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FOREWORD

The Institute of Politics participates in the democratic process through the many and varied programs it sponsors. The programs include fellowships for individuals from the world of politics and the media, a program to encourage undergraduate and graduate students to get involved in the practical aspects of political activity, training programs for elected officials, seminars and conferences, and a public events series in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs presenting speakers and panel discussions addressing contemporary political and social issues.

On January 1, 1990, as a new year—and a new decade—opened, the Institute began a new chapter with the arrival of Charles Royer, three-term Mayor of Seattle, as Institute Director. On that same date, Shirley Williams, having completed her one-year tenure as Acting Director, returned full time to her teaching responsibilities as Public Service Professor of Electoral Politics at the Kennedy School of Government.

Programs and activities sponsored by the Institute during academic year 1989-90 are reflected in this twelfth edition of Proceedings. The Readings section provides a sense of the actors encountered and the issues discussed. The programs section details the people involved and subjects covered by the many undertakings of the student program—study groups, twice-weekly suppers, visits by distinguished visiting fellows, internships, grants for summer research, a quarterly magazine, the Harvard Political Review, and a variety of special projects. Also included is information on fellows, participants in seminars and conferences and public events held in the Forum.

Anne Doyle Kenney
Editor
DIRECTOR’S MESSAGE

The overloaded station wagons with out-of-state license plates, the proud fathers wrestling suitcases and rolls of carpet through a Harvard Yard showing the first signs of New England autumn, are welcome and familiar signs of new beginnings here. But for this relative newcomer, the pulse quickens as I realize that the start of this wonderful cycle, which has repeated itself for so many years, also starts my first full academic year as Director of the Institute of Politics.

Having arrived in early January, I felt my first priority must be to make certain that the spring semester not be a victim of transition but rather a full and rich experience for our fellows, our students, and others who have come to rely on the Institute and its programming.

I believe we accomplished that as I hope you will agree after reading this issue of Proceedings.

That the transition went so smoothly is tribute to a fine, small, but dedicated staff who, under the able guidance of Acting Director Shirley Williams, worked very hard to make it happen. I want to express on behalf of the Institute our sincere gratitude to Shirley, as well as our pleasure that we can continue to work with her.

By the time commencement rolls around, the Institute of Politics will be well into its twenty-fifth year. We’ll have a fine party to celebrate, but perhaps more importantly, we will use the occasion to re-examine what we do here, to re-dedicate ourselves to our mission, and to plan for the future.

While it is too soon for me to say much about the future, I can tell you that the basic mission of the IOP—bridging the distance between the academy and politics and inspiring young people to public service—is as right today as it was twenty-five years ago. Given the current level of confidence in our political system, that mission is perhaps even more important than it was in 1966 when the Institute was created.

Ours is a search for inspiration. Inspiration in the political events and political people we examine and work with at the Institute.

Today, some of that inspiration will come from abroad. Swift and historic change in the Soviet Union, East and Central Europe, South Africa, and elsewhere in the world, not only captures our hearts but sets our minds working to re-examine our own governance. We have much to learn from these global events and from other peoples, and much reason to speed up the process of internationalizing the IOP, the Kennedy School and this University.

I visited Romania during spring semester as an observer in that nation’s first free elections in more than fifty years. In University Square in Bucharest I saw young people by the thousands standing for their rights, petitioning their government, forcing democracy while working to learn it as one might try to learn a strange new language.
We must put before our own students as much of that excitement and inspiration as we can, mindful that it is our own political system which needs our attention and our best people.

Speaking of people, this has been a year of new people at the Institute of Politics. Of our entire staff, only three begin the year in jobs they held last year. Soon we will welcome three new members to our Senior Advisory Committee, former Senator and IOP fellow Dan Evans of Washington State, former fellow and soon-to-be former Governor of Vermont Madeleine Kunin, and former Mayor of San Antonio Henry Cisneros. These are outstanding people who love politics, the Institute, and working with students.

And speaking of students, working with our Student Advisory Committee has been an education and a delight. They do so much work with such good humor. This past year’s SAC will go down in Institute history, not just for their excellent work, but because they are the first SAC ever to lose a softball game to the IOP staff. The score was enormous.

Over the last several months countless people have asked me whether I miss being Mayor of Seattle and whether I am surviving the transition. After nine months in Cambridge, I can say without hesitation that there are things I miss—like my parking space. All in all, though, it has been a smooth transition for me thanks to so many helpful, hospitable student, faculty and staff.

I am happy to be here and I look forward with real excitement to a new year in this wonderful place.

Charles Royer
Director
September 1990
I. Readings
Readings
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Actors on the Political Stage

On Public Service
by L. Douglas Wilder

Following is an edited version of the Class Day Address delivered by L. Douglas Wilder, Governor of Virginia, on June 6th to the 1990 graduating class of the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

I always enjoy travelling to this majestic state of Massachusetts which shares historic bonds with the Commonwealth of Virginia. Since the earliest days of this nation’s founding, Virginia and Massachusetts have been the authors and the defenders of American liberty and justice. In every major chapter of American history, favorite sons and daughters of these two states have played vital roles: leading us to victory in the American Revolution, guiding us through the trenches of World War I, inviting us into the New Frontier.

Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Abigail Adams, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Clara Barton, Maggie L. Walker, Susan B. Anthony, Woodrow Wilson, John F. Kennedy. Despite living in different times and under different circumstances, these individuals are united by a common thread. They had much and they gave much. Whether it was wealth of worldly goods, wealth of knowledge, wealth of compassion—or all three—these sons and daughters of Massachusetts and Virginia willingly shared their good fortune with the nation and with the world. Because of their selflessness, the world today continues to reap the bounty of their labor. How different the world would be had they not lived! How different history would be had some lived longer, lived to see their full vision brought to fruition.

As you may know, today marks the 22nd anniversary of the premature passing of Robert Kennedy. Since his death many have engaged in endless games of “what if?” What if Bobby Kennedy had lived? What if he had beaten Nixon? What if all events thereafter had run a different course? But, it serves no purpose to ask “what if?” Instead, we must merely find comfort in knowing that he lived, that he cared deeply, that he worked to make a difference, that we can learn from his example. Bobby Kennedy never played “what if?” He looked at what was and set out to make it better, make it just.

Like many of you, Robert Kennedy was born into a life of advantage. As some of you will do, he devoted his life to the disadvantaged. He inherited a world of comfort but bequeathed to humankind a world of greater compassion and greater justice. Rather than embracing elitism, he embraced humanity. I still recall Kennedy on the campaign trail in 1968, speaking out, time and again, in anguished words about the inequities and the injustices across the American landscape. He spoke of poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment, illiteracy. The disparities in power and in opportunity which he saw eating away at the very foundation of this country were, in his words, “not acceptable.”

As public servants, it is likewise your responsibility to bring to light the “not acceptable” conditions of society and to address them to the best of your abilities. Sometimes it may seem safer or more expedient to look the other way. Whether you are elected or appointed, you will face many pressures. Institutional loyalties, public
opinion, other influences may pull you in conflicting directions. If you choose any direction other than that pointing to justice and to honesty, you will find yourselves on a path which leads to the darkened abyss of self-service.

Woodrow Wilson captured the true essence, and the profound difficulty, of being a public servant when he observed that better even, if possible, than giving one’s life is giving one’s spirit to a service that is not easy, resisting counsels hard to resist, standing against purposes difficult to stand against.

Above all else, I implore you to be honest with the public you serve. On occasion the news you deliver will not be pleasant. But more important than popularity, you must retain the trust and the respect of the public and of your colleagues. If you ever lose that trust and that respect, Harvard education notwithstanding, your reputation will be destroyed and your career in public service finished.

Unfortunately, candor is not always forthcoming in the public sector. Consider the unfolding Savings and Loan scandal. Since the mid-1980s, and earlier, people who should have foreseen the implications of this disaster chose to turn their heads in the other direction. In recent years, as conditions have continued to worsen, certain leaders have deliberately misled the public about the extent and the ramifications of what is arguably the biggest scandal in this nation’s history. Inevitably, some will rationalize that they are merely shielding the public from the harsh reality which awaits.

Fortunately, Paul Revere did not shield the people from the harsh reality that the British were coming. Abraham Lincoln did not shield the people from the harsh reality that slavery is an immoral institution. John F. Kennedy did not shield the people from the harsh reality that a nuclear threat existed just 90 miles to the south of Florida.

Trust the people and the people will trust you. Equally important, know your public. Make a sincere effort to stay in touch with the thoughts and concerns and dreams of the individuals you are called upon to serve. Often, in the higher echelons of public service, the perks can distort one’s perspective as quickly and as drastically as those of any high-paying, high-profile career in the private sector.

To lose touch with the people is to lose touch with the reason one enters public service. The most effective and the most satisfied of you will be those who make the effort to get out from behind your desks, out from behind your college degrees, those who make an effort to touch the world and who allow themselves to be touched by what they find.

In 1960, John Kennedy went into isolated communities throughout West Virginia, touching the pulse of the people, feeling that pulse in the beat of his own heart. Many, mostly among the press, said that the people of West Virginia would not vote for a Catholic. Kennedy did not listen to the press. He was there to listen to the people. In general stores, at the entrances to coal mines, in the dirt roads of some of the state’s most impoverished communities, he listened and heard what the people of West Virginia were saying. A victorious John Kennedy left West Virginia with an even greater understanding of, and compassion for, the needy.

During the course of the last thirty years I have drawn great inspiration from the example of John Kennedy. When I began my candidacy for Lieutenant Governor in 1985, and again last November, I took my message directly to the people of Virginia on a 3000 mile tour of every city and county in the state. I travelled to communities where candidates for statewide office had never before set foot.
From the outset, members of the press corps were obsessed with the role of race in the campaign. How would I be received? The press pondered the question in article after article after article. Just as Kennedy knew that Catholicism was not an issue for the vast majority of Americans, I knew that race was not an issue for the vast majority of Virginians. It existed only within the sometimes-narrow confines of the press.

More important than dispelling the mythical issue of race, my tours of the Commonwealth in 1985 and 1989 afforded me the opportunity to listen to the voices and the concerns of all Virginians. I didn’t just listen, I learned. After 21 years of continuous service in state government, I know a great deal about Virginia but not so much that I do not seek to learn even more whenever and wherever the opportunity arises.

You must likewise keep your doors, your minds, your hearts open to the individuals who will depend upon you. It is not enough to talk about compassion, about justice, about opportunity for persons, for their families. Without acts of moral courage, mighty words of moral concern for the plight of humanity are like fireflies in a Mason jar, cutting through the darkness of injustice with a flicker one moment, dead and forgotten the next.

Each generation faces its own set of unique challenges. In the years before us, American society will have to do far more to address the ravages of AIDS, the injustice of educational disparity, the tragedy of child abuse, the insanity of environmental destruction, and the drain of drug abuse—just to name a few problems. As you set out to put your education, and your compassion, to work for the benefit of others, may your acts of moral courage forever cast forth as much piercing, lasting heat as your words do light.

Years from now, having been guided by morality and by compassion, may you all look back on your careers with a sense of profound satisfaction, knowing that you have given selflessly of yourselves for the betterment of the human condition, that you have been true to that spirit which marked the lives and the deeds of the individual for whom this school is named and of his brother whom we remember today.
Reflections
by Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

The following is excerpted from a public address by Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. on April 19, 1990 in the Forum of Public Affairs of the John F. Kennedy School of Government. "Tip" O'Neill represented Massachusetts 8th congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1953 to 1986 and served as Speaker of the House from 1977 to 1986. His address, which was followed by comments by David Nyhan, political columnist at The Boston Globe, was co-sponsored by the Institute of Politics and the Kennedy School's Political Junkies student group.

America is a rich nation, blessed with an abundance of natural resources. Other resource-rich nations, Argentina, Brazil, the Soviet Union, are having tremendous difficulties, yet we seem to be doing well. I believe the difference is American values. Americans work hard and play hard. We have found the right mix of democratic freedom and community responsibility. As we look towards the new century, a time of incredible change, both adults and students will have to work harder. We can't afford to waste human resources any longer.

The revolutions in transportation and communication are making the world a smaller place and a lot of people around the globe are buying the American dream of individual freedom and equality of opportunity. The democratic movement is becoming a reality. Poets become presidents, protesters become politicians and across the globe people breathe the strong air of freedom. The American Revolution began on the Green at Lexington, the "rude bridge" at Concord, with "the shot heard 'round the world." Recent events in Eastern Europe have been carried around the world by camera shots, not rifle shots, by people, not wars or battles.

As we look to the future it's easy to become preoccupied with the way technology is changing but we can't lose sight of the power of people, people with convictions. Lech Walesa, a shipyard worker, electrician, never wavered, never lost hope, never surrendered his quest for freedom. He had the courage of his convictions. Without him and others like him in Poland and Eastern Europe the events we're witnessing would never have occurred.

I've seen the beginning of eight decades but never one that began with stronger hopes for peace or stronger tides of constructive change than now. In the '20s the United States rejected its rightful place in the world by rejecting the League of Nations. Instead, it wanted normalcy. In the '30s we had the Great Depression. Fifty percent of Americans lived in poverty, 25 percent were unemployed. At the age of 14 a boy or a girl got a working certificate. Three percent of those fortunate enough to finish high school went on to college. Nine percent of workers had pensions, three percent health insurance. The family breadwinner, if he had a job, worked six days a week. We changed all of that because those elected to public office responded to the will of the American people.

The '40s opened with war in Europe and Hitler at the peak of his power. We entering that war totally unprepared yet we became the arsenal of the world. The '50s—I was then a Massachusetts legislator—saw the beginning of the Cold War and the Korean
War about to break out. In 1958, Sputnik frightened the United States into thinking we had lost our supremacy yet within 10 years we had put a man on the moon.

The ‘60s—I was by then in Congress—began with Castro turning Cuba communist and the Soviets ahead on the ballistic missile. The ‘70s began with the unpopular Vietnam War raging in Asia and millions of Americans raging at home against it. The ‘80s began with Americans held hostage in Iran and runaway inflation at home. Most of us started the ‘80s without VCRs, “FAX” machines or personal computers, and ended the decade with all of those as everyday parts of our lives.

Peter Drucker has pointed out that the Industrial Revolution made it possible to transport vast numbers of people from their homes to their work. The communication revolution is going to transport work from our offices to our homes. Today I spoke with a young lady who works for a chain of restaurants. She goes to the office one day a week and works at home at her computer the rest of the week. As such arrangements become widespread, we’ll have more flexibility in commuting, more freedom in choosing work hours and, most important, more time to spend with our families. The ‘90s, which began with the crumbling of the walls of political repression in Eastern Europe, will end with the barriers of time and distance tumbling all around us.

That’s quite a litany—wars, depression, civil strife. How fortunate we are to see a decade open with peace breaking out all over. So many unbelievable things are happening that I honestly believe the Red Sox may win the pennant! We used to think the only thing we had in common with the Soviet Union was sports. Now they increasingly have democratic politics—and “Big Mac’s.” Some people wonder if communism can survive the opening of American fast food restaurants in Moscow—capitalism in its most visible form. We both have “Big Mac’s” now, but we also must respect our differences. There’s a lot of talk lately about the global village but the world will never be as small as a village. It will be more like a city with many people of different backgrounds, different races, different religions, living and working together.

The Cold War began with new realities, the atom bomb and a new, expansionist Soviet empire. The Cold War is ending with different realities, the rise of the first major non-Western economic power, Japan, and the development of a truly global economy. The American people’s reaction to this new state of affairs has not been one of complacency. There is a sense that we’re not doing enough as a people and as a nation to challenge Japan and a united Europe of tomorrow.

Economic recovery and sustained peace during the ‘80s has not made Americans optimistic about our nation’s future. On the contrary, many Americans are worried about our country’s ability to compete successfully in a changing economic environment. Soaring private debt as well as runaway trade and budget deficits are undermining confidence in America’s future. In recent years, with the notable exception of 1988, the majority of Americans have thought the country was moving on the wrong rather than the right track.

In the past, economic growth depended on an abundance of natural resources and adequate financial resources. In the ‘90s and beyond we must have a better-educated and better-trained citizenry if we’re going to sustain economic growth. I have seen America come a long way in education in my lifetime, especially higher education—the United States has the best higher educational system in the world. Regrettably, we cannot say the same about our elementary or secondary schools. It is a disgrace that in
the nation's core cities, 52 percent of students read at 8th grade levels. George Bush claims to be the education President. If he is, then the '90s had better be the education decade because what we accomplish in education in this decade will determine America's future in the 21st century. In education, we have a lot to do in a very short time.

Also, we are all aware of the importance of cleaning up our environment, being more respectful of nature, of ecology. In the '90s, the throw-away society will become the recycling society. We most likely will not save money but we will do better with our resources.

Since 1984, our nation has had three extremely uncompetitive national elections. Incumbent Democrats in the House like it; incumbent Republicans in the White House like it. I see no change in 1990; Congress will remain Democratic. People do not change formulas for political success even if they result in a divided government. Polls say that 63 percent of people are pleased with the divided government. So the question is not what are the formulas for success in the elections of the 1990, but what is the formula for success in the 1990s. One hundred fifty billion dollar budget deficits and $150 billion trade deficits are not a formula for success. The simple truth is that we must pay our way at home and abroad. We can't continue to depend on foreign loans.

The challenge we face now is no greater than those we faced at the beginning of every previous decade in this century. What we must do is acknowledge that we have a challenge. Many Americans doubt that we're going to make it as the world's leader in the global economy of the new century. I know better. There is no question in my mind that we will be a success and continue as a leader of the world.

*****
Polls and the Government
by Adam Clymer

The following is excerpted from an essay prepared for the December 1989 final report of the Institute of Politics research project on Public Opinion Polls and Federal Policymaking. The project, funded by the CBS Foundation, was overseen by a faculty study group of scholars and practitioners in government and polling. Principal Investigator and chair of the study group was Christopher Arterton, Dean of the Graduate School of Political Management, New York and former Institute of Politics research fellow. Research Director was Wendy O'Donnell Ballinger, Executive Director, Ford Hall Forum and former research project coordinator and special assistant to the director of the Institute. Research assistance was provided by Lisa Belsky, former Institute research and financial assistant.


The recent miserable weather has delayed the reports of interviewers from such points as Norfolk, Williamsburg, Alexandria and Georgetown, and therefore I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

Patrick Henry
March 23, 1775

The diminished oratory is bad enough but suppose delegate Henry's pollsters had indeed overcome the bad roads and returned their interviews of 600 white male Virginians and their responses to the question he ultimately had to pose rhetorically:

Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

Suppose the following results:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>18 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can repose more confidence in what Patrick Henry would have said than we can in what most of the people in his line of work say now. A certain strain of courage was in the air, and Henry, never a coward, might even have read Edmund Burke's speech to the Electors of Bristol, given just under five months earlier. These days however it is rare to find a politician who could, with a straight face, quote Burke to tell his constituents, "Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

It's not unheard of. I remember a Georgia congressman of no singular reputation, Jack Flynt, telling me in June of 1974 that he expected to vote to impeach President Nixon and then be defeated for re-election. He quoted Burke, and had a right to. But it's a lot more common to run into congressmen like the one Michael Oreskes described recently in The New York Times. Representative Les AuCoin, Democrat of Oregon, wrote a speech about the "peace dividend" and sent it to his pollster who warned against giving it saying the congressman was too far ahead of public opinion. As this is written, AuCoin's opinions still remain private.
Actors on the Political Stage

That's a bad use of polling for government; it gives a politician yet another reason, or excuse, not to lead. In the particular instance the immediate stakes for the country may not be terribly high; the denial of the opportunity to hear Mr. AuCoin's views on the peace dividend may be something the Republic can endure.

A more serious abuse on a more serious subject came my way in early 1984 when a telephone interviewer for Decision Making Information called our home in Brooklyn. He asked my wife this question:

The U.S. Marines are currently participating in a multi-national peacekeeping mission in Lebanon. If the Marines continue to be caught in the crossfire of battle, which of the following courses of action would you most prefer?:

1. Withdraw all U.S. forces immediately, regardless of the consequences, or

2. Keep the U.S. Marine forces in Lebanon at their present level.

That was not a balanced question. While not outrageously loaded, it was clearly tilted, by the ominous phrase "regardless of the consequences" in one of the possible answers, to produce an inflated level of support for continued deployment of Marines in Lebanon. But the purpose was more subtle than to get a number which could be cited to show support for the Administration. The point was to test-market foreign policy for the Reagan Administration. As the polltaker, Richard B. Wirthlin, explained to me later, the point of the question was to find out whether, even with a loaded question inviting support, a majority of the public would support keeping troops in Lebanon. The results of that survey showed that a majority still would want troops out, and soon they were withdrawn. Foreign policy should not be made on this basis, like testing a coffee jingle. If the Reagan Administration believed the weighty arguments about the harmful consequences of withdrawal on American credibility generally — the arguments it was offering while Mr. Wirthlin was polling — its obligation was to stand fast.

Those are two bad examples of the use of polls in government although in neither case was a single dollar of federal money involved. The Reagan polling was paid for by the Republican National Committee. Mr. AuCoin's campaign committee pays Garin-Hart Strategic Research but their work influences government just as heavily as if Treasury checks paid the bills.

This is indeed the most serious problem about the use of polls in government, although in neither case was a single dollar of federal money involved. The Reagan polling was paid for by the Republican National Committee. Mr. AuCoin's campaign committee pays Garin-Hart Strategic Research but their work influences government just as heavily as if Treasury checks paid the bills.

This is indeed the most serious problem about the use of polls in government, this use of political polls paid for by some campaign committee, by people holding public office. It is a more serious problem than the pollsters and their clients like to acknowledge because the kind of certainty polling numbers imply can often overwhelm the other influences on what politicians do, influences like considered opinions or long political associations. Politicians hardly ever admit to doing something because polls tell them to; but then politicians hardly ever admit to stealing either.

When it comes to polls paid for by the government itself, there is relatively little going on these days but some examples from the past suggest that in another administration there could be. That makes this a good time to try to define the proper bounds. There does seem to be a fairly simple line between what is and what is not appropriate. It seems to me wrong for government to use polls to decide whether to pursue a policy — giving up the Panama Canal, keeping troops in Lebanon, awarding foreign aid to one country and not another, sending people to prison for not paying income taxes,
prohibiting racial discrimination in hiring, supporting efforts to control drunk driving. If officials don’t know their own minds about issues like those and think that a poll of the often-uninformed public is the way to find out, then they are probably in the wrong line of work.

Once the government has decided what its policy is, then it is appropriate to use polls to try to figure out how to make it work. Amtrak hires pollsters to conduct what are basically marketing studies just as it would if it were not a government corporation. The armed services all study their images among young people as a guide to effective recruiting techniques. Fine, for the government is committed to getting people to ride trains and to a volunteer military. If the Internal Revenue Service thinks it can learn how to get more people to fill out their returns honestly by conducting polls on how people think about the process, that seems appropriate. Or if the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration wants to probe attitudes on drinking and driving so it can propose approaches that could curb that epidemic, that seems like a suitable way to spend the increased tax dollars the I.R.S. has just figured out how to collect. As long as the point is that the policy comes first and the polling is designed to figure out ways to effect it, not determine it.

There is no reason why different standards should apply to the legislative and executive branches. Both should represent the public and both should be concerned with seeing that policy works. I think we would be better off if taxpayers’ money, not campaign contributions, paid for all the polling that is done for government. Then Freedom of Information laws would require that the questions and results would have to be made public sometime and voters could judge whether the officials they elected were leaders or followers. Failing this, it might be constitutional to require that when someone in government buys a poll, or uses one that someone has bought for him, the data be made public.

It is easier to be appalled at the way politicians rely on polls to guide their words and deeds than it is to figure out what to do about it. As someone who has long defended newspaper polling on public issues with the argument that in a democracy what the people think matters, I can hardly argue to deny to the legitimately-chosen representatives of the people what I claim for the Fourth Estate.

There is no logical argument that would contend that elected officials, or the appointed ones who work under them, should not be allowed to use polls to find out what people think. Politicians have always wanted to know the views of their constituents and polls are a very good way to learn them. But the inevitable result is going to be that many of them will trim and accommodate, avoid saying what they think, sometimes say what they don’t think, discard policies they expect to be unpopular and sometimes do what they think is wrong because it will be popular. Polls didn’t impose this burden upon some pure, honest and open political system; it is an inevitable tension of representative government.

In the 1940 campaign, Franklin D. Roosevelt promised the nation’s mothers and fathers that their boys were not going to be sent into any foreign wars when he was clearly contemplating an American role in the war in Europe. In 1948, Lyndon B. Johnson ran for the Senate as though he were the enemy of organized labor and “Coke” Stevenson was its friend because he knew labor was unpopular in Texas. George C. Wallace first sought the governorship of Alabama as a racial moderate but when he lost
to John Patterson in 1958 he vowed never to be outdone in racism again. They used their political instincts. It was not just guesswork, but a rough and ready combination of experience, reports from political leaders around the state or country, some measure of crowd size and enthusiasm, and an estimate of the import of newspaper editorials.

Political instinct as a basis for judging and accommodating to the electorate is one thing and modern polling is another. It’s the difference between preserving a fragile trout fishery by allowing fishermen to use only flies with barbless hooks and permitting live bait or repealing laws which prohibit dynamite as a device for harvesting fish. It’s a difference between the real but limited impact of strategic bombing in World War II and atomic bombs. Except that nobody uses atomic bombs and politicians use polls all the time for targets large and small. The difference in degree of the quality of the information between modern polls and older methods is so great that it has become a difference in kind comparable to the megatons used as a measure of firepower since Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Massachusetts Primary Debates

Following are edited excerpts from two debates held in the Forum of Public Affairs of the John F. Kennedy School of Government with candidates for the Massachusetts gubernatorial primary election.

Candidates participating in the February 12, 1990 Republican debate were Guy Carbone, former Commissioner of the Massachusetts District Commission; Paul Cronin, former member of the U.S. House of Representatives; Steven Pierce, Minority Leader of the Massachusetts House of Representatives; Len Umina, Marketing Manager at Digital Equipment Corporation. Media questioners were Joe Day, WNEV-TV, Christopher Lydon, WGBH-TV, and Janet Wu, WCVB-TV. Co-moderators were Alan Ausluler, Ruth and Frank Stanton Professor of Urban Policy and Planning, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University and John Henning, News Anchor, WBZ-TV. Co-sponsors were the Institute of Politics and the National Ripon Society.

Candidates participating in the May 14, 1990 Democratic debate which was telecast live by WBZ-TV Boston, included Francis Bellotti, former Massachusetts Attorney General; Jack Flood, chairman, Joint Committee on Taxation, Massachusetts House of Representatives; Evelyn Murphy, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts; John Silber, president-on-leave of Boston University. Media questioners were Andy Hiller, WBZ-TV, Rene Loth, The Boston Globe, Brian Mooney, The Boston Globe, Pam Moore, WBZ-TV. Moderator was Jack Williams, News Anchor WBZ-TV. Co-sponsors were the Institute of Politics, the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee, The Boston Globe and WBZ-TV.

Republican Debate

Joe Day: Mr. Carbone, you are really running against government and that includes the legislature. How would you get along with the legislature which is likely to be predominantly Democratic?
Guy Carbone: In my campaigning, you've never heard me attack any individual member of the legislature. You've heard me talk about the legislature as an institution. When I was commissioner of the MDC, after I had cut the payroll by ten percent, the then Senate president (still Senate president today) gave me twelve engineering positions, and funded them. The Secretary of Environmental Affairs refused to allow them to be distributed to the MDC, so I couldn't hire anybody. As a result, we couldn't get done what we had to do with Boston harbor.

The way to work with the legislature is to not seek public acclaim, not take credit for everything, to understand that they are a co-equal branch of government as an institution. They have a job to do and they are very jealous about the job that they have to do. I understand that. I propose, the legislature disposes.

But I can work with the leaders because when I was MDC commissioner and, before that, general counsel for the Department of Labor Industries and, before that, chief engineer for the Government Center Commission, I got to know many of them as middle managers. Today they are legislative leaders.

Christopher Lydon: Mr. Pierce, you've been in the news over the weekend for nonpayment or late payment or late filing of your tax returns. Was this a device to win the hearts and minds of the anti-government voters out there?

Stephen Pierce: No.

Lydon: I know you have said that it was not a matter of saving money. They withheld your taxes so it was a matter of filing a piece of paper. The general question I'd like you to address is what is the responsibility of public officials, especially governors, to set an example in matters like this?

Pierce: I truly am glad you asked me the question because it is a question that I recognize that I must and can address. I knew that simply disclosing my tax returns, which I did voluntarily, would occasion those questions. In previous debates I have focused very specifically on the state budget and so forth. I think I am recognized as having talked very specifically about it. On more than one occasion I have been referred to by one of my other Republican competitors as a "bean counter having the soul of an accountant." I think I've put that charge to rest once and for all.

In all seriousness, and it is a serious matter, I have apologized for it and do recognize it as a serious mistake. It was not a question of late payment of taxes and not a question of non-payment of taxes. Taxes were paid. It was refunds that were to be claimed that I delayed in claiming thinking—wrongly—that it was completely all right to do that. In fact it appears it was a violation of the law, for which there was no penalty. Nevertheless, it was a violation of the law. It is important for public officials to set an example. It's for that reason that I am most regretful because I have worked very hard in my private life, and particularly in my public life, to set an example.

As a state representative for twelve years I have a strong record, of which I am very proud, of answering people's telephone calls, taking care of their problems, casting thousands of roll call votes on difficult issues, and debating those issues for hundreds of hours on the House floor. I am putting that public record on the line. I recognize that when you run for governor, want to be the chief executive officer of the state, there
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are certain things about even your private affairs that the news media and through them
the public have a right to know. Nevertheless, I decided to run and to bring forward
those matters because I felt, and certainly hope that most people agree, that all those
things should be put into context, that my foolish inattention to a private personal
matter should be weighed against the serious and strong commitment to principles to
which I've adhered as a public official. I think and I hope that people will do that.

*****

Lydon: Mr. Cronin, the phrase “downsizing government” has become a cliche this
year. But more particularly it's been used as if it were a constitutional or even a political
principle. The Democrats have used it too, and they too have failed to define what
government has been doing that it ought to think about not doing. Any one of you who
gets elected would be the chief executive and chief broker of that interest. Explain what
it is that the state has been doing that it can no longer afford to do.

Paul Cronin: I don't think we should deny any one the services that are necessary to
them. When I'm talking about restructuring, I am not necessarily talking about
downsizing government. What I'm talking about is redistributing the responsibilities
so that that level of government that can best provide a service provides it and no other
level.

The way I got going on this whole concept was through my first political promise. I
was elected a selectman in the town of Andover with the help of a West Andover
community group. I said to them, “If you help me get elected, I’ll help you get a fire
station in West Andover.” It used to take the fire trucks fifteen minutes to get out to this
rapidly-expanding area of town. I fulfilled that promise, solved the problem of delivery
of fire protection to that area.

There is another fire station less than a mile away. Between the two is the municipal
boundary between Andover and Lawrence. That's a classic example of the wrong level
of government providing a service. If that had been done on a regional basis, instead
of a municipal basis, $287,000—the cost of the station—in government resources could
have been used for education, human resources, or not utilized in taxes at all. It could
have stayed in people's pockets.

You have to look at government in toto in the state of Massachusetts, which includes
local, regional and state. Under our constitution it is the state that gives power to all
those other levels of government, so the buck truly does stop with the governor. Under
our restructuring proposal, a governor with the courage to lead can make a huge
difference in the first hundred days of the next governorship.

*****

Janet Wu: Mr. Umina, for many months now, there has been talk at the State House
about layoffs. At the center of the debate has been the governor's self-imposed target,
the elimination of 5,000 jobs. There has been some dispute about whether they should
be layoffs, attrition, whatever. Higher education is the one part of the state budget that
has refused to go along with the governor's target of eliminating the number of jobs the
governor gave it. Do you think this autonomy should continue, and the governor not have control over this part of the budget when, as he says, he is trying to downsize government?

Len Umina: I myself wouldn’t give this governor control over anything. As far as the next governor goes—yes. I would very much like to have some control over that system.

As to 5,000 layoffs, The Boston Herald reports today that the legislature is using the Freedom of Information Act to look at who was laid off, how many, and so on. There is a dispute as to whether it’s 1,000 or 5,000. My point—and the theme of my campaign—is that we don’t know, no one really knows what’s going on.

As far as motives and who should be laid off, I believe we need to cut patronage. Those cuts are resisted most strongly by politicians. Fortunately those are also the cuts that the people support most strongly. If we somehow connect the people with what’s going on in government, which is exactly what I am proposing to do, we can cut the patronage out of education, while at the same time we increase funding in education.

I want the hacks out. I want the number of professors to increase and the tuitions lowered, if not eliminated, in higher education. That’s what we need to do if we’re going to go from 17th to number one, where we ought to be. Unfortunately, I’m going to need the help of everybody in this room to do that.

*****

Democratic Debate

Rene Loth: Dr. Silber, as president of Boston University you have not always brooked dissent with equanimity. In the 1970s, you called out the Boston Tactical Police Force to put down a demonstration against the Vietnam War. More recently, you had eleven students arrested for having a kind of sit-down demonstration against the University’s continued investments in South Africa. And, a couple of years ago a civil rights lawsuit was brought against the school by a student who received an eviction notice for hanging a banner outside of his dormitory window. In other words, you haven’t had very much experience in running a democracy. How can we be sure that as governor you will tolerate opposing views?

Dr. Silber: A democracy is not a lawless society. What you have described with your very nice and polite interpretations have alternative interpretations. When I sent in the Tactical Police, it was after students had broken up a conference on Quo Vadis Latin America. It was when they tried to deny the right of free speech and free assembly and open discussion on the campus of Boston University. I used the orderly police and police power to enforce first-amendment rights on the campus of Boston University. That’s not denying democracy; that’s upholding democracy.

We have had many sessions on our campus in which we’ve discussed South Africa. Building a shanty on a piece of land that you don’t own, without a building permit, is not the same thing as engaging in free speech on the subject. The students who were arrested in the South African incident were arrested because they were engaged in violations of the law and in trespass, not because of their views on South Africa, which they had many opportunities to express.
I've had lots of experience in upholding democracy in a period of time when many students were trying to tear down democracy and the University simultaneously.

****

**Pam Moore:** Mr. Bellotti, a number of leaders in the minority community have said that its concerns have largely been left out of this campaign. A multi-part question: How many of the people on your paid campaign staff are ethnic minorities, black, Hispanic or Asian? What is the highest position any of them hold? What have you done to reach out to the minority community in this campaign? Do you consider people of color a special interest group as you've described so many other constituencies?

**Frank Bellotti:** No, I do not. I have talked to people of color a great deal and have probably two minority people on my campaign staff out of about 16 or 17 people. I helped write and lobby for the Civil Rights Act and prosecuted under that Act. I have consistently reached out to the minority community while I was in office and while I was outside office. My civil rights record is probably unparalleled in this state. We've brought cases for fire bombings, discrimination, all kinds of things of that nature, while I was attorney general and even now.

**Moore:** You said two out of 16 but you didn't mention what positions they held. The May 29th issue of *The Bay State Banner* says that you were asked specifically how you would create economic opportunity for minorities and you were quoted as saying, "I don't have instant solutions, but I care about people, I'll do it."

**Bellotti:** No, I went beyond that. What I did say in addition was that I would create economic opportunities, have buildings built, and encourage businesses to reach out to the minority community, work with banks for the Community Redevelopment Act. I said a great many of those things at that time. The only thing you're quoting is, "There are no instant solutions." I say that all the time. Because I believe there are no instant solutions.

****

**Brian Mooney:** Representative Flood, you've been a candidate for governor for about a year. Stories about you and your views have appeared hundreds of times in the news media. Yet here we are, 19 days before the Democratic convention, and by every objective measurement—polls, delegate counts and fundraising—you've been dead last since the day your candidacy surfaced. Don't you think Democratic voters are sending you a message that perhaps you don't belong on this primary ballot?

**Jack Flood:** No, I don't think that's true at all. First of all, I think you may be a little bit confused about the number of delegates but we will find that out on June 2nd. Second, I don't have a million dollars to go on television in running shorts which probably wouldn't be a pretty sight anyway! I don't have $100,000 of my own money to put into a campaign. I'm a middle class working person with a family.

The poll that came out today, which was on the news tonight, says a great deal about what's going on in the state. These three people are the best known people in the state. The more well known they become, the higher the "undecideds" go. Over the next several months when we get the 15 percent, when the money starts to come in, we can
get our message out. I believe those “undecideds” will change as soon as Jack Flood’s message gets out into the mainstream. One other thing. I may lose this election, but I’ll never lose my decency or my sense of compassion towards the underprivileged, towards the needy.

*****

Andy Hiller: Lieutenant Governor Murphy, in 1988 at his annual Saint Patrick’s Day breakfast, Senate President William Bulger said to you, “We can be a great governor. You take care of the ceremonies, I’ll handle the rest.” Where specifically in your political past have you demonstrated the strength that proves Bulger could only be joking?

Evelyn Murphy: Let me remind you that Mr. Bulger is now supporting Mr. Silber, not me. Let me say that one of my proudest moments was being in the courtroom against the oil companies of this nation, stopping the oil companies from drilling on Georges Bank when no one gave us a chance to do that. I was sitting there in court against the Justice Department, the Interior Department and nine oil companies of this country, and we got that injunction. I’m proud of that!

I’m proud of what I did in environmental affairs around blocking the Connecticut River diversion. I am proud of what we’ve done to build up the state’s Heritage Park programs. I’m proud of what I did in economic affairs around corporate childcare. I’m proud of what I’ve done to stand up on “choice.” It’s an issue in which women of this state have got to feel comfortable, and would feel far more secure with me as governor. Watch me stand up on issues. I don’t change my positions on the death penalty, on “choice.” I’ve supported prevailing wage. I’ll stand very tall on those issues that I believe in and want to fight for as a liberal, progressive and an activist in government.

*****
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Introducing Cesar Chavez
by Kerry Kennedy


It is a great honor for me to be here tonight to introduce Cesar Chavez. I am proud to stand with a man whose words and actions have opened our eyes and our hearts. The people whom Cesar represents are the people Robert Kennedy wanted to represent. When he stood beside Cesar, he knew he stood with a figure of greatness.

Cesar Chavez organized farm workers when the world said it was impossible and the growers reacted with malice. He succeeded when others could not because he has a special quality. Each generation produces a few such people. They awaken in each of us a vision of what we, as a people, can achieve. People with this quality are precious to all of us. We cannot afford to lose them.

The world cannot ignore Cesar’s sacrifice. The growers cannot overlook his suffering and politicians must heed his warning. Humanity always and everywhere shall be moved to action by a man who risks his life so that others might live. He has endured three great fasts. When I visited him with my brother and my sister on the 19th day of his 36-day fast, I was shocked to see his suffering. We begged him to eat. “It’s not a fast,” he said, “unless you suffer.” Seeing his suffering forced a question we should always be asking when we see injustice. Why? Why does he have to suffer? Cesar’s answer was clear. He suffered because the women, the men, and the children who pick the grapes in the San Joaquin Valley suffer too.

They suffer from one of the nation’s highest cancer rates. They suffer miscarriages and birth defects. They suffer because of pesticides. They suffer because of greed. These are the people, our brothers and sisters, who harvest our daily bread. With their hands, as poor and as oppressed as they are, they feed this nation. And this nation suffers a scar on its soul when we poison with pesticides the hands that feed us.

These workers have a right to live as well as a right to work. They give the growers their sweat but they do not owe them their lives. The day is coming soon when the poison of California grapes will no longer be washed by the tears and the blood of the workers in the field. When the 36-day fast began, Cesar explained that, first and foremost, its aim was the purification of his own body, mind, and soul. But if Cesar should feel a need to seek purification, what about the rest of us? No one has worked harder or accomplished more for the farm workers than Cesar Chavez. When we asked Cesar if there was anything we could do, he said, “Yes, there is something you can do. Boycott grapes!”
If Cesar Chavez can go for 36 days without eating, the American people can do without poisoned grapes. If Cesar Chavez can risk his life so that farm workers can live, then the American people can insist that these workers come back from their fields alive. What little effort it takes to perform these modest acts of justice; what great power we can bring to Cesar and the United Farm Workers as the boycott continues to spread from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

My family will never forget the effect that Cesar’s suffering and the suffering of the farm workers had on Robert Kennedy. Twenty-three years ago, when my father was in Delano, he addressed a crowd of farm workers. He said that when you are old and your back is bent from years in the fields, you’ll look up and you’ll see your grandchildren on their way to school. You’ll know how proud they are that you can say, “I was there. I marched with Cesar.” I look up now and I too am proud and moved, knowing that I have the privilege to say, “My father walked with Cesar.”

On Drugs: Views from Left to Right
by William J. Bennett

Following is an edited excerpt from “Drug Policy and the Intellectuals,” a public address by William J. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Office of National Drug Control Policy, December 11, 1989, in the Forum of Public Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government. Mr. Bennett’s address was co-sponsored by the Institute of Politics and the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

What I read in the opinion columns of my newspaper or in my monthly magazine, or what I hear from the resident intellectual on my favorite television talk show, is something like a developing intellectual consensus on the drug question. That consensus holds one or both of two propositions to be self-evident: first, that the drug problem is absurdly simple and easily solved, or second, that the drug problem is a lost cause. Each of these apparently contradictory propositions is false. Both are disputed by the real experts on drugs and both are disbelieved by the American people whose experience tells them emphatically otherwise.

The consensus has a political dimension which helps account for its seemingly divergent aspect. Some of the far right tend to assert that the drug problem is a problem of the inner city which essentially calls for quarantine. “If those people want to kill themselves off with drugs let them kill themselves off with drugs,” would be a crude but not too inaccurate way of summarizing this position, which has relatively few adherents.
On the left, we see whole cadres of social scientists, abetted by whole armies of social workers, seeming to take it as catechism that the problem facing us isn’t drugs at all. It’s poverty, or racism, or some other equally large and intractable social phenomenon. If we want to eliminate the drug problem, we must first eliminate the root causes of drugs, a hopelessly daunting task but one at which these same people happen to make their living. Twenty-five years ago no one would have suggested that we must first address the root causes of racism before fighting segregation. We fought it, quite correctly, by passing laws against unacceptable conduct. The answer to the question of the causes of racism was pursued and rightly so, but the moral imperative was to end it as soon as possible by all reasonable means—education, prevention, the media and, not least of all, the law. So too, with drugs.

Uniting these views which issue from opposite sides of the political spectrum is that inevitably, they are a policy of neglect, a position that is scandalous intellectually as well as morally. The drug problem is not easy, but difficult, in some respects very difficult, but it is not a lost cause. It can be solved.

One issue on which the left/right consensus has been attempting to build national sentiment is legalization. Most conversations about legalization begin with the notion of taking the profit out of the drug business. Has anyone bothered to examine carefully how the drug business works? As a recent New York Times article described, instances of drug dealers actually earning huge sums of money are relatively rare. They do occur, some do make huge sums of money. But most people in the crack business are low level runners who do not make as much money as people think. Many work as prostitutes or small-time criminals to supplement their drug earnings.

A lot of naive kids are lured into the drug world by visions of a life filled with big money and fast cars. That’s what they think the good life holds for them. The reality is far different. Many dealers wind up smoking more crack than they sell. Their business becomes a form of slavery: long hours, dangerous work, small pay and, as the Times dryly pointed out, no health benefits. In many cases, steady work at McDonalds would, over time, be a step up the income scale. What does straighten these kids out, as the article suggested, is not a higher minimum wage or less stringent laws, but the dawning realization that dealing drugs invariably leads to murder or to prison and that’s exactly why we have drug laws, to make drug use a wholly unattractive choice.

The big lie behind every call for legalization is that making drugs legally available would solve the drug problem. Has anyone actually thought about what the legalized regime would look like? Would crack be legal? How about PCP? Smokable heroin? Ice? Would they all be stocked at the local convenience store, perhaps just a few blocks from an elementary school? How much would they cost? If we taxed drugs and made them expensive, you’d probably still have a black market and the crime problems that we have today. If we sold them cheap to eliminate the black market, cocaine at say, ten dollars a gram, we would succeed in making a daily dose of cocaine well within the allowance budget of most sixth graders.

When pressed, advocates of legalization like to sound courageous by proposing that we begin by legalizing marijuana. But they have absolutely nothing to say on the tough questions of controlling other, more powerful drugs, and how they should be regulated. I did not have to become drug czar, as I am called, to be opposed to legalized marijuana. As Secretary of Education, I realized that given the state of American
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education and the performance of students in our educational system, the last thing we need is a policy that made widely available a substance that impairs memory, concentration, and attention span. Why in God’s name foster the use of a drug that makes young people stupid?

Legalization advocates deny that the amount of drug use would be affected. I would argue that if drugs are easier to obtain drug use will soar. We have just undergone a kind of cruel national experiment, the crack epidemic, in which drugs became cheap and widely available. When powder cocaine was expensive and hard to get it was found almost exclusively in the circles of the rich, the famous, the privileged. We saw it appear in Woody Allen movies. You probably saw it in Beverly Hills. Only when cocaine was dumped into the country, and a three dollar vial of crack could be bought on street corners did we see cocaine use skyrocket and this time largely among the poor, the disadvantaged. The lesson is clear. If you are in favor of drugs being sold in stores like aspirin, you’re in favor of boom times for drug users and drug addicts. With legalization, drug use will go up, way up.

When drug use rises, who benefits and who pays? Legalization advocates think that the cost of enforcing drug laws is too great. But the real question, the one they never ask, is what does it cost not to enforce those laws? The price that American society would have to pay for legalized drugs would be intolerably high. We would have more drug-related accidents at work, on the highways, in the airways. We would have even more loss in worker productivity. Our hospitals would be filled with more drug emergencies. We would have more school kids on dope and that means more dropouts. More pregnant women would buy legal cocaine, and then deliver more of those tiny, premature infants I’ve seen in hospitals all across this country. It’s a hard form of child abuse but under a legalization scheme we will have a lot more of it. For those women and those babies, crack has the same effect whether it’s legal or not. Add the cost of treatment, social welfare, insurance, and you’ve got the price of legalization. So I ask again, who benefits and who pays?

To listen to some legalization advocates, one might think that street crime would disappear with the repeal of our drug laws. They haven’t done their homework. Our current research indicates that most drug criminals were into crime well before they got into drugs. Making drugs legal would just be subsidizing their habit. They would continue to rob and steal to pay for food, for clothes, for entertainment. They would carry on with their drug trafficking, undercutting the legalized price of drugs, catering to teen-agers who, I assume, would be nominally restricted from buying drugs at the corner store.

All of this should be old news to people who understand one clear lesson of Prohibition. When we had laws against alcohol, there was, in fact, less consumption of alcohol, less alcohol-related disease, fewer drunken brawls, and a lot less public drunkenness. Contrary to myth, there is no evidence that Prohibition caused big increases in crime. I am not suggesting we go back to Prohibition but we should at least admit that legalized alcohol, which is responsible for something like 100,000 deaths a year, is hardly a model for drug policy.

On the merits of these arguments, the legalizers do not have a case. There is another crucial point I would like to make on a subject unrelated to costs or benefits. Drug use, especially heavy drug use, destroys human character, destroys dignity and autonomy,
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burns away a sense of responsibility, subverts productivity, makes a mockery of virtue. As our founders would surely recognize, a citizenry that is perpetually in a drug-induced haze doesn't bode well for the future of responsible self-government. Libertarians don't like to hear this but it's a truth that everyone knows who has seen drug addiction up close. Do not listen to people who say drug users are hurting only themselves. They hurt parents, destroy families, ruin friendships.

Let me remind this audience, here at a great university, that drugs are a great threat to the life of the mind. Anyone who values that life should have nothing but contempt for these drugs. Learned institutions should regard drugs as a plague. That's why I find the surrender of so many of America's intellectuals to arguments for drug legalization so odd and so scandalous.

For the past three months I have been traveling the country, visiting drug-ridden neighborhoods, seeing treatment and prevention programs in action, talking to teachers, cops, parents, kids. These are the real drug experts. They have witnessed the problem firsthand. But unlike some prominent residents of Princeton, or Madison, or Cambridge, or Palo Alto, these people refuse to surrender. They are in the community, reclaiming their neighborhoods, working with the police, setting up community activities, getting addicts into treatment, saving their children.

Too many American intellectuals don't know about this and seem not to want to know about it. Their hostility to the national war on drugs is, I think, partly rooted in a general hostility to law enforcement and to criminal justice. That's why they take refuge in pseudo-solutions, like legalization, which stress only the treatment side of the problem. But when the argument turns to the need for more police and stronger penalties, they cry that our constitutional liberties are in jeopardy. Yes, our constitutional liberties are in jeopardy, but not from drug policy. On this score, the guardians of our Constitution can sleep easy. Constitutional liberties are in jeopardy from drugs themselves, which every day scorch the earth of our common freedom.
Risking Old Age in America
by Richard J. Margolis

Following are three brief excerpts from Risking Old Age in America by Richard J. Margolis, published 1990 by Westview Press. Mr. Margolis, former Director of the National Rural Voter Project, was an Institute of Politics fellow in fall 1983 and spring 1984. A former journalist, his published works include books, numerous articles and monographs on contemporary politics and social issues as well as poetry collections and books for children. His current work-in-progress is a blend of autobiography and journalism focusing on how illness transcends the private sphere to become a public issue affected by public policy.

If we are to credit the federal poverty line, the elderly poor are different from you and me: They need less money. That is because they are alleged to eat less than the rest of us. We define poverty in this country by estimating how much a low-budget family must spend annually for groceries and then multiplying that sum by three, on the assumption that unaffluent households commit about one-third of their incomes to food.

The product of that multiplication becomes the official poverty threshold for a given year, or the level of annual income below which all households are deemed poor. Different allowances are made for different sizes of households and for different ages of household members — and there's the rub. Because the elderly are considered to be relatively Spartan food consumers, the line for elderly poverty has been set below that for other age groups. Depending on which groups are being compared, the difference can run as high as 11 percent.

To put it another way, it is possible for someone to live under the poverty line at age 64 and over it the following year, even if that person's income has not increased one cent beyond the cost-of-living index. In 1987, elderly poverty lines were drawn at $5,447 for a single person and at $6,872 for a couple. Had the thresholds been squared with those of the under-65 group — $5,909 for a single person and $7,641 for a couple — at least 700,000 additional older Americans would have instantly become “poor.”

We owe this strange state of affairs to certain pioneers of the mid-1960s who invented the poverty line — chiefly to nutritionists and economists at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and to statisticians at both the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Census Bureau. Their prime mover was Mollie Orshansky, a brilliant and admirably single-minded statistician at SSA who had already devoted the better part of a decade trying to devise a scientifically valid and reliable definition of poverty in the United States. At first, Orshansky told me in an interview, she had focused her research on children; later she began to concentrate as well on the elderly poor. “I thought of the old people as my children,” she recalled.

By 1965 her efforts had become fortuitously attuned to the politics of the period. Reflecting the Great Society’s hopes, and perhaps also its hubris, Orshansky noted in a seminal study that “if we can think bold solutions and dream big dreams, we may be able to ease the problem of poverty even if we cannot yet agree on how to measure it.”
As it turned out, agreement on measurements would follow quickly, and the resulting poverty thresholds would become fixtures on our social welfare landscape. From the standpoint of the elderly poor, the permanence has been a mixed blessing. On the one hand, the very existence of a quantifiable definition of poverty has provided reformers with a benchmark by which to assess social progress and retreat. It is now possible to count "the poor" of all ages; it only remains, as Orshansky had pointed out at the start, "to count the ways by which to help them gain a new identity."

Then, too, the poverty line has introduced a certain amount of order into our customarily chaotic national welfare system and thus into the lives of its beneficiaries. As long as we insist on means-tested programs, justice demands a consistent, fair-minded sorting device.

On the other hand, the poor overall and the aged poor especially have been locked into definitions not always relevant to their difficulties. Most Americans, even the poorest, no longer spend one-third of their incomes on groceries. In the two decades since Orshansky did her work, the costs of fuel and shelter have risen much more rapidly than has the cost of food. In consequence, the poverty definition has lost touch with current pricing realities.

If the food-cost formula were to be adjusted downward by eight percentage points—that is, if we were to multiply a low-budget family's annual food expenditure by four rather than three—the resulting threshold would be considerably more realistic. For an older couple in 1987, the poverty line would have been raised from $6,872 to $8,964.

There appears, moreover, to be little evidence in support of the USDA's long-standing belief that older persons eat less than the rest of us. It may be true that caloric demand goes down as age goes up. People in their seventies and eighties, on average, seem to require about two-thirds of the calories they needed when they were younger. But calories are not nutrients—they do not necessarily contain minerals, vitamins, and proteins—and there is nothing to suggest that elderly persons require fewer nutrients. Indeed, nutritionists have paid surprisingly scant attention to the Required Dietary Allowances (RDAs) of older Americans.

In his Pulitzer Prize-winning treatise on growing old in America, Robert N. Butler, the first director of the National Institute on Aging, noted that "the nutritional needs of the reasonably healthy elderly are really little different from those of younger people. They certainly need the same proteins, vitamins and minerals—perhaps in slightly smaller quantities, but even that is debatable."

Robert M. Russell, who directs clinical research at Tufts University's Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging, has gone a step further. In his opinion, "the aged required a higher quality diet" than do members of other age groups. But as Dr. Russell emphasized in our interview, "That is just my guess. The nutritional needs of the elderly have never been systematically examined. It will be decades before we get RDAs for the aged."

Still, Russell's hunch is widely shared by other physicians and dietitians, many of whom not unreasonably suspect that persons afflicted with brittle bones and chronic diseases may require a special dietary boost.

Whatever the merits or demerits of such arguments, it seems clear that the federal definition of elderly poverty is deficient on at least two scores. One relates to the budgets of the poor, the other to the nutritional needs of the aged. It is hard to escape
the conclusion that creators of the poverty line, for all their careful formulations, have inadvertently fenced out large numbers of the poor and thus deprived them of essential federal and state benefits.

Mollie Orshansky, now retired from SSA, would be the first to concede the point. Her "lines," she told me, "were really crude estimates of need. They were stated very conservatively." But she added, "Once you have chosen a variable, you have to stick with it. I set it up. That's the way it came out."

Thelma Poole was born in Sweden in 1910 and has lived in the same house in Minneapolis for more than half her years. It is a two-story, wooden-frame "fourplex," just a mile south of downtown, which she and her husband bought in 1938 for $2,700. The down payment took all their savings. "My husband was a chauffeur and a gardener for a very rich family," she told me. "We didn't have much money but my husband was smart with his hands. He fixed our house just right."

Her husband died in 1978: "I miss him terrible. Nothing seems to matter any more. All I cared for was... was... I can't think of the word. It's something like 'togetherness' but that's not it."

I had come to Mrs. Poole's house one wintry afternoon at the suggestion of Julie Gamber, a young woman who worked for the Minneapolis chapter of Friends of the Elderly. "It's not a pleasant place to spend time in," she had warned.

"This lady stays forever in one room. She never goes out. The other three apartments are empty, so it's not as if she gets any rent money. A few months ago a woman on welfare moved into some of the rooms downstairs. She didn't pay rent, she just squatted there with her children and her boyfriend. They played music all day and all night — the kind that thumps. It drove Thelma bats. When you're very old, you're helpless. People can just invade your space and do anything they please. The city finally got them out of there, so now the place is empty again except for Thelma upstairs. I'll take you there."

The front door is unlocked. We walk up the groaning staircase and enter a shadowy room that smells of stale food and urine. My feet find trash at every step — twisted cans, plastic dishes, crushed paper bags. Accidentally I kick something large and round, and it rolls across the floor. It is an empty bird cage.

"I used to have canaries." The voice is Scandinavian and lilting. "Oh, what music they made! Not like those tenants and their music. That wasn't music at all — just crazy crazy sounds."

Thelma Poole is lying beneath blankets on a bed in the far corner, her white head resting on a dingy pillow. "Oh, you are a tall one," she says to me, extending a skeletal hand in greeting. She must have been a beautiful woman. Even now her large eyes hold me. They are a deep blue.

Julie says, "Thelma, this gentleman is writing a book. He wants to know how you are getting along in your house."

"Getting along? Well, you see me here. It is a good house. When we bought it, it was just a ramshackle. I said to my husband, 'This house looks like an old pirate's nest, but to us it's a palace.' My friends, oh, how they made fun of it! They wanted to know how
Domestic Issues: The Times They Are A'Changin'

in the world we could buy such an old ramshackle. But later they kept quiet. They didn't have anything, you see, and we had this house, a little piece of the United States, and when I woke up I could step out on my own little lot.”

Mrs. Poole doesn't step out anymore. The doors to her kitchen and bedroom seem permanently shut, and the room we are in, the living room, is indeed the one in which she does all her living. For food Mrs. Poole depends on Meals on Wheels, which delivers two meals each weekday. She does not eat on weekends. Her monthly social security check is mailed directly to the bank where she has a checking and savings account, as are her fuel and tax bills. Mrs. Poole is not much bother to the rest of us. She has outlived all her close relatives; she has no telephone. People from Friends of the Elderly and other agencies look in on her from time to time, but beyond cheering her up and making her comfortable, there seems little they can do.

The house, meanwhile, is slowly reverting to its ramshackle state. There are leaks in the pipes and holes in the plaster. Minnesota storms have cracked several windows and torn away some of the roofing as well as many of the gutters. Nothing gets repaired. One sees a reverse symbiosis at work here, in which house and owner simultaneously deteriorate, growing less and less capable of protecting each other. It is not an uncommon condition in America. Among persons seventy-five years old and older, some 70 percent still reside in their own homes and nearly half the owners have incomes below the poverty line. In tabulations made during the late 1970s, about one-quarter of such dwellings were found to have “persistent deficiencies” such as leaks, unvented room heaters, and inadequate plumbing or electrical wiring. Deficiency rates in rural areas reached 35 percent.

We lack the programs and institutions needed to allow these determined homeowners to age gracefully in place. In Thelma Poole's case, where helpful measures seem feasible, none has been taken. Surely tenants could be found for the vacant apartments downstairs; surely portions of their rent could be paid in essential services — in maintenance work around the house, for instance, and in home care for Mrs. Poole. Such a plan does not appear farfetched, yet it would require initiatives and arrangements for which no agency at present, not even Friends of the Elderly, seems prepared to take responsibility.

So Mrs. Poole remains trapped in her cage. Her alternative — the only real option society has granted her — is to surrender her body and soul to a nursing home. It is a recourse at which I gently hint as we take leave. Wouldn't she receive better care, I wish to know, in a different kind of place?

The question astonishes Mrs. Poole. “Why should I want to leave my house?” she finally asks, her eyes opening very wide. “No, I think I die here.”

There may be a hidden formula at work in every government welfare program: The weaker its commitment to the poor, the more vague its procedures and the less accessible its bureaucracy. From the beginning, vagueness has been a peculiar feature of the Medicaid program, virtually its signature. The very idea seemed to materialize overnight as an afterthought tacked onto Medicare; it was something Wilbur Mills had
shrewdly guessed the Congress could live with. No one on the Hill or in Lyndon Johnson’s White House ever took time to think through the enormous technical difficulties that lay ahead.

The original Medicaid measure mentioned "skilled nursing homes" just once, as one of five "basic" services Medicaid patients would be entitled to. On all related matters Congress maintained a sphinxlike silence. How were reimbursement rates to be set? To what standards of care might nursing homes be held, and who would stick up for the residents when the standards were violated? Such questions, it was casually assumed, would be answered by each state in separate negotiations with the nursing home industry.

The arrangement seemed convenient, although — or perhaps precisely because — it left federal power largely out of the picture. As the social analysts Robert and Rosemary Stevens have observed, "Congress had passed a program of massive proportions and minimal federal accountability."

Much of what has occurred since can be seen as a series of fitful efforts to introduce federal accountability into the Medicaid program. Under pressure from Congress, the courts, and the public, succeeding administrations in Washington have revised Medicaid nursing home regulations at least once every decade, but each fresh version has turned out as toothless as the last. In consequence, the Medicaid program today bears the Scarlet Letter borne by all welfare programs in America: It is a second-rate endeavor for persons perceived as second-rate citizens.

Everything the federal government does betrays its reluctance to make a firm commitment to those who must live in nursing homes. The monotonous parade of studies and reports, the mountebank regulations, the careful neglect of its own data, all these reveal a bureaucracy paralyzed by indifference and mesmerized by its own jargon.

Is it any wonder that state agencies and inspectors often seem as confused as their elderly constituents? A private consulting firm hired by HCFA in 1985 to analyze nursing home inspections reported "a wide variance in how individual states decided upon what to cite . . . Several states cited deficiencies that in other states were presented as recommendations."

The Institute of Medicine’s study on the quality of care in nursing homes was aimed primarily at government and nursing home administrators, yet the institute felt called upon to include a fifteen-page "Glossary" in which it defined 118 different terms used in extended-care circles. In another section the writers decoded 34 "Acronyms and Initialisms." These were eloquent tributes to the triumph of jargon over accountability, which has pervaded every level of the national care-giving enterprise.

To be ignorant of the lingua franca is to live in a foreign country. My family and I got that feeling when we took my father-in-law to the nursing home in New York. The administrator there did his best to explain to my mother-in-law the kind of care her husband, a very sick man, was slated to receive. "We’re a combination SNF and HRF," he told the perplexed woman, "so we’re able to place your husband in a swing bed." (An approximate translation: "We’ve been certified as both a skilled nursing facility and a health-related facility; that’s why we’re putting your husband in a room where he can get both kinds of care.")
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My mother-in-law asked if her husband would be eligible for Medicaid assistance. “Certainly,” replied the administrator, “but you’ll have to take the PRI to the District Office to get Prior Approval. They’ll tell you how much to spend down.”

Just about everyone who lives in a nursing home is old enough to remember Bob Hope’s wartime quip: “Where does an alien go to register?” It seemed funny at the time.

*****

Black History Revisited
By KRS-1 and Glenn Loury


Panelists included “Rap” songwriter and producer KRS-1; Glenn Loury, Professor of Political Economy at the Kennedy School; Georgette Watson, Founder and Director of Boston’s Drop-a-Dime Program; and moderator Christopher F. Edley, Jr., Professor of Law at Harvard Law School.

Q: What we have to realize is that every single one of us in this room came from the same path. We got lost to one another, maybe skin color changed due to climate, things like that, but we’re all from the same path. You talk about African history; we all come from Africa. That’s where original man came from. Because we were lost to one another, when we found each other again we didn’t understand each other and we fought. We still fight. Look at the dead young men, young people slain daily, all the deaths in Roxbury. The question I want to pose to the panel is, what do you think of, hope, for the future? What do you think about ending apartheid in America as well as in South Africa?

KRS-1: In such a situation, the only solution is revolution. There is no soft way or talkative way or debatable way to handle the devil. Satan only knows himself and therefore he must be destroyed. You cannot compromise with apartheid. You cannot try to improve upon apartheid. It must be totally wiped out. Once we have a clear understanding of what America is all about, then we’ll have a clear understanding of what our goal in wiping out this system is all about.

Q: What kind of society do you think we would have if blacks had the proper education in their schools, if they learned about their history, about lynchings, if they knew that when a black woman got raped and went to court, she went to jail. What kind of people do you think that sort of education would produce?
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I'd also like to ask Mr. Lowry a question. Where white people go to school, education is for white people. White people learn white history. Certain school systems in the country are already predominantly black. Why, in a school system 90 to 99 percent black, do people need to learn about Italy, France, Iceland, Norway, the Lapplanders? We need to learn about everything other than the culture in which we are living.

To me, your arguments don't make any sense. Black people have died for this country. Black people in the Army die disproportionately. We don't receive any benefits for the money we pay in taxes. If we pay ten cents on each dollar and we don't get one cent back in services, then your argument on taxes is ridiculous.

Glenn Loury: What argument? I didn't make an argument on taxes. What we ought to get down to is what this argument is really about. What the anger is really about. I don't think I said anything that was that outrageous. I said that if you want to teach kids black history, as black people let's start teaching them. They are our kids. What is there to argue about there?

Now, who are white people? I mean, I've heard a lot about white history and white people. Who are these white people? I know about people from Italy. I know about people from Ireland. I know about people from England. I know about people from Spain. There is, perhaps, an understandable racism implicit in this construct.

Let me tell you what I believe. I'm not asking you to believe it, but I would ask that you listen to it. We're all in this together. Down underneath, we're all the same people. The problems are human problems. The condition that we're in is a human condition. A lot of people smoke crack cocaine. They're not all black. The problem is people smoking crack cocaine, not black people smoking crack cocaine. Alright? This Charles Stuart character kills his wife. He's a deeply troubled man, caught up in evil, in the devil, if you like. Sin is a part of the human condition. The problem is sin, not skin.

How did black people get here? Okay, if we're going to talk about it, how did black people get here? As a matter of fact, we got here because our African brothers sold us into slavery. Hey, man, those Europeans did not go into the interior of West Africa and bring out 20 million people. They did not do that. Okay?

The problem is that there are people doing evil. The problem is that there are people whose lives are desperate or vacant. We have a responsibility as a decent society to address ourselves to those people. People. Not blacks, not whites, not Jews, not Greeks. People!

KRS-1: Definitely. This is a human problem, human situation, people dealing with people.

We have to define the difference between civilization and technology. I point this out because Africa, original Africa, was a civilization. The original ancient Africa did not have the idea of slavery. The original ancient Africa did not even have the idea of jails. They did not know the idea of war. The place was renamed by Alexander the Great, renamed Alexandria. That is where you have metaphysicians and thieves and liars such as Aristotle.

All through our history as a peaceful, spiritual people we have been stepped on by the uncivilized. Civilization is an advanced stage in social development. Technology is the science of mechanical and industrial arts. When technology takes over civiliza-
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ignorance. When ignorance takes over a society, we have false education. We have false politics. When ignorance takes over religion, religion will justify slavery.

The African, in this country and throughout the world, has been stepped on, put out of power, because at one time he ruled the world. We, all of us, should be teaching our younger brothers and sisters, maybe even our mothers and fathers, about African history. African history should be in the public school system because the entire curriculum of the public school system originated in Africa. If you’re going to teach science, math, art, you should know the origin of science, math, art.

Alexandria was known for its knowledge. It was raped and destroyed because of its knowledge. The public school system needs to know that, needs to know to worship and love Africa, needs to teach all races about Africa. It’s not enough for black people to know about Africa. White, black, Oriental, Indian, everybody needs to know about Africa. Because everybody has benefitted from Africa.

Q: I feel it might be beneficial to inner city education if those students who do well could be compensated for tutoring those who do not do as well. I feel it would be important for students to become involved in teaching other students in those areas where they do not do so well. Would you comment?

KRS-1: I think your ideas are very well put together. Yes, students should try to teach other students. A student is nothing but a teacher and vice versa. But we must understand the nature of what has happened. We are missing the point of what has actually happened to the educational system, what has actually happened to the African in this country. We’re totally missing the boat. We’re trying to come up with the solution. Forget the solution. The sickness is not in the act. The sickness is in the consciousness.

What the consciousness of the student tutor is all about will determine how he’s going to teach the other student. Even if a student wrote a book on African history, you only know half when you know the author. When you read the book you have to know where the author is coming from. If you don’t know the consciousness of the author, you are only reading half the book. We constantly crack our bibles and read the authorized King James version of the Bible and we still say it’s holy. But it is his version of the book. He took it and rewrote it.

I think your idea is good but at this point we should understand who is being attacked and who’s doing the attacking. We must get rid of the negative consciousness before we can have such ideas.

*****
No Aid for Legal Aid
by David Weller '92

In the 1960s mainstream America's worst fears were realized when Blacks, Hispanics, women, homosexuals, and Native Americans came to the collective understanding that the political system was not working for them. Many adopted the credo of the Black Panthers' Huey Newton, "political power comes through the barrel of a gun", which he borrowed from Mao Zedong. Revolution could only occur on the streets, not in the courthouses or legislatures.

The new approach of the disenfranchised forced new thinking in Washington. The government's solution was simple: bring the protesters into the fold and provide them with a legal avenue to change. An aide to GOP representative Hal Sawyer says, "If you expect people to solve their problems other than by doing it on the street, you have to give them some way to do that, and the judicial system is that way." The law, of course, was always intended as the final avenue of redress, but roadblocks jeopardized that ideal. The poor lacked the ability to protect many of their rights because they could not afford attorneys. Says Gerry Singsen of Harvard Law School: "The fundamental problem of the justice system is that you get what you pay for."

In 1965, Lyndon Johnson's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the centerpiece of the War on Poverty, launched the Legal Services Program. Legal Services, with the strong backing of the American Bar Association, provided legal assistance to the poor. It advised clients of their rights and provided free representation in family, employment, discrimination, landlord-tenant, and other non-criminal matters. By 1967, OEO was funding 800 offices across the country. Under Congressional pressure in 1974, President Nixon established the non-profit, independent, Legal Services Corporation (LSC), unfettering the program from executive control.

Through the 1970s, Legal Services for the poor grew steadily — by 1980, the program's $300 million budget supported 1450 local offices staffed by 6200 attorneys and 2800 paralegals. Liberals and conservatives alike were attracted to Legal Services; it was their bipartisan coalition in Congress that ensured the program's growth despite an antagonistic Nixon Administration. In the Senate, for instance, Republican Warren Rudman of New Hampshire continues to be an outspoken supporter of the program.

But on the eve of the Reagan Revolution, with the New Right in ascendancy, Legal Services was headed for the "big government" dumpster. "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers," declares Dick the Butcher in Henry VI; but it may as well have been Edwin Meese commenting on Legal Services in 1980. To certain members of the
Republican right-wing, Legal Services has been a hotbed of social activism staffed by liberal do-gooders.

Some Reaganites put the cessation of legal assistance to the poor near the top of their agenda. For instance, the conservative Heritage Foundation's recommendations for the Administration urged abolition of the Legal Services Corporation. Howard Phillips, director of the Conservative Caucus, and once Nixon's point-man in an effort to curtail the program, formed the National Defeat Legal Services Committee. "LSC is a morally leprous organization," Phillips, a Harvard graduate, once said. "Reforming it is like reforming Auschwitz: you don't want to make it work better, you want to eliminate it."

In addition to Reagan's close ties with this powerful conservative block, the President may have had personal reasons to cut Legal Services. In the 1960s when Legal Services was part of the Office of Economic Opportunity, one of its most aggressive offshoots was California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA). In some of its lawsuits, particularly those filed by farm workers, CRLA named Governor Ronald Reagan as a defendant. Reagan tried to thwart the program by commissioning aide Edwin Meese to investigate alleged abuses, but a panel of out-of-state judges called the report "unfair and irresponsible" and dismissed all 135 citations of impropriety.

In the first budget of his administration Reagan asked Congress to eliminate Legal Services. Congress continued funding, but not before cutting the corporation's outlay by 25 percent, to $241 million. In seven of his eight budgets, hoping to reduce the federal budget deficit, Reagan requested zero funding for the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). Each year, Congress ignored his proposal and pushed through the program, a process The Washington Post describes as "annual, bitter warfare."

But LSC did not remain invulnerable to the Reagan Revolution. Reagan, rebuffed in his attempt to disband LSC, instead appointed members to its eleven-member board who were known to have fundamental objections to the program. The President avoided potentially controversial confirmation hearings in the Senate by appointing board members while Congress was in recess. President Bush also exercised the power of recess appointment in selecting his first board. Gerry Singsen, a vice president of the Corporation from 1979 to 1982, served concurrently with the Reagan appointees for six months. "It was a drastic change in 1982," recalls Singsen, who now heads the Program on the Legal Profession at Harvard Law School. "The Reagan boards were not professionally responsible."

Unable to eliminate LSC, its enemies decided to weaken the corporation from within. The board of directors, which The New York Times described as a "wrecking crew," hired two outside law firms in 1988 to lobby for a decrease in its already reduced budget of $305 million. The lobbyists were fired the day reporters got hold of the story. LSC funding, in constant dollars, was already 40 percent lower than in 1980. W. Clark Durant III, the agency chair, used a federalist argument to push for smaller expenditures: "My feeling is that if everyone assumes that [legal aid] is a federal responsibility, the opportunity to develop alternatives simply will not be encouraged." But program critics — most notably the LSC's own board — still were working to completely disband Legal Services.

In 1989, the LSC board hired Charles Cooper, a former Meese aide, to write legal opinions arguing that the corporation is unconstitutional; his briefs claimed that because the President cannot remove corporation members in the middle of their terms,
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Legal Services violates separation of powers. Then-LSC President Terrance Wear wrote to The New York Times that constitutionality is an important matter for the board to investigate because the members are liable if their job is “unlawful.” Daniel Greenberg, who worked in a Legal Services office in New York for sixteen years, says the charges are bogus: “The charges are not based on legal reasoning but on ‘what strategy can I think up to undermine the program.’” Says Greenberg of President Wear: “I think he’s the only one in the country who doesn’t think LSC is constitutional.”

In the summer of 1988, conservative groups changed tactics, and instead of advocating the destruction of LSC, proposed reform. Among the parties involved in shaping the new approach were Howard Phillips (organizer of the National Defeat Legal Services Committee in 1980), Phyllis Schafly, the Conservative Campaign Fund, and the 700 Club.

These and other groups combined to form the Legal Services Reform Coalition. Their proposed changes included eliminating Legal Service support centers which provide advice to LSC attorneys on legal issues pertaining to the elderly, housing, and other specialized areas; restricting LSC attorneys from taking on class-action suits, redistricting cases, or census challenges; prohibiting suits that “promote homosexuality or abortion”; and establishing competitive bidding in the dispersion of LSC grants.

Important concerns lie behind the political grappling between the conservative detractors of the program and its liberal defenders. The impetus behind the conservative attack on Legal Services has been a belief that LSC “funnels millions to agitate social policy,” reporting that LSC has been involved with Planned Parenthood, the American Civil Liberties Union, the San Francisco Sex Offenders Task Force, and other liberal organizations.

Critics argue the LSC does more than help individual poor people who, say, are challenging an eviction. Instead, LSC lawyers, through class-action suits and lobbying, attempt to win broad changes in policy and implement the social agenda of the immoral left.”

To LSC supporters, providing lawyers to the poor makes the courtroom open to all. When all have access to the justice system, Singsen says, “the interests that are served are those of law and order.” The program’s lawyers contend that such access follows from norms of social justice. “If you want to insure justice, as a society we make fundamental decision whether court access regardless of ability to pay is a universal right,” says Greenberg.

LSC supporters hold that they are pursuing no grand political agenda. “Those charges are bullshit,” contends Singsen. He says that successive allegations of abuse and ideology “are almost always unsubstantiated. Anyone not looking through rigid ideological glasses sees this.” The Reagan boards of the LSC had eight years to investigate the alleged liberal agenda, says Singsen, and according to him, they only came up with a handful of documented examples. The Christian Science Monitor writes: “The answer is better auditing, not guerilla warfare. Conservatives shouldn’t confuse legal services with class warfare.”

The New Right’s proposals for reform of LSC have been largely ignored by Congress. Many Congressmen are skeptical of those that have called for LSC’s abolition from its inception. “I trust this group of people about as far as I can throw the [Capitol] dome,” says Senator Rudman. Among the reform proposals promulgated by conservatives in
1988, all but one were thrown out by the Senate. The suggestions would “have the effect of harassing, demoralizing, and overregulating” local programs, says Representative Robert Kastenmeier (D-WI).

The Senate did allow LSC to consider adopting competitive bidding, but barred any changes until the Reagan board was gone. Congressional leaders felt that the board would try to use any reform to strangle itself; the lobbying for decreased funding and the solicitation of legal briefs on the unconstitutionality of LSC furthered this distrust. Such uneasy feelings were exemplified by a letter to President Bush from the deans of five leading law schools — Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Columbia, and the University of Chicago. The deans urged the President to replace the Reagan-appointed board of directors, writing that it was “undermining the proper functions of the corporation.”

Congress rejected the argument that Legal Services lawyers be restricted from handling “political” cases such as redistricting suits. Congressmen recognize that LSC-represented cases may certainly have political implications. But Legal Services is not independently initiating these cases; indigent people who feel their rights have been violated (in the case of redistricting, the right to one-man, one-vote) should be able to, like any American of means, take their gripe to court. It is for the court to decide whether the person’s case is valid.

However, sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between a lawyer fulfilling the legal needs of individuals from one trying to effect larger change. Conservative groups have objected to such successful LSC cases as a suit establishing illegal aliens’ constitutional right to free public education in Texas and a suit compelling Pennsylvania to provide transportation to a female inmate seeking a first-trimester abortion.

Cutting Legal Aid creates unmet, non-criminal, legal needs which may have a particularly large impact on the indigent, argue LSC defenders. A well-to-do person is not usually subject to eviction or the removal of public benefits, for instance. “Poor people’s lives are inextricably tied to legal issues,” says Greenberg. “They are much more likely to be involved in the law than you or me.” According to Time, nearly 80 percent of the legal needs of the indigent go unmet.

A New York State Bar report of October found that the state’s poor face about three million legal problems per year without legal help. One third of respondents said they had at least one housing dispute in the past year without legal assistance. Large percentages of those surveyed said they also desired legal help in the areas of public-benefits maintenance, consumer fraud, and health care, but could not get it. Forty-three percent of the state’s Legal Service offices said they must at times turn away clients.

Whether the current dearth in funding, now at about $300 million, will continue is unclear. Unlike his predecessor, Bush has no strong feelings on Legal Services. Bush could care less about LSC,” writes Fred Barnes in The New Republic. Bush came under a lot of fire from such places as The New York Times for waiting one year before replacing the largely antagonistic Reagan board.

Bush first put forth the name of M. Caldwell Butler for chairman. Butler, a former representative from Virginia and long-time friend of Legal Services, was a popular choice among the eclectic likes of Newt Gingrich, Henry Hyde, Warren Rudman, John Sununu, columnist David Broder, The New York Times, and most liberal Congressmen. But Butler fell at the hands of the New Right. A dozen conservative lobbyists, led by Howard Phillips, interviewed the nominee and concluded that, as Fred Barnes writes,
he was "too pro-LSC and too pro-choice [on abortion]." The White House withdrew Butler.

Bush, it seems, has tried to navigate the way between the pro-LSC forces, led by the American Bar Association, and the far right. The results are not yet clear. The board, according to Singsen, is basically untested." As of late February, the board had only met once.

Meanwhile, others look for alternatives to fill the gap left by low federal funding. Several states have considered requiring lawyers to perform free, pro bono legal work. Recently a New York committee recommended that all attorneys devote twenty hours each year to pro bono work, or to pay their way out of it. Currently, 17.7 percent of the nation's private lawyers volunteer their services. Others, like the organization HALT (Help Abolish Legal Tyranny), advocate simplifying the law so the need for attorneys will be lessened. Simplification measures are being investigated by the LCS. Forced pro bono work seems unlikely to gain acceptance. A more plausible tax on attorneys to fund the LSC is also being suggested.

In an era of big budget deficits, discretionary domestic programs such as Legal Aid have little chance of getting more funding. Says Greenberg: "Do I think it is a feasible goal [to provide lawyers to the poor]? Yes. Do I think we as a society have the commitment to poor people under the law? No." As long as the government has "more will than wallet," the poor will continue to go without basic legal assistance.

*****
Having had the good fortune to have been one of your number, I know of the commitment here at the Kennedy School to the study of strategies for governance, international cooperation and global development. I am convinced that you would wish to confront the manifold challenges presently facing the international community. I join you here today in a process of reflection of the breathtaking and unprecedented changes taking place around the world and of their implication for the “global village,” especially the continent of Africa. These changes present enormous complexities and pose a direct intellectual challenge to the academic community.

As we behold the advent of a new century, it is understandable that the world should view most contemporary global issues with optimism. But optimism and hope must be anchored in reality. I doubt that it is shared by the many people, many countries, of the Third World. Given Africa’s economic situation, it certainly is not shared by the people, the countries, of Africa.

The just-concluded Eighteenth Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, successful as it was, left a rather unpalatable taste in the mouth of many Africans. As a representative of an African Government, I know too well the prevailing discrepancies that exist economically worldwide, know the growing worries on the African continent, know that the envisaged global economic prosperity may very well not be relevant to Africa. The Cold War is over and Africa lost.

The problem of global economic disequilibrium and “dual-track” development must be overcome. When John Stuart Mill wrote, in 1859 in On Liberty, “the people who exercise power are not always the same people over whom it is exercised,” he painted an uncanny picture of today’s relationship between developed and developing countries. Developed countries dictate policies and panaceas for troubled Third World economies—thus “exercising power”—all too often forgetting that those who suffer economic deprivation and retarded growth and development, those who feel the burden of the policies are not the creditors, the rich, the benefactors, not the ones with the power to influence global economic conditions.
Without doubt, the 1980s have been the most critical decade in African economic history. While other developing regions are making rapid strides in raising per capita income, expanding food production beyond domestic requirements, building industrial strength, making significant advances in export markets for manufactured goods, Africa is far behind. The dreams of building self-sustaining and self-reliant economies, as envisioned in the Lagos Plan of Action from the 1980 Extraordinary Summit of Heads of State and Governments of the Organization of African Unity, are now overshadowed by immediate concern about saving vast numbers of the population from the scourge of hunger and famine.

The salient features of the African predicament need to be recalled as a reminder of the scope, the enormity, of the crisis. Switzerland today has the world’s highest per capita GNP, $25,000; Africa has the world’s lowest, a dismal figure below $100 per annum. When the Lagos Plan of Action was drawn up, it postulated a projected seven percent per annum growth. From 1980 to 1984, the actual growth rate was 0.6 percent; the rate between 1984 and today marginal, more often downward than toward an upward spiral. Coupled with population growth well over three percent per annum and drastically reduced food production, we can see that the cumulative growth rate has actually been negative.

Developed countries have a tendency to blame the situation on African domestic policies, thereby minimizing the influence of natural disasters, such as drought and desertification, and the unbalanced political and economic structures inherited from colonial regimes. This disposition is worsened because it is not easy to elicit the sympathy of the information and propaganda industry which is controlled by the developed countries.

The evolving economic pattern, particularly the situation in Eastern Europe and changing East-West relations in general, holds very dire implications for growth and development in Africa, politically and economically. The political impact may seem less, even unobtrusive, in the prevailing global climate of lessened tension and diminishing conflicts, but the economic impact will be enormous. Africa is presently undergoing stringent economic reforms, most of which have been and will continue to be risky. The additional stress of developments in Eastern Europe will not be to Africa’s advantage.

Eastern European states have instantly become the favorites to receive Western aid and assistance. Post-war Europe rebuilt its economy from the largesse of the Marshall Plan; Eastern Europe is now set to reap a similar windfall with the establishment of the new European Bank for Reconstruction and Development in Eastern Europe. The $12 billion multilateral development bank reflects a commitment which has never been made to Africa. A United Nations document, prepared for the just-concluded Special Session, points out that “business investment that otherwise would seek cheap labour from the developing countries will turn instead to the low-priced but relatively skilled labour markets of Eastern Europe.”

While the emerging global economic pattern lopsidedly favors Eastern Europe, some salutary effects in the political field have been brought about by changing East-West relations, including an unprecedented inclination to jointly address the question
of regional conflicts. In Africa, the most visible and remarkable consequence of such collaboration was the successful negotiation of Namibian independence related to which was the Cuban withdrawal from Angola.

The end of the Cold War does have some very obvious and positive implications for the African continent. It not only marks the end of East-West rivalry in Africa but, more profoundly, the ideological freeing of some African states. With the easing of international tensions and the benefits accruing therefrom, part of the resources saved from the cost of armaments and military security could be converted and channelled to urgent environmental questions.

In contemporary world politics, security and economic situations are often skewed, not always deliberately, with the result that Africa absorbs a disproportionate impact of the negative burden of such skewing. Four areas are of particular concern:

a) The demise of ideological barriers and the wish to secure allies around the globe translates into the loss of concrete support—diplomatic, political, economic—for some African states.

b) The end of the limited military and economic support to forces still fighting for self-determination in Southern Africa.

c) Western economic assistance, however miniscule, meant for African states will now be diverted towards the emerging (and white) democracies in Eastern Europe.

4) Foreign, largely Western, investment, long promised to African states in return for their implementing painful structural adjustment programs, will prove even more elusive as resources rush into Eastern Europe and even the Soviet Union.

There must be new opportunities for selective leverage to deal with new realities. As part of its conclusion, the seminar on Africa held at the Carter Presidential Center in Atlanta in 1989, stated that only a multilateral Marshall Plan for Africa could address the need for a comprehensive program of aid, investment, debt relief and trading opportunities, a proposal similar to that resulting from the 1986 United Nations General Assembly Special Session on the Critical Economic Situation. Yet, neither the 1986 Special Session nor the Eighteenth Special Session adopted such a plan.

The Eighteenth Special Session did reach a consensus on the basis for sound and future international cooperation and development—but it does not spell freedom for Africa. An obvious paradox exists in the pronouncements of developed states and what they were willing to commit to in the long term. They acknowledged—in different languages—the imperative need for affluent countries to play an important role in sustaining and supporting programs of economic recovery and development while also insisting that developing countries have the prime responsibility for encouraging domestic resource mobilization and foreign investment. The developed countries were reluctant to commit themselves to the yearning of developing countries in several key areas, primarily on the questions of debt, net transfer of resources, and scientific and technological development.

We cannot divorce the fundamental issues that we face globally in terms of growth and development from the standard of living and per capita income of any people and still consider ourselves honest. The concept of "sustainable development"—the crux of international cooperation and development—while applicable to every member-state in our "global village," is primary and fundamental to developing countries. The
least developed states remain on the lowest rung, their prospects for upward mobility hampered by lack of resources but especially by lack of political commitment by those states higher up the ladder.

The challenge for many African states is both to their ability to overcome limitations and impediments and to fight off marginalization due to skewed and unfavorable global economic policies. The injection of variables arising from political considerations and developments, such as those going on in Eastern Europe, only exacerbates Africa’s difficulties. The long-term dangers of stagnation and continued imbalance assumes an awesome proportion because today’s deferred costs become tomorrow’s ravaging political problems, social unrest and internecine conflict.

I foresee no expansion in the $800 to $850 million bilateral assistance Africa gets from the United States annually, nor any increase in assistance from other Western states, given their current preoccupation with Eastern Europe. What has long been a cliché, “African solutions to African problems,” has assumed more relevance and meaning. Besides strengthening indigenous managerial and entrepreneurial capacities, General Obasanjo, my former Head of State, has argued that Africa must, as a cost-saving measure, shed its perennial dependency on expatriate advisers and look inward, primarily at its collective agricultural policies. Freeing itself from the burden of massive food importation would result in the release of added resources for development of infrastructure and social welfare programs, would at least refurbish existing decrepit structures.

Seemingly intractable underdevelopment is well known; less accepted is that African leaders have, during the past decade, acknowledged their share of responsibility and in many cases demonstrated their willingness to take extremely difficult measures. The West, however, having abandoned colonialism, seems to have found a new way to reinstate it, tying Africa to their apron strings, rendering whatever minimal assistance is required to prevent states from going over the economic precipice but never enough to enable them to become truly independent. It is a matter of deep regret that this standard, so glaringly applied to Africa and other developing areas, has not been applied to Eastern Europe simple because they have “renounced” that Western enemy, “Communism,” as if the West will respond only to something akin to a religious conversion to their own ideological beliefs. I hesitate to bring in the matter of race, but it is hard for Africans, especially in those countries that have always held democracy as their goal and encouraged at least a mixed economy, to understand why there is no enthusiasm, let alone any reward.

When we speak of Africa, we refer to millions of lives—not inanimate objects. Global policies must be predicated on moral grounds in the knowledge that lives are involved, must be humane in the understanding that human desire for the values and benefits of a “kinder and gentler society” remain eternally universal. Finally, let us remember that no human condition remains permanent. Tomorrow the have-nots may become the have-nots the have-nots the have-nots. History is replete with such paradigms.

*****
Fox Butterfield: The Chinese government does not regard me as their closest friend so \textit{The New York Times} was somewhat reluctant to send me to China while things were going well. So, I didn't get there until shortly after the tragedy of June 4th and was not an eyewitness. Therefore, tonight I want to talk about the background to what happened, about something that I think was very important but which has been generally under-reported by the Western press and not written about very widely by scholars but which is critical to what went on—the growing role of nepotism in China.

Our ignorance about China is not new. We’ve always had certain comfortable myths about it. American missionaries in the nineteenth century dreamed of converting all those heathen Chinese to Christianity in a single generation. American businessmen have dreamed for years of those hundreds of millions, now billions, of customers in China. Since 1949, people on the left in America have dreamed of revolutionary Maoism. Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon dreamed of the “China card” and playing it against the Soviet Union. We’ve had other myths too. The Communists ended all crime in China, abolished it. It was an article of faith among Chinese, and among foreigners who studied China, that the Chinese Communists had ended nepotism, put an end to the kind of family influence peddling which had helped bring down the Chinese nationalists, the Kuomintang.

Yet, when I went back to China early this summer I was stunned by what I found because openly, everywhere I went, I came across Chinese who were the sons or daughters of senior officials who are now in positions of power themselves. I was amazed at how open it was. It was affecting Chinese politics, building up enormous resentment among other Chinese, particularly among students, and it became an issue in the democracy movement. Power in China has become more and more personal, more and more involved with the family. I think that helps explain what happened last spring.

In June, shortly after the massacre, Deng Xiao Ping gave a very important speech which you probably have heard about or read. There was one line in it which struck me, because Deng said, “We had nowhere to retreat to.” Several senior Chinese that I’ve talked to have said that we have to understand that line very personally, that Deng
really meant it literally, that he and his family, like the other noble families now in China, felt they had nowhere to retreat to, that they were fighting for their very survival. So we have a reversion to traditional patterns in China. As the Party has broken down, as Marxism has broken down, we have a return to what the Chinese call feudalism. That's a very important factor to remember in looking at what happened in China this spring.

Ya Sheng Huang: I want to talk about two things tonight. First, as someone who saw how the student movement started and then saw its brutal crushing, I want to talk about the general mood and the changes in mood of the students and of the general public in Beijing during those two very incredible months, mid-April to the beginning of June. Second, I want to talk about the factors that shaped the ferocious manner of the government's response.

The student movement started soon after the sudden and untimely death of Party General Secretary Yao Bang Hu. Students felt a particular emotional bond with him, not only because he was considered liberal and open-minded, but also because the students felt a sense of responsibility towards him. They knew that it was their demonstrations in 1986 and early 1987 that brought about his fall. The mood at that time was one of mourning and genuine remorse. On the day of the funeral, the students gathered outside the Great Hall of the People even though Tiananmen Square was sealed off. They managed to sneak in the night before.

Things began to change sometime around April 22nd and the day before, the 21st. On that day, the police used force to disperse the crowd in front of the living headquarters of the Chinese leadership. The mood then became one of confrontation. Students were going around the city distributing leaflets and arguing passionately about their case, their version of the story vis-a-vis the stories that were printed in the official media. They were also soliciting both moral and financial support from the public. The public was very, very supportive, and the students knew that. The confrontational mood reached its apex on April 26th when a virtual guilty verdict on the student movement was published in an editorial, authorized by Deng Xiao Ping himself. It declared that the student movement was anti-Socialist with the intention of overthrowing the current regime. That shook the campus of Beijing. The language of the editorial was that of the Cultural Revolution. It was very ferocious in its attack, very heavy in its judgment.

The next day there was a heavy deployment of police. The students anticipated a confrontation, and many students wrote their last wills and left them in their dormitories. To many of them, it was going to be the day of doom. The demonstration got support from the residents of Beijing. They actually offered to break the police lines. The students were very defiant, singing songs. In order to prevent infiltrators they held hands all the way. The tension lessened a little bit after they broke a few police lines. The climax came as the students reached the eastern tip of Chang An Avenue when they clearly knew that the government was not going to crack down. At noon the government spokesman declared that the government was ready to have a dialogue with students which was one of the students' major demands. Then the mood became one of euphoria.

Between April 28th and May 13th, a sort of uncertain mood prevailed because the dialogue with the government was disastrous. The government didn't show good faith and sincerity. They were using delaying tactics in order to defuse the student
movement. They were not willing to give genuine concessions. There was increasing frustration on the part of the students which led to the fateful decision to launch a hunger strike on May 13th. Even when the hunger strike was going on, the students were still hopeful, because the basic assumption of a hunger strike is that the government will care.

Then, on May 20th the students were met with martial law. I was on the Square when martial law was declared. The decree came through the public loud speaker system. That was one of the most incredible things I experienced. There was dead silence for a while on the Square and then students started crying because they had hoped that the government would wake up to reality. The student leaders locked themselves in a van and then threatened to commit collective suicide if the soldiers reached the border of the Square. What they didn’t anticipate was the reaction of the Beijing residents. After listening to the martial law decree, the Beijing residents—and this was very, very well known to the outside world—they stopped the trucks, they stopped the Army.

After that day the mood became a little more relaxed because the people were convinced that the troops were not coming in—some troops actually were moving away. There were then a few days of large demonstrations when the atmosphere was almost festive. People were celebrating a victory. There was a feeling that the people had succeeded in defeating the imposition of martial law. But then came the massacre, which came largely as a surprise, and was followed by a very sudden mood change. People were shaken—to say the least. It’s very hard to describe. There were acts of insanity and acts of courage. Insanity in the sense that people would throw themselves in front of tanks out of total frustration and total madness. It was that sort of change.

In talking about the government’s response. I’ll do so in the role of an analyst. The central paradox is how could a regime which was considered relatively enlightened and progressive resort to this medieval approach to modern problems? How could it resort to wanton killing of its own students, its own citizens? I would argue that the element of institutionalization and personalization of Chinese politics enabled decisions like this to be taken outside the formal decision-making bodies of the Chinese regime. A bunch of elderly leaders, retired, with no formal decision-making powers, people in their eighties, sat around and decided that they had to impose martial law. One thing led to another. The April 26th editorial led to the imposition of martial law. The imposition of martial law led to the massacre. During this whole period, when the Chinese Communist Party was experiencing the gravest challenge to its authority, no emergency session of the Central Committee was held. After May no full Politburo meeting was convened to discuss the response to such a challenge. The decision was taken outside the formal decision-making bodies and it led to this tragedy.

How could a decision of this importance be made by people who have no concrete stake in the outcome of the decision? One argument is that it was Mao’s legacy, his personalized style of leadership. But I argue that the manner of the political reforms launched by the reformers themselves was also responsible. They were driven by this pragmatic ideology that always cherished ends over means, substance over procedures. They would use political reforms to advance their political objectives without taking into account its effect on the procedures and on the institutions which are violated.
The weakness of the political process was compounded by the problems of economic reforms. The economic reforms in China were going forward without a clear agenda and the result was what we call a hybrid economic system. Bribery and corruption was the requisite oil that greased its operation. The problems of inflation and the corruption generated by the economic reforms led to the widespread disillusionment and social discontent that Mr. Butterfield referred to. The Byzantine manner of Chinese politics is unchanged. The years of reforms not only made these problems but guaranteed the paralysis of the Party as an institution in a moment of crisis. The tragedy of Tiananmen Square happened not because the Chinese Communist Party was too weak or too strong but because as an institution the Party was too weak. If there are any morals in the tales of Tiananmen, this is one.

Al Pessin: Let me start by going through some of my most vivid memories and then I want to make a couple of other asides in a slam-bang analysis at the end. One of the most vivid memories is of the student marches. A lot of discussion has been going on lately about the massacre and the crackdown. Those are obviously important issues and I don’t mean to downplay them in any way but let’s not forget about the amazing, in many ways wonderful, nearly two months from April 15th to June 4th. I attended student marches of a type which I think no one could claim they ever expected to see happen in China.

Another thing I remember from the demonstrations were the police who were sent out. Were they sent out to stop them or were they not sent out to stop them? I guess we’ll never know. Ostensibly to stop them but the police lines broke very easily. There was a wonderful picture that one photographer took of all the policemen’s shoes scattered all over the streets because they weren’t wearing combat boots or any other kind of riot gear.

I also find myself often thinking about the hunger strikers that I interviewed. The hunger strike is something you don’t hear very much about anymore in the wake of the even more cataclysmic events which followed. But these hunger strikers were amazing. It is very special to talk about them to an audience of mostly students because these are people who are your age, involved in the same sort of day-to-day pursuits that you’re involved in. They went out there on the public square and they starved themselves.

Let me move to June 2nd when the troops came jogging in, unarmed, young guys, with their tunics, their overcoats tied around their waists, their white T-shirts clinging to their bodies from sweat. In the light from the streetlights you could actually see the sweat glistening off their short, cropped hair. They came in not really knowing what they were doing or what the situation was. They were turned back very easily by the crowd and they straggled back in the direction from which they had come just shaking their heads, wondering what had happened to them.

Now, my slam-bang analysis. One of the most lasting things that happened was that many Chinese people, millions of Chinese people, said, “The King has no clothes.” They said, “The Party doesn’t represent us.” Everybody knew that but nobody was saying it. They shot down lots of myths and found out in the process that millions of other people felt the same way. That has been repressed in the short term but one question for the future, certainly for this forum, is whether it can be suppressed in the long term. Looking to the future, it seems that the Chinese leaders are not taking note
of that. I think that portends badly. It certainly makes China appear to be a very unstable place and makes its future very difficult to predict at this stage.

Richard Roth: Listening to my colleagues on the panel, I feel that I have a very curious perspective on China which I am going to share with you tonight. It's highly inexpert, not terribly well-informed. It's based on a very brief period of time, really just a small snapshot.

I had been in the Square with my cameraman from about nine o'clock on Saturday night, just four months ago, on the monument that Al has described as being "not the place to be." Around midnight, we came to the conclusion that we wanted to stick around. I think there is a factor here that makes people in our profession do that. It's not just because it's important. You realize you're watching history unfold and that you're going to be able to talk about it, tell people about it. There's nothing that any reporter likes to do more than tell a good story. But it's also because it's so interesting. I think every reporter who was in China at that time felt that about the story. Everything that was going on confounded people. It was all a surprise. It was all brand new. It was all interesting. It was a story with extraordinary texture, with wonderful people to meet, with events that were difficult to keep up with, with rumors that had to be chased down—in a society where rumors were impossible to confirm or deny. The story ended, or turned at least, in such an extraordinary way. That night many of us felt that the story was at a turning point.

Sometime after midnight, at one, two o'clock in the morning, we began to hear the gunfire that had been going on for some hours to the south and primarily to the west. A little later I recall looking to the south and seeing tracer bullets arcing over the sky and realizing that there were troops to the south.

There was churning activity all during this time, people running into the Square, running out, fires being started, the sound of gunfire, occasionally some students running in to try to find reporters, holding up hands covered with blood. We knew that there was tremendous violence, that people were being wounded or killed, but at that point we hadn't seen it in the Square itself. I decided to call New York and tell them that I had the feeling something was up. I didn't want them to put me on the air because I didn't know what was up at that point. But when I got them on the phone they started recording a tape. This is what we in television call serendipity. A few minutes after I got them on the phone, the troops started marching very quickly past us into the Square, perhaps ten or fifteen feet away from where my cameraman and I were standing.

My soundman, who was on the ground, said, "I think they've seen you." I looked up to realize he was right, that two soldiers were beginning to pull the camera away from him. An instant after they had pulled the camera away, as I was backing away, a couple of soldiers came up and pushed me into a rack of bicycles. I managed to get up, was pushed back down, kicked a bit, then pulled up by two soldiers with whom I could not communicate except to insist that I would go. I wanted to tell them know that I was willing to be obedient. I was somewhat chagrined some hours later to realize that my words were reported as, "Oh no, oh no, oh no," when in fact I felt that anybody that knew me well would have known I was saying, "I'll go." The officer in charge hit me which surprised and silenced me. Then I was dragged into The Great Hall of the People.
About five o’clock in the morning, I was briefly treated by a Chinese medic and then was reunited with my cameraman. Neither of us knew what was going to happen next. What did happen was the assault on Tiananmen Square. We heard tremendous noise, the sound of small arms fire, the sound of artillery, and saw flashes of light. About 5:45 a.m., we were put into separate jeeps and driven diagonally through the Square.

We saw tanks and armored personnel carriers lined up and some artillery pieces. What I did not see and what my cameraman did not see, because we compared notes very carefully after we were taken to the Forbidden City, were any bodies. It was terrible for us to have been so close, to be witnesses to what happened in Tiananmen Square and yet not be able to provide a definitive word on what actually did happen. I can’t tell you whether the assault on Tiananmen Square included a massacre of civilians. I know that certainly many people were killed outside the Square and that the assault to the Square involved many deaths. The last I saw of the Square was people leaving peacefully. The next time I saw the Square, it was empty of people except for troops. I did not see any bodies.

I have no analysis that I want to offer you but I would suggest something that is perhaps worthy of being discussed, or wondered about, by all of us. In seventeen years at CBS News, I have never been part of a story that has generated more public comment, more interest, more passion on the part of Americans than this story. I’m not entirely sure why. It had great symbolic content. It had excitement. It was a great news story. Something profound had happened. It’s fascinating to me, and encouraging, that it’s been a story of such enduring interest to the American public.

*****
Q: You said that there are no markets in Peru and no democracy, just elections, that poor and rich alike are affected by the Peruvian political and legal system and that changing the system would bring investment and economic development so that in, perhaps, two hundred years, Peru's economy would look like the United States economy, the Japanese economy, or the economy of any other developed nation. What is your evaluation of the distance between the rich and the poor in Peru now and what do you think it would look like with the changes in the political and legal system that you are proposing?

Also I would like to hear something about your proposal for the political system because all of your examples about the functioning of the democratic system in Peru, and in the United States, were related to the economic sphere—how to invest, how to do business. You haven't spoken about representative democracy and particularly about how Peru would get closer to the ideals of democracy, the essence of democracy, understood here in the United States and everywhere in the world as liberty and equality.

Hernando de Soto: What is not working is the political system. Impediments, obstacles to achieving growth, the lack of facilitative law, directly relate to how law is produced, how rules are made. The framework of rules, the political mechanisms which underlie the policies, are extremely important. The fact that Peru has underdeveloped politics and rule-making is the crux of the matter and the lack of property rights is the crux of the inequality.

We propose, first, that legislators be directly elected by the people. Now a candidate must be on a list of a political party and the party decides the order in which candidates are listed. The candidate's loyalty, once elected, is directly to the rulers of the party. It doesn't matter too much because the legislature only produces about one percent of the rules.

A congressman from Wyoming has to be a very popular fellow in Wyoming. When he gets to Congress, he must vote the way his constituents tell him to vote. He has staff to tell him where things are going. In Peru there is no such accountability or responsive politics because going into politics depends directly on the good will of party leaders, not on the people.
Second, we propose that rule making should be an open system the way it is in Japan and in North America, like the informal system in Peru, a transparent system where the making of rules is not reserved to a bureaucratic or political oligarchy. We propose rules of law. We already have a majority in Parliament to strive to pass them.

Third, access to property rights is extremely important. If people cannot register the possessions they have, cannot use them as collateral, cannot use them to make contracts, to gain economies of scale, to get out of informality, small enterprise, small scale, then people are not going to develop. The registry system has been working for the last six months at a rate about 25 times faster than the one we inherited from the Spaniards about 150 years ago.

Those are our main proposals on how to start modernizing the Peruvian economy.

Q: You defined the informal sector as people who are breaking the law in order to achieve legitimate objectives. You contrasted that with the activities of drug traffickers. But the sale of mind-altering drugs is not in itself necessarily an illegitimate activity. I'm from North Carolina and we probably have a bigger percentage of our farmland planted in mood-altering drugs than you do, but we don't have a Communist insurgency and we don't have death squads. Even in countries like the United States which are governed by the kind of legal system that you describe, the problem with drug-trafficking seems to raise a lot of the same kinds of issues. There are no enforceable contracts. Business transactions are enforced by violence if necessary, and of course in Peru and the Andes in general, this is an even more serious problem than it is here. Does the policy analysis that you have come up with have any bearing on the question of decriminalizing drugs.

De Soto: That is an excellent observation. I think the distinctions, nevertheless, are very important. First, in the areas of the United States where people may start producing drugs, especially where they produce marijuana, there are property rights. Maybe they are growing a forbidden crop, but the property rights question is settled. Second, citizens are registered, are known through their driver's license or one way or another. Third, that doesn't stop them from getting credit or stop them from reaching courts for any minor or other types of offense made against them or made by them. There are degrees of illegality.

Informality is not an absolute situation. Nobody, even in Peru, is totally informal, totally outside the law. In the United States, there is nothing that stops even a marijuana grower from having access to credit. All he has to do is lie about the crops. In Peru, even if a person were growing something else, he wouldn't be able to get that credit because only 3.7 percent of the land is titled. Therefore, a Peruvian will go for those crops that have the highest price at the farm gate. So you are right to the extent that the problem is not exclusively legal. But the degree of illegality in Peru, the degree of unprotection from the system, is much greater. It has an enormous effect on the way people can associate to do business.

Q: What is the political feasibility of your proposals for Peru. Your position on economic freedom as an alternative for developing countries was strongly defended by Mario Vargas Llosa, the candidate who lost the last Peruvian election and who wrote the foreword of your book. What are the consequences of his political defeat, for the future and for the application of your ideas?
de Soto: Mr. Vargas Llosa, as far as I am concerned, made the same mistake as Mr. Lance Taylor. He read it as a neoconservative manifesto for Latin America. It is not. It has very little to do with the reality of your country. It has much to do with the reality of my country. The way I interpret it, he saw what we have tried to say in *The Other Path* as a manifesto for economic freedom.

What I'm trying to emphasize this evening is that the informal sector does have economic freedom but that economic freedom means nothing without the legal underpinnings, like property rights. In a certain sense, even the medieval ages had economic rights, even jungle tribes in Peru have plenty of economic freedom—but nothing happens because there are no transactions among people. There is none of the infrastructure that is required to make contracts, for people to get the right kind of technology to do the kinds of things that people need to do to be able to accumulate capital. That kind of infrastructure is not in place in Peru, so it's not a question of talking about freedom, but talking about efficient government that can allow economic freedom to work.

Mr. Vargas Llosa's argument was very different. Anybody who has been following what's been occurring in Peru knows that we've been on different sides of the political spectrum for the last two years. We have been in opposition to Mr. Vargas Llosa's policies because we feared that it looked too much like lip service for the existing capitalist class.

What we have been talking about, which is already a fact in Peru, has begun slowly. We do not expect it to take two hundred years, as somebody said before. Two hundred years is what you took in the Western world, because, as far as we're concerned, you weren't actually conscious of the institutional reformations which were necessary, which came about in a spontaneous way. What we're trying to find is the deliberate formula for making the transition from what we now call mercantilism to capitalism without having to go through all the costs of the Industrial Revolution that you actually went through.

Moderator: Do you want to respond to that?

Q: Yes. The point that I wanted to emphasize is that while you are in favor of the establishment of decent property rights, the examples in the book are mostly about informals. The code word in the book is that the informals should be made formal. Well, that's nice, but it is by no means a sufficient condition for economic growth. There's a big implicit leap there which says that the process of formalization, if it's not a goal in and of itself, has to be instrumental to economic growth. It really isn't clear, any place in the book, how this process is supposed to work.

Q: Democratic accountability and property rights are very nice, and may be desirable. I can think of Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Asian countries which are typically unaccountable, authoritarian, but are growing very rapidly. The United States is, arguably, over-accountable—as somebody said earlier. Switzerland may be over-accountable. I don't see what the linkage, the mechanism is. It's just not at all clear.

Secondly, if you think that it's important to escape the informal sector, to provide access to credit for the informal sector, are you proposing some sort of land reform for poor people which would provide them with access to credit, collateral to borrow against, some sort of radical land reform or something like that which would achieve that goal?
de Soto: You have asked two questions. Let me begin with the second. We think that to a great degree the land reform has already been accomplished. Most of the land in Peru happens to be in informal hands. I tried to indicate that 90 percent of it is but that it's not enough that it should be in their hands if they cannot use it legally, if they cannot use it by integrating the formal sector. Albert Einstein comes to mind when I hear what Professor Taylor and what you have to say. Einstein once said, "The fish knows little about the water in which it swims." Our perception is that Westerners take for granted their legal system and their institutions, inasmuch as they have caused growth.

We spent a lot of time writing about the informal sector in order to indicate how very enterprising people can be, people who work without the kinds of institutions you've got—enforceable contracts, courts that work, accountability by government. The difference between people who go to work in Miami or go to work in California and become productive and people who go to work in Peru and are unproductive happens to be that environment. We do not pretend to be able to explain exactly how there is a cause and effect relationship in the same way that most doctors cannot explain the cause-effect relationship of most of the medicines with which they actually are able to cure people. It's enough to know that the medicine happens to cause growth or happens to cause curing when it comes along.

Secondly, we're not preaching integration into the existing formal sector because the existing formal sector obviously doesn't work. It doesn't even work for the relatively rich, who are, of course, relatively poor compared to your rich. It doesn't work for anybody. We're talking about the creation of a new formality.

Third, as to your examples of Asia. I think that those are very, very important. In a place like Hong Kong, where the governor is not elected but appointed by Her Majesty, the Queen, in relation to the laws that are created, there are 5,000 or so grassroots organizations, administrative councils, executive councils, different anti-corruption devices for feedback, institutions very similar to yours. Hong Kong has, if I'm not mistaken—you may correct my figures—something like $12,000 GNP per capita. Japan, which has the accountability I've been talking about, has about $19,000 to $20,000 GNP per capita. Countries with authoritarian control that you've talked about, which do not have that accountability, are somewhere between $3,000 and $4,000 [GNP per capita]. I believe Taiwan is around $3,000 and Korea somewhere around $4,000. Therefore, when we talk about the Asian tigers, there are big tigers and there are small tigers. The big tigers happen to be the accountable ones. It is not that good economic policies do not cause growth, obviously they do—look at the case of Chile. Nevertheless, Chile is still very small, about one-tenth GNP per capita compared to any Western country.

If you add the right kind of institutions to good policies you will get much better policies and you will get both homogeneity and equality in application of the law that is required for a market economy to work.

Q: Maybe it goes the other way around. Maybe the democratic accountability is a luxury that can only be afforded once you've become rich. But on the way to becoming rich you have authoritarian regimes.

de Soto: That is, of course, easier to say in a country where you've got your democratic rights protected than it would be if you lived in one like mine where your democratic
rights are not protected. Do not wish upon my people what you wouldn’t accept for yours.

Q: This question is for Professor Taylor. Latin Americans have been trying to develop for the last 30 or 40 years. In your response to Mr. de Soto you basically said, “You have your history wrong. You don’t have the basics of a developing economy in the model that you’re proposing.” But perhaps Mr. de Soto is trying to be just one Latin American, desperate with 30 years of going nowhere, just trying to come up with a solution. Perhaps he is not a super, leading economist but is saying that perhaps the answer is in the political system, in the... civility of laws, etc. Perhaps you might enlighten us as to what Latin Americans should do to develop.

Lance Taylor: If I knew I’d do something about it. No, I think the answer would have to be something like the following. Latin America, prior to 1980 when the serious problems began... I agree absolutely with Señor de Soto that the reasons they happened had to do with over-rigidity of institutions and a too-strongly entrenched class structure at all levels. But prior to 1980, Latin America as a region was the fastest growing developing region in the world. That stopped in 1980 but nonetheless the growth record in Latin America since World War II has been good, on the whole, compared to other places. Certainly far better than Africa.

Second, as to the level of incomes which Mr. de Soto was discussing. The rapid growth rate of Korea and Taiwan are historically unprecedented. Thirty years ago Korea and Taiwan were extremely poor for a variety of institutional reasons, receiving lots of foreign aid. Yes, they are still relatively poor, but 30 years of 7 percent and 8 percent growth rates is not to be taken lightly. What you need to ask, insofar as you can draw comparisons between countries, is what are the elements in Korea and Taiwan, in Japan a generation earlier, in Sweden around the turn of the century, in Germany around 1850, what are the elements that went into their growth?

It is pretty clear that in none of those cases, not even Hong Kong which benefitted very strongly from import of the Shanghai textile industry after the revolution in China, do you have the sort of empowerment, formalization of informals, lots of enterprises which start small running around getting technical progress, economies of scale, and growing. You don’t have that story. You have another kind of story which involves state intervention in a variety of ways and a much more complex history.

My final point is that neoconservative reading of the book is not an exclusive of either Vargas Llosa or myself. It’s the way the book has been read. One can argue that the book should have been read in another way. Adam Smith, for example, is read very badly in this century compared to what he was actually talking about. But if the book has been read in that way, then either everybody is very badly misinformed or else the message has been changing. It could be some combination of the two.

****
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More than sixty years ago, thanks to my high school English teacher, I memorized long passages from Coleridge’s “The Rime of The Ancient Mariner.” The mariner, you will remember, stops a guest on his way to a wedding and compels him to listen to his story. The offended guest cries,

‘Hold off, unhand me, gray-beard loon!’

Eftsoons...

I’ve always loved that word—eftsoons.

‘Hold off, unhand me, gray-beard loon!’

Eftsoons his hand droptd he.

He holds him with his glittering eye—

Coleridge tells us that the feast is set, the musicians already playing, the bride is like a rose, but the mariner will not release his listener:

The Wedding-Guest he beat his breast,

Yet he could not choose but hear;...

When I think of the power of a tale-teller to compel attention, I often recall these lines, for it isn’t every wedding feast that mariners, ancient or modern, be they ever so driven or compelling, can keep you from. It’s no simple matter to get people to listen, and if they do listen, to make them heed, or finally, to lead them to agree. These are some of the difficulties at the heart of the contemporary condition for by now we have learned to hear and not to hear, to be present and absent at the same time.

There are hundreds of ways of talking about this modern condition, terms like “the new urban universe,” “a transformation of human consciousness.” Marx, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche and their followers and interpreters have given us a vocabulary for these “modern” or “post-modern” or “post-post-modern” phenomena. I prefer to keep the point of view of a writer, a novelist. Writers instinctively duck away from terms like “alienation,” “the last man,” “the rebellion of the masses,” because these limit their personal examination of human affairs. Such formulations tend to get in a writer’s way. They are distracting and distraction is the word by which I designate the main difficulty. We are in an unbearable state of distraction.

If you are in a trade that depends on your ability to obtain and hold attention, distraction, massive and worldwide, is the hostile condition you are called upon to overcome. Distraction, a great noise as I sometimes think of it, is a barrier through which your writer or painter or musician or thinker must force a way. Distraction is a term for
the ordeal of getting people to attend to what is essential, and attention is universally solicited. A writer, therefore, finds himself competing not so much with other writers as with all the great social and political powers which continually claim a portion of our minds.

Having begun with Coleridge, I turn to his friend Wordsworth to remind you of his famous statement that poetry come from "emotion recollected in tranquility." But in this vast common field of agitation, the mind has to fly very far to find a tranquil perch. Emotion becomes unstable where distraction is so widespread. Vast enterprises live on our attention and contrive to get it, often more by foul means than fair. Every day we are pushed to buy cars, cosmetics, health pills, pain killers, sleep remedies, invited to bank, to invest, to relieve our itching, to subscribe to publications, to join clubs, to take holidays abroad, to buy laptop computers. I am not pointing here to marketing and consumerism but accumulating evidence for an interpretation of the effects of these business activities, and other activities, on our mental life and culture.

A professor in California (who seems to have nothing better to do) estimated that on an average weekday The New York Times contains more information than any contemporary of Shakespeare would have acquired in a lifetime. I am ready to believe that this is more or less true although I suspect that the information of an educated Elizabethan was better integrated than that of the Times reader. I can't imagine that anybody would want to read every single page of a daily newspaper, go through it from end to end. I grant that an obsessive reader, if he were retired or lying in the hospital or in despair, might do just that. With the Sunday Times, it would be totally impossible and would, if you could do it, constipate your intelligence for a long time to come.

We must assume that the paper is read selectively and that the principles of selection, if well founded, would cast doubts on the facts as reported, raise questions about the policies of the paper, the integrity of the reporters, the views of the commentators and columnists. There are those who believe that the plethora of information contained in the Times or any other newspaper or news magazine has little real value. Indeed, there are dependable observers who hold that newspapers do not give Americans any true picture of the world, that at most they disclose only the version of the world being offered to the public.

As to the television screen—I am concerned with the overall influence of TV on Americans, not because of what it induces them to buy, but because it focuses them on nothing in particular. Television brings solitaries into an environment of millions, allows them to participate in the life of the whole country. It draws the atomized consciousness back to the whole, not to a community but to the beckoning suggestion of a community, leads, by the magnetism of a promise of unity, into wild diversity. Perhaps what we actually look to television for is distraction in the form of reality. We reel about in a world that resembles the real world. Pointless but intense excitement holds us, a stimulant powerful but short-lived.

Remote control switches permit us to jump back and forth, mix up beginnings, middles and ends. Nothing happens in any sort of order. The act of channel switching may be understood as an assertion of independence or superiority or ultimate control, a declaration of autonomy. It is as if an individual were declaring that he is not among those who will really be affected by anything, declaring not merely that the networks
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will never get him but that he is free from all influence, that he leads a sovereign existence in himself. Supremely immune, he is the gingerbread man nobody can catch—but there is always the ultimate fox waiting around the corner. Distraction catches us all in the end and makes mental mincemeat of us.

Why is the crossword puzzle in the daily Times on the book page? So that minds full of ill-assorted and superfluous knowledge can test themselves by remembering facts they had no need to know in the first place. The educated reader is most likely to turn to the book review and then divert himself with the puzzle. People are proud of their ability to "put it all together" in spite of the turbulence that surrounds us. Long ago I wrote that what this country needed was a good five cent synthesis. But what of those who can't come up with a synthesis at any price, are flooded and capsized by inconsequence, disequilibrium, delirium?

Trying to make sense of TV discussions of the drug problem, it occurred to me that television itself may be driving people to smoke crack or take cocaine. The individual sovereignty or mastery game is becoming impossible and the defeated players seek ultimate separation in narcotics. The confluence in recent weeks of the two press and TV topics, drugs and education, suggest a similarity and possibly even an identity of causes.

The media, with their mysterious technology, can teach us to read very little. They themselves are part of the excitement they generate. They can bring no light to the enormities they report. In wracking our nerves they seem to be meeting a wide and even universal demand, a discernible appetite for abominations. We can't seem to get enough of political assassinations, Ethiopian famines, hostage taking, planes exploding in flight, drug wars, cities in anarchy, Cambodian genocides, the fate of the boat people, Chinese soldiers shooting into crowds. The events themselves are not, of course, the fault of the media although the media do at times play a part in the events and can be manipulated by terrorists or by governments and seduced into spreading disinformation and propaganda.

These terrible events are presented also as entertainment and must give way to the major concerns of the networks. In a medium preoccupied with entertainment, they can't be dwelled upon for too long. They are quickly used up. What is the average duration of a disaster? What is the rate of turnover for government scandals or Wall Street crimes? Who can still remember the Pentagon Papers? When they have had their moment, the scandals must go. We are not asked or encouraged to extract any meaning from them and we can't expect the media to educate the public by following up on these stories.

Not every horror can find a place in the horror gallery. In 1932-33, Stalin decided that he must destroy the Ukrainians. His agents seized everything edible and took it away. There were, at a minimum, seven million deaths; some estimates go as high as fifteen million. All this is affirmed by research conducted at the Ukrainian studies program here at Harvard. Reports of this famine were denied in The New York Times in 1932-33. Since our principal paper of record did not report this genocide it has no place in the American horror gallery. Attempts have been made to install it there, but our media have, for the most part, balked at those attempts. I read recently that a documentary on this mass murder was rejected by most of the public television stations in the country
and that when the film was shown at the New York Film Festival, it was then criticized in the *Times* as "frankly biased." The article I read asked how it was that Moscow was able to muzzle the Western media, enthrall Western intellectuals, and entice Western governments? For half a century the story remained entombed. When a major university study and an award-winning film exposed the genocide and its cover-up, the U.S. media do not respond. Why?

One answer is that this crime as already fifty years old. What are we going to do with a fifty-year-old crime, even of such dimensions? Besides, relations between superpowers are improving so the papers want no truck with an old genocide. The Ukrainian famine has no place in the media's information plus entertainment plus public policy version of twentieth-century history. A possible explanation is that the public agitation level is already very high. What would everybody do with yet another horrible crime? What is the point of inscribing the Ukrainian holocaust on the continually melting surface of public memory? Perhaps later generations will want to study the historical record, but we cannot do much with it.

Some of you will be saying, "We have heard this speaker describe an atrocious condition. What does he propose to do about it?" I propose absolutely nothing. Description is my only task. The problems raised are psychological, religious, heavily political. If we were not a media public led by media politicians the volume of distractions might somewhat diminish. It is not for writers or painters to save civilization and it is a vulgar error to suppose that they can or should do anything but what they do best. The mariner keeps the guest from the distractions of the wedding. He holds him with his glittering eye. The wedding guest listens, despite himself, and waking next morning is a sadder and a wiser man. This may be taken as a model for the power of the poet. The writer cannot make the sun of distraction stand still, nor part its seas, nor strike the rock till it yield water. But he can, in certain cases, come between the madly distracted and their distractions, do so by opening another world to them— for the work of art is the creation of a new world.

*****
Peril and Promise
by John Chancellor

Following are edited excerpts from the question and answer period following "Peril and Promise," a public address by John Chancellor, senior news commentator for NBC-TV, on May 18, 1990, in the Forum of Public Affairs of the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Mr. Chancellor's address was based on his recently-published book, Peril and Promise: A Commentary on America. His appearance was co-sponsored by the Institute of Politics and the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Kennedy School of Government. Marvin Kalb, director of the Center moderated the event.

Marvin Kalb: Why is it that the political campaigns in this country have become so trivialized when the candidates know that the problems are there and ought to be addressed?

John Chancellor: The trivialization of campaigns results from fear and technology. Most politicians know that if they cast a courageous vote, say on taxes, then when they run for reelection some very skilled television ads are going to be made and used against them. Certainly members of the House of Representatives and the Senate know that. The technology of television has instilled a kind of cowardice in our politicians that is strangling the country. In some ways you can argue that it's legitimate, that they're afraid of losing their jobs. I don't think this country is well-served by people who are so afraid of losing their jobs that that's all they think about. And in order not to lose their jobs all they do is raise money. Members of the U.S. Senate up for reelection this year, 1990, were raising money at the rate of $143,000 a day! Now that's a busy day! Does that leave any time for you and me? There certainly is not much time left for courage. Money as well as technology—money more so—is corrupting our politics. It's time to get the tin cup out of politics, to go to public financing for campaigns. It's not perfect, but it's a lot better than what we have now.

Q: I heard that we now spend more money on aged people than on young people. I always thought of the United States as favoring the young, spending more money on them. In your talk you said that older people are richer. Most older people are out of the work force, by tradition forced to retire at 65. You mentioned national service, drafting young people for volunteer service. Why not include older people—65 and beyond? They have money and talent and a lot of experience. Let them help the country. They can do a lot of things.

Chancellor: I have always believed that if you had a military draft and only drafted people over fifty, there wouldn't be any wars! I think there's merit in what you've said. Hundreds of thousands of Americans who are retired and over 65 are re-entering the work force where they are really desperately needed because they're educated workers. The schools are turning out workers who are so uneducated that businesses are spending billions of dollars to train them. So I accept your idea as a perfectly reasonable one.
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The age 65 is just an arbitrary selection for retirement. It was a con game set up by Otto von Bismarck, Chancellor of Germany, about 100 years ago. There was great popular demand for some form of social security. Finally, grumbling and shuffling, Bismarck and his people agreed to give workers social security to begin at age 70. Life expectancy in German factories was age 40. A con game! The age was later lowered to 65. It's an arbitrary age, especially given the advances in medicine. So, making use of older Americans is a very good point.

Q: You mentioned that our priorities are a little out of whack, that Americans have misconceptions about how strong we are or how weak we are. Whose responsibility is that? Is the press partially to blame for that situation?

Chancellor: I think the press is partially to blame for that, my part of the press, commentators, editorial writers, columnists, the part of the press that just covers the news, probably more responsible. I do note that in that abysmal presidential campaign in 1988 with George Bush and—I keep forgetting the other guy's name—nobody made that speech. Nobody said that America should draw on the strength it has. You don't hear that from politicians, or from many business people. It's rather a novel argument which is amazing to someone who thinks that people ought to be telling us how strong we are. Reagan said that we were strong but, aside from defense, he never really laid out our basic economic strengths. Reagan's message, it seemed to me, was was we can beat anybody, not we're intrinsically stronger. If politicians don't say it then the news coverage doesn't handle it.

Q: Referring back to Mr. Kalb's question, I want to ask you about the media and campaigns. Why do you let them get away with it? Why are politicians permitted to play their charades? You told of having such wonderful cooperation in Moscow. Why can't you do it in Washington? Just the senior people could say, "We are not going after you to flag factories or to photograph you in a tank. We want to ask you about science, about deficits. If you don't want to talk about issues, if you send us spin doctors, we won't cover that. Our lowest level people can cover that but our senior people will refuse to cover those kinds of things. You talk to us and have a campaign in which a debate is a real debate, not a game, not a charade, we'll cover it. If not, we won't be party to it, thank you." Why don't you do it?

Chancellor: That's a good question. I think you're going to see more of that kind of coverage. ABC actually tried it in 1988, and it didn't quite work. I have argued that we ought to do that. We gave Governor Dukakis and George Bush $42 million dollars each to run for President in 1988. It's our money we're giving them so we ought to set some conditions on how they spend it. We ought to demand real debates and not charades, false press conferences. Without infringing overmuch on the First Amendment we can set some conditions on political advertising. Forty-two million dollars isn't going to make George Bush a smarter man than he was originally. Nor Michael Dukakis.

There are many moves afoot now to clean up the 1992 election. For example, when ad hominem attacks are being made on a candidate, the candidate making the attack would have to read them. There are proposals that free television time be made available. I have no problem with that. And for ads to be no shorter than five minutes so we can get a real sense of what's being said. I'm all for that and I think we can do it without tinkering with the Constitution. If we went to public financing for Congres-
sional and Senatorial campaigns, we might also get some rules in those campaigns which would clear the air a lot.

Will they tell the truth? I don't know. Roger Ailes, who made all the campaign ads for George Bush in that awful campaign of 1988, was quoted—I think he was here at the time—as saying, "If you didn't like 1988, you'll hate 1992." I think we have to stop that.

Q: What is your opinion on the initiation of a minimal national sales tax on high ticket items, such as foreign VCRs, foreign cars, and other items?

Chancellor: I would tax everything, not just foreign products. I think a VAT [value added tax] is one way of doing it. But I really think raising the top levels of the income tax by a point or two, so that people in the United States who are really well-to-do shoulder a little larger burden, is the easiest way. The problem with the VAT, which is a good tax used by most of the European countries to raise a lot of revenue, is that it would take eighteen months to put it into effect and would require hiring about 20,000 more employees for the Internal Revenue Service. About a year-and-a-half from when it was enacted it would raise a lot of money in a pretty painless way and at little cost. It's regressive but it could be paid back to the poor.

We shouldn't tax foreign products because if we're for free trade—and we ought to be—we shouldn't be punitive about the things that we choose to buy. We ought to make them ourselves if we want to do that.

Question: One institution which you have not mentioned, but which may be one of President Reagan's most enduring legacy, is the judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court. I think he has appointed well over half the sitting federal judges and it looks like President Bush is going to follow suit. The Reagan-Bush court has been enormously deferential to state legislatures. Looking forward to the next 30 years, how important do you think the Supreme Court and the judiciary will be, either by inaction, i.e., deference, or action?

Chancellor: I don't know about the next 30 years. I do tend to side with Mr. Dooley that the court breeds election returns so I am not sure that we are set in concrete on a Reagan kind of court for the next 30 years. But also when I think about this issue, I get furious at the Democrats, because they have developed this capacity for losing all presidential elections in which they run. They really are very talented at blowing it! I'm not arguing as a Democrat or a Republican. If it were reversed, I would make the same argument. Democrats, because of their legendary inefficiency at winning the White House, have let the other party control the judicial appointments at the federal level for a long time. Since Nixon was elected in 1968, we've had only four years with a Democratic president, Jimmy Carter, who was the most conservative Democratic president since Grover Cleveland. The system is out of whack.

The way the American system ought to work is that one party gets in for awhile and gets its judges in and the other party comes along and gets its judges in. The Democrats have fouled that up. I'm sorry about that.

Q: In speaking about the difference between community and school, you've spoken about the idea of having year-round schooling and national service. Could you elaborate a bit more on the idea of national service. How does it relate to Bush's "thousand points of light" initiative? How would it be incorporated into schooling? Do you think that there should be required community service programs, and if so, how should they be funded?
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Chancellor: A national service corps is a complicated thing because I understand it's unconstitutional simply to draft people into it. It has to be done on a more voluntary basis. If you can offer people alternative service, say to the military, with the offer of a college education or something, you might be able to fill up the ranks. My purpose, frankly, is social engineering and I confess it. I would like to see young Americans from the suburbs and the inner cities, different races, different genders, working together on projects, for example, in the inner cities. I think of the experience some of us had during the Second World War when we all worked together toward a common goal. The problem is how to state the goals. I don't know.

The sense of community in America is dangerously low and I am looking for ways to change that. It could be pretty easily done with 18- to 20-year-old kids, get them started on projects and build up in the public mind, not a thousand points of light, but the fact that Americans, when they put their will to it, and put their shoulders to wheels, can accomplish an awful lot. It can be pro bono work. It doesn't have to be getting a job on Wall Street. I think that's over.

I see many signs that Americans believe the '80s are over. It was a great party but now the waiter has brought the bill. It's over. That's what my book is about. I hope it's the first book of the '90s that says we've got to get our house in order. As I travel around the country, I find all kinds of young people who want to do something. John F. Kennedy's phrase was turned on its head in the '80s. The government seemed to be saying, "Ask not what you can do for your country, but what your country can do for you." I find young people now saying, "What can I do for my country?" because they also know the country is in trouble. I'm being broad-brushed about this. I don't know all the details.

Q: I am part of a very tiny and frightened minority at this point in this country, part of the very small group of people that doesn't think that George Bush is doing a better job than George Washington and Abraham Lincoln combined. I am totally nonplussed by it because I was never that fiercely anti-Reagan. I have friends who went through eight years of the Reagan Administration frothing at the mouth with hatred of Ronald Reagan who are absolutely in love with George Bush. I try to point out to them that the same policies are being continued and in many cases a real meanness is there that was never there, or was only lip service, during the Reagan Administration. Most of them say, "You're right. It was in the media. It was just the media."

You've been a boyhood hero since I was yea-high. I remember you when Jack Kennedy was running for President—my first TV thing. I would really love to hear from you, "Number One," what you think the secret is and whether you think the media really is giving Bush an unfair advantage, much better than almost any other President, because he has been such an insider for so long in contrast to Carter and Reagan. I turned on the TV one night and I thought, "Oh, my God! Not John Chancellor, too!" when I heard you describing something that George Bush had done as a stroke of genius.

You argue for going back to the old days of politicking, where we had the conventions and, you know, real battles, rather than Iowa and New Hampshire. If we went back to that, do you think you could help?

Chancellor: Let me deal with that part of your question because our time is running out. I do argue that we ought to go back to the smoke-filled room. I am aware that in
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the 1990s it would be mixed gender, racially balanced, and there would be a large "No Smoking" sign, but that doesn't change the contribution that the smoke-filled room could give to our politics. The smoke-filled room is a kind of jury of peers deciding who would be the best candidate for President or Governor or Congress or whatever. We have to bring the professionals back in. It's a lot of fun making the argument that in terms of primary elections and caucuses the power ought to be taken from the people. The primaries are undemocratic. The conventions are meaningless.

Since we went to the system in which Presidential candidates are determined in primaries, the voting turnout in the United States has steadily declined. In 1988, half of the Americans who were eligible to vote didn't go to the polls and voter turnout in the South was the worst in 164 years. What we ought to do is get some fun back into American politics, some honest contestation instead of Roger Ailes' cheap advertising. We need to get candidates who can be elected, not people who win delegates in the dice game of the primaries and suddenly become the nominees of two major American parties.

George Bush won the 1988 Republican nomination in March of 1988 in a primary. He got enough delegates. We all trooped down to New Orleans for the national convention where the only thing we got—we knew Bush was the nominee months before—was Dan Quayle. Dukakis got the nomination in June before we went to Atlanta. The conventions are meaningless. The populace is bored. The voters aren't going to the polls. Presidential elections are about as interesting as a leveraged buyout. When I was a kid, people used to get in fights in bars on Saturday nights, saying, "Hey, you're talking about my guy!" Bam! Do you hear that any more? No you don't. All the fun is gone.

Q: While I agree with many of the political reforms you've mentioned in your book, there are two other recent books which might cause someone to take exception to your idea that traditional liberalism and traditional conservatism are things of the past: The Resurgent Liberal by Bob Reich of the Kennedy School and The Last Lion, a biography of Winston Churchill by William Manchester. Also, Arthur Schlesinger, who has written about the cycles of history, has told me that he thinks the bubble is about to burst with regards to our economy and that we should expect a resurgence of grassroots movements and populism. William Manchester's book is relevant because of the chaos in Eastern Europe. What do you think about the arguments about traditional liberalism and traditional conservatism?

Chancellor: Arthur Schlesinger, Senior, gave us the theory of political cycles. In 1945 he uncannily used that theory to predict the movement that elected Jack Kennedy. I pay a lot of attention to the elder Schlesinger's theories. I thought that I had reinforced the idea that there is genuine liberalism and there is genuine conservatism. My point is that the vocabulary of conservatism, as we have known it, say, from Barry Goldwater's days or Senator Bob Taft's days, has run its course. Maybe it's time for a different kind of conservatism, a different kind of sanctity of property movement. Liberalism isn't dead in the United States but the New Deal is over. The liberal accomplishments, most of which are still in place, are not going to go away. I would like a more pragmatic view from both parties on what's wrong with the body politic and what's wrong with the country. I'm not getting that from either party.
William Manchester relates how Stanley Baldwin, Prime Minister of Great Britain in the 1930s, understood that, in 1935, the British people were only fifteen years or so away from the First World War which really was a horror for Britain. Baldwin believed that going to the British people and asking them to pay higher taxes for rearmament, because of the Nazis, would just not work. In a famous speech—one of the most disgraceful things ever said by an English-speaking politician in the House of Commons—Baldwin said that it would have hurt his party to have talked about Hitler's rearmament and tried to do anything about it. Britain nearly lost the war. There is a parallel between what Baldwin did and what's been happening to us. I wonder if our politicians have not told us the truth about the perils we face because they feel it is politically dangerous.

Q: In the last decade we've had a divided government, Republican presidency and Democratic Congress. Do you see this as causing some of the indiscipline that you've been talking about and, if so, how do we get away from it? Do we campaign so that when we elect a President we elect a Congress to go along with it?

Chancellor: Absolutely, and I don't care which party. The fact is they all love divided government because there's nobody to blame. Reagan carried this to a demented level, saying it was Congress that caused the deficit when Congress gave him every penny he asked for! The Congress now is saying that the Republicans are wrong. They all use it as a shield so nobody is to blame. If I have one heartfelt message to American voters it is, "Vote the straight ticket. I don't care which party. Then we can have somebody to blame and if they get it wrong we can throw the rascals out."

Q: In the current Harvard Political Review, ACLU President Ira Glasser is quoted as saying that 25, 30 years ago nobody denied that they were racist. Nobody denied that discrimination existed. They admitted it and defended it. The facts were never an issue. The only issues were: Is it legal? Is it Constitutional? Is it right? Is it moral? The civil rights movement removed or answered many of these legal questions. How does your book address the patterns of thinking, the devaluation based on ethnicity, race, sex and religion that are so ingrained in our country for the past two hundred years, and how do we change these patterns of thinking?

Chancellor: I'm sorry. I don't address it in the book. It would be a much thicker book if I had. I tried to write a short book. We have gone a long way in terms of legislation about racial equality but there's still a lot of hatred in a lot of hearts around this country. I happen to live in New York City and we're going through a very bad patch in New York City right now. It makes me despair about what's going on in people's hearts. One of the things that is missing in America today is hope, and dreams, and in some cases, a certain kind of self-respect. If we could bring back hope and dreams and self-respect, get the economy moving genuinely so we could use our strengths, it might be easier to heal the wrongs in those hearts. I would not promise you that anything like that would happen because I don't know. I just know that we're in trouble in this country. I think we have ample resources to solve these problems, and if we solve these problems, the problems to which you refer may be ameliorated.
I realize my choice of topic has done little to suggest a coherent theme for this lecture series. Where Paul Volcker [last year] delved with delight into the workings of a floating target zone system for international monetary policy, a director of OMB now comes along and proposes to talk about American romanticism. I must beg your forgiveness. If you had a job with an annual cash shortage of $150 billion and an inherited debt of roughly $3 trillion, I suspect you too might be inclined toward occasional distractions. Be that as it may, I suggest we might all enjoy this lecture more if I spare you a detailed examination of the federal budget's 190,000 individual accounts. I will touch on the budget, and the Volcker lecture, in due course. But I propose to begin with a bit larger issue.

I. Whither The American Romance

"The Race Track" and "The Lorelei" (or America's Decline and the End of History)

In fond memories of my days in the Yard, I put the issue as a question that could be the title of a freshman Humanities course, "Whither the American Romance?"

For the moment a large part of the answer seems to be coming from abroad. It is being played out by the recently-liberated nations of Panama and Nicaragua, and the newly-pluralistic parliaments of Eastern Europe. There the romantic spirit is soaring. It is the same spirit as has shaped the American romance—love of freedom, respect for individual rights, distrust of excessively-centralized authority, appreciation of markets, hope, optimism, a confident faith in the future, heroization of risk-taking and the pioneering spirit.

Yet there is a curious irony. As the American romantic spirit expands in foreign lands, it is oddly quiescent here at home—especially among the intelligentsia. While many Americans lament that the U.S. may be losing its primacy to pro-growth Japan, anti-growth sentiment is also becoming fashionable. Confidence in the American pioneering spirit seems mixed, at best. In some respects, we seem to be becoming a risk-o-phobic society—just when many of our historic risks are seen to be paying off.

This has been an American century. In World War I, Americans were not hesitant to exhibit their romantic enthusiasm. They were "making the world safe for democracy," as Americans would do again in World War II and in the subsequent battles to expand freedom, opportunity, and market-oriented progress.

Yet now much of America is strangely subdued. Some of this is the correct prudence of mature statesmen, some is a discrete politeness. But in general, as history seems to be moving America's way, America is less-than-fully conscious of its own continuing
primacy. U.S. opinion leaders seem less than fully confident of America's vital destiny, its unique capacity to move the world toward new frontiers in the 21st century.

If one asks where in America's cultural establishment is there visible representation of American romanticism, one is hard-pressed to come up with an answer. The closest I have come is an exhibition, now at the National Museum of American Art, of the collected paintings of America's finest romanticist (and a native of nearby New Bedford), Albert Ryder. Ryder's work is still alive but it dates from the 19th century. One wonders, in this time of pluralism's herioc advance, where is the domestic celebration of the compelling power and virtue of the American idea?

The cynicism and self-flagellation of the Vietnam and Watergate eras have passed but the America-is-in-decline school is now intellectually fashionable. The fashion may have reached a peak with Paul Kennedy's recent best seller, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. Yet it lingers with the likes of Mead's Moral Splendor: The American Empire in Transition (popularized in Harper's as "On the Road to Ruin") and Krugman's The Age of Diminishing Expectations (popularized in The Washington Post as "We're No. 3—So What?").

This defeatism remains current in the popular mind with the misguided conventional wisdom that Japan is number one. Indeed, a recent cover of The Economist provides a pathetic commentary on the erosion of America's once supremely confident self-concept. It features a decrepit, hobbled Uncle Sam with this reminder as a caption, "Yes, you are the superpower." The only romantic American counterpoint of note is Fukayama's naive neo-Hegelian suggestion that liberal Western ideology is now so evidently and inevitably triumphant that we are the fortunate witnesses to "the end of history."

One might try to fit these competing images of America's historical condition, the defeatist and the naive, within romantic frames. In doing so, one might recall two Ryder pictures. The American-in-decline school might be represented by "The Race Track," also known as "Death on a Pale Horse." In it, a solitary white horse runs the wrong way on a deserted racetrack with a ghostly skeletal reaper as its grim rider. The end-of-history school might be represented by "The Lorelei," the golden-haired maiden whose seductive siren song would distract naive sailors from attention to the whirlpool ahead.

Unfortunately, these images are not exactly uplifting. Indeed, it would be rather depressing if, in fact, the choice were between an eerie race with death and a complacent drift toward the whirlpool. But of course the choice is not so bleak. America's range of possibility, like Ryder's range of imagery, is more hopeful and encouraging than the limited choice between "The Race Track" and "The Lorelei." The problem is that realistic and romantically-powerful images of hope have not yet been satisfactorily framed to define the American future.

II. The Struggle for Global Management

Of Growth and Greenery (or Neo-Luddities: Making the World Safe for Green Vegetables)

The problem is also that there are romantically powerful counter-images advanced by some who are opposed to the American romantic spirit. I have in mind one recent example, the picture of a simple, bucolic, blue-green planet untainted by competitive industrial advance, unmarked by "artificial" boundaries of competing nation-states. This is an alluring romantic image. It has understandable general appeal and was seen
everywhere on Earth Day. But the natural appeal of such a romantic symbol may lend itself to abuse if its operational significance is determined by anti-growth activists seeking to lead the mass of so-called "greens." Indeed, the currently fashionable green romance could turn rather blue if it is not advanced in a way that is consistent with the American romance.

Let me be clear. I do not mean to criticize the majority of self-styled greens. Nor do I criticize most environmentalists. My wife and children are environmentalists. The President is an environmentalist. Republicans and Democrats are environmentalists. Jane Fonda and the National Association of Manufacturers, Magic Johnson and Danny DeVito, Candice Bergen and The Golden Girls, Bugs Bunny and the cast of "Cheers" are all environmentalists. Increasingly we are all environmentalists.

In many respects that is an important advance. In the main, environmentalism is benign and well-intended. Indeed it would be irrational and ultimately self-defeating not to promote the efficient use of resources, not to address legitimate needs for clean air, clean water, and a healthy biosphere, not to respect reasonably-balanced aesthetic interests in natural preservation.

There is a problem, however, in the very success of legitimate environmentalism. Because so many people are self-proclaimed environmentalists, the label is no longer a meaningful defining characteristic. It is a green mask under which different faces of politico-economic ideology can hide. Now that the East-West conflict is in decline, the green mask is one under which competing ideologies will continue their global struggle.

From this perspective, one might identify two distinguishable faces of environmentalism: pro-growth, market-oriented and pluralistic environmentalism on the one hand—a face consistent with the American romance—and, on the other hand, anti-growth, command-and-control centralistic environmentalism. The environment can and should be protected within a pluralistic market- and growth-oriented framework. But environmental interests should not be used as a false pretext for abandoning that framework. It would be a regrettable irony if, just as the values of the American romance were to triumph in the East-West struggle, they were to be lost in what some environmentalists like to term the struggle for global management.

Fortunately, this latter threat may well prove transitory. The practical and moral underpinnings of the more radical green "global management" regimes are unlikely to withstand unmasking.

The global management perspective will prove at once too large and too small—too large because free people will not be managed by a globally centralized regime in which the nation-state withers away; too small because pioneering people will not long be limited to traditional earthly bounds.

The absolutist approach to environmental values will prove too rigid. Extremists will be met by demands for trade-offs. In efforts to protect existing species, humans will wish somehow to be counted along with turtles and owls—however attractive the latter. In a world of limited resources, proposed environmental investments for incremental human health benefits will have to compete. They will have to be justified in relation to the values of economic growth, and also in relation to competing claims for, say, health research, or maternal and child health care, or auto safety, or drug and alcohol abuse prevention.
Further, in the end the radical anti-growth green perspective will prove too static. The needy of the world will not be helped by, and will not settle for, a neo-Luddite attack on technological advance. More generally, the human spirit, by definition, will not be limited to an aspiration for stasis. Americans did not fight and win the wars of the 20th century to make the world safe for green vegetables.

The Volcker Lecture Revisited (or Managing Market-Oriented Pluralism)

There is, however, still a problem for those who would fight for more than green vegetables and global management. For those who favor market-oriented growth, technological advance, pluralistic tolerance and expanding opportunity—along with responsible environmentalism—the problem is that the management of market-oriented pluralism is often too subtle and complex to capture the public imagination. It is often at a disadvantage in a simplistic competition among romantic images.

Consider, for example, the subject of last year's Gordon Lecture. Paul Volcker was right to focus attention on the "G-5" (Group of Five) and "G-7" (Group of Seven). These informal institutional arrangements are fundamental to the global management of market-oriented pluralism. Building on the 1986 Toyko Summit communique, they have a major role to play in setting targets and in advancing economic growth, development, and the quality of life. Their importance has increased with the rise of interdependence and the decline of likely superpower military conflict. They are an essential complement to, and link between, multilateral economic institutions and independent nation-states. Their reach is far beyond international monetary policy—to virtually all elements of economic policy. Through their connection with the Summit of Industrialized Nations, their reach extends to virtually all of the major international politico-economic issues.

They are, essentially, an executive committee in the international management system for market-oriented democracies. Yet they are largely unknown partly because they have chosen to avoid the spotlight and partly because much of their work is technical, even arcane. But even if they wished to be more visible, they would have an inherent disadvantage in the intense competition for media attention. Because they are not dirigiste, they cannot command dramatic leaps forward. Like market-oriented systems generally, they must inspire more by actual performance than by rhetorical promise. In the end, their power to reshape the world for the better depends on their capacity to deliver and the power of positive example.
Moving On Is Worth The Risk
by Madeleine M. Kunin

The Institute of Politics and the Women’s Campaign Research Fund co-sponsored a “Strategic Leadership ’90” conference on October 12-14, 1989 at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Madeleine M. Kunin, Governor of Vermont and former fellow of the Institute of Politics, delivered an address to the participants at one of the October 12th conference sessions. The following is an edited excerpt from Governor Kunin’s address.

Today, I want to explore with you why moving on is worth taking the risk and what it is that holds us back, even those of us who are politically savvy and reasonably tough, who know who we are and who we want to be.

We know we are needed to fill a glaring vacuum. The statistics on the numbers of women participating in our political system remain disconcertingly dismal—at all levels. That is hard to understand given the progress women have made in other fields and given that so much change has occurred for women throughout society.

The most visible change is the entry into the workplace of unprecedented numbers of women. In 1970, women comprised 38 percent of the workforce; today that figure is 45 percent and is quickly rising to 50 percent. Within the workforce, startling statistics are emerging. Thirty-one percent of new medical doctors are women compared to 8.4 percent in 1970; 39 percent of new lawyers are female compared to 5.4 percent in 1970; 22.6 percent of new dentists, up from less than 1 percent.

In the political profession, however, the statistics are far less encouraging. Progress has been made in state legislatures but in the U.S. Congress there were 11 women in 1970; there are 29 today. As for women governors, there were none in 1970, there are three today—two of whom were elected. Contrary to what happened to women in other traditionally male professions, politics, like law enforcement and the military has remained largely a male domain.

Take a snapshot of the power structure anywhere: on the Capitol steps during President Bush’s inauguration, on the front pages of The New York Times, on the Sunday talk shows on television. On the steps of the University of Virginia two weeks ago during the Education Summit when the governors, the Cabinet and the President smiled for the camera, only a few spots of colorful clothing stood out against the sea of blue-gray suits. I was glad I wore red. When that picture is developed and framed the question asks itself, “Where are the women?”

Perhaps if we had schools of politics from which graduates actually entered the system in the same way that graduates of medical, dental and law schools do, then we might see more encouraging statistics. Even if we did school women for the political life, a large barrier remains to their entry so long as incumbents refuse to leave their seats to make way for the new class. Of course, that is not the only barrier. Women who ran for Congress in recent months did well proving that when women do run they can do exceedingly well even with constituencies traditionally conservative towards women, such as Cuban-American voters in Miami.
I used to think that gender as a question went away once a high level of political office was sought or attained. I hoped there was a safe perch on which I could land where no more gender questions would be asked. Armed with a title, like "Governor" critics and questioners would snap to attention at the sound of authority. But gender never goes away. Like much in life, one learns to put it into context. There are flareups, that sudden visceral response to a remark, an omission, a general characterization laden with sexism which provokes a rush of anger and frustration because such moments are often impossible to explain or to protest against. They must be swallowed, often with no show of emotion at all.

For example, a committee chairman at a National Governors Meeting looking straight to you and saying twice in a row, "Gentlemen" as he addresses the group, or the Marine at the entrance to the East Room of the White House finding it so hard to get straight the announcement of your name and title, "Governor Madeleine Kunin and Dr. Arthur Kunin." Centuries of expectations have been and continue to be that man is the leader. Your very presence is a defiance of tradition. Sometimes you internalize the feeling that this is not normal behavior. You wonder how long it will take for women to be welcome, to be expected guests in the halls of power.

There are also moments of total equanimity, even times of triumph, when gender is not negative but positive. We look around us, smile, conclude that because we are women we are changing the world. My very first speech in the legislature, on the Equal Rights Amendment, in 1973, gave me such a thrill—I knew why I was there. When we have a gathering of some of the past and present women in my administration—we call ourselves The Old Girl Network—I look at what we have achieved for welfare mothers, for child care, for education. I believe we put those issues first because they are part of our personal "female" experience. At the ballet when a bevy of little girls in the audience come up to greet me and to ask me to sign their programs, that generation-to-generation female bond moves me greatly. Those are great times, times to be savored.

As a political factor, gender is both a positive and a negative force. At times it is a barrier, practically and emotionally, on levels we cannot fully define even to ourselves. But it also adds excitement to the race. The very fact of breaking down the barriers, being one of the first, fighting the good fight for things in which we deeply believe, provides the adrenaline for many women in politics. It may not be what makes Sally run but it sure does give her energy for the race. That is why the spirit of sisterhood which exists within the political structure, in circles such as this, for example, is sustaining, is, in fact, necessary for survival.

Five out of eight top positions in my staff are held by women. We often reinforce one another by our mutual presence, by being able to share the nuances, the subleties, of the pressures of political life for women not usually directly articulated. It makes us feel less like insurgents, more like we belong.

Is it worth it to aim higher? You already know what I will tell you—it is much more exciting at the top but it is also more dangerous. You may also surmise my conclusion—it is worth exposing oneself to the dangers because the rewards are great indeed.

Frankly, when I was lieutenant governor, I was in a very nice position, a good apprenticeship. I could take pot shots at the governor from time to time, side with the
legislature on certain issues, say "Yes" to just about all constituencies—they accepted my sympathies but did not expect me to deliver. I could pick and choose my issues, could feel comfortable in an ancillary role, in one sense, a traditional female role.

It was a quantum leap from that position to that of governor. It was no longer they, it was us, it was me. Although I had mastered the art of getting elected to state-wide office, had learned a lot about politics, issues, constituencies, consensus building, had worked my way up through the system as a state legislator, chair of the appropriations committee, lieutenant governor, the position of governor was different from anything I had ever know.

The scope of the responsibility, in actual and symbolic terms, is enormous. The pace of events, moving in rapid succession from crisis to crisis, is almost impossible to describe. The status of the position creates a duality that is sometimes difficult to reconcile, great respect and great expectations, not all of which can be met. Such new responsibility means learning to operate in a whirlwind of conflict and debate, being able to move without a moment's notice from issue to issue with knowledge and confidence.

Expectations run high for women in politics in those areas traditionally associated with the mother figure and female compassion. Therefore, women inevitably disappoint their followers to some degree because it is almost impossible to govern responsibly and also meet the extraordinarily high demands placed upon us. We are supposed to be different and we are but, operating within a larger political system, we cannot be as different as we are expected to be. My own state, Vermont, ranks third nationally in welfare benefits, ranks near the top in foster care and prenatal care coverage. Yet I am still sometimes charged with not doing enough.

Our ability to deal with conflict is often stymied by the public's tendency to characterize female leadership as indecisive. In the world of politics, feminine characteristics—witness the wimp—are disdained. Female attributes, compromise, consensus, are not as highly valued as male characteristics, toughness, bombast and attack. Our fundamental instincts, our verbal language, our body language, sometimes dilute the image of leadership which by tradition has been male defined. Dealing with criticism, conflict, the political attack can be highly uncomfortable.

Has it been worth it thus far? Yes. Are there days when I question the system and my own role within it? Yes. What keeps people like me going? All the answers sound somewhat cliched because we must go back to simple truths.

The ability to express a vision of how things should be, to share that publicly and then to help it take shape is an extraordinary experience. There is a sense of purpose, a sense of connection, an explanation for the ultimate question of why we are here on this earth which, fleeting though it may be, is exhilarating. Everything seems to make sense including one's existence. One feels a connection, a resonance, with the audience. Applause and laughter are marvelous sounds of confirmation. Of course it doesn't last but it is great while it does.

And there is the off chance that history will be kind.
Public Service on Campus
by Becki Berner '90

Following is an edited excerpt from remarks by Becki Berner, 1990 graduate of Harvard College, during a discussion to honor the life of President John F. Kennedy in the Forum of Public Affairs of the John F. Kennedy School of Government on May 29, 1990, the anniversary of President Kennedy's birth. Participants in "Profiles in Courage: John F. Kennedy's Vision of Public Service" included Charlayne Hunter-Gault, national correspondent for the MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour; President Kennedy's brother and nephew, Edward M. Kennedy, United States Senator from Massachusetts and Patrick J. Kennedy, member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives; Madeleine M. Kunin, Governor of Vermont and former fellow of the Institute of Politics; Charles Royer, director of the Institute of Politics and former Mayor of Seattle; and discussion moderator Robert D. Putnam, Dean of the Kennedy School.

While at Harvard, Becki Berner's involvement in public and community service included working to combat gang violence in the inner city, running a summer camp for disadvantaged youth, tutoring autistic children, working at a Massachusetts state psychiatric hospital, serving as research assistant at the Eunice Shriver-Kennedy Center, on the steering committee at Harvard's Philips Brooks House, and as a producer for an on-campus production of Children of a Lesser God.

We sometimes hear, from members of the generation that was so impacted by John F. Kennedy's call to public service, that today there is need for a similar call. I agree with that sentiment but I also see what is happening here on campus, the service in which my peers and I are engaged. Harvard students are involved in staffing several homeless shelters, running ten summer day camps which serve between 300-400 children, operating prison GED [graduate equivalency diploma] programs, maintaining AIDS visitation programs, staffing peer telephone hotlines—far too many activities to list here and now.

Thousands of us come to these programs for many diverse reasons. Once there we strive to work together to provide quality service, to run quality programs, programs which empower people in communities in both Cambridge and Boston. We gain more than we have ever given. We learn about the economic and social realities of our society, about working with people of diverse backgrounds, both peers and people in the community. Many of my companions in service work would join me in saying that public service has been our single most important educational experience during our years at Harvard.

The public service of which I speak requires that we be willing to learn about ourselves, willing to face our own prejudices. In entering into community work, we must open ourselves to giving and to receiving, to forming relationships, to recognizing our impact on the lives of others. Students may feel threatened or vulnerable in the environment in which they serve and at times must advocate for change in the face of resistance. It takes courage to act when one feels something is wrong, to strive to make things better, to not just remain complacent.

A friend reminded me today of the context in which we do public service. Taking the easy route in college usually means taking classes. But those, here and on other college campuses, who do public service are risking, taking chances, growing, learning that
they affect others, are relied upon by others. It takes courage to continue serving when it is impossible to measure how behavior is altered or how lives are changed.

Courage means being concerned with making a difference, rather than making the ultimate impression. Boston Globe columnist Ellen Goodman has reminded us that even greater courage, moral courage is required, if one is to go beyond the soup kitchen to actively working for positive social change, to question why homelessness occurs rather than just serving a meal.

Despite student outreach to the community, there is still a belief that for my generation public service is something to do while at college but not necessarily a career choice. One of my classmates remarked that there are people who do that kind of work and there are people who fund that kind of work. Unfortunately, to him and to most, the belief still exists that you must choose one or the other.

Here at Harvard, recruiters issue the call, “Go for the gold.” That was actually last year’s class motto. To my parents the choice is obvious. There are certain careers that a Harvard education prepares one for, careers with prestige, financial stability, advantages, usually within the private sector. They are not alone in their thinking. The pressure is great for all Harvard students whether they are from upper, middle or lower class backgrounds. Still, I hope to go to Mexico next year to work in community development—despite some “flack” from my parents.

On June 7th, when we leave this campus with our diplomas, many of us will undoubtedly take positions with influence. The decisions we make in those jobs will impact on people’s lives. If we hope to exercise what we have learned from our involvement in public service, then the policies which we make must be enacted with a sense of responsibility to the community. We have learned that social responsibility comes from direct involvement in and knowledge of the community and that long term working solutions come only with community empowerment.

Our generation does need a call to public service, a call which will abolish the “forced choice” myth. We need not be involved only in the private sector but can be involved simultaneously in the public sector. Or we can choose careers in the public sector. I have seen the courage of my peers. Idealism is not lacking. What is lacking is the necessary reinforcement. The call must come but it must be accompanied by incentives, by training, by resources, and most importantly, by validation that working with people is something that we should do, so that students, and others, can choose to make a career of their social service and their social action.
A famous piece of American voter dialogue pretty much captured the essence of the Democratic Party primary in 1976—the election to decide who would face Gerald Ford, the president who pardoned Nixon.

“What do you know about this Jimmy Carter?”
“Nothing. What do you know about him?”
“Nothing. I guess I kind of like Jerry Brown.”
“Oh, yeah? Well, what do you know about Jerry Brown?”
“Nothing.”

I know. It is not 1976. It is 1990. Nixon is a library, Ford plays golf, Carter and Brown are history, and George Bush is the first of what may be a new generation of presidents who are known, experienced Washington politicians.

But in Massachusetts, the race for governor threatens to turn back the clock and repeat political history.

“Who do you like in the governor’s race?”
“I kind of like this John Silber.”
“What do you know about Silber?”
“Nothing. But I know he’s not a politician.”

Like Jimmy Carter in disenchanted post-Watergate America, John Silber, outsider, nonpolitician, may ride that old horse to victory in disenchanted post-Miracle Massachusetts.

The prospect churns up memories in this transplanted Northwesterner. Memories of another outsider for whom political inexperience became a ticket to the governorship. And they aren’t happy memories.

I’m sure many remember Dixy Lee Ray. It was 14 years ago — Dixy’s moment in politics. The Atomic Ray — President Nixon’s appointee to the Atomic Energy Commission. An academic with a PhD from Stanford. A college professor and marine biologist. And, by her own proud admission, a nonpolitician up to her knee socks in a campaign for the democratic nomination for governor of the state of Washington.

It’s the nonpolitician part that got me thinking about Dixy, and the fact that Dixy may be back, in Massachusetts.

The similarities are striking.

John Silber, the academic; a college president, running proudly as a nonpolitician for the democratic nomination for governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There may be a little lesson here. When things get really bad in politics, we try to fix it by electing someone who may make it worse.

If you are sick, call a doctor. If politics is sick, call a peanut farmer, an actor, or maybe an academic.
Remember 1976. It was post-Watergate. The president of the United States had lied to us, allowed crimes to be committed, and resigned just in time to beat the sheriff out the back door. Jimmy Carter, Dixy Lee Ray, and a host of new members of Congress were swept into office as outsiders, new faces, nonpoliticians unstained by Watergate, and largely unburdened by relevant political experience.

Both Dixy and Jimmy managed to serve just one term. The inexperience showed. When Dixy said she was not a politician, we should have believed her. She fought with the press. She insulted the Legislature.

She insulted those who disagreed with her. I once saw her booted at a meeting of the League of Women Voters when she viciously attacked a member who dared to ask if their might be the tiniest bit of danger in having trainloads of nuclear waste run regularly through her eastern Washington city.

Dixy just could not get enough nuclear power. She wanted 600 new plants in 25 years. She was fond of saying, "Nuclear energy is too important to be left to politics."

She was not fond of the government. She would, like John Silber, toss red meat to hungry crowds. "Anything the private sector can do, the government can do worse," she would say to growling audiences.

Then there were the animals. She took down from the Governor's Office wall the portrait of her popular predecessor, Dan Evans, and put up one of her dog. And to everyone's delight, she raised pigs at her remote island home, gave them names of reporters she hated, then gleefully cut their throats.

That was the fun stuff. More serious was the absolute decline in the quality of state government during four years of Dixy, the nonpolitician, the politically attractive outsider who ran against the government in an antigovernment climate.

Fourteen years later, the political culture medium which grew a Dixy and a Jimmy is working in Massachusetts to the benefit of John Silber, outsider.

This is not to say that Michael Dukakis created this climate, like Nixon, by lying or allowing crimes to be committed. Dukakis' only crimes were telling the truth and losing the presidential race.

But in Massachusetts, losing may be a crime. In Boston, the Celtics rarely lose a playoff, but when they do, next day they fire the coach. They don't take political prisoners here, either.

Dukakis lost in the playoffs of 1988 while the "miracle" Massachusetts economy, like those economies in the other Northeastern states, cooled off. Now there's another tax revolt. The legislature has been paralyzed from the neck up, and anyone who looks or sounds like a politician is part of the problem.

Enter John Silber, nonpolitician, to clean out the system. Colorful, like Dixy, he has insulted just about every group with a post office box — the press, labor, women on public assistance. He even insulted one group Dixy missed, the alcoholics.

He borrowed a page from another unhappy Western governor, Dick Lamm of Colorado, and suggested that when the elderly get "ripe" they should be allowed to do what other ripe things do, and should not consume scarce medical-care dollars.

An experienced politician might not have put such a provocative idea as Silber's in terms certain to destroy both the idea and the politician.
Silber describes himself, like Dixy, as a reluctant Democrat. He says he voted for Reagan and Bush, an announcement which did not endear him to the party apparatus in this one-party state.

And, like Dixy, the public opinion polling in June showed Silber unpopular with everyone but the people, running neck and neck with career politicians and early front-runner Frank Bellotti, who now, desperately and unbelievably, tries to convince people that he, too, should be considered an outsider.

The point here is that political experience is useful and worth something, especially when government is in trouble. The truth is that the angry, cynical and disappointed just cannot be convinced to use it.

I am not saying that John Silber would be another Dixy, making political matters worse through his political inexperience, his strong distaste for the necessary business of politics, and his penchant, like Dixy Lee Ray's, for letting his language and style bury his effectiveness.

But I am telling my Boston friends to watch Silber carefully. If he should go out and buy some pigs (where would he keep them in Boston?), and if he should name them after Boston Globe reporters, look out. It's beginning to look a lot like Dixy.
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Administration and Advisory Committees

Administration and Staff

Derek Curtis Bok, president, Harvard University
Robert D. Putnam, dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Charles Royer, director, Institute of Politics, spring
Shirley Williams, acting director, Institute of Politics, fall

Donna Burkholder, secretary to the director, spring
Karri Copman, conference and development coordinator
Catherine Denn, finance and operations manager, fall;
   acting student program coordinator, spring
Nancy Dietz, associate director, fall
Theresa Donovan, associate director
Jennifer Durr, forum assistant
Katherine Eckroad, conference consultant
Karen Engel, staff assistant, spring
Edward F. Flood, interim secretary to the acting director (Nov-Dec)
Dennis Galvam, receptionist
John Howell, deputy director, spring
Jennifer Jordan, forum coordinator
Anne Doyle Kenney, office and publications coordinator
Julia Kilbourne, staff assistant, fall
Jonathan Marshall, financial assistant
Karen McCree-Diaz, financial assistant, summer 1990
Melanie Stucki, secretary to the acting director, fall

Student Assistants

David Bulger
Lloyd “Cliff” Lazenby

Photo by Elaine Mode

Ron Brown
The Senior Advisory Committee

Ronald H. Brown, chairman, Democratic National Committee*
Henry Cisneros, chairman, Cisneros Asset Management Company; former Mayor, San Antonio*
John C. Culver, partner, Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, Washington, D.C.; former U. S. senator from Iowa
Milton S. Gwirtzman, attorney, Washington, D.C.; former advisor on special issues to President John F. Kennedy
Edward M. Kennedy, U. S. senator from Massachusetts
John Kennedy, office of New York county district attorney
Madeleine M. Kunin, governor of Vermont*
George C. Lodge, professor of business administration, Harvard University; former assistant secretary for international affairs, U. S. Department of Labor
Robert S. McNamara, former secretary, U. S. Department of Defense
Warren Rudman, U. S. senator from New Hampshire
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former member of Parliament, Great Britain

*Chair
*Appointed June 1990
*Appointed July 1990

The Faculty Advisory Committee

Francis M. Bator, professor of political economy and chairman, Ph.D. committee, public policy program*
Samuel H. Beer, Eaton professor of the science of government, emeritus
Hale Champion, lecturer in public policy
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
Mark H. Moore, Daniel & Florence Guggenheim professor of criminal justice policy and management
Richard E. Neustadt, Douglas Dillon professor of public administration
Daniel Steiner, vice president and general counsel to the University
Robert B. Stobaugh, professor of business administration

*Chair
Student Program

Student Advisory Committee (SAC)

Chair:  
Vice Chair:  
Communications:  
Fellows:  
Harvard Political Review:  
Harvard Political Union:  
Internships:  
Political Journalism Awards:  
Projects:  
Study Groups:  
Visiting Fellows:  

1989-90 Members:

Fall  
Don Ridings  
Sara Sievers  
Dan Hoffman  
Andy Lindholm  
Jeff Glueck  
David Socolow  
Jocelyn Melcher  
Julie Fromholz  
Kimberly Morgan  
Bruce Goldberger  
Michael Camunez  

Spring  
Bruce Goldberger  
Kimberly Morgan  
Jocelyn Melcher  
Rosie Hyson  
Peter Kozinets  
Mark Mindich  
Sandy Cheng  
Julie Fromholz  
Dan Hoffman  
David Socolow  
Michael Camunez  

Kyra Armstrong HLS  
Mukhlis Balbale ’92  
Ketanji Brown ’93  
Michael Camunez ’91  
Sandra Cheng ’92  
Bruce Deal KSG  
Loryn Dunn ’90  
Adam Fratto ’90  
Julie Fromholz ’92  
Ross Garon ’93  
James Gellert ’91  
Joseph Gentile ’92  
Martin Gitlin KSG/HLS  
Jeffrey Glueck ’91  
Bruce Goldberger ’91  
Colin Gounden ’91  
Christopher Harris ’92  
Kimberley Harris ’92  
Dan Hoffman ’91  
Rosemary Hyson ’91  
Umkoo Imam ’93  
Juliette Kayyem ’91  
Stephan Klasen ’90  
Peter Kozinets ’92  
Alan Krischer ’91  
John Il Kwun ’90  
Michael Levitt ’90  
Karen Levy HLS  
Andy Lindholm ’92  
Jeff Livingston ’93  
Jocelyn Melcher ’92  
Mark Mindich ’92  
Kimberly Morgan ’91  
Heejoon Park ’90  
Raul Perez ’90  
David Rettig ’90  
Don Ridings ’90  
Tamar Shay ’93  
Sara Sievers ’90  
David Socolow ’91  
Hans Stander III KSG  
Susan Stayn ’91  
Carlos Watson ’91  
Norman Williams ’91
Student Study Groups

Fall

"Political Campaign Giving and Spending: A System in Need of Fundamental Repair"
Reubin Askew, fellow, Institute of Politics, 1984 Democratic presidential candidate; former U.S. trade representative (1979-80); governor of Florida (1970-78)

Guests:
Thomas Eagleton, former member, U.S. Senate (D-Missouri)
Brooks Jackson, correspondent, The Wall Street Journal; author, Honest Graft
Greg Kubiak, specialist, campaign election law; legislative assistant to David Boren, member, U.S. Senate (D-Oklahoma)
Scott M. Matheson, Jr., visiting associate professor, Frank Stanton Chair on the First Amendment, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Mike Synar, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Oklahoma)
David Taylor, specialist, campaign election law; aide to Bob Dole, minority leader, U.S. Senate (R-Kansas)

"Viewer Beware: Television and Its Impact on American Life"
Steve Atlas, WGBH-TV Boston; executive producer and co-director, 1988 PBS Election Project

Guests:
Judy Crichton, executive producer, “The American Experience,” WGBH-TV; former senior documentary producer, ABC-TV & CBS-TV
Fred Friendly, director, Media and Society Seminars, Columbia University; former president, CBS-TV News
Robert Pittman, president, Quantum Media; creator, “MTV,” “Cops,” “The Morton Downey Show”
Paul Solman, special economics correspondent, “MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour”
Dighton Spooner, director, CBS “Entertainment” mini-series; former producer, WGBH-TV Boston

"Freedom of the Press: How Far Should it Go?"
Katherine Fanning, former editor, The Christian Science Monitor; president, American Society of Newspaper Editors

Guests:
Michael Gartner, president, NBC-TV News; former editor, The Des Moines Register and The Louisville Courier Journal
Pam Johnson, president and publisher, The Ithaca Journal
Bob and Nancy Maynard, publishers/owners, The Oakland Tribune
Newton Minow, director, Annenberg Washington Program on Communications; former chairman, Federal Communications Commission
Tom Morgan, president, National Association of Black Journalists
The Student Program

Patricia O'Brien, political reporter, Knight Ridder newspapers; national press secretary, 1988 Dukakis for President campaign
Tom Winship, president, Center for Foreign Journalists; former editor, The Boston Globe

"International Development"
Marcia Grant, director, Mason program/assistant director, student programs, Harvard Institute for International Development and associate director, Mid-Career/Master in Public Administration Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Guests:
Jeffrey Sachs, Galen L. Stone professor of international trade, Harvard University; advisor, researcher and author on international economic reform, debt stabilization and the transition to market economies
Peter Timmer, Thomas D. Cabot professor of development studies and fellow-at-large, Harvard Institute for International Development, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Mechai Virvaidya, senator, secretary general, founder, Population and Community Development Association, Bangkok, Thailand

"The Road to 1992 and Beyond"
Pierre Laurent, professor of history and former director, International Relations Program, Tufts University
Guest:
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former member of Parliament, Great Britain

"The White House. What is it? Who is it? - Really!"
Nancy Risque Rohrbach, fellow, Institute of Politics; former White House assistant and secretary to the Cabinet, Reagan Administration
Guests:
John Cogan, senior fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University; former deputy director, U. S. Office of Management and Budget
Elaine Crispin, vice president, Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
Craig Fuller, president, Wexler, Reynolds, Fuller, Harrison & Schule; former White House assistant/Cabinet affairs; former chief of staff to Vice President Bush
Richard A. Hauser, partner, Baker & Hostetler
Nancy Kennedy, assistant secretary for legislation, U.S. Department of Education
Gwendolyn King, commissioner, Social Security Administration
Tom Korologos, president, Timmons and Company
Peter Rodman, White House special assistant/national security affairs; counselor, National Security Council
Deborah Steelman, partner, Epstein, Becker & Green; chairman, Quadrennial Advisory Council on Social Security
Pam Turner, vice president, National Cable Television Association
"Do We Need a New Progressive Political Party in the United States?"

Bernard Sanders, fellow, Institute of Politics; former Mayor (Socialist) of Burlington, Vermont; 1988 candidate (Independent) for U.S. House of Representatives

Guests:

Sandra Levinson, director, The Center for Cuban Studies, New York

Michael Parenti, author, Inventing Reality: The Politics of the Mass Media; Power and the Powerless and Democracy for the Few

Richard Sugarman, professor of religion, University of Vermont

Anthony Mazzocchi, secretary-treasurer, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union, AFL-CIO

"The Politics of Ethics/The Ethics of Politics"

James Tierney, attorney general of Maine; former majority leader, Maine House of Representatives

Guests:

Jeffrey Amestoy, attorney general of Vermont

Peter Berlandi, political campaign fundraiser

Bill Harris, founder, KIDSPAC

Scott Harshbarger, district attorney, Middlesex County, Massachusetts

Ellen Hume, executive director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

David Johnson, former director, Maine Democratic Senate Campaign Committee; administrative assistant to George Mitchell, member, U.S. Senate (D-Maine)

Tom Kiley, partner, Kiley & Martilla, polling and campaign consultants

Dan Payne, consultant on media and politics

Charles Royer, director, Institute of Politics; former Mayor of Seattle

Jim Shannon, attorney general of Massachusetts

Kathleen Sheekey, chief lobbyist, Common Cause

Bill Weld, former U.S. Attorney, Massachusetts

"Political Entrepreneurship: The Ascendancy of Individualism"

Paul Trible, fellow, Institute of Politics; former member, U.S. Senate (R-Virginia); candidate, 1988 Virginia Republican gubernatorial campaign

Guests:

Don Bonker, former member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Washington)

Hays Gorey, senior Washington correspondent, Time magazine

Mark Greenberg, former White House special assistant/congressional affairs, Reagan administration

Ed Rollins, former director, Republican congressional campaign committee; director, 1980 Reagan for President campaign
"Immigration and Language Policy and the Hispanic Civil Rights Movement"
Raul Yzaguirre, fellow, Institute of Politics; president, National Council of La Raza; chairperson, Hispanic Association for Corporate Responsibility

Guests:
Linda Chavez, television commentator; Republican candidate, 1988 campaign for U.S. Senate, Maryland; former president, U.S. English; staff director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
Rita Esquivel, director, office of bilingual education and minority languages, U.S. Department of Education
Leo Estrada, professor, Graduate School of Urban Planning, University of California/Los Angeles
Wade Henderson, associate director, American Civil Liberties Union
Emily McKay, former executive vice president, National Council of La Raza; author Beyond Ellis Island: Hispanics, Immigrants and Americans
Alan Simpson, member, U. S. Senate (R-Wyoming)

"Getting Up and Talking to People: A Public Speaking Workshop"
John Boehrer, consultant, Communication and Teaching Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
No Guests

"Current Affairs Dinner Table"
Eileen McNamara, correspondent, The Boston Globe, former fellow, Nieman Foundation, Harvard University

Guest:
Kitty Dukakis, First Lady, Massachusetts; former director, Public Space Partnership, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"The Dynamics of Hispanic Politics: Issues, Challenges and Problems for the 90's"
Bill Richardson, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-New Mexico); former chair, Congressional Hispanic Caucus

Guests:
John Lewis, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Georgia)
Esteban E. Torres, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-California)
Ed Towns, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-New York)

Spring

"From Pinochet to Democracy"
Genaro Arriagada Herrera, fellow, Institute of Politics; vice president, National Christian Democratic Party of Chile; principal advisor, 1989 Patricio Aylwin presidential campaign; director, "Vote No" campaign opposing General Pinochet in the October 5, 1989 plebiscite
Guests:
Pamela Constable, Latin American correspondent, *The Boston Globe*  
Mark Schneider, senior policy advisor, Pan American Health Organization, Washington, D.C.  
Ken Wollack, vice president, National Democratic Institute; official advisor, Presidential elections in Chile, Panama, the Philippines


Steven Cobble, fellow, Institute of Politics; executive director, Keep Hope Alive; coordinator, national delegate selection, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President campaign  
Guests:  
Jerry Austin, political consultant; manager, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President campaign  
Dan Cantor, coordinator, labor desk, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President campaign  
Danni Palmore, assistant manager, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President campaign

"Student, Soldiers and Citizens: Perspectives on China’s Democracy Movement"

Kathleen Hartford, associate professor of political science, University of Massachusetts / Boston; president, China scholars coordinating committee, Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University  
Guests:  
David Michael Lampton, president, National Committee on U.S.-China Relations  
Robin Munroe, researcher on China, AsiaWatch  
Tong Shen, co-founder, student dialogue delegation at Tiananmen Square; undergraduate (Biology), Brandeis University  
Tyrene White, assistant professor of political science, Swarthmore College  
Xiaoxia Gong, coordinator, China Information Center and graduate degree candidate, Department of Sociology, Harvard University  
Yang Ye, assistant professor of Chinese, Bates College; member and organizer, Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars in the United States  
Ya Sheng Huang, consultant, World Bank resident mission, Beijing; graduate degree candidate, Department of Government, Harvard University  
Shahid Yusuf, principal economist/operations division, The World Bank

"East Central Europe: ‘The Times They Are A-Changin’”

John-Paul Himka, visiting lecturer, Harvard University  
Guests:  
Andrzej Chojnowski, Docent at the Institute of History, University of Warsaw  
Grzegorz Ekiert, co-chair, study group on East Central Europe, Center for European Studies, Harvard University  
Michael Kraus, associate professor of political science, Middlebury College; co-editor, *Perestroika and East-West Economic Relations: Prospects for the 1990’s*
The Student Program

Bohdan Krawchenko, director, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies; author, Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine
Veniamin Sikora, professor of political economy, Institute of Culture, Kiev; economic advisor, Popular Movement of Ukraine (RUKH)
Josef Skvorecky, professor of English, University of Toronto; native of Czechoslovakia

"Who's Punishing Whom?: The Incarceration of America"
Dennis Humphrey, associate commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Corrections

Guests:
Timothy App, superintendent, Park Drive Pre-release Center, Boston
Susan Guarino-Ghezzi, assistant professor of criminal justice, Northeastern University
Prison Inmate, Massachusetts Department of Corrections
Daniel LeClair, director, research division, Massachusetts Department of Corrections
Nancy White, associate commissioner and general counsel, Massachusetts Department of Corrections

"Voluntarism in the 90's: Reviving the Call to Public Service"
Pauline Kezer, fellow, Institute of Politics; former member, Connecticut House of Representatives; nominee, 1986 campaign for Secretary of State, Connecticut; vice chair, board of directors, Girl Scouts of America

Guests:
Jeanne Austin, co-chair, Republican National Committee
Susan Butler, partner, Anderson Consulting, Youth in Philanthropy
Donald W. Davis, chairman of the board, Stanley Works
Clark Ervin, associate director of policy, Office of National Service
Carolyn Losos, director, “Experience St. Louis—Commitment and Leadership”
Carolyn Neal, legislative aide to Bruce Adams, member, Montgomery City Council; coordinator, Maryland “Day of Public Service”
Dennis Smith, regional representative, U.S. Department of Education
Jose Toro, attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
Joyce Yarrow, president, Institute for Non-profit Training and Development, Hartford, Connecticut

"Fight the Power: Race and Ethnic Relations in the 90's"
Brian O'Connor, managing editor, The Bay State Banner

Guests:
Bruce C. Bolling, member, Boston City Council
Francis J. Costello, assistant director, Economic Development and Industrial Corporation
Roy Crazy Horse, chief, Powhatan-Renape Nation
Andrew Jones, founder, Greater Roxbury Incorporation Project; documentary filmmaker and news producer
Don Muhammad, minister, Nation of Islam
Paul O'Dwyer, former president, New York City Council
Marta Rose, member, Chelsea School Committee
Leonard Zakim, director, New England region, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; co-director, Greater Boston Civil Rights Coalition

"Business and Government: How Should They Work Together in the 90's?"
John Rauh, fellow, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government; 1990 Democratic candidate for U. S. Senate, New Hampshire; former chief operating officer, Clopay Corporation

Guests:
Stephen B. Kay, former general partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.; former adjunct fellow, Institute of Politics and fellow, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Sir Roy Denman, former Ambassador to the United States from the European Economic Community
John Dunlop, acting director, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former U. S. Secretary of Labor
Sylvio Dupuis, chief executive officer, Catholic Medical Center, Manchester, New Hampshire
Donald Stone, former vice chairman, Federated Department Stores
Sidney Topol, former chief executive officer, Scientific Atlanta

"Campaign '92: The Candidates and the Press"
Joan Richman, fellow, Institute of Politics; former vice president/news coverage and executive producer/special events & political coverage, CBS-TV News

Guests:
Tom Donilon, attorney, O'Melveny & Myers; coordinator, 1984 Mondale for President campaign; senior advisor, 1988 Dukakis for President campaign
Peter Hart, chairman, Peter Hart Research Associates, political consultants
Martin F. Nolan, editorial page editor, The Boston Globe; member, Fellows Alumni Advisory Committee, Institute of Politics
Dan Rather, anchor & managing editor, "CBS Evening News with Dan Rather"

"Playing the Game: The Politics of Sports"
Bob Ryan, sports reporter and columnist, The Boston Globe, co-author, Drive (with Boston Celtics star Larry Bird)

Guests:
Bob Costas, sportscaster and talk show host, NBC-TV
Dave Gavitt, commissioner, Big East Basketball Conference
Derrick Z. Jackson, columnist, The Boston Globe
The Student Program

Jackie MacMullan, sports reporter and columnist, The Boston Globe
Jan Volk, general manager, Boston Celtics

"Development Strategies for the Future of Africa"
Rose Waruhiu, fellow, Institute of Politics; former member of Parliament, Kenya; former member, Joint Assembly of the Africa, Caribbean, Pacific and European Economic Community

Guests:
Wanjiru Kamau, doctoral degree candidate and retention specialist, academic support services, Pennsylvania State University
James Karuga, former financial secretary of the treasury, Kenya; economist, The World Bank
Shem Migot-Adhola, senior rural sociologist, The World Bank

"Electoral Politics: Southern Style"
Jesse L. White, Jr., fellow, Institute of Politics; former executive director, Southern Growth Policy Board; manager, 1979 Mississippi Democratic gubernatorial campaign of William Winter

Guests:
Brad Hayes, president, Marlet Associates; manager, 1980 & 1984 North Carolina Republican gubernatorial campaigns of Jim Martin
Harrison Hickman, president, Hickman-Maslin Research, polling consultants
Bob Squier, president, Squier-Eskew, Inc., media consultants
Robert Walker, Mayor of Vicksburg, Mississippi; former director, Mississippi NAACP
William Winter, former Governor of Mississippi; former fellow, Institute of Politics

"Current Affairs Dinner Table"
Martha Bradlee, chief correspondent, WCVB-TV, Boston

Guests:
Newman Flanagan, district attorney, Suffolk County, Massachusetts
John Kerry, member, U.S. Senate (D-Massachusetts)
Timothy Johnson, M. D., medical consultant, ABC-TV

Institute Suppers

Institute suppers, scheduled twice each week in conjunction with the study group program, bring together for informal discourse study group leaders and their guests, current and former fellows and staff and representatives from the arenas of electoral politics, public affairs, the media, and academia. The agenda for supper includes a brief
talk, usually by a study group or Forum guest speaker, and a discussion. 1989-90 suppers speakers were:

Fall

October 3:  Fred Friendly, director, Media and Society Seminars, Columbia University; former president, CBS News
guest speaker, Steve Atlas’ study group

Roderick MacFarquhar, director, Fairbank Center For East Asian Research, Harvard University
Alan W. Pessin, news editor, Voice of America
Forum panelists

October 10: Dighton Spooner, director, CBS “Entertainment” mini-series;
former producer, WGBH-TV Boston
guest speaker, Steve Atlas’ study group

October 11: Greg Kubiak, specialist, campaign election law; legislative assis­
tant, office of David Boren, member, U. S. Senate (D-Oklahoma)
guest speaker, Reubin Askew’s study group
Kathleen Sheekey, chief lobbyist, Common Cause
guest speaker, James Tierney’s study group

October 17: Michael Gartner, president, NBC News; former editor, The Des Moines Register and The Louisville Courier Journal
guest speaker, Katherine Fanning’s study group

October 18: Michael Parenti, author, Inventing Reality: The Politics of the Mass Media; Power and the Powerless and Democracy for the Few
guest speaker, Bernard Sanders’ study group

October 24: Linda Chavez, television commentator; former president, U. S.
English; staff director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
guest speaker, Raul Yzaguirre’s study group

October 25: Peter Sutherland, chairman, Allied Irish Banks; former commis­sioner, European Economic Community; former Attorney General of Ireland
Heffernan visiting fellow, Institute of Politics

October 31: Graham T. Allison, Douglas Dillon professor of government and former dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government; co­director, Project on Avoiding Nuclear War

November 1: Brooks Jackson, reporter, The Wall Street Journal; author, Honest Graft
guest speaker, Reubin Askew’s study group
November 7:  **Thomas Winship**, president, Center for Foreign Journalists; former editor, *The Boston Globe*  guest speaker, Katherine Fanning's study group

November 8:  **Peter Rodman**, White House special assistant/national security affairs; counsellor, National Security Council  guest speaker, Nancy Risque Rohrbach's study group

November 14:  **Wade Henderson**, associate director, American Civil Liberties Union  guest speaker, Raul Yzaguirre's study group

November 15:  **Craig Fuller**, president, Wexler, Reynolds, Fuller, Harrison & Schule; former White House assistant/Cabinet affairs and former chief of staff, office of the Vice President (Reagan/Bush administration)  guest speaker, Nancy Risque Rohrbach's study group

**Spring**

February 13:  **Bob Costas**, sportscaster and talk show host, NBC-TV  guest speaker, Bob Ryan's study group


February 20:  **Raul Alfonsin**, former President of Argentina  Heffernan visiting fellow, Institute of Politics

February 21:  **Yang Ye**, assistant professor of Chinese, Bates College; member and organizer, Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars in the United States  guest speaker, Kathleen Hartford's study group

February 27:  **Bohdan Krawchenko**, director, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies; author, *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine*  guest speaker, John-Paul Himka's study group

February 28:  **Leonard Zakim**, executive director, New England region, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; co-director, Greater Boston Civil Rights Coalition  guest speaker, Brian O'Connor's study group
March 6: **Robert Walker**, Mayor of Vicksburg, Mississippi, former director, Mississippi NAACP
        guest speaker, Jesse L. White, Jr.'s study group

March 7: **Bruce C. Bolling**, member, Boston City Council;
        guest speaker, Brian O'Connor's study group

March 13: **Genaro Arriagada**, fellow, Institute of Politics
        **David Asman**, editor, "Americas" column, *The Wall Street Journal*
        **Daniel J. Evans**, former U.S. Senator and Governor, State of Washington
        official observers, Nicaraguan Presidential election, February 1990
        Forum panelists

March 14: **Daniel LeClair**, director, research division, Massachusetts Depart­
        ment of Corrections
        guest speaker, Dennis Humphrey's study group

March 20: **Jerry Austin**, political consultant; manager, 1988 Jesse Jackson for
        President campaign
        **Danni Palmore**, assistant manager, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President
        campaign
        **Bob Squier**, media consultant, president, Squier-Eskew, Inc.
        guest speakers, Steven Cobble's study group

March 21: **Ken Wollack**, vice president, National Democratic Institute; official
        advisor, Presidential elections in Chile, Panama, the Philippines
        guest speaker, Genaro Arriagada's study group

April 3: **John Dunlop**, acting director, Center for Business and Govern­
        ment, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former U. S.
        Secretary of Labor
        guest speaker, John Rauh's study group

April 4: **John Maisto**, deputy permanent representative of the U.S. to the
        Organization of American States
        **Jon Meyersohn**, producer, CBS News
        **Mario Rognoni**, former Minister of Commerce, Panama
        Forum panelists

April 10: **Charles Robb**, member, United States Senate (D-Virginia)
        guest speaker, special session in the Forum, Jesse L. White, Jr.'s
        study group

April 11: **Dick Goldman**, development specialist, Kenya; fellow, Harvard
        Institute for International Development
The Dennis B. and Elizabeth B. Heffernan Visiting Fellows program brings prominent public men and women to Harvard for brief visits designed to provide maximum contact with the Harvard community, in particular with undergraduate students. A public address in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs is often one of the highlights of the program.

The 1989-90 Visiting Fellows were:

**Fall**

Peter Sutherland, chairman, Allied Irish Bank, former commissioner from the Republic of Ireland to the European Economic Community and former attorney general of Ireland.

Activities during Mr. Sutherland's Visit (October 23-25, 1989) included a breakfast meeting with undergraduates at the Harvard Freshman Union; lunch with members of the Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee; participation in a Department of Economics course on Europe 1992, a discussion meeting with students and fellows at the Center for International Affairs and an appearance as guest speaker and discussion leader at an Institute of Politics supper.

**Spring**

Raul Alfonsin, former president of the Republic of Argentina.

Activities during Dr. Alfonsin's visit (February 20-22, 1990) included breakfast meetings with undergraduates at the Harvard Freshman Union and with fellows of the Harvard Nieman Foundation and the Mason Program of the Harvard Institute for International Development; lunch with members of the Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee; participation in a Department of History course on the Argentine Civil War and a discussion on democratization in Latin America at a seminar hosted by the Committee for Iberian and Latin American Studies and the Center for International Studies; delivery of a lecture on legal and human rights issues in Argentina to students and faculty at Harvard Law School and a public address in the Forum on transitions to democracy and lessons from the Argentine experience.

**Summer Research Awards**

The Institute of Politics offers financial support to Harvard undergraduates for summer fieldwork contributing to senior theses relating to American politics and public policy issues. Recipients of summer 1989 research awards and their topics were:
Marc Bodnick '90
(Government)
Stephen Charles Bowsher '90
(History and Government)
Todd R. Lochner '90
(Government)
Christopher Pham '90
(Government)

Melinda T. Tuan '90
(Social Studies)
Fidel A. Vargas '90
(Social Studies)

Public Affairs Internships

The Institute offers several programs for Harvard undergraduates in support of student participation in public sector internships and in public affairs, including:

Information—about internship and employment opportunities in American politics and public affairs—provided in conjunction with the Harvard Office of Career Services

The Summer Stipend Program—provides supplementary funds in support of public sector internships to enable undergraduates to accept unpaid or underpaid summer jobs in federal, state, and local government, political organizations, and public affairs agencies

The Summer-in-Washington Program—provides information and assistance for students seeking summer housing in the District of Columbia and its environs and hosts a speakers series, intellectual, athletic and social activities for Harvard students working and living during the summer in the Washington, D.C. area

The Summer-in-Boston Program—hosts a speaker series, social events and excursions to places of political interest for students and others studying, working or living in the Boston area during the eight-week Harvard Summer School session

Seminars and workshops—bring together Institute Fellows, public sector professionals, former interns and intern supervisors for panel discussions on internship availability, requirements, hiring practices and recruitment, skills needed, office protocol, opportunities for job enhancement and advancement, and tips about summer living and resources available in the Washington, D.C. area

The Externship Program—provides an opportunity for Harvard students, on one or more days during Harvard’s spring break week, to “shadow,” and thus observe first hand, the day-to-day responsibilities of professionals working in government, public sector agencies and the media
Summer Stipends

1989 summer stipend recipients and their employers were:

Margaret Abe '92
Redwood City, California—office of the San Mateo county supervisor

Yvette R. Austin '92
Washington—office of the National League of Cities

Dylan Cook Black '90
Washington—office of Albert Gore, member, U.S. Senate (D-Tennessee)

David Bulger '90
Pittsburgh—office of John Heinz, member, U.S. Senate (R-Pennsylvania)

Eric John Carlson '91
Minneapolis—office of the Hennepin County public defender

Kevin D. Collins '90
Boston—office of Evelyn Murphy, lieutenant governor of Massachusetts

Leslie R. Crutchfield '90
Washington—office of the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition

Lawrence Duncan '90
Washington—office of the Corporation Council

Eliot Fishman '92
Washington—office of Barney Frank, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Massachusetts)

Jonathan J. Frankel '91
Washington—office of the National Audubon Society

Julie E. Green '90
Boston—governor’s office on womens issues

Sean Griffin '90
Washington—Northeast-Midwest congressional coalition

Jonathan K. Hanson '92
Washington—office of Tim Johnson, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-South Dakota)

Justine A. Harris '90
Boston—Lawyer’s Committee for Civil Rights

Jay Lee Koh '91
Washington—office of Henry J. Hyde, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Illinois),

Thomas Lauderdale '92
Portland, Oregon—office of Mayor J. E. “Bud” Clark

Joan Loughnane '92
Boston—office of Mayor Raymond L. Flynn

Hilda Martinez '92
Fresno—office of the Fresno county public defender

Robert McBurney '90
Seoul, Korea—Embassy of the United States

Robyn Minter '91
Cuyahoga, Ohio—office of the county commissioner

Michelle Olivier '90
New York City—United Nations

Carlos Perez '91
Los Angeles—office of the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund

Joan Marie Pokaski '91
Washington—office of Brian Donnelly, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Massachusetts)

Leslie Ann Powell '90
Vienna, Virginia—office of the bureau of intelligence and research, U.S. Department of State

Daniel Ramos '91
Washington—office of Elton Gallegly, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-California)

Linda D. Rottenburg '90
Washington—office of the International Institute for Women’s Political Leadership

Rabinda Soni '90
Washington—office of Sam Nunn, member, U.S. Senate (D-Georgia)
David Sorola '91  
David Sorola '91  San Antonio—office of the Southwest Voter Research Institute

Jeffrey Stern '90  
Jeffrey Stern '90  Washington—office of the Federal Communications Commission

Katherine A. Stewart '91  
Katherine A. Stewart '91  Washington—office of Duncan Hunter, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-California)

Jeffrey Stravino '92  
Jeffrey Stravino '92  Buffalo—office of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, member, U.S. Senate (D-New York)

Lisa Marie Stulberg '92  
Lisa Marie Stulberg '92  Chicago—office of the American Civil Liberties Union

Kevin Toh '91  
Kevin Toh '91  San Francisco—office of Pete Wilson, member, U.S. Senate (R-California)

Elizabeth Ward '90  
Elizabeth Ward '90  Washington—office of the bureau of European and Canadian affairs, U.S. Department of State

Carlos Watson '91  
Carlos Watson '91  Miami—office of Mayor Xavier Suarez

Jason Worth '90  
Jason Worth '90  Washington—office of the bureau of intelligence and research, U.S. Department of State

Summer-in-Washington Program

The 1989 Summer-in-Washington Program, coordinated by Rushika Fernandopulle '89, provided, during April and May, general and specific information on summer housing in the District of Columbia area, and hosted, during June, July and August, the following events:

**Political**

**June 22:** Meeting and discussion with Edward Fouhy, executive director, Concord Communication Group; former fellow, Institute of Politics

**July 11:** Meeting and discussion with Barney Frank, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Massachusetts); former fellow, Institute of Politics

**July 17:** Tour of the White House with David Miller, deputy National Security Advisor

**July 24:** Presentation at the Embassy of the U.S.S.R.

**July 26:** Meeting and discussion with Joan Martin Brown, United Nations Environment Program

**July 27:** Meeting and discussion with Edward M. Kennedy, member, U.S. Senate (D-Massachusetts); member, senior advisory committee, Institute of Politics

**July 27:** Tour of the White House with Chase Untermeyer, White House director of personnel; the White House; former fellow, Institute of Politics
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Cultural/Social
June 23 & 24: Program Receptions (Georgetown)
July 4: Fireworks on the Mall
July 6: National Symphony Tchaikovsky program (Wolf Trap)
July 16: Annual Harvard Club picnic (Maryland shore)
July 30: Barbecue hosted by Mark E. Talisman, advisor to the Summer-in-Washington Program; director, Washington action office, Council of Jewish Federations; former fellow, Institute of Politics (Chevy Chase, Maryland)

July 30: Shear Madness (Kennedy Center)

Sports
July 15: All-College Olympics (the Mall)

Softball:
June 18: Harvard v. Brown
June 25: Harvard v. UCLA
July 16: Harvard v. Berkeley
July 24: Harvard v. Michigan
July 30: Harvard v. Yale
(Washington Monument)

Baseball:
June 30: Baltimore Orioles v. Detroit Tigers
(Memorial Stadium, Baltimore)

Volleyball:
(Smithsonian Castle)

Summer-in-Boston Program

The 1989 Summer-in-Boston Program, coordinated by Lisa Pritchard ’89, hosted the following activities during the Harvard Summer School term:

July 6: A tour of Massachusetts State House with Brad Minnick, chief of staff, office of Steven Pierce, minority leader, Massachusetts House of Representatives
July 12: A brown bag luncheon discussion, "The Supreme Court Decision on Abortion: Reasons, Repercussions," with Susan Newsome, director of public relations, Planned Parenthood, Boston (Freshman Union)

July 12: A panel discussion, "Revolution in China: Peace, Progress, and Policy?" with Jiangqung Cai, Yang Ye, Longxhi Zhang and Donald Klein (moderator) (see The Forum)

July 15: A tour of the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, with Shelley Summer, director of public relations, Kennedy Library

July 21: A brown bag luncheon discussion, "Affirmative Action: Who's Calling the Shots?," with Allan Rom, founder and director, Boston Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights (Freshman Union)

July 27: A discussion, "The Bush Response to Gorbachev's Foreign Policy," with Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Ford Foundation professor of international security and director, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Institute of Politics Conference Room)

August 2: A discussion, "Democracy in Panama?," with Eduardo Valerino, director, National Civic Crusade (group opposed to the government of General Noriega) (Institute of Politics Conference Room)


Externships

The Institute's Externship program, scheduled annually during spring break week, provides undergraduates the opportunity to accompany public sector professionals through a routine workday. Spring 1990 externs and their hosts were:

**Boston**

Rajarshi Bhattacharyya '92: Andy Hiller, political reporter, WBZ-TV
Charles Honig '93: Theodore Landsmark, director, Mayor's Office of Jobs and Community Service
Cathy Lawrence '92: A. David Mazzone, judge, U.S. District Court
Jeff Livingston '93: Paul J. Eustace, secretary of labor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Claire Scherrer '92: Brad Minnick, manager, 1990 Republican gubernatorial campaign of Steven Pierce

**New York**

Kenneth Bamberger '90: Marilyn J. Flood, executive director, Commission on the Status of Women
Evan Grayer '92: Sam Donaldson, co-host, "Primetime Live," ABC News
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Tony Jensen '92: Diane Kemelman, administrative assistant, Corporate Counsel's Office
Mario Mancuse '91: John Wenninger, assistant vice president, Federal Reserve Bank of New York
Cheryl Nelson HLS: Rick McGahey, deputy comptroller, Office of Policy Management
Amy Salzhauer '91: Laura D. Blackburne, president and chief executive officer, Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, Inc.

Washington
Colin Gounden '92: Joseph P. Kennedy, II, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Massachusetts)
Charles Honig '93: Jack Kemp, secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Lydia Otero '92: Thomas Cochran, executive director, U.S. Conference of Mayors

Tamar Shay, Kimberly Morgan, Kimberley Harris, Senator Kennedy
Harvard Political Review

*Harvard Political Review*, a journal of political analysis, is published by the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. 1989-90 officers and staff were:

**Editor-in-Chief:** Jeffrey S. Glueck (Dec/Jan)
Peter Kozinets (Mar/May)

**Managing Editor:** Cherie Harder (Dec/Jan)
James Grosjean (Mar/May)

**Assistant Managing Editor:** Alex Luchenitser

**Editor Emeritus:** Maxwell Rovner (Dec/Jan)
Jeffrey S. Glueck (Mar/May)

**Advertising:**
Umkoo Imam, Jeff Livingston
Sheryl Sandberg, Raul Sandoval
Clare Scherrer, Ian Schmidek
Colin Teichholtz, Liz Yap

**Circulation:**
Joe Secondine (Dec/Jan)
Umkoo Imam (Mar/May)

**Cover Story:**
Peter Kozinets (Dec/Jan)
David Weller (Mar/May)

**Departments:**
James Grosjean (Dec/Jan)
Chris Harris (Mar/May)

**Design:**
Oliver Chin, Joe Tan (Dec)
Joseph Kusnan (Mar/May)

**Features:**
Mukhlis Balbale (Mar/May)

**Publisher:**
Jose Knoell (Dec/Jan)
Joe Secondine (Mar/May)

**Reviews:**
Chris Harris (Dec/Jan)
Robert Gordon (Mar/May)

**Outside Submissions:**
David Weller (Dec/Jan)
Jonathan G. S. Koppell (Mar/May)
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Contributing Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mukhlis Balbale '92</th>
<th>Beth Johnston '93</th>
<th>Sheryl Sandberg '91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Jonathan Bass '92</td>
<td>Sean Kanuck '93</td>
<td>Raul Sandoval '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preetinder Bharara '90</td>
<td>Tae-hui Kim '93</td>
<td>Clare Scherrer '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Castillo '93</td>
<td>Peter Klibanoff '90</td>
<td>Ian Schmidek '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Chen '92</td>
<td>Jose Knoell '90</td>
<td>Joe Secondine '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Chin '91</td>
<td>Jonathan G. S. Koppell '93</td>
<td>Charles Shaw '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Chou '91</td>
<td>Peter Kozinets '92</td>
<td>Ben Sheffner '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Depalo '93</td>
<td>Jeff Livingston '93</td>
<td>Evan Durell Stone '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Eigerman '92</td>
<td>Titi Lu '93</td>
<td>Kyoko Takahashi '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey S. Glueck '91</td>
<td>Alex Luchenitser '91</td>
<td>Joe Tan '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gordon '93</td>
<td>Paul MacKinnon '91</td>
<td>Colin Teichholtz '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Grosjean '90</td>
<td>Jocelyn Melcher '92</td>
<td>Craig Turk '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Harder '91</td>
<td>Samuel T. Menser '93</td>
<td>Jason Vinz '93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Harris '92</td>
<td>John Middleton, Jr. '92</td>
<td>David Weller '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Harrison '90</td>
<td>Cathy Petti '91</td>
<td>Liz Yap '92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umkoo Imam '93</td>
<td>Maxwell Rovner '90</td>
<td>Leon Yen '93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four issues of HPR were published during the 1989-90 academic year. Articles included:

VOLUME 17/Number 1: December 1989

Cover: "42 Issues More Pressing Than Flag-Burning"
"The Price of Symbolism," Cherie Harder
"We're Not Wasting Time," Robert Michel
"Our List," HPR Staff
"Their Lists," National Leaders
"Assignment: Fix Education," Malcolm Harrison
"A Historic Opportunity," J. Eigerman
"HUD, PACs, and Fat Cats," Preetinder Bharara

World:
"Taking the Nuclear Path," Tae-hui Kim

Interviews:
Interview with Al Pessin, Richard Roth, Fox Butterfield, and Huang Yasheng, "Myths, Moods, and Memories"
Interview with former Connecticut Senator Lowell Weicker, "Sex, Fluff, and Politics"

Review:
"Endism is History," Robert Gordon

Vital Statistics
VOLUME 17/Number 2: January 1990

Cover: “Fear and Hope in the Cities,” Cherie Harder

Nation:
“Schools Can’t Fix Everything,” Paul MacKinnon
“Assessing the Court,” Ben Sheffner
“Battle for the House,” Jason Vincz

World:
“Korean Reunification,” Tae-hui Kim
“Asia 1992?,” Joe Kusnan

Interview:
Interview with R.W. Apple, Jr. “Confessions of a Campaign Reporter”

Review:
“Debating Debates,” Samuel T. Menser

Vital Statistics

VOLUME 17/Number 3: March 1990

Cover: “A Dream Deferred”

Interview with Julian Bond, “Civil Rights: Where Do We Go From Here?”
“The Resurgence of Racism,” Chris Harris
Interview with Jesse White, “Keeping the Dream Alive, Southern Style”
“Black Politics at the Crossroads,” Samuel T. Menser
“No Aid for Legal Aid,” David Weller
“A Bitter Pill for Minorities,” John Middleton, Jr.

Nation:
“Cashing in the Peace Dividend,” Tae-hui Kim

World:
Interview with Raul Alfonsin, “Years of Hope and Struggle in Argentina”
“Chile: A Democracy Reborn,” Jonathan G.S. Koppell
“Yen for Eastern Europe,” Kyoko Takahashi

VOLUME 17/Number 4: May 1990

Cover: “Power Comes from the Barrel of a Gun”
“Bush’s Quixotic Quest for the China Card,” Alex Luchenitser
“The Battle of the Gerontocrats,” David Weller
“Terror in Tibet,” Jonathan G.S. Koppell
“Fear and Loathing in Hong Kong,” Titi Liu
“Back to Central Planning,” Anna Depalo

Nation:
“California Dreamin’,” Craig Turk
“Dollars, Drugs, and Death,” John Middleton, Jr.
“Confronting Child Witness Trauma,” Evan Durell Stone
“A Report from the Trenches,” Jonathan G.S. Koppell
World:
"Sweden and the EC: Hesitant Bedfellows," Anna Eliasson

Reviews:
"What I Saw at the Revolution," Beth Johnston
"The Years of Lyndon Johnson: Means of Ascent," Kristen Silverberg

Student Projects

During academic year 1989-90, the Projects Committee continued its sponsorship of educational programs, including conferences on leadership for undergraduate women and for high school students; events in the Forum of Public Affairs including an address by the former president of Argentina, Raul Alfonsin, discussions by the fall and spring Institute Fellows, and on the military crackdown in China, the future of U.S. foreign policy toward China, Hispanics and the Rainbow Coalition, the future of Eastern Europe, the invasion of Panama, anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the role of women in the armed services, and on the environment; a brown bag lunch discussion series; the third annual crisis simulation exercise, Harvard political union debates and the annual political journalism awards.

Projects included:

Conferences

Second Annual Harvard/Radcliffe Women's Leadership Conference, September 10-14, 1989, co-sponsored by the Harvard/Radcliffe Women's Leadership Project. Guest speakers included:
Philippa Bovet, dean, Radcliffe College
Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, vice president, Equator Bank; former Minister of Finance, Liberia
Kathryn Murray, partner, Lukstat, Wade, Likins, and Murray; former fellow, Institute of Politics; communications director, Republican National Committee (1987-89)
Linda Wilson, president, Radcliffe College

Second Annual High School Leadership Conference, December 8, 1989, co-sponsored by the Massachusetts Department of Education. Guest speakers included:
George Bachrach, attorney, Brown, Rudnick, Freed, Gesmer; former member, Massachusetts Senate
Larry DiCara, attorney, DiCara, Attorneyt; former member, Boston City Council
"Kip" Tiernan, director, Rosie's Place, shelter for homeless women, Boston
Forum

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 20, 1989, a panel discussion, with the fall 1989 fellows of the Institute of Politics:

Nancy Risque Rohrbach, senior White House aide and secretary to the Cabinet (1987-89); member, President Reagan’s senior legislative management team (1983-1986)
Raul Yzaguirre, president and chief executive officer, National Council of La Raza (1978-present); former member, U.S. Commission to UNESCO
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government and acting director, Institute of Politics (moderator)

"Eyewitness to a Massacre: Tales from Tiananmen," October 4, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Asian caucus, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with

Alan W. Pessin, news editor and former Beijing bureau chief, Voice of America
Richard Roth, correspondent, CBS-TV News
Ya Sheng Huang, doctoral degree candidate, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Roderick MacFarquhar, director, John K. Fairbanks Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University (moderator)

"Hispanics: Part of the Rainbow Coalition?" October 23, 1989, a panel discussion, with

John Lewis, member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-Georgia)
Bill Richardson, member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-New Mexico)
Ed Towns, member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-New York)
Raul Yzaguirre, fellow, Institute of Politics; president and chief executive officer, National Council of La Raza (moderator)

"The Iron Curtain Rises: The Future of Eastern Europe," November 29, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the student council of the Center for International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with

William Griffiths, former senior advisor to the Ambassador from the United States, West Germany
Klaus-Christian Kraemer, former Counsellor to the Foreign Minister, West Germany
Joseph S. Nye, Jr., director, Center for International Affairs
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government and acting director, Institute of Politics
Stephan Klasen ’90, member, student advisory committee, Institute of Politics (moderator)
"Tales From Tiananmen II: Students in the Square," November 30, 1989, a panel discussion, with
Yuan Liu, student, Brandeis University
Ge Chen, student, Brandeis University
Kaixi Wu'er, student, Harvard University
Roderick MacFarquhar, director, John K. Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University (moderator)

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," February 1, 1990, a panel discussion, with the spring 1990 fellows of the Institute of Politics, including
Genaro Arriagada Herrera, vice president, National Christian Democratic Party, Chile; principal advisor, 1989 Presidential campaign of Patricio Aylwin
Steven Cobble, executive director, Keep Hope Alive; national coordinator/delegate selection, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President campaign
Pauline Kezer, vice chair, Connecticut Republican Party (1987-89); member, Connecticut House of Representatives (1979-86)
Joan Richman, vice president/news coverage, CBS-TV (1987-89); vice president, director, executive producer, CBS News special events (1981-87)
Rose Waruhiu, branch assistant secretary, KANU Party, Kenya (1988); former Member of Parliament, Kenya (1983-88)
Charles Royer, director, Institute of Politics; former Mayor of Seattle (moderator)

"Transition to Democracy: Lessons from Argentina's Experience," February 21, 1990, a public address, by Raul Alfonsin, Heffernan visiting fellow, Institute of Politics; former President of Argentina (see also Student Program/Visiting Fellows)

"How Endangered is Our Planet?," February 22, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with
Richard Benedick, Ambassador from the United States to the Montreal Protocol
William Clark, senior research associate, Science, Technology and Public Policy Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael McElroy, chairman, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Harvard University
E. O. Wilson, professor of biology, Harvard University
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator)

"Invasion Strategy: U.S. Policy and Politics in Panama," April 4, 1990, a panel discussion, with
John Maisto, deputy permanent representative of the United States to the Organization of American States
Jon Meyersohn, producer, "CBS Evening News With Dan Rather"; former hostage in Panama during U.S. invasion (held four days by troops loyal to General Noriega)
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Mario Rognoni, former Minister of Commerce, Panama

Shane Hunt, professor of economics, Boston University; co-author, The Latin American Economies: Growth and the Export Sector, 1880-1930 (moderator)

Special session, Institute of Politics study group on electoral politics Southern style, April 10, 1990, a public address, "Rethinking the Role of Government: A Democratic Perspective," with Charles Robb, member, U.S. Senate (D-Virginia) and study group leader, Jesse White, Jr.

"Business as Usual? The Future of U.S. Policy in China," April 12, 1990, a panel discussion, with
Lawrence Sullivan, professor, Adelphi University
Martin Weil, U.S.-China Business Council
Yang Ye, associate professor of Chinese, Bates College; representative, Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars in the United States

Merle Goldman, professor, Boston University; associate, Fairbank Center for East Asian Studies, Harvard University (moderator)

"Women: Up in Arms?" April 16, 1990, a debate with
Elaine Donnelly, former member, Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Service
Evelyn P. Foote, Brigadier General, Ret., United States Army
Brian Mitchell, author, Weak Link: The Feminization of the American Military
Martha Mullet, vice chair, Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Service
Peter Zimmerman, associate dean for executive training and program development, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator)

"Perestroika and Pogroms: The Rise of Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union," April 30, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by Harvard-Radcliffe Hillel, with
Alan Dershowitz, professor of law, Harvard Law School
Marshall Goldman, associate director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Jonathan Mayhew, office of Soviet affairs, U.S. Department of State
Joshua Rubenstein, director, Northeast region, Amnesty International; author, Soviet Dissidents: Their Struggle for Human Rights

Gene Burns, talk show host, WRKO Radio Boston (moderator)

"Earth Day 1990: 20 Years of Environmentalism," April 23, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Environmental Action Committee, Phillips Brooks House, with
Jason Clay, director of research, Cultural Survival
Doug Scott, associate director, Sierra Club
Sandra Postel, vice president of research, Worldwatch Institute
Heinrich Holland, professor of geology, Harvard University (moderator)
Brown Bag Luncheons

Discussion on law and order in the USSR, November 1, 1989, with Igor Kolesov, Soviet prosecutor, Riga

Discussion on current events in South Africa, February 27, 1990, with Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former member of Parliament, Great Britain

Discussion, April 5, 1990, with Reggie Williams, member, Cincinnati City Council and linebacker, Cincinnati Bengals, co-sponsored by the Taubman Center for State and Local Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Women in Politics, Friday series, April 6 through 27, 1990, with Pauline Kezer, fellow, Institute of Politics; former member, Connecticut House of Representatives

Crisis Simulation

Third annual “Crisis Simulation” exercise, December 8-9, 1989, with forty-eight student participants, in roles as senior government officials, utilizing computer analysis for measured and planned responses and strategic decision making to solve a hypothetical crisis situation.

Harvard Political Union

During 1989-90, the Harvard Political Union, a student debating forum (and subcommittee of the projects committee) organized the following debates:

“Randomization of the Freshman Housing Lottery,” October 18, 1989, an open student debate (Emerson Hall/Harvard Yard)

“Affirmative Action: Where Do You Stand?,” March 8, 1990, an open debate, with Nathan Glazer, professor of education and social structure, Harvard University

Dennis Lin, Harvard ‘93

Michael Lord, Harvard ‘90

Barack Obama, president, Harvard Law Review

Ronald L. Quincy, assistant to the president and associate vice president, Harvard University (Belfer Center/Starr Auditorium)

Political Journalism Awards

Each spring, the Student Advisory Committee presents awards to Harvard undergraduates for political journalism. Entries in two categories, opinion and reporting, are judged by a panel of political journalists.
The 1990 winning entries were:


The panel of judges, which reviewed 45 entries, included:

- Fox Butterfield, correspondent-at-large, *The New York Times*
- Gerard D. Hegstrom, contributing editor, *The National Journal*; former fellow, Institute of Politics
- Eileen McNamara, correspondent, *The Boston Globe*
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.

Panel on Fellowships

Michael Barrett, member, Massachusetts State Senate
John Cullinane, fellow, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Christopher F. Edley, Jr., professor of law, Harvard Law School
Archie C. Epps III, dean of students, Harvard College
Marcia Grant, director, Mason fellows program, assistant director, student programs, Harvard Institute for International Development and associate director, mid-career Masters in Public Administration program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Herman B. (Dutch) Leonard, Jr., George F. Baker, Jr. professor of public management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ann F. Lewis, political consultant; former national director, Americans for Democratic Action
Lance M. Liebman, professor of law, Harvard Law School*
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, executive director, Taubman Center for State and Local Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Richard E. Neustadt, Douglas Dillon professor of government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Martin F. Nolan, editorial page editor, The Boston Globe; former fellow, Institute of Politics
John Shattuck, lecturer at Harvard Law School and vice president for government, community and public affairs, Harvard University
Lewis (Harry) Spence, lecturer in public policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Cathleen Douglas Stone, Attorney, Foley, Hoag & Eliot

Students/spring
Bruce Goldberger
Rosie Hyson
Kimberly Morgan
David Socolow

Students/fall
Bruce Goldberger
Andy Lindholm
Don Ridings
Sara Sievers

* Chair
Fellow's Alumni Advisory Committee

Julia Chang Bloch, ambassador from the United States to Nepal
Robert Bradford, senior vice president and manager, Safeway Stores, Inc.
Alvin J. Bronstein, executive director, National Prison Project
Bernard R. Gifford, dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California at Berkeley
Stephen H. Hess, senior fellow, The Brookings Institution
Patricia Keefer, senior consultant, National Democratic Institute
David Keene, partner, Keene, Monk & Associates, political consultants
Evelyn Murphy, lieutenant governor of Massachusetts
Martin F. Nolan, editorial page editor, The Boston Globe
Philip J. Rutledge, special assistant to the president for minorities, Indiana University
Mark E. Talisman, director, Washington action office, Council of Jewish Federations
Chase Untermeyer, director of personnel, The White House

Institute Fellows 1989-90

Fall

Reubin Askew, candidate, 1984 Democratic presidential election; U.S. Trade Representative (1979-1980); Governor of Florida (1970-1978); Florida state legislator (1958-1970);

Mr. Askew led a study group entitled, "Political Campaign Giving and Spending: A System in Need of Fundamental Repair."


Ms. Fanning led a study group entitled, "Freedom of the Press: How Far Should it Go?"

Nancy Risque Rohrbach, senior White House aide and secretary to the Cabinet (1987-89); member, President's senior legislative management team (1983-1986); White House deputy assistant/legislative affairs and member, legislative liaison team to House of Representatives (1981-1983); member, boards of directors, International Women's Leadership Exchange and National Commission on Children

Ms. Rohrbach led a study group entitled, "The White House: What Is It — Really!"

Mr. Sanders led a study group entitled, “Do We Need A New, Progressive Political Party in the United States?”


Mr. Trible led a study group entitled, “Political Entrepreneurship: The Ascendancy of Individualism.”

Raul Yzaguirre, president and chief executive officer, National Council of La Raza (1978-present); former secretary and vice chair, board of directors, independent sector and member, U.S. Commission to UNESCO

Mr. Yzaguirre led a study group entitled, “Immigration and Language Policy and the Hispanic Civil Rights Movement.”

Spring

Genaro Arriagada Herrera, vice president, National Christian Democratic Party of Chile; principal advisor, 1989 Presidential campaign of Patricio Aylwin; director, 1989 election campaign, Christian Democratic Party of Parliamentarians; director, “Vote No” campaign opposing General Pinochet for the October 5, 1989 plebiscite vote

Mr. Arriagada led a study group entitled, “From Pinochet to Democracy.”

Steven Bruce Cobble, executive director, Keep Hope Alive; national coordinator/delegate selection, 1988 Jesse Jackson for President campaign; special assistant to New Mexico Governor Anaya (1984-86); former organizer, United Farm Workers of America


Pauline R. Kezer, vice chair, Connecticut Republican Party (1987-89); member, Connecticut House of Representatives (1979-86); nominee, 1986 election for Secretary of State, Connecticut; former president, Connecticut Order of Women Legislators; chair, New England Caucus of Women Legislators; member, board of directors, Girl Scouts of America

Ms. Kezer led a study group entitled, “Voluntarism in the 90’s: Reviving the Call to Public Service.”

Ms. Richman led a study group entitled, “Campaign ’92: The Candidates and the Press.”


Mr. White led a study group entitled, “Electoral Politics: Southern Style.”

Rose Waruhiu, branch assistant secretary, KANU party, Kenya (1988); former member of Parliament, Kenya (1983-88); member, Joint Assembly of African, Caribbean Pacific and European Economic Community; secretary, constituency level, KANU party (1985-present); member, Kenyan government delegation, United Nations Decade on Women Conferences (1980 and 1985)

Ms. Waruhiu led a study group entitled, “Development Strategies for the Future of Africa.”
Fellows Luncheon Speakers

Weekly luncheons with members of the Harvard community and other distinguished guests have become a tradition of the fellows program. 1989-90 guests included:

Fall

Francis M. Bator, Ford Foundation professor of international political economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Sissela Bok, professor of philosophy, Brandeis University
Robert S. Brustein, director, Loeb Drama Center, Harvard University
Jorge I. Dominguez, professor of government, Harvard University
Nathan Glazer, professor of education and social structure, Harvard University
Anthony Lewis, lecturer on law, Harvard Law School
Roderick MacFarquhar, director, John K. Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University
Robert B. Reich, lecturer in public policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael J. Sandel, professor of government, Harvard University
Lunch with the Nieman Fellows

Spring

Genaro Arriagada Herrera, fellow, Institute of Politics; vice president, National Christian Democratic Party of Chile
Francis M. Bator, Ford Foundation professor of international political economic, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Roy Denman, fellow, Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Marshall Goldman, Kathryn Wasserman Davis professor of Soviet economics, Wellesley College and associate director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Stanley H. Hoffman, Douglas Dillon professor of the civilization of France, Harvard University
Randall Kennedy, assistant professor of law, Harvard Law School
Martin Kilson, Frank G. Thomson professor of government, Harvard University
Paul Kirk, attorney, Sullivan & Worcester; former chairman, National Democratic Committee
Richard E. Neustadt, Douglas Dillon professor of government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Simon M. Schama, professor of history, Harvard University
Kathleen M. Sullivan, assistant professor of law, Harvard Law School
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Strategic Leadership '90 Conference
October 12-14, 1989

In continuation of its commitment to advance opportunities for women to run successfully for elective office, the Institute co-sponsored, with the Women's Campaign Research Fund, a "Strategic Leadership '90" conference on October 12-14, 1989.

Designed to assist potential women candidates develop the skills necessary to campaign for and be elected to public office, the conference combined practical sessions on campaign planning, press strategy and fundraising with issue briefings on drugs and crime, education, health policy, and federal-state relations. In addition, a special session for those conference participants planning to run for governor was conducted by Madeleine M. Kunin, Governor of Vermont.


Participants:

Arizona: C. Diane Bishop, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Arkansas: Julia Hughes Jones, State Auditor
California: Voris Brumfield, County Supervisor
Delaine Eastin, member, State Assembly
Anna Eshoo, County Supervisor
Ann Klinger, County Supervisor
Sandy Smoley, County Supervisor
Gwen Moore, member, State Assembly
Jackie Speier, member, State Assembly
Louise Renne, City Attorney, San Francisco

Delaware: Janet Rzewnicki, State Treasurer
District of Columbia: Charlene Drew Jarvis, member, City Council
Sharon Pratt Dixon, former Treasurer, Democratic National Committee
Florida: Betty Castor, Commissioner of Education
Helen Gordon Davis, member, State Senate
Georgia: Cathy Steinberg, former State Representative
Idaho: Jeanne Givens, former State Representative
Illinois: Penny Severns, State Senator
Linda Hawker, Secretary, State Senate
Peg McDonnell Breslin, member, House of Representatives
Iowa: Elaine Baxter, Secretary of State
Bonnie Campbell, Chair, State Democratic Party
Kansas: Joan Adam, member, State House of Representatives
Kentucky: Melissa Mershon, member, City Council
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Louisiana: Irma Muse Dixon, member, State House of Representatives
Michigan: Lyn Bankes, member, State House of Representatives
Missouri: Joan Kelly Horn, Political Consultant
Karen McCarthy, member, State House of Representatives
New Hampshire: Elizabeth Hager, Mayor of Concord
Susan McLane, member, State Senate
New Jersey: Leanna Brown, member, State Senate
New Mexico: Pauline Eisenstadt, member, State House of Representatives
Patricia Madrid, former Judge
New York: Suzi Oppenheimer, member, State Senate
Cecile Singer, member, State House of Representatives
Gail Shaffer, Secretary of State
Lucille Pattison, County Executive
Ohio: Mary Ellen Withrow, State Treasurer
Oregon: Shirley Gold, member, State Senate
Norma Paulus, former Secretary of State
Delna Jones, member, State House of Representatives
Jeannette Hamby, member, State Senate
Rhode Island: Kathleen Connell, Secretary of State
Victoria Lederberg, member, State Senate
Texas: Eddie Bernice Johnson, member, State Senate
Regina Montoya Coggins, Attorney
Lori Palmer, member, City Council
Vermont: Mary Ann Carlson, member, State Senate
Virginia: Emilie Miller, member, State Senate
Jessie Rattley, Mayor, Newport News
Washington: Jennifer Belcher, member, State House of Representatives

Faculty:

Joan Bagget, Political Director, International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen
Carol Bellamy, Attorney; Principal, Morgan Stanley; former member, New York State Senate
Michael Berman, President, The Duberstein Group; Counsel and Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of Vice President Mondale (1977-1981)
David S. Broder, National Political Correspondent/Columnist, The Washington Post; author of several books on media and politics
Kathy Bushkin, Director of Editorial Administration, U.S. News & World Report; Press Secretary, 1984 Hart for President Campaign
Christopher T. Cushing, President, C. & C. Consulting Group, Inc.; Director, Finance Committee, 1988 Dole for President campaign
Jane Danowitz, Executive Director, Women's Campaign Research Fund
Shirley Dennis, Consultant and Lecturer; former Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor
Helen Gordon Davis, member, Florida State Senate
John Deardourff, Political Consultant; co-founder, Bailey, Deardourff & Associates
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Todd Domke, Republican Advisor
Bob Farmer, Treasurer, Democratic National Committee
Ellen Goodman, Associate Editor, The Boston Globe
Harrison Hickman, President, Hickman-Maslin Research, Inc., public opinion research
William W. Hogan, Thornton Bradshaw Professor of Public Policy and Management and Acting Director, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ellen Hume, Executive Director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former White House correspondent, The Wall Street Journal
Maxine Isaacs, Press Secretary/Deputy Campaign Manager, 1984 Mondale for President campaign; Press Secretary to Vice President/Senate Mondale (1973-81)
Patricia Keefer, Consultant; former Fellow, Institute of Politics
Mark A. R. Kleiman, Lecturer in Public Policy and Research Fellow, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Madeleine M. Kunin, Governor of Vermont
Celinda Lake, Vice President, Greenberg-Lake, The Analysis Group, Inc.
Herman (Dutch) Leonard, George F. Baker Professor of Public Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Ann Lewis, Political Consultant; columnist, magazine; commentator, national television news; former Political Director, Democratic National Committee (1981-85)
Judith Lichtman, President, Women's Legal Defense Fund
Ruth B. Mandel, Professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University and Director, Eagleton's Center for the American Woman and Politics
Robert S. McIntyre, Director, Citizens for Tax Justice
Mark H. Moore, Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Evelyn Murphy, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts
Robert Murray, Lecturer in Public Policy and Director, National Security Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joseph P. Newhouse, John D. MacArthur Professor of Health Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Director, Division of Health Policy Research and Education, Harvard University
Daniel B. Payne, President, Payne & Company, advertising/communications consultants to Democratic candidates
Sara E. (Sally) Potter, Attorney; Counsel/Government Relations, National Education Association
Robert B. Reich, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Audrey Rowe, Program Consultant, Rockefeller Foundation
Pat Schroeder, Member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Colorado)
Peggy A. Simpson, Washington Bureau Chief, Ms. magazine
Louise Slaughter, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-New York)
Stephanie M. Solien, Political Consultant; former Executive Director, Women's Campaign Fund
Linda Tarr-Whelan, President and Executive Director, National Center for Policy Alternatives; former Deputy Assistant to President Carter
Sheila Tate, Vice Chairman/Communications, Cassidy and Associates, Inc.; Press Secretary, 1988 Bush for President campaign and transition; Press Secretary to Nancy Reagan (1981-85)

Linda Faye Williams, Associate Director of Research, Joint Center for Urban Studies

Shirley Williams, Public Service Professor of Electoral Politics and Acting Director, Institute of Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former Member of Parliament, Great Britain

**Guest Speakers**

opening session - Madeleine M. Kunin

luncheon - David Broder on “The Changing American Political Scene”

breakfast - Evelyn Murphy

luncheon - Robert Reich on “Prospects for the American Economy”

**Session Topics and Faculty:**

*Introductory Remarks/Opening Session*

Jane Danowitz, Shirley Williams

*Special Session for Gubernatorial Candidates*

Madeleine M. Kunin

*Campaign Planning*

Mike Berman, John Deardourff, Joan Bagget

Constituency Building: Building Electoral Support

Ann Lewis, Todd Domke, Audrey Rowe

*Press Strategy*

Kathy Bushkin, Sheila Tate, Maxine Isaacs

*After Webster, What?*

Helen Gordon Davis, John Deardourff, Harrison Hickman, Judy Lichtman, Linda Williams

*Women in Politics: Objective and Achievement*

Jane Danowitz, Celinda Lake, Ruth Mandel, Pat Schroeder

*Press Perspective on Women Leaders*

Ellen Hume, Ellen Goodman, Peggy Simpson

*Fundraising*

Bob Farmer, Chris Cushing

*Political Decision Making*

Legislative - Louise Slaughter

Administrative - Shirley Dennis

Campaign - Stephanie Solien

Moderator - Carol Bellamy
Public Policy Sessions - I

Drugs and Crime - Mark Moore
Energy - William Hogan
Education - Sally Potter
Public Financial Administration - Dutch Leonard
State-Federal Relations - Linda Tarr-Whelan
Tax Policy - Robert McIntyre

Public Policy Sessions - II

Health/Access and Finance - Joe Newhouse
Defense/Base Closings, Procurement - Bob Murray
Crime - Mark Kleiman

Administrative Staff

Institute of Politics
Karri Copman, Conference Coordinator
Theresa Donovan, Associate Director
Shirley Williams, Acting Director

Women's Campaign Research Fund
Maura Brueger, Program Director
Jane Danowitz, Executive Director

Student Coordinators
Sandy Cheng  ‘92
Loryn Dunn  ‘92
Jocelyn Melcher  ‘90
Seminar on Transition and Leadership for Newly-Elected Mayors
November 15-18, 1989

The Institute, in conjunction with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, conducts seminars for newly-elected mayors designed to help the mayors make optimal use of the transition period and the crucial early months in office. Seminars, held biennially since 1975, are designed to provide insight and instruction on several substantive policy areas.

Discussion topics during the 1989 seminar, eighth in the series, included the transition process, press and labor relations, drugs and crime, delivering basic services, and ethics. The program also encouraged interaction among newly-elected mayors and urban experts and included the first presentation of a case study on economic development in Charleston, South Carolina and a discussion on the case led by Charleston Mayor Joseph Riley.

Financial assistance was provided by Sears, Roebuck and Co.

Participants

Sheri Barnard  Spokane, Washington
Michael Capuano  Somerville, Massachusetts
James P. Connors  Scranton, Pennsylvania
Cardell Cooper  East Orange, New Jersey
John C. Daniels  New Haven, Connecticut
Kane Ditto  Jackson, Mississippi
John McHugh  Toledo, Ohio
Norman B. Rice  Seattle, Washington
James Scheibel  St. Paul, Minnesota
Karen Vialle  Tacoma, Washington
Raymond J. Wieczorek  Manchester, New Hampshire
Martha Swain Wood  Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Faculty

Jerry Abramson, Mayor, Louisville, Kentucky
Victor Ashe, Mayor, Knoxville, Tennessee
Maria Berriozabal, member, City Council, San Antonio, Texas
Kenneth Blackwell, Deputy Undersecretary for Intergovernmental Affairs, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
William Canary, Special Assistant for Intergovernmental Affairs, The White House
J. Thomas Cochran, Executive Director, United States Conference of Mayors
Roger Dahl, United States Conference of Mayors
Alfred Dellibovi, Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Albert DiVirgilio, Mayor, Lynn, Massachusetts
Ronald F. Ferguson, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Raymond Flynn, Mayor, Boston, Massachusetts
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Don Fraser, Mayor, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Tony Gomez-Ibanez, Professor of Public Policy and Urban Planning, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Arnold Howitt, Associate Director, Taubman Center for State and Local Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Helen (Sunny) Ladd, Professor, Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs, Duke University
George Latimer, Mayor, St. Paul, Minnesota
Martin Linsky, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Patrick Murphy, former Commissioner of Public Safety, Washington, D.C. and New York City
John Norquist, Mayor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
John Petersen, Government Finance Research Center; Government Finance Officers Association
Robert Putnam, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Jessie Rattley, Mayor, Newport News, Virginia
Joseph P. Riley, Jr., Mayor, Charleston, South Carolina
Marc J. Roberts, Professor of Political Economy and Director of Executive Programs in Health Policy and Management, School of Public Health, Harvard University
Lee Robinson, Mayor, Macon Georgia
Charles Royer, Mayor, Seattle Washington; director-designate, Institute of Politics
Paul Soglin, Mayor, Madison, Wisconsin
Walter Sondheim, Jr., Mayor, Baltimore, Maryland
Harry Spence, Lecturer in Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Fontaine Sullivan, former Director, Mayor's Office of Volunteer Services, Baltimore, Maryland
William Stafford, Deputy Mayor, Seattle, Washington
Mack Vines, Chief of Police, Dallas, Texas
Don Wasserman, Director of Collective Bargaining, AFSCME
Kathryn Whitmire, Mayor, Houston, Texas
Shirley Williams, Public Service Professor of Electoral Politics and Acting Director, Institute of Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Kenneth I. Winston, Visiting Professor, Program in Ethics and the Professions, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Peter B. Zimmerman, Associate Dean and Director of Executive Training Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Faculty Advisory Committee

Alan Altshuler, Director, Taubman Center for State and Local Government*
Arnold Howitt, Associate Director, Taubman Center
Martin Linsky, Lecturer in Public Policy*
Nicholas Mitropoulos, Executive Director, Taubman Center
Peter B. Zimmerman, Associate Dean*

* John F. Kennedy School of Government
Conference on Race, Politics and the Press: Recommendations for the Future
May 3-4, 1990

A conference on "Race, Politics and the Press: Recommendations for the Future," co-sponsored by the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and the Institute of Politics, was held on May 3-4, 1990 at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. The conference brought together prominent political leaders, journalists and scholars to explore the pitfalls and successes in how the press covers blacks in the political context and what might be done to improve the process. Discussion focused on three case studies, press coverage of the 1989 campaign of Mayor David Dinkins of New York, press coverage of the career of Congressman William Gray (D-Pennsylvania), and the sensational press coverage of the Stuart murder case in Boston.

The conference opened on the evening of May 3rd with a panel discussion in the Forum of Public Affairs on "Race, Politics and the Press: An Overview." Sessions on May 4th included workshop discussions on three case studies prepared by Dr. Linda Faye Williams, a 1990 fellow at the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center, and a wrap-up session with audience participation.

Financial support for the conference was provided by AT&T Foundation, The Ford Foundation, Margret Rey, Sears, Roebuck and Co., and Sun Company, Inc.

Case Studies

Years of Contrast: Race, Politics and Press Coverage from Sutton '77 to Dinkins '89
A Rising Star: The Political Career of Representative William Gray
Race and Crime in the American Mind: Boston's Stuart Murder Cases
Panelists

Julian Bond, Civil Rights Leader
Michelle Caruso, The Boston Herald
Ellen Hume, Executive Director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Hulbert James, Deputy Coordinator, Office of David Dinkins, Mayor of New York
Arthur Jones, Press Secretary, Office of Raymond L. Flynn, Mayor of Boston
Marvin Kalb, Director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Harriet Michel, President, National Minority Supplier Development Council, Inc.
Jerome Mondesire, Administrative Assistant, Office of William Gray, member, U. S. House of Representatives (D-Pennsylvania)
Acel Moore, The Philadelphia Inquirer
Tom Morgan, The New York Times; Fellow, Nieman Foundation, Harvard University
Sam Roberts, The New York Times
Charles Royer, Director, Institute of Politics
Benjamin Taylor, The Boston Globe
Jim Upshaw, Washington Bureau, NBC-TV
Alan Wheat, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Missouri)
Dianne Wilkerson, Attorney, Roche, Carens & DeGiacomo, Boston NAACP
Linda Faye Williams, Fellow, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center

Participant/Observers

Kiku Adatto, Fellow, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Simon Anekwe, New York Amsterdam News
Lezli Baskerville, National Black Leadership Roundtable
Bruce Bolling, member, Boston City Council
Emmett Carson, The Ford Foundation
Steve Cobble, Fellow, Institute of Politics
Diane Colasanto, Princeton Survey Research Associates
Tim Cook, Visiting Professor, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Andrew Costello, The Boston Herald
Callie Crossley, Medical Producer, “20/20,” ABC-TV
Joe Davidson, The Wall Street Journal
Mike Donilon, Donilon & Petts Research, Inc.
Arthur S. Ecker, Los Angeles Municipal Court
Margaret Edds, Virginia Pilot/Ledger Star
Christopher Edley, Harvard Law School
Louis Elisa, Boston NAACP
Archie Epps, Dean of Students, Harvard College
Joel Ferguson, F & S Development
Carmen Fields, News Anchor, WGBH-TV Boston
Shepard L. Forman, The Ford Foundation
Kathy Francovic, Elections and Survey Unit, CBS News
Alexis George, Special Projects Producer, WBZ-TV Boston
Dorothy Gilliam, The Washington Post
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Paul Goldman, Democratic Party of Virginia
Ralph Gomes, Department of Sociology, Howard University
David Hansen, Republican National Committee
Sheila Harmon, Department of Political Science, University of the District of Columbia
Richard Hatcher, former Mayor of Gary, Indiana
Evelyn Hernandez, New York Newsday
Ronald A. Homer, Boston Bank of Commerce
John Howell, Deputy Director, Institute of Politics
Gwen Ifill, The Washington Post
Linda Jakobson, Fellow, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg School of Communication
Julie Johnson, Time
Anna Faith Jones, The Boston Foundation
Joyce King
Mel King, Rainbow Coalition
Beth Knobel, Fellow, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Albert Knoll, Sun Company, Inc.
Gail Leftwich, Attorney, Goodwin, Proctor & Hoar
Michael Lipsky, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Mark Lloyd, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C.
Michael Lomax, Chairman, Fulton County Board of Commissioners
Carolyn Martindale, Department of English, Youngstown State University
Scott Mathesdale, Visiting Professor, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Jim McEnteer, Fellow, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
Alice McGillion, Philip Morris Companies, Inc.
Gordon McLeon, McLeod Grisanti
Michel McQueen, The Wall Street Journal
Greg Moore, The Boston Globe
Linda Wright Moore, Department of Radio, Television and Film, Temple University
Pamela Morehead, New York Daily News
Lorenzo Morris, Department of Political Science, Howard University
Brian O’Connor, Bay State Banner
Gary Orren, Associate Director, Joan Shorenstein Barone Center
William Owens, member, Massachusetts State Senate
Priscilla Painton, Time
Edward Palmer, Black Press Institute
Paul Peterson, Department of Government, Harvard University
Diane Pinderhughes, University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana
Worrie Reed, William Monroe Trotter Institute, University of Massachusetts/Boston
Barbara Reynolds, USA Today
Sarah Ann Shaw, WBZ-TV Boston
Phyllis J. Shorenstein
Walter H. Shorenstein, The Shorenstein Company
Micah Sifry, The Nation
Jim Sleeper, New York Newsday
Stephen Smith, Harvard University
May 2, 1990

On May 2, 1990, the Institute of Politics hosted eight first-term members of the Japanese National Diet of Japan, for a one-day program of scheduled meetings with faculty and students of the John F. Kennedy School of Government. The members of the delegation represented the four leading political parties of Japan. Their visit to the Kennedy School was one event of a two-week study-observation tour, April 27 - May 11, sponsored by The Asia Foundation of San Francisco, California.

The tour was designed to provide an opportunity for a group of new members of the Diet to gain some broad exposure to aspects of United States social, economic and political policies. The group attended a series of meetings with national, state and local
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government officials and leaders from a cross section of American institutions, such as social service agencies, education, labor, business, the media, farms, factories and small communities. The itinerary included stops in San Francisco, Portland (Maine), Boston, Washington, D.C., Des Moines and Atlanta.

Topics discussed during meetings at the Kennedy School included American business entrepreneurship, the diversity in American views toward Japan, trade policy, issues currently under discussion by the United States Congress and training programs for public officials.

Participants

Richard Cavanagh, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
James Cooney, Executive Director, McCloy Scholars Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Yoshihiro Nose, Deputy General, Consulate of Japan, Boston
Robert D. Putnam, Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Charles Royer, Director, Institute of Politics
Ezra Vogel, Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Harvard University

Japanese Delegation
Motohisa Ikeda, Kanagawa Prefecture, Japan Socialist Party
Yoshimisa Inoue, Tokyo, Komeito or Clean Government Party
Kiyoharu Ishiwata, Kanagawa Prefecture, Liberal Democrat Party
Hideko Itoh, Hokkaida Prefecture, Japan Socialist Party
Kiyoko Ono, Toyko Prefecture, Liberal Democratic Party
Yoshiaki Takagi, Nagasaki Prefecture, Democratic Socialist Party
Taku Yamamoto, Fukui Prefecture, Liberal Democratic Party
Yuji Yamamoto, Kochi Prefecture, Liberal Democratic Party
Ulrich Straus, Escort Officer and Consultant
Yuko Matsumoto, Interpreter
Yoshitada Yamagami, Interpreter

Visit Coordinators

Stephen Clayborne, Program Officer, Asian American Exchange, The Asia Foundation
Karri Copman, Conference and Development Coordinator, Institute of Politics
Judy Kugel, Director of Career Services, two-year program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
The Institute of Politics administers all formal programs held in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs, a multi-tiered amphitheater located in the heart of the Littauer building of the John F. Kennedy School of Government. As Senator Edward M. Kennedy remarked in his address at the dedication of the School in 1978, the Forum serves 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."

1989-90 Forum events included:

"Revolution in China: Peace, Progress, and Policy," July 12, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Summer-in-Boston Program, with:
Jinyoug Cai, graduate degree candidate, Harvard University
Yang Ye, associate professor of Chinese, Bates College; representative, Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars in the United States
Longxi Zhang, 1989 doctoral candidate, Comparative Literature, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, Harvard University
Donald Klein, professor of political science, Tufts University (moderator)

"The Future of Affirmative Action?," August 9, 1989, a debate, co-sponsored by the Summer-in-Boston Program, with:
Charles Fried, Carter professor of general jurisprudence, Harvard Law School
Randall L. Kennedy, professor of law, Harvard Law School
Charles J. Ogletree, Jr., assistant professor of law, Harvard Law School (moderator)


"Personal Perspectives on Politics," September 20, 1989, a panel discussion with the fall 1989 fellows of the Institute of Politics, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

Jack Beatty, editor, The Atlantic
Anthony Lewis, columnist, The New York Times
Christopher Lydon, anchor, "The Ten O'Clock News," WGBH-TV Boston
Ellen Hume, executive director, Shorenstein Barone Center (moderator)

"Eyewitness to a Massacre: Tales From Tiananmen Square," October 4, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)


"The German World View of the 1990s and Beyond," October 6, 1989, a public address, by Rita Sussmuth, president of the German Bundestag, co-sponsored by the Robert Borsh Foundation Alumni Association and the German-American Forum
"AIDS Drug Trials: Racing Against Time," October 10, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Harvard AIDS Institute, with
Ellen Cooper, director, division of antiviral drug products, Federal Drug Agency
Martian Delaney, director, Project Inform, San Francisco
Jerome Groopman, M.D., chief of hematology/oncology, New England Deaconess Hospital
Daniel Hoth, director, division on AIDS, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases
Deborah Prothrow-Stith, former commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health (moderator)

"SOS For America’s Children," October 16, 1989, a public address, by Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children’s Defense Fund, co-sponsored by the Center For Health and Human Resources Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Racial and Sexual Harassment on Campus v. The First Amendment," October 19, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by Radcliffe College and the Committee on Degrees in Women’s Studies, Harvard College, with
Louise Fitzgerald, associate professor, University of Illinois
Rebecca Flewelling, assistant to the president/office of equal opportunity, Tufts University
Randall L. Kennedy, assistant professor of law, Harvard Law School
Robert Sedler, professor of law, Wayne State University
Robert B. Putnam, dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator)

"Hispanics: Part of the Rainbow Coalition?,” October 23, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

"First Annual Theodore H. White Lecture on the Press and Politics," October 30, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, with
Benjamin Bradlee, executive editor, The Washington Post
John King Fairbank, Francis Lee Higginson professor of history, emeritus, Harvard University
Marvin Kalb, director, Shorenstein Barone Center (moderator)

A special learning workshop, “Latin America’s Debt, Mixed Enterprises & Recovery,” November 1, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (L.A.S.P.A.U.), Harvard University, with
Hank Frothingham, director, International Capital Markets, Bank of Boston
Felipe Larrain, visiting scholar, Department of Economics, Harvard University; associate professor of economics, Universidad Catolica de Chile
Luis Parodi, vice president of Ecuador
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics and acting director, Institute of Politics (moderator)
“Capitalism v. Socialism: Which is the Moral System?,” November 8, 1989, a debate, with
**Harry Binswanger**, editor, *The Ayn Rand Lexicon*
**Jim Chapin**, former national director, Democratic Socialists on Campus
**Jack Clark**, former national leader, Democratic Socialist of America
**John Ridpath**, professor, Department of Economics and Intellectual History, York University
**Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr.**, Frank G. Thomson professor of government, Harvard University (moderator)

“A Writer Looks at 20th Century History,” November 9, 1989, a public address, by **Saul Bellow**, Raymond W. and Martha Hilpert Gruiner distinguished services professor, University of Chicago; winner, Pulitzer prize and Nobel prize for literature (1976); co-sponsored by the Program for Constitutional Government, Harvard University

“The Last Elephant on Earth?: Extinction, Poverty and Politics,” November 16, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government and the International Tusk Fund, with
**Dr. Iain Douglas-Hamilton**, researcher in the behavior and conservation of elephants
**Richard Garstang**, Endangered Wildlife Trust of Southern Africa
**Richard Leaky**, paleontologist; director of Kenya’s Wildlife Services
**Richard D. Estes**, associate in mammalogy, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University (moderator)

“U.S. Policy and the Future of Peace in the Middle East,” November 20, 1989, a panel discussion, with
**Helena Cobban**, visiting peace fellow, Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University
**Oded Eran**, deputy chief of mission, Embassy of Israel, Washington, D.C.
**Richard Haass**, special White House assistant/ Near East and Southeast Asian affairs, Bush Administration; member, National Security Council
**Shirley Williams**, public service professor of electoral politics and acting director, Institute of Politics (moderator)


“The Iron Curtain Rises: The Future of Eastern Europe,” November 29, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

“Tales From Tiananmen II: Students in the Square,” November 30, 1989, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

"A Change in the Core: A Curriculum for the '90s," December 5, 1989, a public address, by Lynne Cheney, chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, co-sponsored by the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University and the Program for Constitutional Government, with
Arthur Levine, chairman, Institute for Educational Management, Graduate School of Education (respondent)
Harvey C. Mansfield, Frederick G. Thomson professor of government, Harvard University (moderator)

"The Shattered Wall: What Future for Germany?," December 7, 1989, a panel discussion, with
Feydor Burlasky, member, Supreme Soviet and chairman, Soviet Public Commission on Human Rights
Freimut Duve, member, Socialist Party (SPD), Bundestag
Stanley Hoffmann, C. Douglas Dillon professor of the civilization of France, Center for European Studies, Harvard University
Shepard Stone, Aspen Institute, Berlin; honorable chairman, McCloy scholars program, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Shirley Williams, public service professor of electoral politics and acting director, Institute of Politics (moderator)

"A Return to the Killing Fields?: U.S. Policy and the Future of Cambodia," December 8, 1989, a panel discussion, with
Chester Atkins, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Massachusetts); former member, subcommittee on Asian and Pacific affairs, House Foreign Relations Committee
David Hawk, director, Cambodia Documentation Commission
David Lambertson, deputy assistant director, office of East Asian and Pacific affairs, U.S. Department of State
Stephen Solarz, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-New York); chairman, subcommittee on Asian and Pacific affairs, House Foreign Relations Committee
Nayan Chanda, senior associate partner, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (moderator)


"If Gorbachev Fails: What Next?," December 11, 1989 (8 p.m.), a public address, by Paul Nitze, former special adviser to President Reagan and Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters (1985-89), co-sponsored by the Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," February 1, 1990, a panel discussion, with the spring 1990 fellows of the Institute of Politics, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)
"Refugee Resettlement: Policy and Politics," February 5, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Asian and Hispanic student caucuses, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with
Chester Atkins, member, U.S. House of Representatives (D-Massachusetts); former member, subcommittee on Asian and Pacific affairs, House Foreign Relations Committee
Lynn August, coordinator, Rhode Island Office of Refugee Resettlement
Le Xuan Khoa, president, Indochina Action Center
Raul Yzaguirre, president and chief executive officer, National Council of La Raza (moderator)

"A Reunified Germany: Impact on Europe and the Superpowers," February 7, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the American Council on Germany, with
Guido Goldman, director, Center for European Studies, Harvard University
Andreas Meyer-Landrut, chief of staff, office of the president of West Germany; former Ambassador from West Germany to the Soviet Union
Joseph S. Nye Jr., Ford Foundation professor of international security, John F. Kennedy School of Government and director, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Carroll Brown, president, American Council on Germany (moderator)

Massachusetts Republican Gubernatorial Candidates Debate, co-sponsored by the National Ripon Society, February 12, 1990, with candidates
Guy Carbone, managing partner, Serra, Jordan & Carbone; former commissioner, Massachusetts District Commission
Paul Cronin, chairman and president, Highline Industries, Inc.; member, U.S. House of Representatives (1973-74); Massachusetts House of Representatives (1966-70)
Steven Pierce, minority leader, Massachusetts House of Representatives
Len Umina, marketing manager, Digital Equipment Corp.
Janet Wu, WCVB-TV
Co-moderators: John Henning, news anchor, WBZ-TV
Alan Altshuler, Ruth and Frank Stanton professorship in urban policy and planning, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University

"Transition to Democracy: Lessons from Argentina's Experience," February 21, 1990, a public address, by Raul Alfonsin co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

"How Endangered is Our Planet?", February 22, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government and the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

"Finding the Future: Resolving the Crises of Urban Youth," February 23, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Black student caucus, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with
KRS-1, "Rap" songwriter and producer
Glenn Loury, professor of political economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Georgette Watson, founder and director, DROP-A-DIME Program, Boston
Christopher F. Edley, Jr., professor of law, Harvard Law School (moderator)
Mary Jo Bane, Marian Wright Edelman

"Tip" O'Neill

Richard Darman
Glenn Loury, KRS-1

Francis Bellotti, Evelyn Murphy, John Silber, Jack Flood
"The State of Black America," February 27, 1990, a public address by John Jacob, president, National Urban League, co-sponsored by the Harvard/Radcliffe Black Student Association

"It is Up to Us: Policy v. Public Solution to Pesticide Poisoning," February 28, 1990, a public address, by Cesar Chavez, founder and president, United Farm Workers Union; labor and civil rights leader


"Eyewitness to an Election: Miracle in Managua?," March 13, 1990, a panel discussion, with David Asman, editor, "Americas" column, The Wall Street Journal Genaro Arriagada Herrera, member, Nicaraguan election observation delegation, Carter Center, Emory University; vice president, National Christian Democratic Party of Chile Daniel Evans, co-leader, with former President Jimmy Carter, of the Nicaraguan election observation delegation, Carter Center, Emory University; former U. S. Senator and Governor of Washington Marc Lindenberg, lecturer in public policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former director, INCAE, Central American regional graduate school of management with campuses in Nicaragua and Costa Rica (moderator)

"How High a Priority for the Nation is Housing the Homeless and the Poor?," March 14, 1990, a public address by James W. Rouse, chairman of the board, The Enterprise Development Company, co-sponsored by Harvard Real Estate and Urban Development; the Joint Center for Housing Studies, the Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy, and the Taubman Center for State and Local Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government, with William C. Apgar Jr., associate professor of city and regional planning, John F. Kennedy School of Government (respondent) Harry Spence, lecturer in public policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government; former court-appointed receiver, Public Housing Program, Boston (respondent) Mary Jo Bane, director, Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator)

Tenth Annual Harvard University Tanner Lecture on Human Values, "The Civil and The Sacred in Marxist, Muslim, and Other Societies," March 20 and March 21, 1990, by Ernest Gellner, William Wyn professor of social anthropology, University of Cambridge, England, co-sponsored by Harvard University

"Invasion Strategy: U.S. Policy and Politics in Panama," April 4, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)
"Substance Abuse, Pregnancy and Parenthood," April 5, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by Radcliffe College, with

Joan Bertin, associate director, women's rights project, American Civil Liberties Union
Dr. Wendy Chavkin, Institute of Chemical Dependency, Columbia University
Nzati Keita, project coordinator, community maternity project, Maternity Care Coalition
Jo-Anna Rorie, director, ob/gyn services, Dimock Community Health Center, Boston
Linda S. Wilson, president, Radcliffe College (moderator)

Special session of the Institute of Politics study group on "Electoral Politics: Southern Style" led by Institute fellow Jesse L. White Jr., "Rethinking the Role of Government: A Democratic Perspective," April 10, 1990, a public address, by Charles Robb, member, U.S. Senate (D-Virginia)

"Private Sector in Latin America, You've Been Talking to the Wrong People!," April 12, 1990, a public address, co-sponsored by the International Development Interest Group, John F. Kennedy School of Government, by Hernando de Soto, economist from Peru; author, The Other Path, with
Lance Taylor, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (respondent)

Shanta Devarajan, specialist in international development and natural resource economics; associate professor of public policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government (moderator)

"Business as Usual?: The Future on U.S. Policy in China," April 12, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

"Women: Up in Arms?," April 16, 1990, a debate, co-sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

"Baltic Independence: Strategies for Making the Inevitable Less Painful," April 18, 1990, a panel discussion, with
Aleksey Grigorjevs, editor-in-chief, Atmoda; member, Supreme Soviet, Latvia
Tunne Kelam, founder and leader, Estonian National Independence Party
Lowry Wyman, attorney; fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard University; official guest of the independence movement and the new government during a recent visit to Lithuania
Anthony Jones, fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard University; professor of sociology, Northeastern University (moderator)

“Making A Difference: A Conversation with Kennedy School Alumni Holding Elected Office,” April 20, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Alumni Office, with

Elaine Baxter, secretary of state, Iowa (S&L program ’88)

Douglas Bereuter, member, U.S. House of Representatives (R-Nebraska) (MPA-MC 1966; MPA ’73)

Bruce Bolling, member, Boston City Council (S&L program ’86; MPA ’91)

Charles Royer, director, Institute of Politics, former Mayor of Seattle (moderator)

“Earth Day 1990: 20 Years of Environmentalism,” April 23, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Environmental Action Committee, Phillips Brooks House, Harvard University and the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)

“Crisis in Massachusetts: Has Politics Killed Public Service in the Commonwealth?,” April 25, 1990, a panel discussion, with

Howie Carr, political columnist, The Boston Herald

John W. Gorman, president, Opinion Dynamics

Avi Nelson, editorial director, WEEI NewsRadio; commentator, “Five on 5,” WCVB-TV

Michael Sandel, professor of government, Harvard University

Robert Turner, political columnist, The Boston Globe

Charles Royer, director, Institute of Politics (moderator)

“Perestroika and Pogroms: The Rise of Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union,” April 30, 1990, a panel discussion, co-sponsored by Harvard-Radcliffe Hillel and the Student Advisory Committee (see Student Program, Student Projects)


A session of the conference on Race, Politics and the Press co-sponsored by the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and the Institute of Politics, May 3, 1990, a panel discussion, with

Julian Bond, civil rights leader; former member, U. S. Senate (D-Georgia 1975-87); president emeritus, Southern Poverty Law Center; founder, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)

Michael Oreskes, national political correspondent, The New York Times

Alan Wheat, member, U.S. House of Representative (D-Missouri); member, subcommittee on government operations and metropolitan affairs, House Committee on the District of Columbia

Linda Williams, fellow, Shorenstein Barone Center; associate director of research, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C.

Marvin Kalb, director, Shorenstein Barone Center (moderator)

A public address, May 8, 1990, by Reverend Jesse Jackson, candidate, 1988 Democratic Presidential campaign; introduction by Steven B. Cobble, fellow, Institute of Politics; executive director, Keep Hope Alive
"U.S. - Saudi Relations," May 10, 1990, a public address, by Prince Bandar bin Sultan bin Abdulaziz, Ambassador to the United States from Saudi Arabia, co-sponsored by the Executive Programs and the Taubman Center for State and Local Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Live telecast of the Massachusetts Democratic Gubernatorial candidates debate, May 14, 1990, co-sponsored by WBZ-TV, The Boston Globe and the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee, with candidates Francis Bellotti, partner, Gaston & Snow; former attorney general of Massachusetts (1975-86) Jack Flood, member, Massachusetts House of Representatives (1980-present); House chairman, Joint Committee on Taxation (1984-present) Evelyn Murphy, lieutenant governor of Massachusetts John Silber, president-on-leave, Boston University (1971-) Media/Questioners: Andy Hiller, WBZ-TV; Rene Loth, The Boston Globe; Brian Mooney, The Boston Globe; Pam Moore, WBZ-TV Moderator: Jack Williams, news anchor, WBZ-TV

A public address, May 15, 1990, by Joseph N. Garba, President of the General Assembly, United Nations; Ambassador to the United Nations from Nigeria; former Foreign Minister of Nigeria (Belfer Center/Starr Auditorium)

"Peril and Promise," May 18, 1990, a public address, by John Chancellor, senior news commentator, NBC-TV; author, Peril and Promise: A Commentary on America; co-sponsored by the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center of the Press, Politics and Public Policy


1990 Class Day address to the graduates of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, June 6, 1990, by L. Douglas Wilder, Governor of Virginia
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