG
David ................................................................. Gary Negbaur '89
Dr. Emma Brookner .................................. Twanna LaTrice Hill GSAS
Bruce Niles ............................................................. Bill Parsons '89
Felix Turner .......................................................... Kevin Jennings '85
Ben Weeks .......................................................... Ian Thornley staff/KSG
Hiram Keebler ..................................................... Jim Torres '83
Grady ................................................................. Larry Nash '89
Examining Doctor .................................................. Jim Torres '83

Production crew:
Stage Manager ......................................................... Louis Gardner '88
House Manager ....................................................... Claire Fleming '88
Lighting Designer ........................................... Ellen Noonan '88
Set Designer ................................................ Dan Doern '88
Console Operator .......................................... Christopher Lucas '87
Video and Sound .......................................... Mark Pine KSG
Stage Crew .................................................. Matt Auer '88
............................................................ Richard Chin '87
............................................................ Charlie Dupree '89
............................................................ Arthur Rublin '89
............................................................ Jane Schneider '90
............................................................ Ken Segel '88
............................................................ Louisa Smith '89
Artwork ...................................................... Diana K. Lipford
Costumes/Research ...................................... Kathy Keogh '89
Properties/Research ...................................... Sarah Durham '89
Make-Up ..................................................... Chris Chambers '87
Medical Advisor ............................................ Jonathan Worth, M.D.

Political Journalism Awards

The winners of the third annual awards for Harvard Political Journalists of the Year were announced on April 4, 1987 by the Student Advisory Committee. Winners—this year chosen from among sixty entrants—will each participate in a week-long journalism internship arranged by the Institute and also received book prizes at a SAC awards-presentation dinner at the Institute in late April.

1987 award recipients were:


Reporting: Jess Bravin '87, former Assistant Editor, What Is To Be Done? (an affiliated Harvard Crimson publication), for a four-part series on the controversy involving Northwestern University’s Traffic Institute, which was training members of El Salvador’s Armed Forces, including six officers under U. S. Congressional inquiry for alleged human rights abuses, The Chicago Tribune, July 20-August 1, 1986, (a summer internship project), "'Death Squads’ Suspects Get an N U Education," "'N U Catches Flak for Salvador Program," "'N U Drops out of Anti-Terror Program," and "'N U’s Withdrawal Leaves U.S. with a Counter-Terrorism Gap."


The 1987 awards committee included:

- **Joelle Attinger**, Boston correspondent, Time magazine; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
- **Martin Linsky**, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Assistant Director and former Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Editor, The Real Paper
- **Larry McCarthy**, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Senior Vice President, Ailes Communications; Emmy Award-winning television writer
- **Martin F. Nolan**, Editorial Page Editor, The Boston Globe; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
- **Wesley Pippert**, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Senior Middle East Correspondent, UPI, Jerusalem
- **Jonathan Schell**, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Staff Writer, The New Yorker
- **Judy Stoia**, Executive Producer, WCVB-TV Boston
The Fellows Program

The program for fellows is central to the Institute’s dual commitment to encourage student interest and competence in public life and to develop more effective ways in which the academic and political communities may share their resources.

The program for fellows was originally designed to offer a chance for reassessment and personal enrichment to individuals in politics and government—particularly those described as “in-and-outers”—who might feel the need for this opportunity and benefit from it. Although this original purpose still exists, fellows have become increasingly involved in the other programs of the Institute, as well as in other areas of the Kennedy School and the University. Significant emphasis is now placed on a fellow’s contribution to the Institute and to the Harvard community during the term of residence.

The Panel on Fellowships

Lawrence S. DiCara
Archie Epps
Susan Estrich (on leave)
Dan Fenn
Lance M. Liebman, Chair
Richard J. Light
Michael Lipsky
Ernest R. May
Mary F. McTigue
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos
Richard E. Neustadt
Don K. Price
Ann Ramsay-Jenkins
John Shattuck

Students/fall
Gregory McCurdy
David Michael
Eric Mindich
D. Hannah Taylor

Students/spring
Claire Fleming
Jill Neptune
Charles Dupree
Gregory McCurdy
Fellows' Alumni Advisory Committee

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

Institute Fellows

Fall

Catherine Bertini, Manager/Public Policy, Container Corporation of America and former Director, Youth Outreach Program, Republican National Committee. During her sojourn at the Institute, Ms. Bertini examined regional differences and attitudes in the relationship between business and politics. Her study group was entitled "The Modern Corporation: Does It Really Influence American Public Policy?"

Albert H. Cantril, former President, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. and National Council of Public Polls. Mr. Cantril’s study group was entitled, "Political Rhetoric and American Public Opinion: Presidential Politics After Reagan." His independent project was an examination of the paradox that the American people respond positively to "conservative" rhetorical appeals in spite of their support of a "liberal" role for government.

Michael C. Janeway, former Editor, The Boston Globe. At the Institute, Mr. Janeway continued research on the politics of the era from Andrew Jackson through Abraham Lincoln, an historical period that has held his interest and curiosity since his days as a Harvard undergraduate. He led a study group entitled "Politics and the Press—What’s News, What Gets Covered, What Doesn’t."

Ann McBride, Senior Vice President and Chief Lobbyist, Common Cause. Ms. McBride’s independent research while at the Institute focused on evaluating post-Watergate reforms relating to ethics, campaign finance and the openness of American public institutions. Her study group was entitled "Congress: Policy, Pressures and Politics."
Newton N. Minow, Partner, Sidley and Austin, Chicago; former Chair, Federal Communications Commission; former Co-chair, League of Women Voters’ Presidential Debates. Mr. Minow’s study group, “The Presidential Debates,” laid the ground work for his research on the candidate debates for the 1988 presidential elections. His project culminated in the “Theodore H. White Conference on Presidential Debates,” held at the Institute of Politics on December 5-7, 1986, co-sponsored by the Institute and the Twentieth Century Fund.

Carolyn Mosby, Indiana State Senator (D-Gary); member, Executive Committee, National Black Caucus of State Legislators; former member, Indiana House of Representatives. Ms. Mosby’s research project was an evaluation of the benefits of federal and state “set-aside” programs. She led a study group on “Emerging Trends in Regional Government: Political, Economic, and Social Empowerment in the Midwest.”

Spring

Bella Abzug, Attorney; author; feminist activist; President, WOMEN USA; former U. S. Congresswoman (D-NY). Her study group, “What If Women Ran the World?: Women and Political Power,” allowed her to continue her work on women in decision-making roles in domestic and foreign policy.

Julie Belaga, 1986 Republican candidate for Governor of Connecticut; former member, Connecticut House of Representatives. Her independent research fellowship project was an analysis of the involvement of institutions of higher learning in influencing and serving public policy and interests, using Massachusetts as a model. The focus of her study group was “Clean Drinking Water: Is It a Luxury of the Past?”

Albert H. Cantril, author; public policy analyst; former President, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. As a second semester fellow, Mr. Cantril analyzed partisan implications of the liberal-conservative paradox in public opinion. He focused on how the liberal agenda can be most effectively communicated in the political environment of the 1990s. He also completed editing a book of his father’s essays, “Psychology, Humanism and Scientific Inquiry: The Selected Essays of Hadley Cantril,” (Transaction Books, October 1987).

William Lucas, 1986 Republican candidate for Governor of Michigan; former Chief Executive, Wayne County. While at the Institute, Mr. Lucas’ independent research and the study group he led focused on “The Black Office Holder in America: The Challenge of Partisan Politics.”
Larry McCarthy, former Senior Vice President, Ailes Communication; Emmy-award winning television writer. While in residence at the Institute, Mr. McCarthy began work on a novel. He led a study group on "The Thirty Second War: Making Political Television Commercials."

Wesley G. Pippert, former Senior Middle East Correspondent, UPI, Jerusalem, Israel. For his independent fellowship project, Mr. Pippert completed the research and writing of a manuscript for a book on the ethics of news. His study group was entitled "The Ethics of the News Story."

Jonathan Schell, former Staff Writer, The New Yorker; author, The Fate of the Earth, The Abolition. For his fellowship project, Mr. Schell worked on an assessment of the political legacy of the Vietnam War. The focus of his study group was "Independent Voices: The Role of Independent Observers and Thinkers in a Democratic Political System."

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

Samuel H. Beer, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, Emeritus, Harvard University
Abram W. Chayes, Felix Frankfurter Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Fellows of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University
Michael C. Janeway, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Editor, The Boston Globe
Winthrop W. Knowlton, Director, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Nelson W. Polsby, Visiting Professor in the Frank Stanton Chair of the First Amendment, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael J. Sandel, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University; author, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice
Dinner with Fellows of the Senior Executive Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Dinner with John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard University
Spring

Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Sissela Bok, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis University; author and lecturer on moral philosophy
Carl M. Brauer, Director of Public/Private Careers Project, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William M. Bulger, President, Massachusetts State Senate
Fellows of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University, with David T. Ellwood, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Stanley H. Hoffmann, C. Douglas Dillon Professor of the Civilization of France, Harvard University
Elizabeth Reveal, Administrative Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Thomas C. Schelling, Director, Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
John Shattuck, Vice President for Government and Public Affairs, Harvard University
Thomas Winship, President, The Center for Foreign Journalists
Cal Thomas, Syndicated Columnist, The Los Angeles Times
Dinner with Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. Assistant to President Reagan for Political and Intergovernmental Affairs

Research Fellows

The Institute of Politics occasionally offers research fellow appointments to individuals who provide special program support or conduct research while affiliated with the Institute. In recent years, research fellows have provided support in areas such as media-politics and have researched topics such as bureaucracy, politics and policy; campaign finance; momentum in presidential primaries; new communications technologies; presidential transition; and regulatory reform.

Li Miao, Head of the Division for U. S. Government, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, The People's Republic of China, held an appointment as a Research Fellow from September 1986 through February 1987, with support from the Ford Foundation. Mr. Li has been a Research Fellow at the Institute of American Studies of the Chinese Academy of Social
Sciences and was an Administrator and Translator at the World Bank Division of the Chinese Ministry of Finance. In 1980, he was one of the group of Chinese working for the return of the PRC to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

At the Institute of Politics, Mr. Li began work on a project on the American media, one component of which was a comprehensive questionnaire which 27 American media professionals completed, providing their insights on issues ranging from what common threads exist among the various components of the media to whether and how foreign governments use the media of the United States to influence American and world opinion. Mr. Li also continued to study American government and culture, both formally, through attendance at Harvard University classes, and informally, through active participation in the programs and activities of the Institute, especially the fellows program, as well as in the life of the larger University community.

Following his tenure at the Institute of Politics, Mr. Li had an appointment as a Research Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D. C. where he was to continue his work in American studies and on the media project before returning to the PRC in early fall 1987.
The Faculty Studies Program

The faculty studies program draws practitioners and scholars to the Institute to examine critical political and policy issues with an eye to innovative problem solving. The insights resulting from their work are distributed by the Institute to the widest possible audience.

The program brings together individuals from a variety of disciplines and professions to think and work collectively on issues of substantive public concern. These issues may be limited to a single question or to ongoing examination of a policy topic. Many publications, including a number of books, have resulted from Institute faculty studies.

Three to five faculty study groups are under way most years. Topics covered include: ethics in public life, legislative reapportionment, national intelligence activities, presidential transition, public opinion and polling, and vice presidential selection. An example of long-term inquiry is the Campaign Finance Study Group, which examined data on political campaign contributions and expenditures, analyzed the implications of the new campaign finance laws and the experience of the 1976-80 elections, developed recommendations for future legislation and is now refocusing its inquiry looking toward the 1988 presidential elections.

Campaign Finance

The Campaign Finance Study Group, under a grant from the Committee on House Administration of the U.S. House of Representatives, analyzed the impact of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) from 1972-1978, publishing a report of its findings and recommendations in May 1979. The study group also examined, under a grant from the U.S. Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the impact of federal election campaign laws upon the conduct of presidential campaigns, publishing its findings and recommendations in a report in January 1982 which focused on major problem areas resulting from 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 Study Group which was inactive in 1985 and 1986, is refocusing its efforts in three areas:

- the kind of regulatory agency necessary to implement campaign laws on the federal level;
- the problem posed by Political Action Committees (PAC's);
• looking to the 1988 presidential campaign, an overall review of campaign finance practices and policy, including analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of policy proposals currently circulating in the Congress.

Members of the Study Group are:

Christopher Arterton, Dean, Graduate School of Political Management, New York; former Research Fellow, Institute of Politics
Joel L. Fleishman, Director, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University
Gary Jacobson, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California/San Diego
David Keene, President, Keene, Monk & Associates, Alexandria, Virginia
Susan B. King, President, Steuben Glass, New York; former Chair, U. S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Executive Assistant to Michael S. Dukakis, Dukakis for President Campaign; former member Institute staff
Jonathan Moore, Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State; former Director, Institute of Politics
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Presidential Transition

The Institute of Politics has long been interested in presidential transitions 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 existed, and it is hoped that his book, Presidential Transition: Eisenhower Through Reagan (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), will become a useful tool for new presidents and their appointees, and an informative guide for the press and the public.

The project was funded by grants from the Ford and Sloan Foundations, which also provided support for "Webs of Influence: Policy Development
and Decision Making in Two Presidential Transitions 1952-1960," a chapter from the dissertation by Jennifer Laurendeau, 1986 Ph.D. candidate, History Department, Harvard University. Dr. Brauer and Ms. Laurendeau were assisted by the Faculty Study Group on Presidential Transition. Andrew W. Robertson was research assistant to Dr. Brauer.

The Institute is planning for the preparation of materials in anticipation of the transition which will follow the 1988 presidential election.

Members of the Study Group are:

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Philip E. Areeda, Langdell Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Ernest R. May, Charles Warren Professor of American History, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Chair
Jonathan Moore, Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State; former Director, Institute of Politics
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Roger B. Porter, Professor of Government and Business, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Don K. Price, Weatherhead Professor of Public Management, Emeritus, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Public Opinion Polls and Federal Policymaking

Over the past two decades, the use of public opinion polls by federal officials has increased greatly, especially in relation to their policymaking responsibilities. Relatively little is known, however, about the character, actual extent or impact of this activity. To address these questions, the Institute of Politics received a grant from the CBS Foundation to conduct a two-year study, "Public Opinion Polls and Federal Policymaking."

The research is focusing on the following three areas:

- The development of an inventory of practice and activity of the use of public opinion polls at the federal level, including the White House, executive branch agencies and the Congress;
- Understanding the impacts the use of polling data may have on federal decisionmaking and policy outcomes;
The Faculty Studies Program

- Beginning to chart the implications and consequences of the use of polls for governance in our society. The project is scheduled for completion at the end of 1987. A manuscript resulting from the work is expected to be published in 1988.

The study is being overseen by a faculty study group composed of scholars and practitioners from the fields of government and polling. The chairman of the study group and principal investigator for the work is Christopher Arterton.

Members of the faculty study group are:

Christopher Arterton, Dean, Graduate School of Political Management, New York; former Research Fellow, Institute of Politics
Michael E. Baroody, Assistant Secretary for Policy, U. S. Department of Labor
Andrew Feinstein, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U. S. House of Representatives
Karlyn Keene, Editor, Public Opinion
Steven Kelman, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Andrew Kohut, President, The Gallup Organization
Martin A. Linsky, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary R. Orren, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics; Associate Director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William Morrill, President, Mathtech
William Schneider, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

Research director of the project is Wendy M. O'Donnell; research assistant is Lisa Belsky.
Professional Study Program and Special Projects

Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress
December 7-11, 1986

Participants were:

Thomas "Cass" Ballenger (R-North Carolina)
James H. Bilbray (D-Nevada)
Joseph E. Brennan (D-Maine)
Benjamin L. Cardin (D-Maryland)
Jim Chapman (D-Texas)
Jack Davis (R-Illinois)
Peter A. DeFazio (D-Oregon)
Mike Espy (D-Mississippi)
Floyd H. Flake (D-New York)
Elton Gallegly (R-California)
Fred Grandy (R-Iowa)
Bill Grant (D-Florida)
Claude Harris (D-Alabama)
J. Dennis Hastert (R-Illinois)
Jimmy Hayes (D-Louisiana)
Wally Herger (R-California)
George J. Hochbrueckner (D-New York)
Clyde C. Holloway (R-Louisiana)
Amory Houghton, Jr. (R-New York)
Tim Johnson (D-South Dakota)
James Jontz (D-Indiana)
Joseph P. Kennedy II (D-Massachusetts)
Ernest L. Konnyu (R-California)
John Lewis (D-Georgia)
Donald "Buz" Lukens (R-Ohio)
Thomas C. McMillen (D-Maryland)
Kweisi Mfume (D-Maryland)
Constance A. Morella (R-Maryland)
Wayne Owens (D-Utah)
Elizabeth J. Patterson (D-South Carolina)
David E. Price (D-North Carolina)
Tom C. Sawyer (D-Ohio)
David E. Skaggs (D-Colorado)
Louise M. Slaughter (D-New York)
Frederick S. Upton (R-Michigan)
The faculty included:

Graham T. Allison, Jr., Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Charles M. Atkins, Commissioner of Welfare, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Robert Ball, Senior Consultant, Center for Study of Social Policy; former Commissioner, U. S. Social Security Administration
Marion Barry, Mayor, Washington, D. C.
Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard L. Berkley, Mayor, Kansas City, Missouri
John R. Block, President, National American Wholesale Grocers' Association; former Secretary, U. S. Department of Agriculture
David Blumenthal, Executive Director, Center for Health Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ken Bode, National Political Correspondent, NBC News
Derek C. Bok, President, Harvard University
Albert Carnesale, Academic Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
John E. Chapoton, Esq., Vinson and Elkins, Washington, D. C.; former Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, U. S. Department of the Treasury
Richard N. Cooper, Maurits C. Boas Professor of International Economics, Center of International Affairs, Harvard University
Douglas Costle, Esq., Beveridge and Diamond, Washington, D. C.; former Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency
Elizabeth H. Dole, Secretary, U. S. Department of Transportation
Jorge Dominguez, Professor of Government, Harvard University
David T. Ellwood, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Rashi Fein, Professor of Economics, Department of Social Medicine and Health Policy, Harvard University
Charles Fried, Solicitor General, U. S. Department of Justice
John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard University
Marshall Goldman, Associate Director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Bill Hogan, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Alan Holmer, General Counsel, Office of the U. S. Trade Representative
Ellen Hume, White House/Political Reporter, The Wall Street Journal
William Kaufmann, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Guy Martin, Esq., Partner, Perkins, Coie; former Assistant Secretary, Public Land and Water Management, U. S. Department of the Interior
Ernest R. May, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Charles McDowell, Syndicated Columnist, The Richmond Times-Dispatch
Abner Mikva, Judge, Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit
Donald Moran, ICF, Inc.; former Associate Director of Human Resources, U. S. Office of Management and Budget
Robert Murray, Director, National Security Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Frank W. Naylor, Jr., Chair, Farm Credit Administration
Richard E. Neustadt, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Wallace Nutting, General, U.S. Army, ret.; former Commander, U. S. Southern Command
Joseph S. Nye, Director, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Norman Ornstein, Research Scholar, American Enterprise Institute
Nelson W. Polsby, Visiting Professor in the Frank Stanton Chair of the First Amendment, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William Quandt, Acting Director, Foreign Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution
Robert Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert Rubin, Executive Vice President, ICF; former Assistant Secretary, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services
Allen Schick, Professor, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland
John Schnittker, former Assistant Secretary, U. S. Department of Agriculture
Dmitri Simes, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Alan Tracy, Special Assistant to President Reagan/Agricultural, Trade and Food Assistance
Paul Tsongas, Partner, Foley, Hoag and Eliot; former U. S. Senator, (D-Massachusetts)
James Verdier, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Paul Volcker, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System
Peter Zimmerman, Associate Dean and Director of Executive Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Institute of Politics Administrative Staff included:

Eric A. Berman '88, Student Coordinator
Paul G. Bograd, Associate Director
Theresa Donovan, Fellows Coordinator
Scott Eblin, Curriculum Coordinator, Congress Program
Theodore H. White Conference on Presidential Debates
December 5-7, 1986

Televised debates among and between candidates have taken place in three of the six presidential elections since 1960. In anticipation of the 1988 presidential election campaigns, the Institute of Politics and The Twentieth Century Fund co-sponsored the "Theodore H. White Conference on Presidential Debates" on December 5-7, 1986 at the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

The conference brought together political professionals from national campaigns, the Democratic and Republican parties, public affairs analysts, pollsters, elected officials, and print and electronic media for discussions on presidential debates, looking especially at the issue of sponsorship and structure and the role of the candidates, the parties, the media and the public in determining the content, format and number of debates.

Conference participants included:

Jonathan Alter, Senior Writer/Media and Politics, Newsweek
Catherine Bertini, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Manager/Public Policy, Container Corporation of America; former Manager, Youth Programs and Statewide Youth Campaigns, Republican National Committee
Paul G. Bograd, Associate Director, Institute of Politics; former campaign director and consultant
Ronald H. Brown, Partner, Patton, Boggs & Blow; Chair, Senior Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics; former Deputy Chairman/Chief Counsel, Democratic National Committee
Albert H. Cantril, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former President, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.; public opinion analyst
Walton Chalmers, Executive Director/Chief of Staff, Democratic National Committee; former Director, Broadcast Research, CBS Television News
Barry O. Chase, Vice President, News and Public Affairs Programming, Public Broadcasting Service

Lawrence K. Grossman, President, NBC News; former President and Chief Executive Officer, Public Broadcasting Service

Victoria Harian, Manager, Presidential Debates, League of Women Voters Education Fund; Manager, Projects on Voter Outreach, LWV

Michael C. Janeway, Fellow, Institute of Politics; former Editor, The Boston Globe

Gene F. Jankowski, President, CBS/Broadcast Group; former Vice President/Administration, CBS, Inc.

James Leach, U. S. Representative, Iowa (R-1st District)

Edward J. Markey, U. S. Representative, Massachusetts (D-7th District)

Mary McTigue, Acting Director, Institute of Politics; former Director, Public Records, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Laurie L. Michel, Deputy Counsel to Chairman, Republican National Committee; Counsel/Budget Committee, RNC

Newton B. Minow, Chair, Theodore H. White Conference on Presidential Debates; Fellow, Institute of Politics; Partner, Sidley & Austin, Chicago; former Chair, Federal Communications Commission

Lee N. Mitchell, President and Chief Executive Officer, The Field Corporation; Counsel, Sidley & Austin, Washington, D.C. and Chicago

Richard Moe, Esq., Davis, Polk & Wardell; former Chief of Staff to Vice President Walter F. Mondale

Roger Allan Moore, Partner, Ropes & Gray, Boston; General Counsel, Republican National Committee; Chair, Board of Directors, National Review

Nancy M. Neuman, President, United States League of Women Voters; Chair, Education Fund, LWV

David Norcross, Chair, Republican National Debates Committee; Counsel to Chair, RNC; Counsel to Republican Institute for International Affairs

Nelson W. Polsby, Visiting Professor in the Frank Stanton Chair of the First Amendment, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Professor, Department of Political Science, University of California/Berkeley (on leave); author, Congress and the Presidency and other works on government and elections

Edward R. Rollins, Managing Partner, Russo, Watts & Rollins, Inc., Consultants; former Assistant to President Reagan for Political and Intergovernmental Affairs

Clifford Sloan, Project Director, Theodore H. White Conference on Presidential Debates; former Law Clerk, U. S. Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens
Experiencing Power

The Institute of Politics is sponsoring a one year research project, funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, to be conducted by Xandra Kayden, consultant, writer and educator, on the study of the inner meaning of gaining, using, and relinquishing power. Ms. Kayden's project, which will result in a book to be published in fall 1988, will explore what it is like for different kinds of people to hold power: men and women; those raised to expect it and those who raise themselves into it; people who do battle in the world at large and those who wield it (perhaps more absolutely) in the smaller worlds of organizations.

Ms. Kayden's thesis is that the experience of power changes an individual's sense of self, leading sometimes to the creation of a separate public identity, sometimes to a more integrated character. Power—having authority or influence or being famous—has consequences for the individual, a change in the way other people react and possibly a change in the way one views oneself. If winning power is a goal in life, losing it is part of the process, part of the nature of things, yet we do not legitimate that process, neither naming it nor recognizing that there is a period of transition involved. Ms. Kayden's book, Experiencing Power, will examine especially those who have gone through the transition of losing power and the meaning in their lives of that loss and that process. It will look also at the meaning of power for the individual in light of the ever-growing need for leadership as organizations proliferate at all levels of society; the emergence of societal changes that have been in the making for some time, and the urge for equality that has characterized our domestic politics for most of this century.
A Preview of the '88 Presidential Campaigns
February 28-March 1, 1987

The 1988 presidential election marks the first time in twenty years that both the Democratic and Republican parties face the primary season and the national conventions with no incumbents in office, thus providing a unique opportunity to examine the similarities and differences of how candidates from each party conduct their campaigns. The Institute has sponsored, quadrennially since 1972, post-election conferences on presidential campaign decisionmaking. This year the Institute sponsored its first pre-presidential election conference, "A Preview of the '88 Presidential Campaigns," which brought together campaign managers and other representatives from campaigns of declared candidates, other campaign practitioners and national political journalists, to discuss the effect of the nomination structure on individual campaigns and on the selection process, and the strategic and structural components of individual candidacies.

Participants were:

Laurence Barrett, National Political Correspondent, Time magazine
Ken Bode, National Political Correspondent, NBC News
Hal Bruno, Director of Political Coverage, ABC News
James Cannon, Vice Chair, Republican Majority Fund;
former Chief of Staff, Office of U. S. Senator Howard Baker (R-TN)
William Carrick, Campaign Manager, Gephardt for President
Richard Cohen, Senior Producer, CBS News
William Dixon, Campaign Director, Gary Hart for President Committee
Christine Dolan, Political Director, Cable News Network
Jack Germond, Syndicated Columnist, Baltimore Evening Sun
Elaine Kamarck, Deputy Campaign Manager, Bruce Babbitt for President Committee
David Keene, Senior Political Consultant, Campaign America/Dole Committee
Glenn Kenton, Campaign Director, Pierre DuPont for President
John Marttila, Chair, Strategic Planning, Biden for President Committee
Marc Nuttle, Chief Political Consultant, Americans for Robertson Committee
Thomas Oliphant, Political Reporter, The Boston Globe
Edward Rogers, Deputy Campaign Director, Bush for President Committee
Martin Schram, Associate Editor, Chicago Sun Times
Robert Shogan, National Political Correspondent, The Los Angeles Times
David Shribman, Political Reporter, The Wall Street Journal
Ronald Walters, Consultant, Jesse Jackson for President Campaign
Linda Wertheimer, Political Correspondent, National Public Radio
David Yepsen, Reporter, Des Moines Register

Institute of Politics Administrative Staff included:

Lisa Belsky, Financial Assistant
Paul Bograd, Associate Director
Ronn Davids, Receptionist
William G. Mayer, Ph.D. Degree Candidate, Department of Government, Harvard University
Mary McTigue, Acting Director
Wendy O'Donnell, Special Assistant to the Director
Diane Pliner, Secretary to the Director

Special thanks to Nelson W. Polsby and the staff of the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy for their assistance with the conference.

The Lord Harlech Memorial Conference on Ideals and Values in Politics and Public Service and Institute of Politics 20th Anniversary Reunion
May 8-10, 1987

A conference dedicated to the memory of Lord Harlech, former Ambassador to the United States from Great Britain, was held on May 8-10, 1987, with the generous support of Marshall Cogan, Harvard '59, to coincide with the Reunion held in celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the Institute.

Lord Harlech, born William David Ormsby Gore, was a confidant of John F. Kennedy since the late 1930s when the future president was a student at the London School of Economics. He was a friend and supporter of the Institute since its inception and, at the time of his death in an automobile accident near his home in Wales in January 1985, was Chair of the Institute's Senior Advisory Committee.

Conference sessions and reunion events, held in the Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government except as otherwise noted, included:
Friday, May 8th:

5:00 p.m.: Weekend registration

7:30 p.m.: Welcome and Opening Remarks, Introduction of Institute Director-designate

Edward M. Kennedy
U. S. Senator, Massachusetts
Member, Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute

Introductory Remarks

Richard L. Thornburgh
Director-designate, Institute of Politics
former Governor of Pennsylvania

Public Address: “Contemporary American Politics: Asserting Social and Political Justice”

Bruce A. Morrison
U. S. Congressman, Connecticut
alumnus of the Institute’s Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress

Respondents:

Elisabeth Griffith
author; Founder of the National Republican Women’s Task Force
former Institute Fellow

Paul E. Maslin
Partner, Hickman-Maslin Research, Inc.
former Member, Institute Student Advisory Committee

Ann McBride
Senior Vice President and Director of Program Operations, Common Cause
former Institute Fellow

9:00 p.m.: Reunion reception for weekend guests
(Kennedy School Penthouse)
Saturday, May 9th:

8:30 a.m.: Continental Breakfast

9:30 a.m.: Welcome and Introductory Remarks

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

Public Address: "Challenges of an Elective Career: Values, Compromise, Conscience"

John C. Culver, Esq.
Partner, Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn
Member, Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute

Respondents:

Robert F. Drinan, S.J.
Professor of Law, Georgetown Law School
Institute conference participant and study group guest speaker

Susan McLane
State Senator, New Hampshire
former Institute Fellow

Carolyn Brown Mosby
State Senator, Indiana
former Institute Fellow

11:00 a.m.: Introductory Remarks

Richard E. Neustadt
Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
former Director of the Institute

Public Address: "Challenges of Policymaking: Ideals and Pragmatics"

Richard G. Darman
Managing Director, Shearson Lehman Brothers
former Deputy Secretary of the U. S. Treasury
former member, Institute Faculty Study Group
Respondents:

Karen S. Burstein  
Auditor-General, City of New York  
former Institute Fellow

William G. Miller  
President, American Committee on U.S./Soviet Relations  
former Institute Fellow

Chase Untermeyer  
Assistant Secretary of the Navy  
former Institute Fellow

12:30 p.m.: Reunion Barbecue Picnic (Kennedy School Courtyard)

2:30 p.m.: Introductory Remarks  
Ronald H. Brown  
Partner, Patton, Boggs & Blow  
Chair, Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute

Public Address: “Covering Politics: Responsibilities of Observation and Influence”  
David S. Broder  
National Political Correspondent and Syndicated Columnist, The Washington Post  
former Institute Fellow

Respondents:

E. J. Dionne  
Chief Political Correspondent, The New York Times  
former Member, Institute Student Advisory Committee

Gail Harris  
Co-Anchor and Reporter, WGBH-TV Boston  
former Institute Study Group Leader

Marvin Kalb  
Director-designate, The Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government  
Chief Diplomatic Correspondent, NBC News
5:00 p.m.: Reunion Reception hosted by the current Student Advisory Committee (Holyoke Center Penthouse)

7:00 p.m.: Reunion Dinner parties for guests at several locations around Harvard

9:00 p.m.-
1:00 a.m.: Reunion Dance in the Forum

Sunday, May 10th:

8:30 a.m.-
10:00 a.m.: Religious Services available

9:00 a.m.: Continental Breakfast

10:00 a.m.: Introductory Remarks

Jonathan Moore
Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State
former Director of the Institute

Public Address: “An International View of American Politics and Values”

Shirley Williams
President and Co-Founder, Social Democratic Party, Great Britain
Member, Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute

Respondents:

Joelle Attinger
Boston Correspondent, Time Magazine
former Institute Fellow

Joseph N. Garba
Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations
former Institute Fellow
Adam Klein
President, Klein & Company
former General Secretary of the Garment Workers
Union of South Africa
former Institute Study Group Leader

11:30 a.m.: Reunion Picnic Brunch
(Kennedy School Courtyard)
Opening Ceremony
The Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy
September 27, 1986

Dedication and opening ceremonies were held on September 27, 1986 for The Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy in the Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government and in Town Hall and at the new Center in the School’s Belfer Center.

Joan Shorenstein Barone was a political journalism professional who in 1969, while pursuing graduate studies at Harvard, attended an Institute of Politics Study Group taught by David Broder, then an Institute Fellow. Impressed by her considerable abilities, Mr. Broder in 1970 recommended Joan for a position as political researcher at The Washington Post. In 1973, she joined CBS, became a news producer and a specialist in politics and on Watergate. At the time of her death in 1985, she was a producer for “The Dan Rather CBS Evening News.”

Joan Shorenstein Barone is remembered by all who knew her for her professionalism, generosity, kindness and courage, qualities she manifested in her many roles—journalist, mother, wife, devoted daughter and first-class friend.

Opening Ceremony Schedule and Participants included:

Opening and Dedicatory Remarks in the Forum:

Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Derek Bok, President, Harvard University
Jonathan Moore, Ambassador at Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State; former Director, Institute of Politics
Edward M. Kennedy, United States Senator, Massachusetts
Walter H. Shorenstein, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Milton Meyer and Company
David S. Broder, Associate Editor and National Political Correspondent and Columnist, The Washington Post

Address, “National Security and the Press“:

Benjamin C. Bradlee, Executive Editor, The Washington Post

Unveiling of Plaque and Reception in the new Center and in Town Hall: Program participants and invited guests.
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 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 four years ago by the Institute, with funding from the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation, to examine how these new methods of communication are affecting the ways in which we are governed and how we, as citizens, choose to participate in our democracy.

The project has developed materials on such topics as the common characteristics new media technologies share, and how these technologies do now, and could in the future, change the conduct of electoral politics, governance, and citizen participation.

The project was overseen by a faculty study group composed of political and media practitioners as well as scholars. The final product of the group's work is a book authored by Jeffrey B. Abramson, Christopher Arterton and Gary R. Orren, which will be published in the Spring of 1988 by Basic Books, Inc. under the title The Electronic Commonwealth: The Impact of New Media Technologies on Democratic Politics. In their work the authors raise a number of questions for both citizens and officials which require serious consideration as we move further into this new era.

Members of the Faculty Study Group include:

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Director, Center for Science and International Affairs, and Professor of Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Chair

Jeffrey B. Abramson, Research Fellow, Institute of Politics; Assistant Professor of Politics, Brandeis University; Assistant District Attorney, Middlesex County, Massachusetts

Christopher Arterton, Dean, Graduate School of Political Management, New York; former Research Fellow, Institute of Politics

Daniel Bell, Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard University

Stephen G. Breyer, Justice, U. S. Court of Appeals, First Circuit; Lecturer on Administrative Law and Regulatory Policy, Harvard Law School
Les Borwn, Editor-in-Chief, Channels of Communications
John Deardourff, Chairman of the Board, Bailey, Deardourff Associates
Henry Geller, Director, Washington Center for Public Policy Research
David R. Gergen, Editor, U. S. News & World Report
Winthrop Knowlton, Director, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard Levine, Editorial Director, Data Base Publishing

Jonathan Moore, Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State; former Director, Institute of Politics
Roger Mudd, Chief Political Correspondent, NBC News
W. Russell Neuman, Assistant Professor of Political Science and Co-Director, Research Program on Communications Policy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Richard M. Neustadt, Senior Vice President, Private Satellite Network
Gary R. Orren, Associate Director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Research Fellow, Institute of Politics
Michael Sandel, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University

The Research Coordinator for the project was Wendy M. O'Donnell.

Momentum in Presidential Primaries

It is now a truism, but not necessarily true, that the media have replaced the parties in the American nominating process. To examine this question, the Institute has sponsored a two-year project begun in July 1985 by Henry E. Brady, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University, on "Momentum in Presidential Primaries," with support from the National Science Foundation.

Through a comparison of American primaries since 1972, American conventions before 1972, and Canadian conventions since 1920, Mr. Brady has sought to learn more about the nature of American and Canadian parties, their relationship to the mass media, and the extent to which the media have or have not replaced the parties as the vital link between political elites and citizens. His research includes a content analysis of all United Press International (UPI) stories on the Democratic Presidential nomination between January 1-July 31, 1984.
Project publications include:


Working papers:

- "The Horse-Race or the Issues: What Do Voters Learn from Presidential Primaries?" (Also a presentation at the 1986 meeting of the American Political Science Association which was broadcast by C-SPAN, the public affairs television network.)
- "Chances, Utilities, and Voting in Presidential Primaries."

The Media and the Congress

In October 1983, the Institute of Politics and *The Los Angeles Times* sponsored a three-day conference examining news media coverage of Congress, how and how well it is covered and what consequences there might be of coverage. Participants included current and former members of Congress, members of the academic community and print and broadcast journalists who were congressional reporters and correspondents. A book of the transcripts of the conference, edited by Stephen Bates, Harvard Law School degree candidate, under the direction of Jonathan Moore, former director of the Institute, is forthcoming early in 1988 by Publishing Horizons, Inc.
The ARCO Forum of Public Affairs is a multi-tiered amphitheater located in the heart of the John F. Kennedy School of Government's Littauer building. It serves, as Edward M. Kennedy remarked in his dedication address, as a “crossroads by day and a meeting place by night, an arena for debate where democracy can come alive, a forum where citizens can meet with presidents and kings, or poets debate with secretaries of defense.”

The Institute of Politics administers all formal programs held in the Forum. Selected Forum events [as indicated by (*) below] were carried on American Public Radio Network as part of the 13-part Forum radio series co-sponsored with WGBH Boston.

C-SPAN, the national public affairs television network, videotaped the symposia [indicated by (+) below], held in the Forum on September 3-6, 1986 in conjunction with the joint celebration of the 350th/50th anniversaries of Harvard University and the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

With the implementation in fall 1986 of a pilot project involving American Cable Systems (ACS) of Cambridge, Massachusetts, the Institute of Politics, and C-SPAN, selected Forum programs [indicated by (#) below] are videotaped by ACS for broadcast both on the ACS network and on C-SPAN.

1986-87 Forum events included:

The Capitol Steps, July 19, 1986, a Washington-based musical comedy octet of full-time Capitol Hill staffers, presenting spoofs of domestic and international personalities and issues, with:

Jim Aidala, Member, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress;

Winthrop Cashdollar, Staff Member, office of U. S. Senator William Cohen (R-ME);

Sandy Darley, Staff Member, office of U. S. Senator John Warner (R-VA);

Dave Gencarelli, Legislative Liaison, U. S. Customs Service;

Mary Joyce, Legislative Liaison, U. S. Small Business Administration;

Elaina Newport, Staff Member, office of U. S. Senator Alfonso D'Amato (R-NY);

Richard Paul, Member, Majority Staff, Senate Labor Committee;

William Strauss, Staff Member, National Taxpayers Union.

(*) “Invisible Enemies in the Middle East: Three Myths of Terrorism,” July 29, 1986, an address by Benjamin Netanyahu, Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations.

"Running for Congress: A Personal Perspective," August 26, 1986, a panel discussion by Republican candidates for U. S. Congress/Massachusetts 8th Congressional District, with:

Clark Abt, Chairman of the Board, Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts;
Joe Baldanza, Political Consultant;
Paul G. Bograd, Associate Director, Institute of Politics (Moderator).

"Running for Congress: A Personal Perspective," August 28, 1986, a panel discussion by Democratic candidates for U. S. Congress/Massachusetts 8th Congressional District, with:

George Bachrach, former Member, Massachusetts State Senate;
Mel King, former Member, Massachusetts House of Representatives, Boston City Council;
James Roosevelt, Jr., Political Lobbyist;
Christopher Lydon, Senior Editor/Anchor, "The Ten O'Clock News", WGBH-TV Boston (Moderator).

Events and Symposia in conjunction with the 350th/50th combined anniversary celebration of Harvard University and the John F. Kennedy School of Government:

John Harvard Commemorative Stamp Ceremony, September 3, 1986, with:
Graham t. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government;
Robert Anderson, Stamp Designer;
Derek C. Bok, President, Harvard University;
Albert V. Casey, former, U. S. Postmaster General;
Matina S. Homer, President, Radcliffe College.


(+) "Tobacco, Smoking and Health Policy," September 4, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy, John F. Kennedy School of government, with:

Tenley Albright, M.D., Medical Research Foundation;
C. Everett Kopp, M.D., U. S. Surgeon General;
Thomas C. Schelling, Director, Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;
John M. Pinney, Executive Director, Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy (Moderator).
The Forum

"Medicare: Coming of Age," September 4, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the Center for Health Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

David Blumenthal, M.D., Executive Director, Center for Health Policy and Management; Co-chair, Harvard University Medicare Project.

Wilbur Cohen, Professor of Public Affairs, University of Texas/Austin; former Secretary, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare;

Joseph P. Newhouse, Senior Corporate Fellow, Rand Corporation;

William L. Roper, M.D., Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services;

Julius B. Richmond, M.D., former U. S. Surgeon General; Co-chair Harvard University Medicare Project; Director, Division of Health Policy Research and Education, Harvard University (Moderator).

(Starr Auditorium/Belfer Center)

(+ ) "America's Poor: What is to be Done?" September 4, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Charles M. Atkins, Commissioner, Department of Public Welfare, Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Mary Jo Bane, Executive Deputy Commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services; Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;

Glenn C. Loury, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Member, U. S. Senate (D-NY);

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

(+ ) "Beyond Deterrence: Avoiding Nuclear War in the Long Run," September 5, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

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;

Randall Forsberg, Executive Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies;

Caspar Weinberger, Secretary, U. S. Department of Defense;

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Director, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator).

(+ ) 'DeToqueville Revisited: Views of American Politics from Abroad,' September 5, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the Institute of Politics, with:
Thomas Axworthy, Visiting Professor of Canadian Studies, Harvard University; Principal Secretary and Senior Policy Advisor to former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada;

Tommy T. B. Koh, Ambassador to the United States from Singapore;

Shirley Williams, President and Co-Counder, Social Democratic Party of Great Britain; former Member, House of Parliament, Secretary of State for Education and Science, Great Britain;

Stanley Hoffmann, Chair, Center for European Studies, Harvard University (Moderator).


McGeorge Bundy, Professor of History, New York University;

Richard Darman, Deputy Secretary, U. S. Department of the Treasury;

David R. Gergen, Editor, U. S. News and World Report; former Communications Director, White House, Reagan Administration;

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Albert Schweitzer Professor of the Humanities, City University of New York;

Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator).

(+ ) "Public/Private Careers: Perspectives from Distinguished Public Servants," September 6, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Douglas Dillon, Secretary, U. S. Department of the Treasury (1961-1965);

Henry Fowler, Secretary, U. S. Department of the Treasury (1965-68);

Elliot L. Richardson, Senior Resident Partner, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy; Undersecretary, U. S. Department of State (1969-70); Secretary, U. S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare (1970-73); Secretary, U. S. Department of Defense (1973); U. S. Attorney General (1973); Secretary, U. S. Department of Commerce (1976-77);

Anne Wexler, Chair, Wexler, Reynolds, Harrison & Schule, Inc.; former Presidential Advisor (1979-81);

John Whitehead, Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of State (1985-present);

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

(+ ) "Religion, Politics and Television," September 6, 1986, a panel discussion, sponsored by the Institute of Politics, with:
John Buchanan, Chair, People for the American Way; former Member.
U. S. House of Representatives (R-AL);
Harvey G. Cox, Jr., Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity,
Harvard Divinity School;
Cal Thomas, Syndicated Columnist, The Los Angeles Times;
former Vice President, Moral Majority;
John Chancellor, Senior Commentator, NBC News (Moderator).

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 17, 1986, a panel discussion with the fall 1986 Fellows of the Institute of Politics, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)

Dedication of The Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politic and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, September 27-28, 1986:

"The Press and Federal Policy Making," September 26, 1986, a panel discussion, with:
Martin Linsky, author, Impact: How the Press Affects Federal Policy Making; Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with respondents:
Richard E. Neustadt, Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government;
Jonathan Moore, Ambassador-at-Large and U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State; former Director, Institute of Politics (Moderator).

Dedication Ceremony, September 27, 1986. (see Media-Politics)

"Against All Hope: 20 Years in Castro's Prison," September 29, 1986, an address by Armando Valladares, Cuban political prisoner, 1961-81; author, Against All Hope and The Heart with Which I Live; with remarks by Jorge Dominguez, Professor of Government, Harvard University.

"On the Verge of Default: Peru and the World Debt," October 3, 1986, an address by Luis Avla-Castro, Vice President, Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economics, Peru, with respondents:
Shantayanan Devarajan, Consultant, Country Policy Department, World Bank; Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;
Shane Hunt, Professor of Economics, Boston University;
Philip Wellons, Associate Professor of Business Administration, Harvard Business School; Daniel Alvarez, graduate student, Harvard Divinity School (Translator).

"China: On the Road to Capitalism?" October 9, 1986, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)

- Richard Haass, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;
- John McAward, Organizer, Congressional fact-finding missions to Central America; President, Face to Face (L.Am. consultancy group).

(*) "The Quest for Sanity: U. S./Soviet Relations," October 21, 1986, an address by Marvin Kalb, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)

"The Cuban Missile Crisis Revisited: Can Future U. S./Soviet Confrontations Be Managed?" October 23, 1986, a panel discussion with:
- Antonia Chayes, Chair, Endispute, Inc.; former Undersecretary, U. S. Air Force (1977-1980);
- Richard Holbrooke, Vice President, Public Strategies; former Assistant Secretary, East Asia and Pacific Affairs, U. S. Department of State (1971-81);
- Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator).

Conference on Community Leadership, October 24-25, 1986, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See Special Projects, The Student Program)


National election returns projected on the big screen preceded by an informal buffet supper hosted by the Institute of Politics, November 4, 1986, co-sponsored by the Kennedy School Student Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government.
"The Economic Reform of China," November 6, 1986, an address by Han Xu, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)


Reception following the Harvard/Yale football game, November 22, 1986, hosted by Graham T. Allison, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

(#) "Defense, Democracy and Development—Components of Security," December 2, 1986, an address by Neil Kinnock, Member of Parliament; Leader of the Opposition, House of Commons, Great Britain.


"Republicans After '88" December 10, 1986, an address by Thomas Kean, Governor of New Jersey.

(*)(#) "Original Intent of the Constitution," December 11, 1986, a debate, co-sponsored by *The Atlantic Monthly*, with:

- Orrin G. Hatch, Member, U. S. Senate (R-UT);
- Laurence Tribe, Ralph S. Tyler Professor of Constitutional Law, Harvard Law School;

with remarks by:

- Jack Rakove, Professor of History, Stanford University;
- Howard Simon, Director, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University (Moderator).
"The State of the Union," President Reagan's address to the Congress and the Nation, January 27, 1987, projected on the big screen, followed by commentary by:

Walter Broadnax, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;

Albert Carnesale, Academic Dean and Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government;

Susan Irving, 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;

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

Paul G. Bograd, Associate Director, Institute of Politics (Moderator).

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," February 4, 1987, a panel discussion with the spring 1987 Fellows of the Institute of Politics, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)


(#) "China in Turmoil?" February 12, 1987, a panel discussion with:

David Aikman, former Beijing Bureau Chief, Time magazine;

Hu Ping, graduate student, Department of Government, Harvard University and student activist, People's Republic of China;

Merle Goldman, Associate for East Asian Research, John King Fairbank Center for East Asian Studies, Harvard University;

Dwight Perkins, Director, Harvard Institute for International Development (Moderator).

"Making a Difference: Careers in Public Service," February 19, 1987, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by IMPACT (Student Organization), John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Patricia Derian, First Assistant Secretary, Human Rights, U. S. Department of State, Carter Administration;

Bob Hayes, founder, National Coalition for the Homeless; former Wall Street attorney;

Cal Thomas, Syndicate Columnist, The Los Angeles Times; former Vice President, Moral Majority;

May Ling Tong, Executive Director, New England Minority Purchasing Council;

Martin Linsky, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator).

"Women in '88: Where Do We Go From Here?" February 23, 1987, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Women's Caucus, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Julie Belaga, Fellow, Institute of Politics; 1986 Republican candidate for Governor of Connecticut;

Susan McLane, Member, New Hampshire State Senate (R-Concord);

Constance Morella, Member, U. S. House of Representatives (R-MD);

Barbara Patton, Member, New York State Assembly (D-Queens County);

Liz Walker, News Anchor, WBZ-TV Boston (Moderator).

"In Celebration of Moderation," February 25, 1987, 1986 Joe Alex Morris Jr. Memorial Lecture, by Peter Jennings, Anchor and Senior Editor, ABC World News, with an introduction by Howard Simon, Curator, Nieman Foundation for Journalism, Harvard University, co-sponsored by the Nieman Foundation. (Starr Auditorium/Belfer Center) [Rescheduled from April 1986]

"Managing the White House," March 2, 1987, a panel discussion with:

Richard Cheney, White House Chief of Staff, Ford Administration;

John D. Ehrlichman, Counsel to the President, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs, Nixon Administration;

David R. Gergen, former Communications Director, Reagan Administration;

Hamilton Jordan, White House Chief of Staff, Carter Administration;


"Peace and Security in Afghanistan," March 9, 1987, a panel discussion, with:

Wakil Akberzai, Director General, Mujahideen Refugee Relief Committee;
Mohammed Es'haq, Political Advisor, Jamiat-Islami; Representative,
Ahmed Shah Masoud, Commander of the Panjshir Valley;
Laili Helms, Free Afghanistan Alliance;
Eden Naby, Associate, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University (Moderator).

"The Gorbachev Legacy," March 12, 1987, a panel discussion with:
Yuri Orlov, Soviet physicist; Professor of Physics, New York University;
Richard Pipes, Frank B. Baird Jr. Professor of History, Harvard University;
Marshall Goldman, Associate Director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University (Moderator).

"The Status of Gay Rights," March 12, 1987, an address by Barney Frank, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)


(#) "Immigration Reform: Present and Future Implications," March 16, 1987, a debate, co-sponsored by the Hispanic Caucus, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Bill Richardson, Member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-NM);
Alan K. Simpson, Member, U. S. Senate (R-WY);
Deborah Anker, Lecturer, Harvard Law School, (Moderator).

"The Normal Heart," March 19-22, 1987, political drama produced by the Student Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics. (See The Student Program, Special Projects)

(#) "An English Only America: Uniting or Dividing," March 23, 1987, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Asian, Black, and Hispanic Caucuses of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:
John Loring, Massachusetts State Representative, (R-Concord);
Monty Manibog, Mayor, Monterey Park, California;
Mario Moreno, Assistant Counsel, Mexican American Legal Defense
Education Fund;
Charles Pappas, Attorney; Representative, U. S. English lobby;
Amando Torres, Political Consultant for Hispanic Affairs;
Martha Matzke, Editor, Education Week; Fellow, Nieman Foundation
for Journalism, Harvard University (Moderator).

(#) "Refugee and Foreign Policy: Immediate Needs and Durable Solutions," April 6, 1987, an address by Jonathan Moore, Ambassador at Large and Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, U. S. Department of State; former Director, Institute of Politics.

"Dilemmas of Development," April 9, 1987, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Overseas Development Network and the Harvard-Radcliffe International Development Forum, with:
S. Shahid Husain, Vice President, The World Bank
Stephen Lewis, Ambassador from Canada to the United Nations;
C. Peter Timmer, Professor of Development Studies, Harvard University;
Donald F. Hornig, Whitehead Professor of Chemistry, Harvard School
of Public Health (Moderator).

"Dilemmas of Foreign Aid," April 10, 1987, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Overseas Development Forum, with:
Richard Bissell, Assistant Administrator, United States Agency for
International Development;
Margaret Catley-Carlson, President, Canadian International
Development Agency;
John Hammock, Executive Director, OXFAM America;
Dwight H. Perkins, Director, Harvard Institute for International
Development (Moderator).

"Hold on Mr. President: Covering the Presidency," April 17, 1987, an address by Sam Donaldson, White House Correspondent, ABC News.

"International Security: A Woman's Perspective", April 21, 1987, a panel discussion, with:
Carol Cohn, Senior Research Fellow, Center for Psychological Studies
in the Nuclear Age, Harvard Medical School;
Vivian Lowery Derryck, Program Director, National Democratic
Institute for International Affairs;
Claudine Schneider, Member, U. S. House of Representatives (R-RI);
Bella Abzug, Fellow, Institute of Politics; Founder and President,
WOMEN USA (Moderator). (Starr Auditorium/Belfer Center)
"Two Years into the Gorbachev Era: Where Do We Stand?" April 21, 1987, 1987 Lamont Lecture, by Arthur A. Hartman, former Ambassador from the United States to the Soviet Union, with comments by Richard Pipes, Frank B. Baird Jr. Professor of History, Harvard University, co-sponsored by the Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

"Women and Changes in the Workplace: Economic, Managerial and Public Policy Considerations," April 28, 1987, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Labor Research Group and the Center for Health and Human Resources Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with:

Barbara Hutchinson, Director of Women's Affairs, American Federation of Government Employees;
Janet Walker, President, Massachusetts Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women;
Joanne Troy, Special Assistant to the Mayor, City of Boston;
Mary Jo Bane, Director, Center for Health and Human Resources Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Moderator).

"The Distorting Lens: The Media and Presidential Politics," May 4, 1987, a panel discussion with:
Dale Bumpers, Member, U. S. Senate (D-AK);
David Shribman, Political Reporter, The Wall Street Journal;
Mark Starr, Boston Bureau Chief, Newsweek;
Tom Patterson, Professor of Political Science, Syracuse University;
Chuck Robb, Chair, Democratic Leadership Council; former Governor of Virginia (Moderator).

"Whose Care is Child Care? Public and Private Responsibilities," May 5, 1987, a panel discussion with:
Jay Belsky, Professor, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University;
Christopher Dodd, Member, U. S. Senate (D-CT); sponsor, legislation on child care and parental leave;
Elinor Guggenheimer, Founder and President, Child Care Action Campaign;
Nehama Jacobs, author, Success and Betrayal: The Crisis of Women in Corporate America;
Dana Friedman, Senior Research Associate, The Conference Board, (Moderator).

The Lord Harlech Memorial Conference on Ideals and Values in Politics and Public Service and Institute of Politics' 20th Anniversary Reunion, May 8-10, 1987 (See Professional Study Program and Special Projects)
"A New Agenda for American Foreign Policy, May 28, 1987, an address by Joseph Biden, United States Senator (D-Delaware), Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee; 1988 Candidate for President.


(#) "John F. Kennedy: A Vision of Public Service," May 29, 1987, a panel discussion in honor of the 70th anniversary of the birth of President John F. Kennedy, with:

McGeorge Bundy, Professor of History, New York University;
National Security Advisor, Kennedy administration;

Christopher Dodd, Member, U. S. Senate (D-CT); former volunteer,
The Peace Corps;

Michael S. Dukakis, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Edward M. Kennedy, Member, U. S. Senate (D-MA);

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


(*) indicates 1986 Radio Series.

(+) indicates 350th/50th anniversary symposia videotaped for broadcast on C-SPAN.

(#) indicates programs videotaped by ACS for broadcast on ACS network and on C-SPAN.