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The Institute of Politics, founded in fall 1966 as a living memorial to John F. Kennedy, celebrated its 25th anniversary on October 25 and 26, 1991. The two-day anniversary program included an open house hosted by former directors at the Institute's first home—the "little yellow house" on Mount Auburn Street—a traditional Institute supper, a 1960s dance, three public addresses, a political debate and three panel discussions on diverse topics. Awards were presented on Friday evening to three Harvard undergraduates for their winning entries in the 25th anniversary essay contest. The celebration closed with a picnic lunch preceding the kickoff for the annual Harvard-Princeton football game.

The theme for the anniversary was "Strengthening America's Democracy: Politics and Purpose in the Post Cold War Era." The following pages include a schedule of events and edited excerpts from the speeches, panel discussions and debate. Speakers included Edward M. Kennedy, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; Theodore C. Sorenson, who served as Special Counsel to President Kennedy; and Lamar Alexander, U.S. Secretary of Education and a 1971 Institute Fellow. Three panel discussions addressed the topics, "Young Elected Officials: Why We Chose Politics," "The New World Order: What Does It Mean at Home and Abroad?," and "Political Activism on Campus: Then and Now." The chairmen of the Democratic and Republican National Committees, Ron Brown and Clayton Yeutter, debated "Democrats vs. Republicans: Who's the Party of the 1990s?" Also included on these pages is the winning entry from the essay contest. Students were asked to answer the question, "Revitalizing American Democracy: How Can 18 to 25 Year Olds Help Build Confidence and Trust in Our Political System?"

More than 500 former and current members of the greater Institute family attended the anniversary which provided an opportunity for people to come together—in reunion, to celebrate, to reflect, to be participants, speakers, questioners and audience. The ever-versatile Forum in the John F. Kennedy School of Government accommodated 450 guests at the IOP supper—the largest number ever to dine there—as well as being the setting for the opening session on Friday afternoon and the buffet breakfast, Lamar Alexander's speech and the Brown-Yeutter debate on Saturday morning.

We hope you—both those who were able to attend the anniversary and those who were not—will enjoy this retrospective on an historic occasion in the life of this dynamic institute.

Anne Doyle Kenney
The Institute of Politics was established "to promote greater understanding and cooperation between the academic world and the world of practical politics and public affairs." Its founders anticipated creating programs which would inspire students to enter careers in politics and public service. Today's programming concentrates on electoral politics; no formal courses or academic credits are offered.

Institute programs designed to inspire students to think creatively about public affairs include an extracurricular student program; a program for resident fellows; special projects, including conferences and training programs for elected officials and other political practitioners; activities in the ARCO Forum of Public Affairs; and interdisciplinary problem-solving research by faculty study groups. These programs and activities provide students with informal contact with people interested in politics—governors, mayors, members of Congress, state legislators, political pollsters, candidates, campaign managers, policymakers, community activists, public interest group leaders, and others. Often, this means relaxed but lively talk over food and drink. The Institute attracts a perpetual stream of activists, theorists and kibitzers to weekly suppers, luncheon discussions, receptions and small meetings.

The Institute's full time staff is aided by a Senior Advisory Committee of persons prominent in public life and by a Faculty Advisory Committee of Harvard scholars.
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DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

Last October the Institute of Politics turned 25 years old. In honor of the occasion we organized a celebration that was part birthday party and part family reunion. It was a wonderful event. Former students, fellows, staff and faculty got a chance to renew acquaintances, swap stories about the good old days in the "little yellow house", and, as always, talk politics. More than 500 members of the extended Institute family returned for the festivities.

When we began planning the anniversary, in mid-1991, we were struck by the irony of democratic movements around the globe. People from South Africa to the Soviet Union were looking to the United States for guidance, support, and technical advisors by the plane load. But what were we exporting? At home political debate focused on ethical scandals, the influence of big money in politics, or the lack of political leadership to address long-term problems. We may have the oldest, strongest democracy, but most participants agree it needs some repairs.

The end of the cold war era is certainly cause for rejoicing, but it also requires a new introspection about the condition of our own democracy. Our senior advisory committee suggested the theme for the anniversary, "Strengthening America's Democracy: Politics and Purpose in the Post Cold War Era." It's a theme that may well be the focus of our programming during the next twenty-five years.

Former IOP Directors, Dick Neustadt, Ernest May, and Jonathan Moore, were kind enough to host a reception in the Little Yellow House, which was a wonderful way to begin the anniversary. The former home of the Institute brings back many fond memories for IOP alums.

Then for two days our celebration was the focus of political discussion around the country. On Friday afternoon and evening we were treated to two outstanding speeches about the current condition of politics. Senator Edward Kennedy gave a very personal and powerful account of his journey through political life, and Ted Sorensen, reminding us all of the forceful prose he used to write for President Kennedy, delivered a speech that took current political leaders to task.

On Saturday, we began the activities with three stimulating panel discussions. We asked fellows, students, and several young politicians (including Patrick Kennedy, the second generation of Kennedy elected officials) to lead discussions on three topics: why young people should choose political careers, campus political activism, and the real meaning of the New World Order.

After the morning seminars we reconvened in the Forum to hear remarks by former fellow, and U.S. Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander. We asked Secretary Alexander to gaze into his crystal ball and tell us what political trends we should expect during the next twenty five years.

We completed the celebration with a good old fashioned political debate between Clayton Yeutter, the chair of the Republican Party, and Ron Brown, the chair of the Democratic Party. This debate broke the mold of most political debates. It was substantive, each debater spoke directly to the questions, and
members of the audience participated in the debate by asking questions.

By the end of the weekend we were swamped with requests for the speeches and transcripts of the panel discussions. After reviewing all of the tapes we decided to publish edited transcripts of each session. I think you will find something moving, poignant or profound in every passage.

For twenty-five years the Institute of Politics has been trying to inspire a new generation of political leaders. We are very proud of our alumni who have gone on to careers in public service. However, we would be the first to admit that inspiration comes from many different sources.

One of the most enjoyable aspects of the 25th anniversary was to watch students become inspired by a variety of unique messengers—the elected and appointed officials whose distinguished careers served as excellent role models, the rhetorical flash of a fiery speech, the reasoned analysis of a clear thinker, or an individual connection based on a personal anecdote. We know the weekend provided some much-needed inspiration to Harvard's students. We hope that reading through these pages will do the same for you.

Charles Royer
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Schedule of Events

Friday, October 25

1:00 - 7:00 p.m.  Registration (IOP Living Room)

1:30 - 3:30 p.m.  Open House - Little Yellow House (78 Mt. Auburn Street)
Hosted by former Institute of Politics Directors:
Ernest May (1971-74)
Jonathan Moore (1974-86)
Richard E. Neustadt (1966-71)

1:30 - 3:30 p.m.  Tours of John F. Kennedy's undergraduate suite (Winthrop House)

4:00 - 5:30 p.m.  Opening (Forum)
Welcome: Charles Royer, Director, Institute of Politics
Address: Edward M. Kennedy, Member, U.S. Senate (D-Massachusetts; Member, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee
Remarks: Ron Brown, Chairman, Democratic National Committee; Chair, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee

7:00 - 7:30 p.m.  Cocktails (Forum)

7:30 - 9:00 p.m.  Traditional IOP Supper (Forum)
Presentation of 25th Anniversary Essay Contest Awards
John F. Kennedy, Jr., Assistant District Attorney, New York County; Member, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee
Introduction: Richard E. Neustadt, Douglas Dillon Professor of Government, Emeritus; former Institute of Politics Director (1966-71)
Speaker: Theodore C. Sorenson, Senior Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison; former Special Counsel to President John F. Kennedy

9:30 p.m. - 1:00 a.m.  1960s Dance (Winthrop House)
Saturday, October 26

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.  Breakfast Buffet  (Forum)

Three Concurrent Sessions:
9:00 - 10:15 a.m.  Young Elected Officials: Why We Chose Politics
(KSG/Room 150)

Panelists:

Patrick Kennedy, Member, Rhode Island House of Representatives (D)
Todd Paulson, Mayor, Brooklyn Center, Minnesota (R)
Susan M. Tracy, Member, Massachusetts House of Representatives (D)
Walter M. Tucker III, Mayor, Compton, California (D)

Moderator:

John Culver, Senior Partner, Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn; Member, U.S. Senate (1975-81/D-Iowa); Member, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee

9:00 - 10:15 a.m.  The New World Order: What Does It Mean at Home and Abroad?
(KSG/Room 140)

Panelists:

Barber Conable, former President, The World Bank (1986-91); Member, U.S. House of Representatives (1965-85/D-New York); former Member, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee
Madeleine M. Kunin, Distinguished Visitor in Public Policy, Mary Ingraham Bunting Institute, Radcliffe College; Governor of Vermont (1985-91); Member, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee
John O'Sullivan, editor, National Review; Special Advisor to Great Britain Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (1987-88); 1983 Institute of Politics Fellow
Art Torres, Member, California State Senate (D); Member, Council on Foreign Relations; Member, National Commission on International Migration and Development; 1974 Institute of Politics Fellow

Moderator:

Jonathan Moore, Ambassador and U.S. Representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; Coordinator and Ambassador-at-Large for Refugee Affairs, U.S. Department of State (1986-89); former Institute of Politics Director (1974-86)
9:00 - 10:15 a.m. **Political Activism on Campus: Then and Now**

*Panelists:*

*George Gorton,* Fellow, Institute of Politics; Chairman, California Governor Pete Wilson's Reapportionment Committee; National College Director, 1972 Nixon for President campaign

*Art A. Hall '93,* President, Harvard/Radcliffe Black Students Association

*Kim Harris '92,* Chair, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee

*Hendrik Hertzberg,* Senior Editor, *The New Republic,* chief speechwriter for President Jimmy Carter (1979); former Editor, *The Harvard Crimson*; 1985 Institute of Politics Fellow

*Shirley Williams,* Public Service Professor of Electoral Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Acting Director, Institute of Politics (1989) Member, Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee

12:00 - 1:00 p.m. **Debate: “Democrats vs. Republicans: Who’s the Party of the 1990s?”**

*Ron Brown,* Chairman, Democratic National Committee

*Clayton Yeutter,* Chairman, Republican National Committee

*Moderator:*

*Charles Royer,* Director, Institute of Politics

1:00 p.m. **Picnic Lunch**
The Greatest and the Most Honorable Adventure

by Edward M. Kennedy

Edward M. Kennedy is a member of the U.S. Senate (D-Massachusetts) and a member of the Institute of Politics Senior Advisory Committee.

I want to take the occasion of this anniversary to commend Charles Royer for the strong and thoughtful leadership he is providing to the Institute of Politics that honors my brother's name. Charley is Seattle's gift to Boston and the Institute. Our family is grateful to him, and I know that President Kennedy would be proud of him.

I return here again to join you in celebrating the first quarter century of the Institute. This is the part of the Kennedy School that most touches all of Harvard, from the newest college class in the Yard to the most advanced Ph.D. candidates conversing with visitors here—who may well be sources or even subjects for your dissertations.

Above all, the Institute is a place where the university meets the real world. My brother would have been impressed with its achievements, especially the way it has opened new horizons of public service to succeeding generations of the young.

It is a center of study, reflection, debate and controversy. It is accessible, vital and often exciting. In many different ways, the Institute of Politics sets a high standard and in doing so it helps advance John Buchan's ideal that President Kennedy loved to cite, "politics is still the greatest and the most honorable adventure."

That ideal has many implications:

• A belief in a larger purpose, not just the pursuit of power for its own sake;
• A refusal to replace reason with fear, or rational debate with irrational stereotype;
• A continuity of commitment, where leaders look to basic values, not just passing polls and ten-second sound bites;
• A resolve to attempt great and enduring things and a recognition that they cannot be built by the dark politics of suspicion, division, and hate.

Some of the anger of recent days, the powerful reaction to the final phase of the Thomas hearings, reflects the pain of a new idea still being born—the idea of a society where sex discrimination is ended, and sexual harassment is unacceptable—the idea of an America where the majority who are women are truly and finally equal citizens.

We are told that in other nations people watching the Thomas hearings could not understand what the fuss was all about. By that measure at least, America is different—and I believe better. Whatever any of us may feel about the outcome of the confirmation vote—and as you know, I have strong feelings—it is a mark of our progress that here in this nation, the charges raised by Anita Hill had to be taken seriously.

With women, as with minorities, we are seeking to end the endless ages of injustice. So we should not be surprised that the passage is often stormy. Few worthwhile changes come quietly or on a gentle breeze. Yet it is also clear that
when the storm comes, there are some who cannot resist a ride on the winds of fear—and others who even seek to fan them.

The success of David Duke in Louisiana is the latest case in point. He has taken off the white sheet, but his appeal is fundamentally the same. It is racism in a business suit. And while the denunciations now pour forth from the White House, there is also a deeper, more disturbing truth here.

David Duke is the logical, inevitable, and shameful extension of a politics that has increasingly appealed to our worst instincts. What is happening in Louisiana is a louder, unmodulated echo of what has happened already on the national stage. Those who have sown the seeds of racism are reaping the whirlwind of a nation increasingly divided against itself. We must not now—we must not ever—permit the principle of equal justice to be sacrificed on the altar of negative politics.

Civil rights is the unfinished business of America. It is wrong, deeply wrong, for any administration, let alone the party of Abraham Lincoln, to rub salt in the nation's wounds on race.

Yet for many months, the civil rights bill that Senator Danforth and I have been urging in the Senate was denounced as a quota bill—which it is not, and never was.

Fortunately, for our bill and for the country, the Administration has now relented. To his credit, President Bush has rejected the counsel of those who would keep the quota code word in their arsenal of racial resentment. The agreement we reached last night is a well-earned victory for civil rights—and a well-deserved defeat for those who would misuse race as a political weapon.

Far too often, in a similar troubled vein, crime and violence have been treated not as threats to all of us, of every background, but twisted into images of Willie Horton. The authors of that strategy, who say they oppose crime, also join the gun lobby in opposing laws that would disarm the criminals and the deranged.

I know something of the feelings of pain shared by legions of families across this land who have been victimized by the instant, tragic, terrible violence of gunshots. I fought for the Gun Control Act of 1968, and I intend to continue the fight for gun control in the 1990s.

While all of this occurs—while our public dialogue is poisoned by aggression and code words—a vast recession rages on, a national economic decline which in any other time would have stirred a great national debate about jobs and taxes and the future of the economy. Instead, this recession has been allowed to lengthen and deepen, while Massachusetts has borne the brunt of Washington's failure to act.

Twice, Congress has tried to step in and each time we have been met with the back of the Presidential hand—two successive vetoes of a simple extension of unemployment benefits for working families. This Administration's principal response so far to economic suffering has been to deny help to the people who are hurting most. That is unfair—and unacceptable.

The poisoning of our politics also invites its trivialization. In the absence of great issues, in the search for scapegoats, the resentment inevitably targets government itself. In the years I have been in public life, there has never been a period when the public dialogue was as arid or cynical as it is today. The problem is not an absence of ideas, but a failure to stand and fight—and to recapture the focus of national debate. We must get back to what matters.
So let us have a real debate about a middle class tax cut—a tax cut consciously designed to restart the economy and to redress the tax injustice of the 1980s. Let's have a tax cut, and let pay for it by raising the top rate on those for whom the last decade was one long, comfortable windfall.

I reject the idea that tax relief for the middle class should be paid for by savings from defense. The peace dividend is essential to urgent domestic initiatives like education, which have been short-changed through the long years of Cold War.

Two days ago, in a Senate Labor Committee hearing which I chaired, a talented woman was honored as one of the Teachers of the Year. She testified eloquently about the false promise of education reform and the failure of our schools.

The faces of society, she said, are reflected in her classroom every day—dysfunctional families, poverty, drug and alcohol abuse, unemployment and illiteracy. We leave our teachers in the trenches alone, fighting disillusionment and despair. Education reform, she said, is failing all of us, one child at a time, one class at a time, one teacher at a time. It is time to stop refusing to provide the overdue resources that will make all the difference between successful school reform and continuing school decline.

I have called for Head Start to be available for every three, four, and five year old in America, so that all children can begin school ready to learn. And I have also sought new ways to harness the miracles of high technology for the future of education, so that America can have Star Schools, and not just Star Wars.

I have also worked hard for many years to achieve the next great step after Medicare—accessible and affordable health insurance for all Americans—not only for the almost 40 million Americans who are uninsured today but for the vast majority whose coverage is too limited, too expensive and constantly shrinking.

We need to put national health insurance squarely before the nation—to state a plan, insist that it be debated, to make it a decisive factor in the campaigns of 1992.

It is time to say to the President: We will not wait quietly until after the election to see what you have to propose.

And it is time to say to the members of my own party: If we can't stand up on this issue, then what are we all about?

There is one other place where we must continue to stand, even when the ground, is rocky and politically dangerous. We must not betray our country and our conscience by retreating, in our own day and generation, from the hard, long and historic work of achieving equal rights for all Americans. I gave my maiden speech in the United States Senate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That is a battle we must keep waging, a battle I will never walk away from.

America will not be America if it is a society of unequal parts, oppressed and advantaged, powerful and exploited. At the most fundamental level, this country will fail if we do not succeed in bringing down the barriers of race and sex and prejudice.

President Kennedy was ready to lose re-election, if he had to, for the cause of civil rights. Let us now reaffirm his belief that, "This nation, for all its hopes and boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free."

Each of us understands that in recent years the climate of the times has grown harsher, the work harder. But when we have stood our ground, we have made substantial progress. We overcame those who called for constructive engagement with apartheid, and we imposed strong sanctions against South Africa. In the past two years alone we have passed child care, a new minimum wage, new
rights for millions of Americans with disabilities, and a landmark law to encourage the young of all ages to become involved in serving their own communities. Today we are at a new milestone on civil rights. The work goes on, and I take a measure of satisfaction in my role in the progress we have made.

If we neglect the challenges now, if we do not invest in our people, this great enterprise we call America will lose its confidence and vigor—and we will condemn this still young and vital democracy to a middle age of decline that no future generation will be able to roll back.

If we are to revive and prosper, if we are to prepare for the 21st Century, if we are to have schools that teach, health care that heals, business that competes, we must stop clawing at each other for petty advantage and start asking one another what sacrifices of narrow self-interest we must make and share, in order to advance the greater public good.

Many of our problems at home and in the larger world are also opportunities. In this state they are especially urgent—and also especially promising. Vital issues that have been among my own highest priorities in the Senate are coming to the fore. Jobs and school and health are increasingly at the center of concern about the direction of our country and our role in a dramatically changing world. Most of all for Massachusetts, we must focus on the transition to the new high-tech economy in which our state is well-positioned to excel, and which holds such high potential for our future.

Clearly, the temper and pressures of this period demand new energy from all of us, and renewed resolve. But the New Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society are not the end of American social history. Our day will come again and we must keep the faith until it dawns.

I say all this, understanding that no one has a monopoly on truth or virtue. But individual faults and frailties are no excuse to give in—and no exemption from the common obligation to give of ourselves.

I feel a special obligation to those who share my hopes for this state and nation, who in the past have given me their help—and often even their hearts. My views on issues have made some people angry over the years—and frankly, I accept that as the price of fighting hard for my beliefs. But I am painfully aware that the criticism directed at me in recent months involves far more than honest disagreement with my positions, or the usual criticism from the far right. It also involves the disappointment of friends and many others who rely on me to fight the good fight.

To them I say: I recognize my own shortcomings—the faults in the conduct of my private life. I realize that I alone am responsible from them, and I am the one who must confront them. Today, more than ever before, I believe that each of us as individuals must not only struggle to make a better world, but to make ourselves better too. And in this life, those endeavors are never finished.

In my own life, I have been given many gifts. I have been blessed with extraordinary parents. I have also been blessed with extraordinary brothers and sisters—and their children and my own. In the next generation's sense of public service, I take considerable pride.

Not least, unlike my brothers, I have been given length of years and time. As I approach my 60th birthday, I am determined to give all that I have to advance the causes for which I have stood for almost a third of a century.
Above all, whether the odds are in my favor or against me, I will continue to stand up, in good times and in seasons of adversity, for the people who sent me to the Senate in the first place, nearly thirty years ago.

So I say to my fellow citizens of Massachusetts—you have supported me in many of the great battles of our time, and you have sustained me in the worst moments. You have permitted me to take positions with which you have sometimes differed.

I cannot promise you that I will fulfill every expectation, even my own. But I do pledge my commitment, unchanged and unwavering, to the core values that for two centuries have made this Commonwealth a force for economic justice, for progress and compassion.

In short, I will continue to fight the good fight. I will continue to see issues in the way I have always sought to see them—not as numbers and words, but as individuals and families with worries and dreams—firefighters in Lowell, elderly citizens at the senior center in Agawam, nurses at the community health center in Roxbury, students at U/Mass working to make it through college—women and men from the Berkshires to Boston to the Cape who earn a living, try to save a little money, hope to buy a home and build a future for their children.

Twenty-five years ago, when this Institute of Politics began, the wish that many of us had was that it would help raise the quality and renew the purposes of the public arena. We need that today more than ever. We must resist disillusionment, the tendency of politics to be cautious and cynical. We must not turn aside from tough and essential challenges.

I remember the words of one of the founders of this Institute, who visited it and cherished it when it was just a small frame house on Mount Auburn Street. As Jacqueline Kennedy said, "John Kennedy believed so strongly that one's aim should not just be the most comfortable life possible—but that we should all do something to right the wrongs we see."

Many years later, that is still my belief. It is the belief that helped bring this Institute of Politics into being. It is a belief that can sustain the efforts we each must make, now and in the years ahead, to make our country better.
The New Politics

by Theodore C. Sorenson

Theodore C. Sorenson, Senior Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, served as Special Counsel to President John F. Kennedy.

It is a high honor for me to address the 25th Anniversary dinner of an Institute founded by Robert Kennedy as a tribute to John F. Kennedy—two extraordinary men whom I loved and served as deeply as they loved and served our country. They constantly urged others to serve this country. Indeed, this Institute was conceived as a means of not only preparing but inspiring young people to enter politics and public service; and “strengthening America’s democracy,” the theme of this 25th reunion and a theme of John Kennedy’s life, depended in his view and in his words on once again making politics and public service in the United States “a proud and lively career.”

“A proud and lively career.” How hollow those words ring in the wake of the recent Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on the confirmation of the appointment of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court. Today, countless numbers of Americans, regardless of party, ideology, race or gender, wonder if this is the best we can do, consider whether they would really want to get into politics or public service and subject themselves to the kind of nasty attack and moral hypocrisy we have just witnessed.

The current disdain for public servants is reinforced by myriad other recent events: members of the U.S. House of Representatives who bounced checks, fixed parking tickets, skipped out on their restaurant bills; a long list of U.S. Senators under investigations by grand juries, the IRS or the toothless Senate Ethics Committee for moral, financial or other misdeeds; a high White House official chauffeured by Air Force jet or government limousine in pursuit of private interests; the sad spectacle of a wise old former Cabinet member and presidential advisor caught up in a global banking scandal; the indictment of U.S. diplomatic and intelligence officials for flouting the law and lying to Congress about the Iran-Contra conspiracy; the indictment of former high-ranking Defense Department officials for accepting and paying bribes; and more.

Clearly, power corrupts. Even worse, corruption is built into the very path to power for our elected national officials. The most expensive political campaign system in the world has degenerated into little more than a stream of negative television commercials, attacking opponents through symbols instead of talking about real issues. To pay for those commercials, most candidates spend a majority of their time not discussing or studying issues, not formulating policies or proposals, but raising money from PACs and other special interest donors.

Does this Institute really think our challenge today is “strengthening” America’s democracy? Resuscitating our democracy, rejuvenating, rehabilitating, our democracy might be a more accurate description of our need. Take Lincoln’s definition of democracy at Gettysburg as a standard.

It is not government of the people when a smaller and smaller minority of the population even bothers to vote, convinced that it doesn’t matter; when fewer
and fewer participate in political party activities or even in the one dollar tax check-off for public financing; when fewer and fewer are willing to run for elective office or accept appointive office and the indignities it entails.

It is not government by the people when most elections are won by a permanent political class of incumbents beholden to the rich and powerful few who finance distorted or irrelevant campaign commercials that manipulate but do not educate the voters.

It is not government for the people when both the executive and legislative branches, comfortable in the equilibrium that some call deadlock, equivocate, procrastinate and prevaricate in order to avoid taking action, or even positions, on urgent but controversial issues, such as health care or homelessness, that might cost taxpayers dollars, or campaign contributions, or political support.

Our democratic system is in deep trouble—ailing, failing, no longer enjoying public confidence, no longer sufficiently responsive to the public interest, no longer providing the public what it rightfully deserves on the basis of our history and principles. Not surprising, this sorry state of affairs has fueled the cry among our nation's editors and commentators for reforms in our political institutions.

Change the process, we are told. Amend the Constitution. Fix the rules. Revamp the confirmation process. Limit the number of terms an elected official can serve. End divided government by adopting some form of parliamentary system. Revise the laws governing the conduct and financing of Presidential and Congressional elections. Revitalize the parties, reexamine the press, restrict the Presidency, require more women in Congress or real Presidential debates or longer political commercials or free network time or easier voter registration or more limits on PACs and lobbyists and special interest organizations. In short, blame the process (along with the media), alter the structure, reform the institutions, and all will be well.

Nonsense. Procedures can always be improved. Institutions can always be strengthened. But not every reform results in progress. Some sow the seeds of new problems. Do not import mongooses to get rid of the rats if you then can't get rid of the mongooses. The Southern Democratic moderates who conceived Super Tuesday as an election reform did not realize they would primarily be helping Michael Dukakis and Jesse Jackson.

The Congress, citing an outrageous $2.8 million donation by one wealthy Nixon backer, limited campaign contributions to $1,000 without realizing the inordinate proportion of a candidate's schedule that would be required to raise $2.8 million $1,000 at a time. The Supreme Court, in declaring campaign contributions a form of First Amendment free speech, spawned an unrestrained gaggle of supposedly independent expenditure committees that specialize in character vilification.

The members of the U.S. Senate, substantially increasing their subcommittee and office staffs to balance the greater personnel resources of the executive branch, found themselves stretched thinner and thinner over a heavier and heavier workload created by those same staff members justifying their salaries. Reformers in the U.S. House of Representatives, in virtually every 20th Century generation, have either acted to "strengthen democracy" by reducing the power of the Speaker or the Rules Committee or the Caucus, or have acted to make the House more productive and responsive to popular will by increasing the power
of the Speaker or the Rules Committee or the Caucus. The McGovern and other Democratic Party commissions who brought us Presidential primaries and caucuses in every state surely did not intend to load the nominating process in favor of those with the best access to money.

Unintentional "friendly fire" can do as much damage by way of structural reform as democracy's enemies. Today, let's look twice before we fire off a new round. Let us also remember, before rushing off to make our institutions less corrupt, that crooked campaigns, Congressmen and Cabinet officials are hardly new phenomena in American political history. Recent complaints decry "hardball" politics but politics in this country has never been beanbag. By and large, there is today less vote-buying, less vote-stealing, less voter intimidation, and less egregious conflicts of interest and nepotism and graft than this country has seen for most of its history.

The failure with which our system is confronted today is not procedural or structural but political. It is a failure not of machinery but of the men and women who operate it; a failure not of process but of will. The problem is not the erosion of our institutions but of our values. It is not the rules of the game but the game itself that requires rejuvenation.

Politics should illuminate our national condition, extend our national horizons, inspire our national vision. American politics no longer does this. It is tired, spent, exhausted, approaching bankruptcy. This is the fundamental crisis our democracy faces, and it transcends process.

So long as most of our politicians, young and old, Republican and Democrat, senior and junior, Presidential and Congressional, prefer platitudes to controversy and slogans to risk, no tinkering with term limitations or national primaries or a parliamentary system or most of the other proposed reforms will amount to a damn. Certainly they will not produce early action on the backlog of domestic problems in this country—inadequate but inordinately expensive health care, inadequate public education, crumbling physical infrastructure, untouched environmental hazards, uncompetitive export industries, undeserved entitlements, uncontrolled consumption instead of saving, unsolved drug and crime epidemics, unwise energy dependence, and all the unanswered questions of race in all their manifestations.

Revamp the Senate rules, restrict donations by PACs, remove procedural obstructions, end divided government—but if there is no political courage, no political consensus, no leadership, there will still be no meaningful action on these issues.

We are told that any remedial proposal other than empty gestures and half-way measures would be politically unrealistic, impossible, suicidal. Party leaders say their hands are tied by division in the ranks, by the need to maintain a big tent in which every view is welcome and no member is offended, however much that may blur important distinctions between the parties. Political campaigns are too often exercises in evasion, negativism, distortion, exaggeration, prefabricated sound bites now averaging less than ten seconds each, phony photo opportunities, superficial appeals to short-term self-interest and to the lowest common denominator as reported to the candidate by his public opinion pollster.

Even those polls reflect our current political miasma. They show a public distrust of elected officials today that is at its highest point in decades, expose a sense of powerlessness, disconnectedness from government, a sense of
alienation that is incompatible with and ultimately a threat to the fundamental values of democracy. They show that in the absence of clear, coherent, courageous leadership on the issues that count, the basic social and ideological consensus that has largely shaped our nation's path and politics since World War II has ground to a halt. Those old-fashioned virtues of the political trade, civility and comity, have given way to polarization and vituperation. The congenial center that practiced reason and preached restraint has increasingly given way to zealous single-issue advocates and ideologues of the extreme left and right.

In short, far more than structural and procedural reforms, we need in America today—if we are to salvage, much less strengthen, our democracy—nothing less than a new politics, and above all, a new kind of politician. One who is not afraid to take risks, take responsibility, take initiatives, take decisions, take the lead in shaping practical proposals, shaping a consensus around them. One who is not afraid to take on the special interests, both left and right, to do battle for the public interest. One who is not afraid to discipline his public and political behavior in strict accordance with a consistent set of democratic principles, the principles we preach abroad and profess to embrace at home. One who is not afraid—dare I say it—to lose, lose honorably, to speak up when necessary against wrong and go down when necessary for what's right. A profile in courage, an inspiration to others, an ultimate winner in one jurisdiction or another.

In 1963, John F. Kennedy's leadership on civil rights legislation caused a sharp reduction in his standing in the polls, particularly in the South, but that caused no reduction whatsoever in his effort. He did not change the political process or structure as much as he changed the attitudes of both politicians and voters in this country. From the very hour of his June 1963 speech onward, he worked at this task virtually every day, preaching, cajoling, educating, explaining, putting the issue into perspective and putting Congressmen on the spot.

On the political continuum of dedication, not ideology, we find essentially three types of political activists—the "strategist," the "idealist," and the "fanatic." The strategist, cynical, calculating, cold-blooded, looks upon politics as a contest of power, not principles. There is no denying the political truism that only winners can put their principles into law, but for that increasing number of politicians and consultants who are primarily strategists, winning is the only principle—whatever the cost to the country, whatever the cost to our sense of national community and trust. They believe that politics, from the campaign trail to the committee hearing room, is dog eat dog, and every man for himself. Accept no blame, display no shame, find a way to fix the game. Serious issues—race, crime, pollution, welfare, lend themselves not to solution but to exploitation and demagoguery.

At the other end of the spectrum, the fanatic is sincere in his beliefs but irresponsible, intolerant and inflexible in his drive to force them on others, a zealot willing to defy both law and humanity in his single-minded push for success. In the name of compassion, fervent mobs torment women entering abortion clinics. In the name of racial harmony, self-ordained arbiters of political correctness stifle dialogue and dissent. "The greatest dangers to liberty," wrote Mr. Justice Brandeis (in the passage read to an uncomprehending Oliver North by Senator Sarbanes in the Iran-Contra hearing), "the greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."
The New Politician of whom I speak must be the idealist in the middle of that continuum, unwilling to compromise principles if needed to win an election, but willing to compromise programs if needed to serve the public. That is an all too rare breed today, a politician who understands values as well as costs, the core values of our democracy and communities; a politician who focuses on the next generation, not merely the next election, and who remembers, as JFK urged us all to remember, that “civility is not a sign of weakness.” The New Politician campaigns and governs on the basis of principles, not polls; emphasizes comity, not confrontation; and is well versed not only in the art of politics but also in the substance of policy, the demands of ethics, and the lessons of history.

To help develop this kind of New Politics and New Politician, to further the renaissance of democratic values, we look to the Institute of Politics at the Kennedy School. If you just produce skilled political strategists, whether Democrat or Republican, expert in the tactical use of attack commercials and tracking polls but convinced along with the late philosopher Leo “the Lip” Durocher, that “nice guys finish last,” then you will have failed your obligation to the memory of those who founded this Institute.

If you merely increase the number of zealous political fanatics, on the Left or on the Right, who are ready and willing to deny the rights of others in order to secure the Truth as they alone can see it, then you would be truer to the legacy of John F. Kennedy if you taught only touch football and sailing.

If, however, you can teach future and current politicians and public servants the ethical and moral limits of a winning strategy, the difference between commitment and zealotry, and the everlasting need for comity and civility in American public life, then you will be fulfilling your mandate and your charter, truly strengthening democracy in the post-Cold War era, and carrying out John Kennedy’s firm belief that politics and public service must elevate our standards, not subvert them.

“No government is better than the men (and women) who compose it,” he declared in a campaign speech 31 years ago last week, “and I want the best.” Today, our democracy needs the best, but we are all too rarely receiving it. I look to this Institute of Politics, this School of Government, this University of renown, and this audience of political practitioners, advisors, instructors and chroniclers, to give us your very best.

* * * * *
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John Culver: In his life and Presidency John Kennedy evoked a special passion for public service—a joy in elected politics—in young men and women throughout our country, indeed throughout the world. The transition from the presidency of Dwight Eisenhower to that of John Kennedy was a leap in generations. We moved to the youngest president and to a Cabinet and senior staff nearly 20 years younger than that which preceded it. The 1960-61 period marked the decisive moment, the first since early New Deal days, in which there was a large infusion of new talent and fresh faces in all segments of national political life. As one who was elected to the Congress in 1964, I have a particular appreciation of how John Kennedy inspired me, and many others among that year’s large number of newly-elected members, to find vital meaning in public service.

This morning we take the measure of the health and vitality of elected politics by looking at the first level of our political lives, state and local politics, often the seedbed of our national politics. If we want to preview the politics of the year 2000 and beyond, we can do no better than to listen to four young politicians representing a diversity of backgrounds, geographical locales and political positions, as each addresses the question, “Why did you choose politics?”

Patrick Kennedy: The 25th anniversary of this Institute, which is dedicated to the memory of John F. Kennedy, gives people a chance to get close to the values and inspirations that led a generation to get involved in politics during his lifetime. That inspiration, those values, are not present today in many other places. They were, however, present in my home when I was growing up; that’s what led me to get into politics. I was very lucky because I was exposed to strong, positive feelings about public service, about getting involved in government. I am really happy to be involved in politics and to be here this morning for this discussion.

Todd Paulson: A book I’ve been reading, A Parliament of Whores, by P. J. O’Rourke, provides one answer to our question. O’Rourke writes that if people choosing politics, running for office, said what was really on their minds, they might say, “I’m running for the U.S. Senate in order to even the score with those grade school classmates of mine who 35 years ago gave me the nickname ‘Fish Face.’” Or, “Please elect me to Congress so I can get out of the Midwest and meet bigwigs and cute babes.”
My answer is that there are two reasons why people choose politics, one personal, the other societal. If asked why they are in politics, people will say, "I like it, it's rewarding, challenging; it's frustrating at times but it's also fun." Or they'll say they believe in something or they got involved in a particular issue which led to getting more involved in politics. We really need both reasons. Without both, we can fall into one of the three categories that Ted Sorenson so aptly described last night: the strategist, in it to gain position; the zealot, in it to promote a particular cause; or by blending those two, the ideologist, where both we and society benefit.

Being in politics can make you a better person and society a better place. You've got to keep your sense of self, your values, your perspective, your honor and in the process learn to relate well to other people, to problems, and to problem people. By changing things, you end up changing yourself, for better or for worse, depending on the kind of person you are.

**Susan Tracy:** I think about running for public office on two levels. There are the easier questions: "Can I win?" "If so, can I do the job?" "Who are my opponents?" "Can I raise the money?" "Do I have the necessary resources?" Then there's the hard question: "Why do I want to do this — the pay is terrible, the hours are awful, too many events scheduled in too short a time, my personal time will be sacrificed, any sort of life apart from the campaign will be impossible, there'll be great frustration?"

My answer comes from my own ideological perspective, from looking at what's happening today. This is a really negative time. If you care about what's happening in the Supreme Court, care that our education system is so unequal and that resources are continuing to be cut back, care about the fact that civil rights laws are starting to be chipped away, care that Americans have seen no real growth in their income in the last decade, care about crime in the inner cities, then you do one of two things. You decide, "Forget this, it's all too big, I can't handle it, let someone else do it." Or you decide, "I'm not going to just let this go by and not play a part in trying to change it."

President Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country." Unfortunately, we've gotten away from that, completely turned around the spirit of that. People now ask, "What can the country do for me?" I certainly hope that the pendulum is going to swing back. That's why I got involved in politics. I couldn't in good conscience just walk away.

**Walter Tucker:** Why politics? If you take the measure of all that you've heard already, you'd have to say that you've got to be a little crazy to want to be in politics. I am recently elected — just six months on the job. On the campaign trail, I often remarked to people that I am just young enough and just dumb enough to believe that I can do something. I think that's why they elected me. They thought it was time for somebody who had some idealism, a breath of fresh air for the political structure.

Politics deals with one's conscience, with issues that you feel you need to stand for. But it also deals with one's heart, things for which you have compassion. What could you have more compassion for than people?
The city I represent, Compton, is a community of some 100,000, located between Los Angeles and Long Beach, California. The population is predominantly minority — 52 percent African-American, 44 percent Latino-American and others, including Samoans and Native Americans. The problems of Compton are problems that reflect the struggles of the underclass in this country, those who are suffering from poor education and from high unemployment.

Young African-American males in this country are at risk. Statistics show us that one out of four are in the criminal justice system, six out of ten will be involved in some type of shooting before they're 25 years old. There are more African-American males in jail or in prison than in college.

Having had the opportunity to get an education, it was incumbent upon me to try to give something back to my community. I started off being an attorney but handling cases day-to-day, particularly criminal cases, adult or juvenile, I saw the cycle going on and on. A conscientious person could impact one person at a time, but not numbers of people, as is possible by being in public office. That's why I chose politics, to be able to make a difference. And, as John Culver indicated, those of us who start on a local level, at the grassroots, can hope to become the leaders of tomorrow on a statewide or national level.

Trey Greyson (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee):
Mr. Tucker, do you see being a role model as one of your most important duties, almost as important as being a good administrator?

W. Tucker: It may be the single most important job that I have. When I was growing up, John F. Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King, my dad, all influenced me. We're all influenced by role models but there is a lack of role models in the African-American community. I'm from that community. I went away and came back so I have that connection. What you can do just by example is so important. Someone said it best the other day. The first teacher that you ever had in your life is your mother. What you learned from her, you learned by example.

Elizabeth Caputo (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee):
All of you have very interesting and diverse reasons for wanting to pursue political office. Could you tell me of an experience you've had that has really made you feel as though you chose the right field.

P. Kennedy: Last year I introduced several rules changes in the legislature. By compromising, I was able to get some of them passed. I felt that I made a major difference because instead of having no time to study the budget we had three days, which was a big change. Instead of not being able to force a vote in committee, now three members could force a vote. Those were things I felt strongly about.

Also, everybody got an education when the credit union collapsed in Rhode Island. One of the reasons that it collapsed was that a bill, which would have required federal deposit insurance, never even got a vote in committee. So people began to realize that the process, how it works, affects the decisions we make. More than any other bill that I've managed to get through the legislature and sign into law, changing the rules is the accomplishment I'm most proud of.
T. Paulson: I campaigned on the theme of communication and citizen participation because I didn't feel we were doing well enough in Brooklyn Center. Now we've made some strides forward. We've got a communications commission started. We're doing some things with citizen participation to empower people to make decisions within the community. What happens at the local level can have a lot of effect on what happens in the larger community. Too often in politics we write off the local level. Everybody thinks about Congress, the President, the Supreme Court. That's one reason why people get turned off.

What your neighbor's house looks like, what your neighborhood looks like, how you can prevent crime in your district — those local issues are backyard issues. A lot of legislators say they'd like to pass tougher sentencing laws. But you can provide enforcement at the local, city or county level. You can put money into that, start programs like DARE or a drug task force. Citizen participation, empowering people to be part of their own decision-making, decentralizing decision-making power is something I'd like to leave behind.

S. Tracy: For me right now, dealing with issues and policy is the most frustrating side of Massachusetts government. I think I've been on the losing side of just about every vote in the legislature, whether it was a tax issue, general relief benefits, whatever. Little things help me through the most frustrating days. Government gets a bad rap. It's so complicated for people to deal with. But when you actually make government work for someone, you feel really good.

For example, an elderly woman, in her '80s, lives on a street that no large buses or trucks can pass through. She wants to go to Bingo on Saturday nights but the bus won't pick her up because it would get a traffic ticket. I provided her with a letter to allow the bus to pick her up. I made someone's life happier, and that makes me feel good.

Last night, at the Brighton Congregational Church, I met with a group of single parents, most of whom live in housing developments in my area. They didn't know how to apply for welfare benefits. These small things, feeling like you really help someone, make the other hurdles that we fight every day a little bit easier.

W. Tucker: One of the greatest things that you can ever feel is when you have the "power" to pick up the phone and make a difference in the life of someone who has a problem. The issues of empowerment, communication, participation have been raised. When I got into office, one of the first thing I realized about our city was that everybody was very apathetic. There was not a great degree of participation. The community was very fragmented. In southern California in particular, but other parts of the country also, there is a great deal of fragmentation among different ethnicities. You've seen Korean and African-American confrontations; Hispanic and African-American confrontations.

I thought about this and I said, "Well, if all these things are happening in Los Angeles, it's only a matter of time before the fire moves this way and we see a violent manifestation." I called for the first annual unity festival and summit conference in the city of Compton. And it was tremendous. It was a five-day event that was not only a festival, which a lot of cities have had, but a summit conference empowering all the citizens to come and to participate on those things that they believe are important to the community. There was a lot of
impact and we got a lot of feedback. I really believe it's going to be a watershed for the whole community.

Audience: I am wondering, given your dedication to public service, what your views are on term limit legislation?

S. Tracy: I'm on the election laws committee so I've thought a lot about the issue. I'm not impassioned about it, not vehemently opposed to term limitations. One problem with term limitations is that it takes the voters off the hook. People are frustrated with politics but the vast majority of them don't even take the time to vote. If you don't like what's going on, do something about it, but don't just say, "Let's haul people in or out."

I certainly respect the people I work with, people who have experience, people who have been there, people I can ask for guidance. I can't imagine what a legislative body would be like with people who are changing every couple of years. We would really suffer from the inexperience. There is real power, though, in encumbency; it can be frustrating to try to unseat a person that you may not want there.

I would rather see this society focus on good campaign finance laws. People should have the choice of who they want to vote for, incumbent or not. But the playing field should be evened up a little bit and money should play less of a role.

P. Kennedy: I agree. Susan has expressed exactly my sentiments.

T. Paulson: I'm not trying to equivocate, but I really haven't made up my mind about the issue. I think there is a big problem and that Susan has outlined it well. There is power in encumbency and we do need some degree of turnover. We're here advocating fresh blood and new faces—well, that helped me along.

W. Tucker: I would largely agree with Susan's comments, particularly with the need to reform the campaign laws. That's important. If I were in favor of term limits, it would be more on a state level than on a federal level.

S. Tracy: It's interesting when people talk about term limits and new blood. In the Massachusetts House there are 160 members. This year there are 43 new members who came in with me. One-quarter of the House changed. So there are changes.

Audience: I imagine that in your campaigns you all had to deal with the issue of credibility as far as being younger and less experienced. Would you comment on how you dealt with that issue.

T. Paulson: I think the best way is to ignore it and just do your best. If people detect that you are letting it get under your skin, they can prey upon that. There are a lot of other factors in a campaign. If you can set up a lot of the "M&Ms"—money and management, message and manpower—to get the vote out, then you've got a good shot at winning.
W. Tucker: In my campaign, my age was definitely an issue. I'm older than I look but I don't think a day goes by without someone saying, “You're the mayor?” It did work to my advantage in the sense that people were ready for a change, ready for fresh ideas. I think it's very important to have youthful entrants into the political process, particularly today.

In Compton, in the inner city, we've got problems that we didn't have ten or fifteen years ago, like the increase in crack cocaine. The voters, whose median age was about 55, looked at me as someone who was a little more in touch with these evolving problems. So I think my youth worked to my advantage in that regard.

P. Kennedy: When I first ran, what helped me was that I didn't have a lot to say for myself. It forced me to listen to people. That was one thing that they had been missing so I turned it on its head, said I just wanted to listen to their concerns. I think that made a big difference to people. As far as what young people bring to the process, we have more credibility than anything else. We have more of a stake in what's being decided upon right now. It's going to be our generation that pays for all the decisions being made today.

A couple of days ago I was with my father and I overheard what the interest on the federal debt is going to be—$304 billion a year. That's higher than the defense budget. It was $40 billion when Reagan took office. What are we doing? We're just mortgaging our future. My generation, future generations, will end up paying and their quality of life is going to be diminished. So I think young people have a stronger case than anyone else as to why they belong in the process.

Audience: What experience do any of you wish you'd had before taking office, whether personal or professional or academic?

S. Tracy: For all of us life didn't begin with elected office; we all did a lot of things before and had educational backgrounds. For myself, I wish I had better speaking skills, more confidence, was better at telling jokes, better at personal interaction. During the campaign, you think, “What if someone asks me this or that; I'm not going to know the answer.” Then you begin to realize that people don't expect you to know everything, that it's perfectly fine to say you don't know things when you don't. Those internal personal things are probably the same things all of us feel in any job. Maybe confidence just comes with time.

J. Culver: In her comments on term limitations, Susan made reference to perhaps an anti-democratic aspect to the term limitation issue and that people should have the opportunity to choose whoever they want to choose, support or reject people in a discriminating way, based on their judgment of who can best represent them.

We talk a lot about the failures of leadership, how the fate of this nation is going to pivot on the quality of our education because that's a cornerstone of a democracy. It's based on the assumption that people have the capacity to self-govern and make discriminating, intelligent, enlightened choices in their own self interest. How are we going to jump start this democracy of ours? It's rather embarrassing today. The whole world looks to us—Eastern Europe, the Soviet
Union. We're exporting political handlers to Eastern Europe to tell them about our democracy. What is worth telling? How much do we really believe in it? What do you think can be done?

_P. Kennedy:_ I agree with Todd that it's not a matter of people not caring but of them not feeling as though they can make a difference. He pointed to the Kettering study. There's another study that shows more people recycle than vote so it's clear that people are participating and involved in issues. But they don't feel that when they get involved in government they can see how it works. What I've been working on in Rhode Island is to try to simplify the process. The rules changes I mentioned are an attempt to open up the process so people can see how government arrives at decisions. Once they see that, they'll be able to vote in an educated way for a certain elected official based on their priorities.

President Kennedy didn't say all the solutions and answers lay with the government. He said that a young person going into the Peace Corps can make a difference, an attorney giving legal assistance can make a difference, a small business person in the community can make a difference. The idea that government has to be the answer to all our problems has to be done away with. We've got to find government's appropriate role in society and stick to it.

_W. Tucker:_ We must, as government, take some innovative measures to involve our people, particularly our young people. When I was on the campaign trail, I noticed that overwhelmingly the great concern of the community was the problems in the schools. As I went from one campaign forum to the next, I felt as if I was running for the school board. All the questions were focused on what I was going to do about our children. I realized I was running to be the mayor of the city but the people didn't seem to see that. All they wanted to know was what I was going to do about the kids, the lack of education, the schools going down. But my bailiwick is City Hall; I don't have jurisdiction over the schools. They've got a superintendent, they've got a school board. So we have to start making some bridges, building better partnerships between those different bailiwicks so that those issues are addressed. If you have a school system that is not teaching our kids about local government, then there's going to be apathy, a turnoff to any participation. Not only do we need to teach local government but we need to create more programs that actually provide some hands-on involvement and exposure.

_Audience:_ You're talking about local government being important but fewer people vote in City Hall elections than U.S. Senator. Most people don't know who their state representative is or how to contact that person. It's not easy to get people to show up at a PTA meeting even when their kids are involved.

In your roles as people involved at basic levels of government, how do you go about bringing your constituents closer to government, making them feel more a part of the institutions that serve them?

_P. Kennedy:_ One of my proudest legislative accomplishments was passing a bill requiring voter registration at all state agencies so that whatever business people might be conducting with the state, if they weren't registered to vote, they'd be registered on the spot. That is one direct way.
What can we do to inspire people to get involved? We need to talk about issues and show people the process. I come back to what I see as an elementary point. The process of government must be straightforward, not confusing. People need to see how their actions can have an effect in a direct way.

**Audience:** As a brand new elected official, do you think that you are disadvantaged vis-a-vis people in office a long time? Do you feel you're disadvantaged in doing the job that you were elected to do?

**T. Paulson:** Well, again, if you have confidence, you're going to do okay. But there are pitfalls for young people coming into the system. There is a form of ageism. But you do have something to contribute. You can add new perspectives, have new ideas, offer new proposals. I chair the MTC commission, our bus system. Another member called a proposal of mine “naive” just before the rest of the commissioners voted with me on it.

Often, there's a group already formed, people who have known each other and been involved with the issues for years, so in effect you're breaking into that club or clique. You can get the reputation of someone in a hurry. They will think it's just blind ambition. People caution you to slow down, wait your turn. Again, you have to listen to your own self on that.

Also, you can't have your own kind of ageism, can't think, “I'm not going to listen to that old fuddy duddy.” There's a lot of experience there, a lot to be learned. Finally, we all need to have a mentor or two to draw upon.

**W. Tucker:** An analogy I like is jury selection. Prospective jurors shrink back sometimes, seeing others with previous experience as jurors as being better. But the one thing they don't have is they can't be you; they don't have your mind, your morality, your convictions. There's only one you; nobody else can replace you.

**Audience:** When there is a conflict, do you vote your conscience or your constituency?

**S. Tracy:** I believe that people are elected to do a job, which is to vote, to make decisions, to take responsibility for things which the voters don't have time to learn about. I believe the people in my district asked me to vote on things that will affect the world they live in, to do so to the best of my ability using the information available to me as an elected official.

When you go into public office, you should, one, run on a platform so that people aren't voting for an unknown but know where you come from philosophically, and two, when you get elected, you should listen to the debate, talk to your colleagues, make informed decisions based on what you think is right.

**P. Kennedy:** If people know that you care about the issue, that will make a difference to them even if they disagree with you. If you come across as believing in what you're doing, that holds a lot of weight with people.
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Jonathan Moore: There has been a lot of loose talk about “new world orders,” going back to Alfred Lord Tennyson in 1842 and probably a good deal earlier. More recently, Churchill, and now Gorbachev and President Bush, have addressed the issue. Today, we’re going to continue, maybe even expand, that loose talk.

The most interesting thing about our topic is the relationship between home and abroad. One common aspect to both national and international orders is change; without change we cannot have either a new world or a new domestic order. A second common aspect is the protection of individual human rights and group rights—religious, ethnic minorities and nationalities. Self-determination in various manifestations is common to both realms. Third, any system, any order, won’t work if it’s limited to being principally imposed by the rich and the strong over the poor and the weak. Fourth, a system based on enforcement, or on the military, without incorporating factors of social and economic justice, won’t work. Fifth, traffic in arms, the problem of destructive weaponry and its proliferation, is a common problem. Sixth, is the competition between means of enforcement and provision of human services. Finally, there must be an underlying or overarching moral commitment or purpose guiding and charging the concept.

Then, there are some natural links between home and abroad. For example, we have learned to our own regret that our national foreign policy can’t work unless it is politically sustained at home, one way or another. The people have to support the extension of our government’s policies and interests abroad. The domestic consequences of what we do overseas must reinforce what we want, or at least be able to tolerate that at home. The ideals we hold in our own
society, our political culture, cannot be abandoned when we're dealing beyond our own national boundaries.

Another natural link between home and abroad is the extent to which we are economically interdependent with the rest of the world, not isolated economically. And finally, I would cite as a natural link the contempt of environmental threats to political boundaries or even to hemispheres.

Art Torres: If we look at major industrial actions in the world today, one of the most interesting phenomena is immigration. Previously homogeneic countries face immigration much more rigidly than ever before, partly due to importing a work force, partly because of migratory patterns resulting from democratic reforms in some areas of each hemisphere, and for other reasons. France is a vivid example. One domestic reaction to North African Muslim immigrants has been the emergence of a new party framed on the issue of immigration and the destruction of traditional French culture. That party, in the last French presidential elections, claimed almost ten percent of the vote. So this new religious minority is having an impact on French national politics and is clearly forcing a reaction in terms of foreign policy.

In West Germany, we see the same issue with the impact the Turks are having on that society. Again, a work force being brought into a homogeneic country is creating a confrontation. At a symposium sponsored by the German Marshall Fund, we brought the West German leadership and the Turkish leadership to the hills right outside of Washington, D.C. There was a fascinating discussion on how people are looking around the world to see how to deal with immigration and the work force and minorities, because for the most part, Germans have never dealt with minorities, at least on a positive level.

There is also a very interesting dynamic in Sweden. For the first time in history, the Greeks and the Turks got together to build a coalition in Stockholm against Finnish Gypsies migrating into Sweden. The usual stereotypes of an immigrant community were cited: burglaries, not willing to work, robbing our cars, taking away our daughters to places of unknown establishment. So in Sweden minorities which traditionally had never come together were forming a coalition to confront an immigration problem from another minority. Unbelievable! A new world order? Who knows about the future?

In the Western Hemisphere, look at Latin America. The President of Mexico, Carlos Salinas, has told us to either accept his people or his goods in a free trade accord. We are separated by much more than a river in terms of the impact that that community is having on America.

The same thing is true with the Vietnamese population. Those of you who live in California may know the tremendous impact of migratory patterns in California. Former South Vietnam Premier Ky opened a liquor store in Orange County and many Vietnamese followed. They also followed local leaders from Ho Chi Minh City, formerly Saigon, to San José. The impact is clear. The opening of relations between the U.S. and Vietnam has been significantly stalled because Vietnamese refugees within certain policy-forming bodies have had an impact on domestic policy.

The same phenomenon is happening in Vietnam and in Japan. For the first time, the Japanese are having to import a work force because population trends
are down. A new phenomenon in Japan is the inability of young Japanese "yuppies" to find proper wives. Women in Japan are not willing to take a back seat any more. Japanese men are going to the Philippines and to Sri Lanka for mail order brides.

How is the new world order affected by what is happening in America in terms of immigration patterns? Even Sony will take notice of the American Latino community with its purchasing power of $135.2 billion. In 1992, the sale of salsa in America will reach $802 million, for the first time overtaking the sale of ketchup which will be down to $732 million. Viva Mexico! The impact is clear and is felt not only in political circles but in other institutions as well. The Vatican recently sent special emissaries to Latin America because of the threat of evangelical movements on the Catholic Church. Increasing numbers of evangelical Protestants are singing songs across Latin American and worrying the Holy Father because losing control is very difficult for the Catholic Church.

A new world order will mean looking at the world very differently. For the first time the phenomenon of immigration will not be limited to America but will be widespread. To me, a new world order does not necessarily mean the separation of powers or geographic distinctions. It can also mean a collective rather than an individualistic order.

John O'Sullivan: I am going to reverse the title of our topic to "The New World Order: Abroad and at Home," because we should be discussing the impact on us of the great changes we have seen in the international system in the last two years.

The post war world had a very clear order which broke down over the last two years. That order had been forged in two periods by two men, Hitler and Stalin. Hitler created the Allied cooperation of 1944 to 1947 which brought about the United Nations, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Breton Woods meeting, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and all the institutions of international cooperation which are so important. Those organizations and their cooperation was stillborn because Stalin provoked the Cold War which in turn produced its own institutions — NATO, the Warsaw Pact, and later on some of the economic institutions like the European Community. We are in danger of forgetting just how stable a world that was. Consider that the largest war in Europe since 1945 was in Yugoslavia. The enormous changes you've seen in the last several years—the collapse of the Soviet Empire in Eastern Europe, the collapse of Soviet Communism itself in its heartland, the rise of Japan as a financial power, the unification of Germany, the Gulf War, and the emergence of this country as the sole world superpower — those changes have brought about a new world order, whether or not we like the phrase. When you have a world in which the Soviet Union has, in effect, retreated into its own isolationism to contemplate its own navel, and when the United States is, in a sense, the power to which the rest of the world must now look for leadership, then things have changed very dramatically.

Nowhere is this more true than in regard to international organizations. Some, like The Warsaw Pact, will simply go out of business. Some are more effective than before because superpower conflict, which crippled them, has been removed. The United Nations is the best example of that. Some, like the World Bank, are responding to the great change in the international intellectual climate. I think it's
safe to say, with Barber Conable here, that the stress of the World Bank on markets predated the events of 1989 and connected largely with his stewardship.

Some international organizations find themselves, almost for the first time, in conflict with others. The economic development of the European Community, particularly its stress on agricultural protection, is bringing it into conflict with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Some, like NATO, remain in business but don't quite know what to do in the changed conditions of the international world. There is considerable flux and we ought to look around and see what the new challenges will be, examine how these international institutions will cope with them.

I see two particularly important risks facing us. The first is protectionism. The Uruguay Round may well now survive, but if it doesn't, one can see the drift to increasing protectionism throughout the world. Europe, Japan and America are already forging their own trade blocks. Already we see troubles between the U.S. and the European Community. Europe is using anti-dumping legislation to keep out Japanese goods. The most dramatic example is the attempt by some European countries to ensure that Japanese quotas for cars will include those cars manufactured in Britain by Japanese companies. The protectionism, if it develops in the way one fears, would lead to all kinds of other conflicts in the world. At least that has been the pattern in the past.

The second great risk, a greater one in my view, is nuclear proliferation. The case of Iraq warns us of the danger of rogue states acquiring weapons of mass destruction. According to Richard Cheney, by the year 2000 more than two dozen developing nations will have ballistic missiles, 15 will have the scientific skills to build their own missiles, 12 will either have or be near to getting nuclear capability, 30 will have chemical weapons, 10 will be able to deploy biological weapons. The Third World is full of ethnic conflicts, border disputes and irredentist arguments so the risks of proliferation go far beyond the theoretical.

We need international institutions capable of dealing with these kinds of threats, organizations like a strengthened GATT, a strengthened International Atomic Energy Authority, a strengthened United Nations.

But how strengthened? Strengthened in what way? The new world order will be very new indeed if it's able to get by without the leadership of a great power. The world has always needed a bank of last resort, an importer of last resort, and ultimately a policeman of last resort. Only the United States is in a position to provide anything like that role. Of course, the United States is not in a position, as it was 20 or 30 years ago, to provide that role alone. It can only do so in cooperation with other countries. It cannot be the policeman of the world unless it's really the police sergeant of the world. There have to be other countries prepared to help. So this country needs to forge a new relationship with Europe to ensure that the two sides of the Atlantic do not go in different trade directions but forge some new sort of free trade.

Secondly, NATO, based upon that free trade, will have to develop a permanent burden-sharing arrangement so that if the U.S. is going to carry out some of the enforcement rules of the United Nations, it will be able to rely on money and military cooperation from its allies. Above all, America needs to resolve its internal arguments over its world role in the post Cold War World. There is a growing neo-isolationism on both the right and the left. A combina-
tion of Pat Buchanan and George McGovern is a powerful, if uncomfortable one. But isolationism is not and never has been the only tradition in American foreign policy. There are two others as well.

One is the liberal internationalism of men like Dean Acheson, Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, a tradition generally more associated with the Democrats than with the Republicans. A second is the strategic realism of people like Henry Stimson, Dwight Eisenhower, Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon, generally more associated with the Republicans. If we can combine, or rather harness, these two traditions in some sort of harmony, we can have a foreign policy that would combine the desire of the left for international cooperation with the realistic acknowledgment of the right that sometimes force or the threat of force will be required to make international cooperation work against outlaws within the system. I believe forging that kind of alliance is going to be the great challenge in foreign policy in the next three or four years.

Madeleine Kunin: The changes internationally—the demise of Communism, the right of democracy, the end of the Cold War, the realignment of the Middle East—have been faster, more monumental, more comprehensive than anything we ever imagined. We still haven't absorbed their depth and breadth and long-term impact. This weekend started out, I think justifiably so, with a great deal of pessimism, recognizing that democracy itself is in trouble. But we do have to pause for a moment and celebrate the triumph of the human spirit that has occurred in so many parts of the world. We tend to overlook those brief moments of euphoria. They won't last if we don't nurture them. It is an amazing time in which to live, a time which we, our children, and grandchildren, cannot fully understand. Of course, the camera may speed up even faster in their lifetime.

The emergence of democracy, the emulation of American democracy, this is what we wanted. This has been our policy and it has happened. Sometimes wishes do come true and then you're doomed to live with the consequences. The irony is that as we have seen this glorious celebration in practically all parts of the world, we are seeing an erosion of our export. We don't know how to keep pace with the demands on democracy both at home and abroad. I believe we really have to reinvent democracy at home so that what is being imitated is something of which we are proud.

We could start out with the statue of Liberty in Tiennamen Square—that was a glorious sight. Listening to the recitations of the words of Jefferson and Lincoln in Poland and Hungary and Czechoslovakia—those were poignant moments. But people are going to imitate us very quickly; they are also just on the brink of, or have begun to, imitate our disillusionment. For example, voter turnout in elections in Czechoslovakia and recently in Poland was much lower the second time around. Already, there was a sense of, "Can this process work? Is it worth it? Do we really have a chance to control our destiny as the quotations we recited last year told us we did?"

The hard work of making democracy work has just begun. We have to be very careful that we don't simply send our consultants, as we've been doing, to teach the worst. Even if we don't send them, they will learn from us anyway, because of CNN and C-SPAN, all of our television. We live in a kind of instant international communications network.
How do you reinvent democracy? I'm shaken when I just say the words; it's such an awesome thing to contemplate. There are only a couple of ways to do it. One is to prove that the democratic system of government can solve problems. Yesterday Ted Sorensen eloquently described disenchantment and lack of political will. We haven't been able to prove that the democratic system, as we've used it in recent years, solves the major problems about which we are most concerned.

Second, what kind of leadership comes forth to solve those problems? People, ideas, problem solving, are at the heart of how any government works. There's no great mystery there. We have to go back to the realization that we cannot totally blame the leaders. I sense such an impatience with the hard work of problem solving.

For example, everyone agrees health care is a necessity—Ted Kennedy, anyone you would ask in this room, would say it is. But the reality is that it's going to cost money and it's going to mean tangling with probably this country's wealthiest, most powerful advocacy group—the American Medical Association and all its adherents. It means really shaking up the system, shaking up the status quo, asking taxpayers to make a contribution, and changing what we've become accustomed to. It isn't just a question of words. It's getting away from the no-pain form of politics, realizing that some tough decisions have to be made, and that we, the electorate, also have to change.

The same may be true for the environment. Everybody wants a new environmental agenda. But that also means a change in values, a change in priorities, the necessity of looking at economic costs and benefits in a different way than we have in the past, and factoring in the economics of bad environmental policy.

On the leadership side, we have to change politics to make it more inclusive rather than exclusive. One could argue that democracy has never been terribly inclusive, that it has always been mainly a white male establishment. I cited the statistic—98 men and 2 women in the United States Senate—in speech after speech over the last several years but it never had the impact that one minute on television did—that lineup of white male establishment on one side and the witnesses on the other side during the Clarence Thomas hearings. The visual impact of the distortion of our existing political system is so powerful that I surmise we will see a very strong reaction against that, to create a more open, more inclusive, more expansive political system which more fairly represents the make-up of this country. With new people in the system, both women and minorities, we will also get new ideas and perhaps new faith. But we, the electorate, have to make some adjustments, ask ourselves, "What do leaders look like?" We have all become accustomed to leaders looking like the white male leadership that is pictured, with few exceptions, on the front pages of our newspapers, on the evening news, on the walls inside the buildings we so deeply respect. When we see women like Anita Hill, like current IOP Fellows Anita Blackwell and Maria Berriozabal, who is Latino, we have to say, yes, that's leadership. We have to readjust our own cliched expectations of what leaders look like.

On an optimistic note, things have gotten so bad they've got to get better. There is such an impatience with the lack of addressing the problems facing this country that there is going to be a demand for practical solutions.
It is much more attractive for a President and for the Congress to focus on foreign policy than on domestic policy. On domestic policy everybody has an answer, the heat is more intense, the problems are more complex, the electorate is more on the ball, things are much more tumultuous. In the last two years we’ve experienced the equivalent of war, in the sense that the President and the Congress could focus on external events so compelling the country was willing to give them that leeway. We rallied in a patriotic way to allow that vacuum to occur. That period is coming to a close. That focus is shifting back to the home base and the hard work begins abroad as well. The answers are not as easy as they used to be.

New leadership is emerging. We need to give them a chance, encourage them and back them. The next phase of the women’s movement in this country is going to be a movement of political activism. I hope we’ll see the time when the composition of political bodies of the world will be 50 percent women.

Barber Conable: I believe the future world order must be based very heavily on development. There are a billion people in the world. Four times the population of the United States live on less than a dollar a day. That is defined as absolute poverty. There are 100 million children that have access to no primary education at all. We define development as an improvement in the quality of life through economic growth tempered with social investment. The poor have only their labor to sell. That labor must be buttressed by education and health programs adequate to make that labor valuable.

Obviously, development is an ongoing process. It has been occurring and has been changing quite dramatically. Part of the process of development is evidenced by the empowerment of peoples taking place all over the world. That empowerment is more complex than the interest in democracy that you find, for instance, throughout Latin America. Perhaps Latin America is not a perfect place for democracy. Ten years ago there were very few democracies there. At least now there is aspiration and the form of democracy taking shape despite, in many cases, rather bad economic policy.

Development goes beyond the geometric growth of the non-government organization process, which is people taking their destinies into their own hands through collective action. Non-government organizations are no longer just cited in London and Washington and Toronto. The are being replicated throughout the Third World as people try to gather together to work to improve the quality of their lives. Development can be greatly enhanced by the potential for defense cutbacks although they must be planned and orderly.

The decline in confrontation between great powers gives us an opportunity we otherwise would not have. The growth of consensus through the private sector and market forces make for greater economic efficiency and therefore greater economic growth than government intrusiveness. Other factors include the mobility that Art Torres spoke of, plus trade and other regional efforts being made to reduce barriers of one sort or another. I hope GATT will succeed, but even if it does not, any reduction of trade barriers, even on a block basis, is an improvement since so much of the transfer that goes on in the world is hindered by trade obstacles.

There are several realities of development that were not there five or ten years ago. One is the environmental issue, which is here to stay. There’s a tremen-
dous overlap between environment and development. Poverty itself is a toxic
force. Development cannot be sustained if it's environmentally unsound.
Population growth is something now generally conceived to be an area where
we must put more emphasis. If you look ahead to the year 2000, there'll be 100
million more people in Africa living in absolute poverty than there are now. If
current trends continue, population growth will overwhelm economic growth,
which is only gradually being recaptured through adjustment programs related to
market forces, and so forth. So, development has got to be an important part of
the new world order.

What is the role of the United States in this? First, it's important to understand
that development for ourselves is a necessity. There's an old saying, "Develop­
ment is like a bicycle; if it doesn't continue to move forward you fall over." The
U.S. has many areas of development that need to be dealt with, including eco­
nomic inequities, failures in our educational system and our attitude toward the
environment. We need to look at ourselves and try to throw off the hypocrisy
that tends to be an important part of our tremendously egocentric world.

I got awfully sick of people from California coming to say to me, "You've got
to impose, through the World Bank, some kind of energy conservation on
Brazil," when California uses slightly more energy than all of Brazil. We have
four percent of the world's population; we're using 25 percent of the world's
energy. For our Senators to go to some other place and talk about the imperative
of not cutting their tropical rain forest when our temperate rain forest is being
cut at a faster rate than theirs, or for them to leave the country rather than vote
on a three-cent-per-gallon tax increase, is hypocrisy of the first order.

Other instances of such hypocrisy? The sinners in defense buildups are the
purchasers. The sinners in the drug traffic are the sellers. It just happens that
the purchasers of arms and the sellers of drugs are the Third World. We think
we are blameless because we consume drugs and because we make arms?

The modality for helping and participating in the process of global develop­
ment in the new world order has to be multilateral. I don't believe the world will
permit the U.S. to continue to dominate the processes by which development
occurs because we have done so in the past as part of the Great Power rivalry.
I believe in cooperation, not confrontation. That was not always apparent
during my five years at the World Bank when the U.S. tended to dominate
decisions in that institution by virtue of its 17 percent share of the ownership.

Congress believes that it has an absolute right to impose all kinds of
conditions on foreign policy matters, whether they are multilateral or bilateral,
but it can do so effectively only through bilateral processes, which are very
expensive. They are not leveraged by the contributions of others and do not
require the cooperation of others. They are, therefore, ultimately politically
directed so development is not advanced significantly by bilateral efforts.

Cooperation starts in places like Harvard University. It's tremendously important
that Americans understand they are part of the world, that they study languages,
that they understand comparative law, that they prepare themselves for a coopera­
tive and not a bully's role. If we do that, a new world order will eventuate.

Christina Davis '93 (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee):
Often, in the international arena, our national interests conflict with universal
moral principles whether defensive self-determination or development of Third World countries. Is there any possibility of resolving this conflict?

J. Moore: As Barber said, you've got to avoid hypocrisy and arrogance in terms of what your own moral order or moral framework is. So it's a search, an effort to try to figure out what your moral ideals are and how you apply them. For example, if our definition of our national interests includes an ethical or spiritual or moral dimension, some vibrant manifestation of our ideals, then when we look at how we behave abroad, there will be less of these conflicts.

Obviously, there are tradeoffs, conflicts and competition you are never going to get away from, but if you're working off of some philosophical pulse, some reservoir of idealistic convictions, then you're going to diminish those conflicts.

B. Conable: I'm more concerned about our perception of morality. Mention was made of the fact that everybody wants to emulate the American system. That's not morality. Morality is bringing concern for individuals right down to the individual level. It is not some particular form of democracy. I remember Mobutu saying at one point, "I have a better democracy than the United States because I've got seventeen parties and you've only got two." Well, he wasn't right, and neither is the American system necessarily right.

You have many countries that have the form of democracy but at the bottom of the bureaucratic level there are those same individuals, so the quality of life of people is not improving because the system is flawed in its values. No particular system will change this process. It's very important to understand that other countries have other traditions.

The American system has grown out of our history, our traditions, our values. There are many ways in which morality toward the individual can be expressed through human rights and through permitting individuals to achieve his/her ultimate greatest potential. It's important that we understand that it is not going to be achieved by a mindless repetition of systems in some way.

M. Kunin: The biggest area of future conflict is economic, trade. John O'Sullivan pointed out that we should be cooperating with Europe but Europe is also our competitor. Where will we align those interests? Obviously, we want underdeveloped countries to emerge but they also will become potential competitors as they strengthen their economies.

The fact that the United States is now single-handedly the world power is something that should give us pause, no matter who is President. There is something frightening about being able to cut a broad swath without the tensions and counterpressures that we lived with in the Cold War era. None of us wants the Cold War back, of course, but we have to realize that we've lost that brake. Anything the United States says or does is now on a faster track.

J. O'Sullivan: Can you reconcile these two things? The answer, of course, is no. They have to be worked out in practice as each problem arises. If I were feeling outrageously, paradoxically right wing—a mood which occasionally overtakes me near the full moon—I think I could argue that the undiluted pursuit of moral principles, like the principle of self determination, is going to cause a great deal more
trouble in the world than the pursuit of self interest by nations. Bertrand Russell once said that if only people would act in their self interest instead of as they do, the world would be a good deal more accommodating. But in fact I share what I take to be your bias and think the pursuit of self interest, enlightened and corrected by a desire for international cooperation in dealing with very difficult problems, for example, Yugoslavia, is the best approach to pursue in the long run. Coming back, a first principle of morality, according to Pascal, is thinking clearly. In each case, we'll have to think clearly about how we reconcile the two.

A. Torres: There are two moralities we ought to pursue, which are universal and which transcend geographic distinctions. Number one, as Barber said, is human rights. I believe there are human rights issues that we can universally agree on, in terms of dealing with and trying to appease dictatorships and regimes where human rights are not being recognized. Number two is the environment. We need to establish a universal order in terms of the environment. Those two factors, human rights and the environment, transcend other areas.

Chris Harris '92 (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee): With civil strife tearing apart so many countries, is it now time to empower these international organizations to intervene, either through embargoes or through some military action, in civil wars?

J. O'Sullivan: I favor a reduction in the principle by which we don't intervene in the internal affairs of other countries, in certain cases. First, where they pose a very serious direct threat to their neighbors — the best example would be someone like Saddam Hussein acquiring nuclear weapons. That is something the international community simply cannot accept. It may accept it in the short term, but if the point ever comes when somebody explodes a nuclear weapon in such circumstances, international opinion would change very quickly to seriously entertain immediate intervention.

Second, also drawing on the Iraq crisis, is what happens when your policies are so oppressive that you drive large numbers of your own population into neighboring countries where they must be accommodated in camps at enormous cost in terms of instability to the neighbors. The most dramatic example of that was Spanish Equatorial Africa where the dictator murdered one-quarter of the population and drove another quarter out. In such circumstances, you have forfeited the right to have the international community ignore what is going on because you are causing problems for other countries in a major way. I think the next stage in international systems will be to develop a set of rules whereby this principle is attenuated and the international community agrees on ways in which it can take action. It will take time and be a step by step case but it is desirable.

J. Moore: In cases where internal problems and lack of governance and violation of human rights create movements of people outside borders, then you have the excuse, if you will, to argue that international law or regional security is affected, that peace and security are endangered and that, therefore, there is more of a prejudice toward intervention than would otherwise be the case. But how much intervention would you countenance if the violations of human rights, the
general chaos in a country, outright suffering, were brought about by political means rather than, say, by natural disasters?

**J. O'Sullivan:** The first principle is what is practicable. If we're talking about a powerful country, the international community is not going to do anything, however it might like to, because the costs are liable to outweigh the benefits. In countries where it's possible to take action, or to get an amendment of the country's behavior by the threat of action, then I would like to see that principle established.

The first stage would be to begin with the principle that if they affect their neighbors directly, creating instability for them, then action can be taken. The next stage would be to look at what happens in each circumstance. International law and international custom may proceed step by step but I think we can't run too fast.

**Audience:** Both Mr. O'Sullivan and Mr. Conable talk about restructuring international organizations — the United Nation, the World Bank — but seem to come down on different ends of the spectrum about what, ideally, would be the role of the U.S. Do you have a vision of how these organizations might work more effectively, especially the role of leadership and the role of consensus.

**B. Conable:** These institutions have to reflect world power realities if they are to get the support they need. That is one of the difficulties with the U.N., where the one-country-one-vote rule has resulted in the major powers not being willing to give the support to the U.N. that it must have to be effective. The World Bank and the Breton Woods institutions do reflect, to a greater degree, power realities through weighted voting based on ownership, but that system also is flawed. We have got to refine the system.

The World Bank is having a very interesting time regarding the application for membership of the Soviet Union. It is going to take a long time to work out, not because people don't want the Soviet Union in the World Bank, but because the relations of the other countries will be affected if the Soviet Union comes in with a capital percentage sufficiently large to reflect its real role in the world. For instance, the G7 (Group of 7) will lose its 52 percent on the board, the United States will lose its veto power over charter changes, smaller countries will get even considerably less clout than they now have—rather a sore point with them—and Germany, which has just absorbed East Germany, wants more capital, not less, and therefore will not be willing to give way to the Soviet Union.

These things have to be a matter of major negotiation and constant refinement. That reflects a reality that we sometimes don't consider. We think we have the ultimate system now and that we can be conservative about it. I don't believe we can.

**J. O'Sullivan:** The U.S. must show leadership but must not be a bully. I think that can be achieved. There is a moral and political argument about the role of the U.S. and a strong lobby in every Western country for the kind of U.S. leadership that Mr. Conable is talking about. Also, the process of immigration has created lobbies in major Western countries for the opinions and views of Third World countries. With those kind of influences, there will always be an
argument about the role of the U.S., but the U.S. will tend to play a constructive, cooperative role rather than a dominating one in a bad sense.

You have to answer the question, "Do you think the world will be a safer place if one power, the United States, assisted by its allies, tends to dominate things for good or for bad, or do you think the world will be safer if there were to be three competing power centers built around Japan, the United States and the European Community? My own instinct is that the world is safer when one power tends to dominate, particularly when it's a power which has shown an attentiveness to the opinions of other countries as the United States has done—with occasional exceptions, of course. That's in the nature of great powers; you'll never get away from that. It's unrealistic to think you will. You must examine the record of this country as opposed to other countries to see which you prefer.

Audience: The Gulf War coalition operated under U.N. resolutions but not under U.N. command. Do you think that the U.N. Military Staff Committee should be put in order so that future interventions should be directed by it? Is the U.S. prepared to place its effort under the command of an international body? Also, might not the United States be more interested in using any peace dividend for our overwhelming domestic problems? Finally, what conclusion can we draw from the fact that, despite the argument that Iraq was the ideal country against which to use economic sanctions, after a relatively short time it was decided that the sanctions would not work?

B. Conable: In a world in which world government is possible it is not necessary. That's a paradox and I don't know how to resolve it. But we have to work on refining the United Nations. It is the instrument at hand, the universal instrument, and it has a broader mandate than the other potentials. On issues of collective security we have to maintain a degree of flexibility. Last May, in a speech to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Nigeria, I strongly urged the OAU to take greater responsibility for civil unrest in Africa because I did not believe that great powers from other parts of the world should try to impose Pax Americana or Pax Europa on Africa, issues of national sovereignty being as sensitive as they are. So, some degree of flexibility has to be built into whatever system we work on. We should start with the U.N, but it's going to require quite a bit of reform before it will have the degree of support necessary to bring about a Pax Generalis.

J. O'Sullivan: In a sense, you answered your own question because, yes, there has to be a degree of flexibility and, as Barber Conable says, regional forces will be the proper instrument of peace keeping. In some cases, the U.S. will retain its freedom of action while acting under a general U.N. mandate. Sometimes that will be determined by domestic political considerations. When it does hand over control of forces to the U.N. for particular operations, it will tend to exercise predominant influence on that matter. This is a constant process of evolution.

On the question of economic sanctions: impoverishing the country, if you were dealing with a democratic country with a reasonable government, would be a serious threat which a government would have to take seriously. Saddam Hussein didn't have to take it seriously but that doesn't mean sanctions will never be any use in any circumstance.
M. Kunin: When there's an obvious injustice and there's a military threat and people spill over into other countries, then the world takes notice. But I think the United States still has a separate responsibility where there isn't that kind of notoriety. There are countries, like Burma and even Kenya today, where there are tremendous abuses of human rights, where we still don't know how to intervene, how to apply the right kind of pressure. The United States has to take a moral human rights leadership role.

* * * *
Political Activism on Campus: Then and Now

by George Gorton, Art A. Hall, Kim Harris, Hendrik Hertzberg and Shirley Williams.
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Shirley Williams: I suppose that I could be described as having sat in at the receiving end of political activism in the 1960s. I can still remember sitting in my office in the British Ministry of Education, in which I was a junior minister. The senior minister was Edward Short. I sat there morning after morning listening to cries of, "Short, out! Short, out! Short, out!" as huge student activist groups marched around the Department of Education.

On one occasion I went down to the ground floor in order to get on with my ministerial work. As I entered the ground floor from the elevator, I heard a shout of, "Action!" whereupon the student activists in the lobby began to clench fists, poke them in the air, shout, hurl abuse and so on. They had been totally silent until that minute but there was a television crew there. It struck me with tremendous force that this was a 1960s televisually-related demonstration, that much of it was related to being seen on television and some of it was extremely contrived.

Once, in desperation to try to find out what was going to hit Britain, I went to France. I was staying in a small hotel on the Left Bank. One morning at 7:00 o'clock I looked out the window onto what I thought likely to be a quiet, conversational street only to see students pulling up cobblestones and flinging them with full power at the police. I remember thinking, "If this is the shape of the future I'm not sure that I want to be part of it." It was a very frightening time. It was also an extremely exciting time, and I suppose I'm probably the only person in the room who was, as it were, at the receiving end in the sense of being a member of a government that was the target of a great deal of the student revolution, at least in Europe at that time, though not in the United States.

George Gorton: I really got my start in politics in student politics. I mean, that's what I did. I was on college campuses, had a "Fu Manchu" mustache and longish hair and called myself a "Hippie Republican." It actually meant I was on both sides on a lot of issues, so both sides hated me from time to time. One of the things that I noticed right away when I arrived here at Harvard last month is that a lot of the energy I expected to be here is not here, the kind of energy that was there on college campuses in the '60s.
There was an idealism. There was, not just a hope that we could do something, but a certainty that we were going to do something, that we were going to solve the problems of the world, probably before our senior year.

One day we held a rally to allow ROTC to remain on campus, a stance which was highly unpopular. The students who came decided we shouldn't be having our rally. There were a lot more of them than of us. They came in and picked up chairs and threw them through the closed windows. Then they explained to me that I should leave which I did, quietly, thankful that they were offering me the opportunity.

There was a lot of that kind of thing. I remember the burning down of the Bank of America in Isla Vista. I remember a lot of violence and intimidation on campus. I sort of miss that idealism and the energy and excitement but I don't miss the intimidation, the anger, the manipulation in front of the cameras. I don't miss the really hostile things which probably impacted the next generation.

In his speech here last night, Theodore Sorensen talked about how we've been reforming the political process. We've tried a little of this and a little of that. We created political action committees, a reform intended to distance politicians from campaign contributions from corporations. Of course, it didn't. We've tried this reform and that reform. Mr. Sorenson remarked that it isn't tinkering with the process that's going to help. It is that we, the people involved in the process, need to stop being strategists, stop being partisans, stop being ideologues and regain our idealism.

As I listened, it suddenly struck me that those of us who are in positions of power and authority now are the "idealistic" students from the '60s. It struck me that the methods we used in being idealistic in the '60s were confrontation, anger, violence. I guess that's what we learned and what we knew. Maybe that's why there's so much confrontation in politics today.

In 20 years of watching things change, I've noticed that both Republicans and Democrats have become more partisan. So, there are a lot less people looking to solve the problems of the country and a lot more people looking to embarrass the other party and win elections, that kind of thing.

I just wonder if my generation of students doesn't need to get hold of itself, look at itself and say, "Well, we were idealistic, we wanted to do the right things, but maybe the methods that we used weren't too good, maybe solving these problems is a bit more complicated than confrontation."

Before hearing Ted Sorensen's speech last night, I was planning to say to you this morning, "You don't have that energy that we had, that idealism, that worldshakingness." But now, having thought about it a little more, I think there needs to be some combination of idealism and solution-orientation that perhaps we just don't have.

Hendrik Hertzberg: I want to talk about a part of the '60s that is usually neglected. When we think of the '60s, we generally think of a sort of swirl of Oliver Stone kind of images, of confrontations and rock music and riots and so on. But that really didn't begin, especially here in Cambridge, until around 1967. Most of the '60s occurred in a quite different atmosphere. I'd like to take you back to the early 1960s—'62, '63, '64. It's hard to overestimate the sense of uniqueness, not to say superiority—yes, let's just say it, superiority—of the early
'60s that people here, around Harvard, felt with respect to the rest of the world. We had no campus radicals at Harvard because we had no campus. I mean we didn't use that word, "campus." That was a word for "Big 10" schools. We had the Yard and the Houses, but we didn't have a campus.

We had no student body president and no student union. By 1962 or '63, we didn't even have a student council. We had had a student council, but the president, Howie Phillips, who is now a prominent rightwing activist, had made a national speaking tour, billing himself as president of the Harvard student council, a highly obscure organization. So the Harvard student council was abolished.

The President of the United States was John F. Kennedy who had graduated from Harvard 22 or 23 years earlier and whose administration was largely drawn from Harvard. The President was a member of the Board of Overseers and a regular visitor to Harvard. This gave a sense—particularly here, but there were versions of this all around the country—of continuity and of the feeling that we were naturally going to assume positions of leadership, that that was the way the world was. Sometime before your 25th reunion you were going to end up President.

The style of student activism in the early '60s was moderate. It was not hostile to the older generation. The cleavages were ideological, not generational. I only remember, before 1963, three radicals on all of the Harvard campus. I'm sure there were more, probably as many as seven or eight. I remember three in particular. I can name them: Paul Cowan, who later became a staff writer for the Village Voice, Fred Gardner, who later became a very heavy Berkeley radical in the Red Family Commune and who was the first antiwar activist to recognize that soldiers were an important constituency for the antiwar movement. He organized the GI movement and the GI coffee house movement. The third was Kathy Amatnick who later changed her name to Kathy Sarachild because her mother was named Sara. She was a founder of Red Stockings, the original radical feminist organization. Kathy Amatnick Sarachild personally invented consciousness raising. But that was all later, in the late '60s, the period that we now usually think of as the '60s.

I was here in that period; I graduated in 1965. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) did not yet exist at Harvard. It barely existed in the country. It was just going through its transformation from being the student wing of a sort of old-fashioned social democratic organization, with 200 or 300 members, to being the participatory-democracy organization that it was for a few years before going over into political psychosis.

The most charismatic student leader at Harvard in those days was a guy named Peter Goldmark. He was head of this very genteel, very intelligent peace group called Tocsin. The very name, 'Tocsin,' an obscure word meaning bell or alarm bell, indicates something about the group, which campaigned for unilateral initiatives, like moratoriums on nuclear testing. Tocsin led the first peace demonstration of the '60s at the White House. There were two or three thousand kids marching around the White House. President Kennedy sent out an urn of coffee for them.

So, there was Tocsin; there were various other organizations. There were various efforts to support the civil rights movement in the South. There was no Black student organization at the time. The first one was not organized until 1964, the "quadruple A S," The Association of African and Afro-American
Students. It was a highly controversial act to organize that group. One big controversy was whether a white South African would be permitted to join and, if not, would that mean the organization was racist and therefore shouldn’t be chartered under the Harvard procedures for chartering student organizations.

Probably the most important kind of student activism going on here, looked down on by all student politicians of whatever stripe, was Phillips Brooks House. It was seen by people like me as being a sort of Lady Bountiful do-good private solution to public problems. We were never going to solve the problems of our society through volunteerism or by tutoring kids. It had to be done on a mass basis, on a political basis.

There was not even that much opposition to the Vietnam War at the beginning. The Harvard Crimson took the position of partial support for the war, against immediate withdrawal, for more enthusiastically seeking a negotiated settlement but certainly not for cutting and running. That the Crimson took that position reflected student opinion.

The key to the quality, the hopefulness of the activism of the early and middle ’60s, the comparatively nonconfrontational nature of it, was that there were in our society and in the world these huge, obvious and correctable wrongs, particularly legal segregation. I think we were lucky, in a way, to have these wrongs to struggle against, wrongs for which the solutions were obvious. The wrongness of them was overwhelming and obvious and, unlike the problems that we grapple with today, for which the solutions are not at all obvious, you could throw yourself into these activities with complete abandon.

The cataclysmic events that touched off what we normally think of as the ’60s, the crazy ’60s, began with the assassination of President Kennedy. What began to change me in that era was not, at first, the Vietnam War but rather the U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic, an almost forgotten event now. Probably some of you have never heard of it. It was a U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1964, seemingly to prop up a dictatorship against a democratic uprising.

Then in 1966 came the revelation that the National Student Association had been manipulated and supported, practically since its inception, by the CIA. The National Student Association was the federation of student governments for the whole country. It was the real engine of student activism nationally through the late ’50s and ’60s.

It was through the National Student Association that the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the sit-ins in the South got their logistical and financial support. The National Student Association organized opposition to the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was the spark plug of liberal activism. It was where many later-prominent activists and politicians were nurtured.

The 1966 revelation of the CIA’s role was another very important disillusioning piece of news that had the effect of radicalizing a lot of previously liberal students and embittering the atmosphere. It wasn’t long before life turned into an Oliver Stone movie.

Art Hall: I want to look at what this idea of democracy means and what activism has meant in relation to democracy, activism in reference to issues that
concern this country as a whole but also specific Black issues as refining and strengthening this concept of democracy. I see activism as bringing to light some of the faults and inconsistencies that have been apparent within this concept called democracy. This country was founded on the concept of democracy but as times have changed we have found that that concept of democracy was not necessarily correct.

Activism began with such leaders as Harriet Tubman, who worked against that concept of democracy to bring to light some of its faults and inconsistencies. Then we moved to the civil rights movement and some of the continuing inconsistencies and faults of democracy were brought to light. Today there are still problems and inconsistencies and faults in democracy and there are still forms of activism to bring them to light.

Activism in the 1990s at Harvard is, I think, a bit behind other universities. Therefore, in one sense there is more possibility for change. Students at Harvard can look to other universities and other areas and find that things have changed. We would like to see things change here, see changes specific to Harvard.

Activism in the past was more ideological and not necessarily generational. You had mothers and fathers and also students participating in activism. Today, students are the ones primarily participating in activism. Finally, issues seem a lot less pressing, a lot less immediate, a lot less visible than in the past. Issues of institutionalized racism are still there but are not as apparent.

Phillips Brooks House, community service, has been mentioned. There is a need for Black students to go back into the community, to help the community. There is the necessity to bring to light, to invoke within students the need for self-pride. Many Black students feel that is where the problem is today and feel that the problem necessitates some type of activism.

Activism has changed drastically since the 1960s because of changing times, the changing situation, changing issues. However, issues are still there and students are meeting those issues differently than they were in the past.

**Kim Harris:** My image of activism in the 1960s is as Rick Hertzberg describes it, an Oliver Stone movie, crowds of students screaming and chanting. It remains that, an image, for today's students.

Most students at Harvard have never taken part in a demonstration, never been in a protest. They don't understand protests. They look at protests, like the one last week against Columbus Day, and think of them as esoteric, strange, bizarre, as "fringe". Why protest Columbus Day? How many people actually sit and reflect on Columbus? Many people are just excited to have the day off.

Or students look at the eat-ins that took place in Kirkland House last year to protest the Confederate flag that was hung in a Kirkland House window, as well as an insensitive comment made to a member of the gay community in Kirkland House, and they see that as an annoyance. The lines were too long for dinner. What were these people doing invading our house? They see the current rallies for diversity as somewhat futile. Do they really think they're going to get the President of Harvard to change his mind and hire a bunch of minority professors?

To a certain extent, the image is perpetuated by these "fringe" people because it's largely the same group of people protesting, standing in front of University
I do not believe that means students on campus today are more apathetic or less active. The following statistics came from Dean Epps, Dean of Students for the College: the number of publications on campus has increased from ten in the 1970s to 30 today and the number of student groups has increased from 70 to 236. That's really significant. It demonstrates that the focus of student activism has changed from the protests of the 1960s to more institutional forms of activism today.

It is not that students don't care anymore; it's that they are focusing their energies in more constructive ways, from Peninsula—our watchdog on the Crimson which tries to document its many liberal-leaning sentences, to the Crimson—which wages major campus wars on its pages and in its editorials, to Phillips Brooks House—which is, as Art said, a very vital part of the Harvard campus. It's important for people to go out there and tutor, to teach civics to people in Cambridge, to understand what community life is like, because it certainly isn't the same as Harvard.

All of those are very important forms of student activism. There are so many people here involved in so many different things, from tutoring to being a member of the Harvard Democrats, or of ALARM, the Association Against Learning in the Absence of Religion and Morality, or of ORGASM, the Organization for the Advancement of Sexual Minorities. We've got everything here on this campus. I think that's important. I think it's great that so many on campus are really active.

What concerns me is that while here everybody is really active but then they graduate and go to work for J.P. Morgan or for McKinsey. They seem to forget what's important about activism on campus, seem to forget that it's important to be involved in the community, in what you believe in. They seem to forget that the activist groups here on campus are really important because the people involved believe in furthering ideals and encouraging debate and engendering discussion and that we have to translate that to community life after we graduate. Activism shouldn't stop on campus; it should continue in normal life as part of being a regular, average, everyday citizen.

If that activism did continue, the kind of apathy that people feel today toward the government would disappear. People would feel more interested not just in their singular interests but in the nation as a whole. That's the direction that activism has to take in the future.

S. Williams: Art and Kim have described a tremendous amount of activity of a very constructive kind, students as good citizens in many ways, concerned and active citizens. The real difference was caught, I think, in a phrase of George Gorton's, when he said, "One doesn't feel the same kind of energy." I think I would actually choose a slightly different word. One doesn't see the same kind of anger.

As I bicycle home late at night and ride by people lying in the park in cardboard boxes, even at this time of the year, I see tremendous cause for anger. As a life long politician, what is slightly surprising to me is that there isn't any anger. I wonder whether the lack of anger has to do with a kind of discourag-
ment with the political process, a feeling people didn’t have in the 1960s, a feeling that the political process can’t deliver, so why bother? In the ’60s people did believe that the political process, once seized, could actually bring about the things they wanted, like the end of the Vietnam War, and so forth.

There isn’t any doubt that the student revolution of the ’60s, while one can certainly argue that much of it was misdirected, did bring about major social change. Look just at civil rights. One can’t say that movement didn’t achieve anything, because it clearly did.

Audience: I graduated from Harvard, class of ’68. Rick, when you talk about the early ’60s, you may be correct about Harvard but I hope you’re not making the error, so common among us Harvard students and graduates, of thinking that this is the center of the universe. While I was still a senior in high school, there were some very serious protests at Berkeley. They were covered on the front page of all the newspapers and in the news magazines. At that same time — it seems now as if it was the same day — there was a panty raid in Harvard Yard, or rather at Radcliffe. I’d already been accepted to Harvard and I was very upset about that. I asked myself, “Where am I going?”

I arrived in the fall of 1964. I don’t think the Oliver Stone image is what everyone remembers. It isn’t truly accurate but is what TV portrayed because, as Shirley said, that made the best visual picture. I was a Democrat and there were some 900 members of the Harvard-Radcliffe Young Democrats. Every one of us was participating in a political campaign, most in the presidential campaign of Lyndon Johnson against Barry Goldwater. Four years later on this very day, the day of the Harvard-Princeton football game, I organized the first Eugene McCarthy rally. We had the rally right after the game. The football crowd was moving across the river and we made it look like everyone was part of the rally!

Whether you were really active, really radical, or active just in the political process, the difference from today is that we were moving on issues that clearly affected us, affected not only the campus, but the country, the world.

Kim, you say there are more organizations now and I have no doubt about that. People may still be active, still have a social conscience, but there isn’t this desire—or at least it hasn’t emanated to the outside—that you want to change the world. You may want to change what’s going on at Kirkland House or in Harvard Yard but we wanted to change the world and we thought we could do it. We thought we could make a difference.

Maybe what’s happened is, as George Gorton said, maybe we didn’t make a difference. I still like to think we did. We always thought our involvement could make a difference.

I now serve on the Board of Governors of Higher Education in Rhode Island with responsibility for governance of public institutions. I deal with a lot of students who do show a great concern for what’s happening in their education, on their campus. They’re very bright and articulate people but they are totally insulated. There isn’t a desire to look outside, look beyond the borders of their educational institutions.

Audience: I was at the State University at Albany between 1967-1971. Although there was a lot of activism and a lot of anger, there was still a basic view that we
couldn't necessarily change politics, change the system. A very critical point in my own political involvement came out of a screaming match in the cafeteria with a guy who was very much a radical. He was screaming at me because I was president of the college Republicans. I also didn't like the war, I marched against the war. But he said, "How could you support Richard Nixon? How could you do all these terrible things and support all these terrible Republicans. The system is totally corrupt and we're not here to help the system. We're here to try to turn it all over."

I thought he was really speaking for what the students on my campus were saying. I told him, "I don't think the system is so hot, either, but I don't think the way to change it is by trashing the buildings at school. I think the way to change it is by being in the system and supporting some of these guys who are president now or governor now. I'm going to be someplace in the system where I'm going to make a difference."

_Audience:_ I have two images—both of the Mall in Washington. I was a little too young to actually be there, but one is of Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech at the Lincoln Memorial. I was there for the second one, the moratorium march against the war in Vietnam, in October or November of 1969.

King's speech was one of the great emotional highlights of all American history. At the moratorium march there were half a million or three quarters of a million people from all over the country, on that Mall. There was a stupendous sense of what American democracy was all about.

So even though there was this unfortunate, gigantic, horrible, disastrous mistake called the war in Vietnam, which raised the need for protest, nonetheless, we were there. If you were there, and if you had anything to do with those events, you carry those memories and that energy and that inspiration for the rest of your life. Those were stupendous events. What's missing now is that sense of being through something together, of getting a lot of good work done. If that sense gets passed down somehow, no matter how you work it out, no matter what organizational activity you do, then we'll really have something, then the '60s will have a positive legacy to pass down. That's still very possible. There's no reason why we can't connect what happened to what is happening or what can happen in the future.

_K. Harris:_ Several people have said that one of the important things about the '60s was that sense of something tangible that needed to be changed. That's a really important point. In the '60s there was a system of legal oppression that needed to be changed. There was a war that needed to be changed.

Today, I think, it's an attitude that needs to be changed. It's a lot harder to get people really energized to protest an attitude than it is to protest something tangible. Maybe that's one of the reasons why you're not seeing the anger today. Maybe it's a lot harder to figure out what the right answer is about attitudes, about diversity, about rights for homosexuals, about ROTC on campus. It's a lot harder to figure out today and it's a lot harder to get angry about it, unless you're one of the people directly affected. Maybe that translates into why some people think that protestors are fringe groups, because it is small pockets of people who are still affected by a kind of institutional oppression which is not overt, legal oppression.
Another point. Don't take me too literally. Maybe it wouldn't be such a bad thing if Roe v. Wade was overturned, not in terms of the policy aspects but in terms of what it would do to this nation. I think that more than any other policy event of this decade, that would really show people what a direct effect government can have on their lives. It would be the first time that people of my generation, people already very involved in that issue, would see something catastrophic happening to them, see something they had always seen as a right taken away by the Supreme Court. You'd see protests again, see people going to Washington to march on the Mall, see real anger again. People would feel the necessity for protest. They would see something that needs to be changed immediately or something so egregious that we have to do something about it right away. That, I think, would be the only comparable thing for our generation to what the '60s were for yours.

H. Hertzberg: I want to say something to everyone, particularly younger people, who are sick and tired of hearing about the '60s. Memories are short. In the '60s we were sick and tired of hearing about the 1930s. We were constantly hearing about the '30s generation, the movements of the '30s, what things were like in the '30s, how we were inadequate compared to the '30s, how then they had really serious problems, fascism, Stalinism, how what we had to deal with was relatively mild. I hope you'll get your revenge in the 1990s. I think it’s about time for another decade that can be used to bore people well into the 2020s.

S. Williams: Earlier this year I spent a few months as a Regent’s lecturer at the University of California at Berkeley. While there, I was very struck by the whirlwind that was going on around political correctness. I’ve seen the palest reflection of that back here in Harvard. At Berkeley it has become the center of something that looks very much like a new kind of student movement. People become passionate about language that's not politically correct. They demonstrate against professors who use language or express attitudes that are not politically correct. I may be wrong but it looks as if this could be be the start of something new and, in my view, quite sinister.

* * * * *
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This morning I'd like to mention some of my thoughts, from two perspectives, about the next 25 years in politics.

First, what will be some of the characteristics of our politics?

More local politics. "Tip" O'Neill would probably say it's always been local—but we'll see more local politics. Except for war, welfare, Social Security, debt, and sometimes the environment, the most satisfying political answers are community answers. We're going to come to realize that more.

More domestic issues. We won't define a domestic agenda just by how many federal laws are passed but in terms of the kind of questions that Vaclav Havel asked the Czechoslovaksians: "What kind of place is this? What is important to us? What do we have to contribute?" In the next 25 years, we will, I think, become once again fascinated by this idea we call America.

More involvement by women. It is inevitable because women are under-represented and because we Americans tend to seek change in our politics. So we will see more women in politics.

More authentic people in government. We have the media interviewing each other, consultants and pollsters interviewing each other and even interviewing the media. Elected people read press releases written by people just out of college. Most voters don't care what those people think and it's not much of a democracy if unelected people have that much sway.

In 1967, I was writing speeches for Senator Howard Baker. I gave them to him but he didn't use a word I wrote. So I went to see him privately and said, "Senator Baker, we have a problem with our relationship. I write these great speeches and you haven't been using a word of them." He looked me squarely in the eye and said, "Lamar, we have no problem at all. Our relationship is perfect. You just keep writing what you want to write and I'll keep saying what I want to say, and we'll get along fine."

Communications will become even more important. Sometimes I think I'm going to get up in the middle of the night and walk into the next room and there will be C-SPAN. It's everywhere. It's even taping here today, I think. It will be hard in the MTV generation for people in public life not to be able to communicate. The nature of the issues will be such that communication and persuasion will be awfully important.
Movement politics will be more important. Political leadership for the issues and the times over the next 25 years will be more reminiscent of political leaders like Ghandi or Martin Luther King or Abraham Lincoln.

Coalitions will be more important. People will be saying, "All together now. Let's get together and see if we can do something about this or about that." That's going to be a big part of the politics of the next 25 years.

Now, let's look at the politics of the next 25 years in a different way.

The Presidency. Inevitably the Presidency will become more important over the next 25 years. Becoming President will become an even more unfathomable thing for someone to consider. We'll still have people who will want to do it, but campaigns will become even more political "star wars." The only people willing to run for President, or likely to be successful, will be those who are able to devote their lives to a form of political priesthood. Not only must candidates give up any sort of normal life after being elected but apparently they are expected to have done so from the age of six. There will be a certain number of people willing to do that and a large number who won't. The quality, as well as the number, of candidates will be affected. Those who do run will be competing for a more interesting, more exciting—and more difficult—job.

The contest for the Presidency has become one in which we kill the losers—or at least turn their pictures to the wall—so we can't remember who they were, even though they might have been considered to be very decent people before running. That will become even more true unless we can somehow reverse it. We even permanently wound most of those who do succeed.

The issues of the Presidency will be the same issues as always, peace and prosperity. Peace will be more important. The following television image will be the kind that voters will look for and respond to in the next election, probably the next several elections. You wake up from a night's sleep, turn on the television, and there, emerging and gathering out of the shadows, are the President and Jim Baker and Dick Cheney and Colin Powell explaining what happened the night before that wasn't expected to happen—and what they're doing about it. The confidence that the voter has in that Presidential team, whatever team it is, will probably determine who will be President of the United States.

In the next 25 years, there will be a second function of the Presidency, one that will be better defined. The opportunity exists for people of either party to set the domestic agenda on a few urgent issues, to make things happen. George Reedy wrote in The Twilight of the Presidency that aside from the Commander-in-Chief responsibilities, the President should: first, see a few urgent needs; second, divine a strategy to meet them; and third, persuade at least half the people of the rightness of the policy. That's more than using the Presidency as a bully pulpit. That's what the President is attempting to do with "America 2000," the education strategy, help touch a feeling, a growing attitude across the country and move things in a certain direction.

There will also be a greater role for the President—I guess there always has been, but I think it may be more important in the next 25 years—in symbolizing what we are as a nation. The President acting as the great teacher, helping us understand ourselves.
The Congress. I'll say this gently. I think that what Congress should do—I really do think this—is go home in June and July. Congress is becoming increasingly irrelevant, getting in trouble, losing respect, because it is making up things to do that don't really need to be done. Congress has 40,000 staff members. Forty thousand! To do what, I can't imagine. Well, I can imagine some of it, because I'm there.

To give you an example, last week I spent two-and-a-half hours testifying before the House education committee which had discovered that the President had actually made a speech to school children on television and that the Department of Education had paid $26,000 to help pay for it. One of the members of the committee asked the House historian to see if he could find a time in the history of Congress when there had been so trivial an investigation. They are still researching the subject. I'm not sure that's the best use of time for so many members of an important committee, for the General Accounting Office, for the Secretary of Education, for a lot of departmental people, when there are so many other things to do in education in this country.

I suspect we'll see term limits in the next 25 years. We have them for the President and for governors; we'll probably have them for Congress. There's also a good chance that the new breed of members of Congress will decide that Congress might do less, because foreign policy issues are left more to the President and domestic issues are left more to communities and governors. Congress, by the end of 25 years, will become an increasingly respected forum, doing less, fewer things, meeting for a shorter period of time.

Local Politics. The most action, the most fun, will be at home, with governors and mayors and local movement leaders. Those will be the best jobs in politics in the next 25 years. Governor is a better job than President because it's not so necessary to enter the political priesthood, to give up the rest of your life. By movement leader I mean people like Jimmy Carter. Just last Friday he told me he wants to try to solve the problems of Atlanta's poor. That is such an ambitious goal that one wonders about it for a minute. It seems fraught with great potential for highly publicized failure. On the other hand, it is a very good thing for him to do. We, Jack Kemp, Lou Sullivan, myself, and others in the Administration ought to work with him. He probably can do a great deal, mobilizing people to do things in their hometown for people who need help.

The burgeoning education movement is a lot like the civil rights movement, people across this country coming to a judgment about the importance of education. The job of leadership is to touch each community and try to help it move. In Los Cruces, for example, a dean of a college of arts and sciences will divide a steering committee of 89 people into six teams. Each team will support one of the six national education goals. Such communities will be much easier for Congress and for governors and for the rest of us to help. There is that kind of action for the future, sort of a collective unconscious, forming itself out there. Political leadership has a role in shaping those attitudes and accelerating that thought, as with the civil rights movement, with recycling and with reducing the demand for drugs in the 1980s, as with "America 2000".

When I was reelected Governor in 1982 and thought about what I could do during my last four years in office, one thing was a better schools program.
Another was something called "Tennessee Homecoming '86." I talked about it in my inaugural address and "Tennessee Homecoming '86" got one line of attention. I explained it to some members of the legislature and one of them literally went to sleep during my explanation!

I asked every Tennessee community to do three things: look at its roots, find something to celebrate, and invite everybody who ever lived there home to help celebrate that in 1986. During 1986 there were 3,000 celebrations. The Forest Brook community invited everybody who ever lived in Forest Brook to return on July 4th. They came and sat in their old kitchens, rocked in their yards and on their porches, compared notes on where the children had grown up. They thought about what was important to them, how they would lead their lives and what kind of country this would be.

I suspect that sometime during the next 25 years, politics will include a new American homecoming, something like "Tennessee Homecoming," where people look at those questions: What kind of place is this? What is important to us? What do we have to contribute to each other, and to the world? I think that will be where the political action will be—and ought to be.

* * * * *
Ron Brown: "Which is the party for the 1990s?" The answer seems very simple. It is certainly not the party most responsible for the disaster of the 1980s. The party of the 1990s has to be the party that recognizes that America is in trouble, that the very essence of our democracy is threatened. It has to be the party that understands that politics is about much more than strategy, much more than sound bites and photo opportunities and polls.

Politics is about ideals and values, hard work and excellence, compassion and decency, fairness and opportunity. Politics is about trying to deal with issues that the American people are concerned about, trying to solve the problems that average working men and women face today. Politics is about leadership, a willingness to take risks and to make difficult decisions. The Democratic Party is the party ready to take that leadership.

We have to reject unequivocally the 1980s, a decade of greed, cynicism and self-centeredness, a decade that focused on me rather than we. The rich got richer, the poor got poorer, the middle class had the very life blood squeezed out of it. It was a decade of retreat from what America is all about—social justice, equal rights and equal opportunity, and a vision for the future.

The party that leads America in the 1990s, the Democratic Party, has to reverse those negative trends, has to revel in the diversity of America, has to understand that the strength of America is that we are different races and ethnic groups from all parts of the world struggling to work together as one people and one nation. It is the party that understands inclusion and outreach and the necessity for involvement and participation, that wants high voter turnout on election day, that wants to register voters so they can participate in the political process. It is not the party that opposes every effort to make it easier to register and to participate in the political process.

The party of the 1990s, the Democratic Party, must reject negative "wedge" politics that splinters, divides, separates Americans from Americans. It must say, "Let's stop ripping at the very fabric of America, let's understand there's more at stake than one campaign. Let's understand that the people are saying, 'Enough is enough.' Let's deal with the real issues that are on the minds of our people."

The party of the 1990s has to be the party that recognizes that we have deep-seated economic problems, not the party that denies that those problems exist. President Bush said, "What recession? No recession." Then he said, "It'll be short and mild." Then he said, "It's over." Tell that to more than ten million Americans out of work, to four million Americans whose unemployment
compensation has expired. Tell that to Chrysler and Ford and General Motors
who are announcing today that their losses for this quarter are $2 billion.

We need a party to lead in the 1990s that understands we are now competing
in a very complex global economy, one very different than in years gone by.
Talk of free trade is fine but what about fair trade? Talk of workers overseas is
fine but what about American workers? What about our infrastructure, job
training, education so that we can compete in this global economy?

The party that leads in the 1990s must be a party that understands the role of
government, not a party which starts with the proposition, the assumption, the
presumption that government is the enemy, that the purpose is to get rid of
government. It is not the party that doesn't believe in government but rather the
party that understands that government, working effectively with the private
sector and the people, really can make a difference.

When John Fitzgerald Kennedy was elected President an attitude and energy
prevailed in America. People had enthusiasm, a belief that they really could
make a difference in this country and in the world. People were rushing to
Washington to work for the federal government. Today you can't find people to
fill some jobs because so much time has been spent beating up on government,
beating up on the institutions of America, beating up on politics. No wonder
cynicism exists. That is very dangerous for America.

We've got to start building our institutions so that Americans can believe in
them again, can understand that government can help. It can't solve all our
problems, but it can be a positive vehicle to help. When we Democrats talk
about the future, it's not enough to be critical of George Bush and this
Republican administration. There is plenty to criticize but we've got to have a
plan and program and vision of our own.

It's very simple; it has three basic elements. One, we must reinvest in America, in
our infrastructure, in our schools, in our health care. Thirty-seven million Ameri-
cans with no health insurance, another 60 million underinsured—that's a disgrace.
Two, we must reorder our priorities. We can no longer afford to spend $200 billion
a year protecting Europe and Japan. Protecting them from what? This Administra-
tion acts like they don't even read the daily newspapers to see how much the
world has changed. Finally, we have to reject, unequivocally, Reaganomics. Ten
years ago George Bush called it "voodoo economics" but now he's bought into it,
bought into trickle-down economic theories that are discredited and cannot work.

The 1990s are a decade for the party which recognizes that the American
people deserve better, that America can do better. That party is the Democratic
Party. George Bush can, must, and will be defeated in 1992!

*Clayton Yeutter:* You can make a simplified comparison of the performance
record of the two parties by evaluating the two branches of government for
which each party has responsibility at the moment. The Republican Party is in
charge of the Executive branch; the Democratic Party is in charge of the
Legislative branch. Just a few days ago the approval rating of the branch under
the jurisdiction of the Democratic Party was in the 20s and the approval rating of
the branch in charge of the Republican Party was in the 60s, about a 3-to-1
margin for the Republican side. That rather accurately reflects the leadership
capacity and capabilities of the two parties.
Executive leadership is incredibly important to this nation today. Our Democratic friends haven't even formulated a farm team yet let alone generated the experience and the background and the knowledge to perform effectively in the arena outside of the United States.

Ron suggested that the Republicans had a recovery plan for the Soviet Union, Kuwait, and a lot of other places, but not for the United States. It is important to nurture that process in the Soviet Union, Kuwait and a lot of other places but I don't think anybody in the Democratic Party has the foggiest idea how to do that. When you look at the ability to handle ourselves and the world over the next decade or two, the responsibilities in that arena should lie with the Republican Party because that's where the competence is today.

You all know President Bush's background, the tremendous international experience he's had, the track record he's accumulated through the years. There's no need to embellish that. There is a lot of strength in the Cabinet, too. We ought to be very proud of that. If the Middle Eastern situation materializes as we hope, Jim Baker is going to go down in the history books. Your grandchildren and great-grandchildren are going to be studying about him a few decades from now. Dick Cheney has provided magnificent leadership in the Defense Department, as was demonstrated in the Persian Gulf situation. I wouldn't be surprised if Michael Boskin, the brilliant economist heading the Council of Economic Advisors, becomes a Nobel Prize winner sometime in the future. Roger Porter, formerly on the faculty here at Harvard, is doing a great job as a key member of the White House staff. This is a high horsepower team that, along with the President, is handling the Executive responsibilities of government in a magnificent manner. The approval rating of the general public illustrates that.

This is not to suggest that the world, or the nation, is without problems. We're always going to have problems and challenges. That is inevitable in a democratic society, in a dynamic, vibrant society like the one that we have here in the United States. The question becomes one of how we confront and manage ourselves through these challenges when they occur. The track record accumulated by the Republican Party in recent years is awfully, awfully good. I don't share Ron's evaluation of the 1980s at all and I don't think most Americans share that evaluation. I was just looking at some numbers and noted that tax revenues were up almost 80 percent for the decade. That has to be one of the highest growth records of tax revenues in the history of the nation. That's indicative of generation of income; you don't pay taxes unless you generate income. Every income level, from the lower fifth to the higher fifth, was up. Ron is going to make an income redistribution argument and say higher-income people benefitted more in the 80s than did lower-income people—and that's right. But every boat was lifted, not every individual boat, but every category of income level was lifted. If that's a reflection of greed then that is, it seems to me, something to which most Americans aspire. Most Americans do want to live better and want their children and their grandchildren to live better as well.

The fundamental differences between the two parties are very evident to everyone. You can make your choice. Fortunately, the trend seems to be coming our way, especially in the younger category, the 18-to-29 age group. I don't know whether that's true at Harvard but it is true for the nation as a whole.
That's an encouraging and propitious development which indicates that the young people of this nation understand what's going on better maybe than my generation does.

The world as a whole is shifting in a Republican policy direction, in a sense, because countries like the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are throwing off the shackles of government intrusion and infringement in their lives. That's a welcome development for all. They're shifting into a *modus operandi* based upon free enterprise and job creation, things we in the Republican Party have been espousing for a long time:

- use of economic incentives, generation of market forces to make decisions rather than having bureaucrats make them;
- values of entrepreneurship, letting people start from the bottom and succeed;
- rewarding outstanding, rather than mediocre, performance;
- seeing the benefits of self-reliance and the benefits of family values.

That's a Republican agenda, one to which most Americans today aspire. This is happening more and more throughout the world, a most appropriate development which we hope will succeed elsewhere just as in the United States.

It seems as if the Democratic Party continues to go off in the direction of government solving, attempting to solve, the problems of society. Let's hope that we'll get further enlightenment on that. Government isn't the answer. I've been in and out of government for a good number of years, probably more than anybody in this room. I do not ascribe to the theory that government has no role in society, nor does the Republican Party. But government is *not* the answer. What we have to do is get a proper balance of government and the private sector. The Democratic Party tilts too much towards governmental answers for the problems and challenges of society and too little toward having a viable, dynamic, energetic private sector where the individual accomplishments of people generate the enhanced standard of living in our society.

We're moving now toward the right course and we ought to stay the course. We're having economic travail today. We all know that. But let's remember that we live in a cyclical society. We have recessions under both Democratic and Republican administrations and will for a long time to come. We're going to pull out of this recession. I hope we can take the right policy actions to make sure that occurs. Let's not take actions in the arena of fiscal policy that will do more harm than good, that will set us backward instead of forward. This week the tax proposals of Senator Benson were allegedly to give some relief to middle-income taxpayers. The markets immediately plummeted in response to that proposal. Middle-income taxpayers, middle-income workers, were adversely affected after that proposal was made, even though it has not yet been enacted into law.

There's much more that can be said in articulating the differences between the two parties. I'm a lot more comfortable in a party that puts much greater emphasis on self-reliance than in a party that continues, after all these years, to put enormous emphasis on government as the solution to the problems of America or the world.
C. Yeutter: A Washington Post editorial says the Democrats have all sorts of proposals that would cost a lot of money. They want to make Head Start an entitlement, greatly expand college student aid, extend health insurance to additional segments of the population, begin to subsidize long-term care for the elderly and disabled, increase aid to cities, increase transportation spending, and much more. The Post goes on to conclude that this is carrying the spending process too far, that we just can't do all of those things and also engage in tax policy changes that will reduce revenues.

What do we do to persuade folks on your side of the political aisle that we just cannot spend with impunity anymore, that we've got to accept some budget disciplines in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere, because without discipline we're in deep financial and economic trouble for many years to come?

R. Brown: There's no question that we need economic common sense. There's no question that our deficit is a very real problem that is partly responsible for draining our economic growth. We also have to recognize what has happened over the last decade. When Ronald Reagan came to Washington in 1980, the federal deficit was about $700 billion; when he left it was about $3 trillion. You can't just blame that on Democrats. Both Ronald Reagan before and George Bush now have said they want a Constitutional Amendment to balance the federal budget. The Reagan and Bush administrations prepared the federal budget every year. Why not try sending a balanced budget to the Congress? They haven't done it once since 1980. If this Administration is so committed to doing something about the deficit, to balancing the federal budget, it's within their hands to do it.

This President has presided over the three-year period when there has been the lowest growth in our economy since World War II. Somebody in the Administration is not real competent. You're talking about competence being the issue in the 1992 campaign. I hope that it is competent on economic policy because frankly the Administration doesn't appear to have a clue about what to do with this economy. Nothing but false promises. No real intervention. No real action. The American people feel economically insecure. We need some leadership to get us out of this economic decline.

Charles Royer: Mr. Yeutter, if you agree even partially that the 1988 Republican campaign for President plumbed new depths in our politics, in fact turned many people away from politics and away from voting and away even from the two parties, what specifically would you do as Chair of your party to ensure that the campaigns are elevated? If there is a racial tone or a racial direction—a wedge, as the Democrats call it—in the campaign, would you resign as Chairman?

C. Yeutter: That's a non-relevant question, because that isn't going to happen. I'm not going to comment on what I think is assuredly hypothetical and has zero probability of occurring. Ron and I have talked about the overall issue of the quality of political debate. We cannot mandate the kinds of campaigns that Democratic and Republican candidates run. All we can do is try to set an example at the national level. I hope both of us do set the right kind of example. I'd like to see the quality, the level of debate go up. I suspect that we
will see a good bit of negative campaigning in 1992 and perhaps for years to come. As long as the American public, and this happens on both sides of the aisle, reacts toward or against a given candidate because of negative campaigning, we're going to have negative campaigning. It's only when people like yourselves rebel and vote against the people who engage in negative campaigning, whether they be Democrat or Republicans, that it will change.

R. Brown: I hope that Clayton is right. He clearly has a more optimistic view of 1992 on those issues than I do. I think all the signs for the last several years lead us to the opposite conclusion. I hope that under his leadership we'll have a different kind of Republican Party strategy and campaign effort than we had in 1988. I hope that both of us working together would try to get the campaign on a higher plane, take responsibility for those in our party who say things that we know are above and beyond legitimate political discourse and in the strongest and most unequivocal terms condemn that kind of negative politics.

********

[Note: Audience questions and comments were not screened in advance but former Fellows and members of the Student Advisory Committee were designated in advance to participate as questioners.]

Doug Minor '92 (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee): Chairman Brown, a question on reapportionment. It would appear that a potentially very serious thing is going to happen to the Democratic Party. The Bush administration, specifically the Justice Department, is very craftily using the letter of the Voting Rights Act to attempt to draw congressional districts which would create more minority districts but also create districts most likely to be Republican. Such a policy would strike at the very heart of the Democratic congressional majority. This alliance also seems to be very formidable because you're going to have Democratic minorities in alliance with Republicans, something that appears to be very detrimental to your party. My question is what you plan to do about that.

R. Brown: You have identified a clear part of the Republican strategy. Obviously, reapportionment is terribly important. There is nothing that happens in America that is more political than reapportionment. I'm not surprised although I am somewhat chagrined by the Republican tactics. If the Republican Party had its way it would like to pack every African-American and Hispanic person in America into one congressional district. If they could fit us all into one congressional district then obviously there would be a higher likelihood of more Republicans being elected in those other districts.

Frankly, the minority community in America is much more sophisticated than that. They understand that the Democratic Party is absolutely committed to expansion of the number of minority elected officials. There is nothing incompatible between the expansion of the number of minority elected officials in America and the expansion of the number of Democratic elected officials. We are committed to doing both of these things. I think we can and I'm sure we will.
Craig Turk '93 (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee):
Chairman Yeutter, how would you respond to the recent New York Times piece saying that the success of someone like David Duke is a phenomenon whose implications are not limited to Louisiana but are actually a manifestation of a more nationwide sentiment of popular unrest coming predominantly from 12 years of Republican administrations that have played on the divisive issue of race and have mishandled the economy.

C. Yeutter: I simply do not accept the argument that the Republican Party has followed a policy of racism at any time in recent years. That is a criticism that has no foundation in fact. As I said earlier, I will do everything in my power to make sure that there is no legitimacy to any of that during my tenure as Republican national chairman. I'll let my own personal record stand for itself in that regard.

Jonathan Koppell '93 (member, Institute of Politics Student Advisory Committee and editor, Harvard Political Review): The dissatisfaction of many Americans with politics arises because the lion's share of time spent by both parties is devoted to blaming the other party for our problems. The same thing took place here this morning.

Chairman Brown, the Democrats have spent much of the last decade assailing the Republican administrations of Presidents Reagan and Bush for their failure to deal with many domestic problems, from homelessness to crime. During that time, however, we've had a Democratic majority in the House and the Senate who have also failed to deal with those problems. Speaking as a Democrat, what concrete indications or points can you show me to prove that the Democrats really can handle the problems that face America? And if, as you suggest, the Democrats really have to have a Democratic President to forward their initiatives, what then is the prognosis for the next five years, given the fact that, at least at the moment, George Bush's reelection seems likely.

R. Brown: Let me start by disagreeing with your conclusion. It seems to me that George Bush's reelection is not at all a certainty and becomes less so every day. I have not talked about polls this morning but even the polls say that. The fact is, we're going to have a closely contested contest for the Presidency in 1992.

I am as frustrated as you are with the divided government that we have, a divided government that really leads to the kinds of exchanges that you are critical of, that have been going on in our politics for too long. I would submit to you that it is much more likely that a Democrat can beat George Bush in 1992 than that the Republicans can take control of the House or the Senate. So those who want to make sure we have a unified government can best do it by supporting a Democrat for President in 1992.

There have been 26 vetoes in the Bush presidency. We have had good legislation going to the White House, legislation that dealt with some of the problems that America needs to deal with. This Administration leads by veto. That is not leadership. The Administration then comes forward with nothing except that which they think has some political merit. The Administration's view on the question of health care is not to do it first but to let Congress do it first so
they can then criticize Congress. That's not what we expect from our President, not when we have a problem of crisis proportions in America. We have what could be the best health care system in the world but only about three percent of the American people can afford it. That's not good enough. We need a President who's willing to take risks, willing to spend, not hoard, political capital. That's what leadership is all about.

There is a real difference of opinion on what the responsibility of the Presidency is and on which way America ought to go. I am encouraged by the kind of debate that started here today, that I hope is going to continue through the 1992 presidential campaign. One of the things that most encourages me is that we've got a field of change-oriented, tough, aggressive, anti-status-quo candidates running for the Democratic Party's nomination, candidates who have determined that the real target is not each other but is to raise hard questions with this Administration about those basic leadership issues. So I'm optimistic, confident about the future. As I said, I think that George Bush will be beaten in 1992.

Margaret Carlson (deputy chief, Washington bureau, Time magazine; 1990 Institute of Politics Fellow): As the Supreme Court agrees to hear these cases which challenge Roe v. Wade, the pro-life position might not cut as well for you as in the 1980s. Your predecessor was talking about a big tent in which you could bring in pro-choice voters. What is your position on that and what will you do about the pro-life plank in your platform?

C. Yeutter: In innumerable speeches over the last nine months I have said that I would hope there's ample room in both parties for people with views up and down the spectrum on that issue. All of us ought to make a decision about party allegiance based upon a whole composite of factors that are important to us. That issue may be one, but I can easily articulate 15 or 20 other issues that would be important to me in determining whether I want to register as a Republican or as a Democrat. I suspect the same would be true of most people. So I do subscribe to Lee Atwater's big tent theory. I think there ought to be a big tent in both parties that would be sufficient to have people of all views on that subject.

Putting it another way, I hope that neither of us would say that simply because someone is pro-life, he or she ought to be drummed out of a political party or that because someone is pro-choice he or she ought to be drummed out of either party in America.

With respect to the platform, that's a bit different. The Republican Party does have a pro-life platform. That platform received the approbation of the President in 1988 and unless his views were to be altered on the subject, and I do not expect that to occur, it's just inconceivable to me that we can have a platform position on this, or any other major subject, inconsistent with the views of our candidate, the President. So I expect that to be a part of the platform. But not everyone in the world subscribes to every individual segment of anybody's platform.

John O'Sullivan (editor, National Review; 1983 Institute of Politics Fellow): The Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas case has brought gender politics to the fore again
and the gender gap is once again being discussed. It is normally thought of as an advantage to the Democrats but, as you must know better than anyone, the figures for the last Presidential election suggest that although the Democrats enjoyed a very slim majority among women, there was a 16-point lead for the Republicans among men. Assuming that you're not intending to disenfranchise men, are you worried about this? If so, is there anything in particular you're going to do about it?

R. Brown: First, the gender gap is there and it ought to be there. It's there because the Democratic Party has stood for the issues that most American women really believe in, whether it's child care, "choice," parental leave, whatever. The positions of the parties are very different notwithstanding Clayton Yeutter's big tent theory.

The President of the United States wants a Constitutional Amendment to ban a woman's right to choose. That is a very major difference from the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party trusts the women of America. We think they ought to have a right to choose, and that no elected official, politician or government ought to interfere with that right.

As to the part of your question that dealt with the other gender, men, I think that there are three things that we Democrats have to do to be successful in 1992. We have to do all of them well and we have to reject the Republican theory that somehow these missions are incompatible. Number one, we have to continue to earn the respect and trust and confidence and support and votes of our core constituents, those Democrats who have been with us through thick and thin, have been the very base of our party, the backbone of our party. That's common-sense politics but it's not enough to win a general election for President of the United States. We also have to reach out to new voters, principally new immigrant voters coming into the voting population for the first time. Those voters are particularly important in key states like Florida and Texas and California. It also means young voters, with whom we have not done as well in the past several election cycles as I would like us to do. Finally, we have to get back some of those who have deserted the party in the last several election cycles, voters who are disproportionately white working class men. The way you get them back is to speak to their issues, to address their needs and goals and aspirations. That's what the Democratic Party is doing.

You've heard Clayton Yeutter acknowledge the fact that Democrats are proposing middle class tax relief. That makes sense. If anybody needs a tax break, it's middle class people, people who have suffered the abuses of this trickle-down economic policy during the 1980s. We take very seriously the fact that we've got to do better among all voters. We try not to see the American population as a set of little groups but rather as a nation that we have to bring together and make unified and whole. That's what we're going to be attempting to do as we reach out in those three separate directions.

Lamond Godwin (senior director, American Express Bank; 1985 Institute of Politics Fellow): Mr. Yeutter, a question about the Republican Party's Southern strategy. When I was a Fellow here in 1985, I invited Lee Atwater, who was a good friend of mine—we disagreed on everything but we were friends—to come
and talk to my study group about the party's Southern strategy. Using the blackboard, he made a brilliant presentation explaining how the party was going to use race as a wedge issue to divide the Black and white working classes to the benefit of the Republican Party, how, in effect, they were going to recruit the redneck vote, David Duke and his constituency.

I wish Lee was here now to see how the strategy has backfired because now these people are solidly in the Republican constituency, so much so that Duke, a former Klansman, and his people, identify with the Republican Party. He sees himself as a Republican, even if you don't. What he has done in Louisiana is defeat the White House's Republican candidate. He probably will elect the Democrat who otherwise would have had a difficult time getting elected.

Are you worried that this strategy, which you have used so effectively in the last three elections, will backfire because these people who followed David Duke will feel used and betrayed now that you don't want them?

C. Yeutter: No, I am not concerned about it because, in my judgment, people have been misreading what has happened in the South for a long period of time. The preface of your question is really a reflection of that and I say that with all due respect. First of all, I would read no signals whatsoever in the David Duke victory. That's an aberration that we hope will be a one-time aberration in this nation forevermore. People can give themselves whatever political denominations they wish, I suppose, in a democratic society although there could be some legal implications of that. The fact is that the gentleman is not welcome in any party with which I am associated.

The South has, for a good number of years, moved toward the Republican Party not because of wedge issues—that would be a very small, maybe insignificant, part of the reason—but because the South is fundamentally conservative. It embraces many of the very principles that I articulated in my opening remarks and is doing so more and more all the time. It's just a very small period of time until the entire state of Florida will be Republican. The same thing is happening very rapidly in Texas, and is beginning to happen across the South. I really believe that 20 years from how you'll see the South as one of the very strong bastions of the Republican Party but for reasons essentially unrelated to any kind of wedge issues.

John Deardourff (president, Deardourff Associates; 1977 Institute of Politics Fellow): Let me preface my question to Chairman Brown by saying that while I know Clayton Yeutter to be a very decent man, as a Republican I am very concerned that David Duke somehow finds himself comfortable in the Republican Party. I don't think that's an accident and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will use every ounce of influence you have to avoid the kind of campaign that makes the David Dukes of this world feel comfortable in the Republican Party. I spent 25 years trying to elect the kinds of Republicans that I like and have had some success so I feel I have a right to occasionally differ with my party. On the issue of abortion, we are in the wrong place and we need to move.

Ron, you spoke against negative campaigning. As a consultant I bear some burden for that over the years. What I'm concerned about is that the message the Democrats seem to have taken is not that this is so awful but that they have
to learn how to do it. The Frank Greers and the Bob Squires and others simply have adopted the position that the solution is to hit earlier, hit harder and hit as low as they can in the hope of stopping these attacks before they begin.

In the Presidential election next year, the general election in particular, we ought to get rid of the vehicle for the delivery of these negative messages, the 30-second television commercial. Why can't both parties, both national chairmen, lead the way in agreeing on a new format for Presidential elections? Whatever the argument is in favor of short commercials, by the time there are two candidates for President they don't need the 30-second commercial except to deliver the most negative possible messages. In exchange for free time to debate, to talk in longer segments about their positive positions on the issues, it ought to be possible in 1992 to broker some voluntary agreement to get rid of these kinds of short messages and then to put that into law for 1996 and beyond. Why should the American people be paying each party or each Presidential candidate $35 or $40 million, most of which is used to deliver the very kinds of messages that you think are bad?

R. Brown: Thank you for your question and the outstanding statement that preceded it. I think we, Clayton Yeutter and I, have a special responsibility. Democratic elected officials and candidates for the highest office in the land also do. Your point is extraordinarily well taken. We've got to somehow intervene in the system and stop complaining about it. We've got to do something to change the way we do politics in America.

When I became chairman of the Democratic Party the first thing I did was to send over to my counterpart at the Republican National Committee a proposal for a set of fair campaign standards and policies. I want to try to renew that effort with Clayton Yeutter. We need to get some things on paper, establish some rules and guidelines that really change the way we go about our business. We've got to have real debates so that the American people can have a sense of where folks stand, what they believe in, what they stand for, who they stand with in our society. They haven't had an opportunity to do that because of the 30-second TV ad. I am willing to publicly pledge here today that I will sit down with Clayton Yeutter, and any other Republicans who are willing to sit down on this issue, to see if we can construct some guidelines that make sense so that we can get American politics back on track.

**********

C. Yeutter: I want to thank all of you for your involvement today in this democratic society function. It is good to see young people participating in the process. I encourage you to do that for the reminder of your lives.

Let me very quickly make three of four points as to the essence of what we've said this morning. First, I'd like to return to a point about redistricting which was involved in one of the questions directed to Ron because I think it is an important issue for this nation in 1991, probably our most important political issue. It's going to determine the political landscape in which all of us operate for the next ten years; we can only do this once a decade. The question related to the use of the Voting Rights Act to secure additional representation for
minorities. It is not only perfectly appropriate but logical and sensible for Republicans and minority groups to join together in this effort because we have common cause.

Ron's Democratic colleagues did a splendid job of gerrymandering ten years ago. I congratulate them for what they did. They locked in a lot of white Democrats very skillfully and very effectively and they locked out Black Democrats and Hispanic Democrats and they locked out Republicans, which is why you see those groups working together now, including here in Massachusetts where a lawsuit was filed just yesterday, I believe.

Second, Ron said the Democrats have been sending good legislation to the White House, and it's that bad guy in the Oval office who vetoes it, and he's vetoed 26 times. All 26 of those vetoes have been sustained. On no occasion has the U.S. Congress yet overruled a George Bush veto. That may suggest that the President has it right and the Congress has it wrong. Maybe that's why the President's approval rating is in the 60s and the approval rating of the Democratically-controlled Congress is in the 20s. Why doesn't the Congress send back to President Bush the legislation he has proposed which is languishing on the desks of the Congress?

Finally, over the next year a lot of the debate is going to relate to middle-class values and middle-class aspirations. The Democrats have not yet figured out that the policy prescriptions they take do not follow the rhetoric. They have pro-middle-class rhetoric and anti-middle-class policy positions. Until that changes, until they make the policy do the right thing for the middle class, they're going to continue to lose the support of the American public. The folks of America know and understand that. That's why President Bush is going to be reelected by a very handy margin next year.

R. Brown: I've also enjoyed being here with you today and enjoyed being with my friend, the chairman of the Republican National Committee. As we move toward the Presidential election in 1992 an awful lot is at stake for our country and for our people. That is the most important thing.

We both have partisan roles. I've said some partisan things today and will probably say some more. What is important is that we understand what the stakes are, understand how important it is to communicate to the American people that politics is not a spectator sport. It requires involvement, participation, giving of yourself, thinking about issues that affect your lives. It requires voting for elected officials, politicians that are going to address those issues. I believe that this Administration has been an abject failure on the issues that are of most importance to the American people, the issues of crime and drugs, health care, housing, education, and most of all this economy. This economy is in awful shape. The American people are hurting. They feel economically insecure. They don't know how to make ends meet. There now are two-parent families with both parents having two jobs just to make ends meet. College loans are important not just to the people in this room but to all Americans who are trying to uplift and educate their families. Health care is important not just to the people in this room but to all Americans. Americans are scared to death. What will happen if the breadwinner gets sick?

We have an Administration that has no domestic agenda whatsoever. We have
a President who doesn't really want to roll up his sleeves and get his hands dirty dealing with the difficult problems that face Americans today. We need leadership desperately, leadership that understands that there is a connection between foreign policy and domestic policy. These aren't two separate things, one over here and one over there. George Bush has set two records. One of them I've talked about, the slowest period of growth since World War II. The second is more days overseas than any President since Richard Nixon and now another major overseas trip being planned. To show that domestic policy and foreign policy are connected, let's say, "President Bush, while you're overseas bring home some American jobs. While you're overseas, tell the countries you visit to accept American products, let us market them so we can compete. While you're overseas, tell them to keep drugs from flowing onto our shores; that's part of foreign policy, President Bush."

The American people are saying, "Enough is enough. Let's get serious about the issues that really concern us, that really affect our lives." That's why I am confident that George Bush, can, must and will be defeated in 1992.

* * * * *
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The great problem with asking 18-25 year olds to revitalize American democracy is that before my generation can start to make others believe in the American political system, we have to believe in it ourselves. Right now, we don't. Our age bracket votes less, knows less and cares less about American politics than any in history. Our ignorance and voting apathy does not come from indifference to the world; we are incredibly involved in grassroots activism for environmental and social welfare causes. It does come from disgust with American political culture. As a generation raised on a constant flood of split-second MTV images, we are both accustomed to sound bite politics and sick of it. Although we adore television and enjoy moments of political video ("Make my day" "Read my lips"), we also recognize their emptiness. These moments are brief diversions and little else. That politics appears to be only television spectacle does not make it more exciting to us. Instead it dissolves into the rest of the homogenized junk on the airwaves, no more than a music video, or a sit-com, or a made-for-TV movie, just as easy to tune out, just as irrelevant to daily life. Even the topic itself—with its phrase "18 to 25 year olds"—reflects this decline. The language of Madison Avenue is the language of pollsters is the language of politics. We are not a generation anymore. We are a demographic.

So the task becomes building our own belief in American democracy by making it something relevant to us. Once that happens, I hope, our energy will spill over to the culture at large. Fully inspired, youthful vigor is the most powerful political force in the world. Now that it has proven itself in the rest of the world, we need to get it going at home.

An Idea:

One possible way to start to turn our apathy around is to take up the weapons of modern politics—the video camera and the threat of bad press—and invert
them for the good. My idea has two parts. The first, which I call "Mau-Mauing the Spin Doctors," uses the threat of negative publicity to force political debate. The second, and more important, part—which doesn't need a catchy title—concentrates on encouraging this real, face-to-face dialogue between politicians and our generation. I will first outline the idea, and then explain how I think it might change American political culture for the better by making politicians listen to our voices (not our non-votes).

What I envision is a kind of expanded, rational version of the kind of political theater practiced by Abbie Hoffman or ACT-UP. A few of us, just those diehard political types at first, would take a video camera and go visit local elected officials and candidates in their offices. It would begin at colleges and graduate schools, or among grassroots activists in cities. In big state university towns, like Austin, students might go to their state legislators. In a city like Boston, the many local activist groups might do the same. In Washington, the vast army of students and activists would have the whole Congress to work on. The groups could be partisan or not; they could be concerned about one specific issue or not. I don't think those things matter at the beginning. Basically, these people and their video cameras would demand to see a certain politician in order to have a real, face-to-face discussion. If the politician refuses, the group gets a nice video, a la Roger and Me, that it can distribute to television stations. It turns the weapon of the political hack—the negative sound bite—against those politicians who refuse to meet and talk to their constituents. It is punishment for the wicked. Admittedly it's a dubious tactic, but the sad fact is that politics have changed: if we want to make our governors listen to us, we have to hit them with weapons they understand. Unresponsive politicians would learn quickly that ignoring constituents with cameras, voices, and energy does not pay. The tactic forces our politicians, who are widely perceived as disconnected to citizens, to connect or be burned.

So that is the ugly side—"mau-mauing the spin doctors." The second part is more pleasant and constructive. When politicians agree to meet with the groups—which they will—there will be nice long dialogues with no cameras. The group and the politician should probably set ground rules at the start: the group gets an hour to express its concerns or ask its questions. The politician gets the same amount to respond. This is the crux of the idea, a willingness to engage in substantive, unfettered, unedited, unrehearsed dialogue. The people who lead these groups, whether students or activists, must believe that the video spectacle is only the threat, and that the debate is all important.

So what would all this discussion do? First, it would make us "ignorant youth" understand political issues better. It would allow us to see if a politician really thinks about the fate of the city or state or country. It takes politics out of seven-second snippets and forces it into the world of subtleties, where an issue can get at least some of the time it deserves. Though the size of each group would limit its immediate large-scale effect, the content of the discussions might well spur those who do participate to greater involvement, to lobby more and more forcefully, which in turn would create a political ripple effect.

Most importantly, it would make politicians listen to a constituency that is largely ignored. Politicians can count, and they know that we don't vote. But we represent a very special, compelling interest: the future. If we start to make
politicians hear us, we may change the way they think. Short-term political thinking replaced long-term years ago, because politicians are always up for re-election, and always beholden to immediate special interests. Our concerns are long-term (will there be an ozone layer in 2020?), and we have to use our political muscle to get them heard. Anything that shifts priorities from short to long term will be good for the country and its democracy.

This idea has three advantages that would get it off the ground. First, it capitalizes on the tools of youth: energy and free time. College students and young workers generally have lots of time to do things (they lack jobs or families), and they have lots of physical and mental energy to do them with. Second, dramatic political activity is exciting: it's hard to top the thrill of meeting people, arguing with them, and persuading them. Finally, it might succeed because we can't say no to television. Look at the success of home video shows. Look at the video coups of ACT-UP. We can't resist the excitement and empowerment of controlling television.

There are a few different ways this program might get under way. College students might read editorials proposing it and decide to give it a try. Political and grassroots organizations might hear about it and put some resources into it. Foundations concerned with American political decline (the Kettering, for example) might be willing to fund a college group in a demonstration project. In any case, it will start small, because so few of us are still interested in politics. There will be a few acts in a few state legislatures by a few small groups. Then as the television images and the stories spread—as they did with Abbie Hoffman's shenanigans 20 years ago—people will rush to join. And while it will draw people with its TV thrills, it will keep them because they will start learning the issues. And, more importantly, it will keep them because they will learn that it is still possible for them to make their voices heard in our democracy. And that lesson, I hope, they can teach the rest of America.

* * * * *