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FOREWORD

Here is Proceedings '81, the third edition of this annual retrospective of the Institute of Politics. It serves the function of an annual report, but it is more than that.

Part One, "Readings," is a sampling of written and spoken words drawn from the many formats of Institute activity: panel discussions and speeches in our Forum, dialogue among conference participants, an essay from a faculty study group, student writing from the Harvard Political Review, personal evaluations from a summer intern and from our resident Fellows, and so forth. They contain impassioned rhetoric from controversial figures as well as opinion and analysis from less well-known individuals. This year we even have a poem and a little humor. Taken together, the "Readings," represent a good cross-section of what happens here.

Part Two, "Programs," is a record of all the events sponsored by the Institute during the 1980-81 academic year. This section delineates the participation of hundreds of individuals who together make the Institute the lively, interactive place that it is. Although they are not all captured on tape or on paper, their contributions make this place come alive, and this listing is a recognition of that.

Thus, the annual editions of Proceedings provide an ongoing portrait of the Institute of Politics. I hope you find it both informative and enjoyable.

Alan Mitter,
Editor
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DAVID S. BRODER (associate editor and national political correspondent, Washington Post): I want to jump in on this point, because I think this is a crucial point. Caddell said last night that the strategy for winning against Kennedy was to make it as much like a general election as possible. The characteristic that distinguishes a general election from a primary is that the winner and loser don't have to end up liking each other or even dealing with each other very much. I'd like to ask Bob Keefe how he thought that kind of a primary campaign could be conducted and still end up with a Democratic party that was viable for general election? Was that ever a consideration in the decisionmaking?

ROBERT J. KEEFE (political consultant, Carter-Mondale): I don't know whether it was a consideration in the decisionmaking, but I think that it was. When the campaign finally got started in January of 1980, there was great hope in all sectors of the Carter campaign that it would be over two to three months down the road and that there would be a long time to heal the thing and put it back together, which conditioned the way the campaign got started. Then as the campaign went on and it became more difficult to win, I think both sides stepped up the use of different kinds of artillery and made it more difficult to heal eventually and less time in which to do it. Does that answer your question, David? No?

BRODER: Well, I'll try it on the reverse side with Paul Kirk. I recall a conversation with Senator Kennedy on the plane just before Christmas. I asked him, if he were nominated, what it would be like in the general election with Jimmy Carter sitting in the White House while Kennedy was the Democratic nominee? His answer was, as I recall it, that you always assume that the tough fight is to get nominated and that the Republicans had a history of self-destructing in the general election. Were you really that naive about what you would face in terms of a general election campaign if you had been able to nominate him?

This excerpt is from a roundtable discussion of the Democratic presidential primaries at the "Conference on 1980 Presidential Campaign Decisionmaking," held at the Institute in December of 1980.
PAUL G. KIRK, JR. (national political director, Kennedy for President): On the threshold of Iowa, we had not focused at all, at that point, on the general election. Early on, there was a feeling that it would not be a cinch in the primaries at all, that it might well be a long, protracted struggle. As we got into the campaign and the roof started to fall in, Iowa then became more and more important for purposes of showing early viability. But the seeds of division, the rhetoric of the campaign, really hadn't built up. By the point at which it was known there would not be a debate, the attitude in the Kennedy campaign had shifted somewhat on the hostage thing from cynicism to feeling that the tactic or policy from the other side was a sham, given the flights to the White House by Iowa political leaders and the phone calls out to Iowa by President Carter, yet no "political activity." The feeling was not just that our campaign was being hurt, but that the process was being distorted somewhat. That, I think, built up some rancor within, which seeded possibilities for further division down the line. But it was not, at that point, so much a thought process within the Kennedy campaign; we were not saying then, "How're we gonna put it together in November?"

CARL WAGNER (director of field operations, Kennedy for President): Early on, late in 1979, we had to make a number of decisions about the tone of the Kennedy campaign. This is before the debate was frozen by Iran. There were calculations made about the campaign that went by the boards and were not even useful sixty days later. We got into a campaign running against Jimmy Carter and his record, and within thirty days, we're running against the President of the United States, every day, in the White House. So, a lot of the thinking that had gone into the structure and tone of the campaign was just impertinent, almost immediately. As a case in point, I can recall we dropped about a million pieces of mail in December or January. A lot of thought went into what this letter should look like, what the tone of it would be. And there were a number of people in the campaign who argued that the Kennedy campaign in the primaries shouldn't be driven hard left in a challenge to Carter, so that in winning the nomination, you could still put together a viable general election strategy. That sort of right-left focus of the primary debate occupied, I think, probably as much time, in terms of the calculation about the general election, as the question of the toughness of the argument with Carter.

CATHERINE MACKIN (network correspondent, ABC News): Bob, when you said that you thought it'd be over in two or three months, at what point did you all think that? Was it before the hostages were taken?

KEEFE: We're talking about January of 1980. The president was doing awfully well. The senator was doing very poorly. And when the thing got started, Carter jumped out of the box and bang, bang, bang ....

ADAM CLYMER (correspondent, New York Times): I'd like to question Jack
Walsh, and then somebody from the Kennedy side, in pursuit of David's point. Was there any time, for example, when television ads were being looked at, when someone came up with a piece of research that could be used to criticize Kennedy's voting record? Did anyone say, "Yeah, this might help this week, but in the long run, this approach will make it harder for us to get him and his supporters with us, and thus, harder to win the general election"?

JACK WALSH (national political director, Carter-Mondale): In the fall of 1979, there was tremendous trepidation and confusion about how to run against a draft committee that would then just show up your negatives, but therefore you wouldn't have an opponent who had negatives. The assumption built into the summer and fall of 1979 said, "This will be a long, protracted problem if there are draft committees and Anybody But Carter Committees out there." But if a candidate gets in and it becomes a real political situation, it will resolve itself very quickly. It will be an easier solution to deal with.

CLYMER: Did anybody ever look at the "I Help Amy with Her Homework" ad and say, "This is useful, but that tactic might get us into trouble in the long run"?

WALSH: Pat did.

PATRICK H. CADDELL (president, Cambridge Survey Research): ... There's no question that, in the campaign, we planned to emphasize those strengths that the public perceived about the president, which were mainly personal. And I think that as the campaign wears on, the ads take on a more and more difficult hue to them. The point was that, early on, we were trying to walk the balance between making sure that we won, and getting the thing over quickly, but trying to do it in such a way that it didn't open up the party any more than it already was at that particular junction.

In response to your direct question, was there anybody sitting down to question the ads, saying, "Hey, that one won't work" or "We shouldn't do that," in fact that did not occur, because Jerry Rafshoon wouldn't show them to anybody. (Laughter) Jerry's situation was that he had pretty much carte blanche in terms of the ads. They were looked at by some people and decisions were made, but there are a whole lot of other people who wished to have say in it, perhaps, who should've had say in it, but who didn't.

BRODER: Could we hang on that point for just a second, because I think we're learning something rather interesting about the internal decisionmaking structure. Who was involved and who was not involved in that kind of a decision? Did the candidate see them?

CADDELL: He didn't. He had never seen ads, basically. No, seriously, he didn't see the ads for the primaries in '76 until after the primaries, as it turned out. One day he indicated that he had not ever seen them, so he decided he ought to see them.
Basically, Hamilton saw them, Tim saw them, Jody saw them, I saw them. There was some discussion about them; it was not totally a free hand.

KENNETH A. BODE (network correspondent, NBC News): When Jerry Rafshoon was going to put the ads together, did you sit down with him and your polls and say, now this is what we know the public perceptions of Kennedy are and so forth? What were the kinds of advice you offered him in projecting, putting together some of the ads, like the "Amy" ad, for example?

CADDELL: Well, let me say the Amy ad came out of the half-hour film that Bob Squier had produced on the president which was an effort, at that point—given Bob's and Jerry's feelings—to give some sense of depth to the president, both as a person and as a president.

MARTIN F. NOLAN (Washington bureau chief, Boston Globe): I have to interrupt you. The slogan did not come out of the half-hour, though. The slogan that everyone remembers—"Husband, father, president: he's done all three jobs with distinction"—was that in the half-hour Bob Squier film? That voice-over?

CADDELL: No the voice-over wasn't. But in fact, if you go back, Marty, and look at the half-hour, the sentiment at that point in the film was, indeed, expressed, even if it wasn't—

NOLAN: The slogan wasn't. Is that correct?

CADDELL: Well, I don't think that—

KRAFT: So what's your point?

NOLAN: I think the slogan's the only synopsis of the half-hour film that's a one-line definition of what we're talking about—the "husband-father-president" business. Because Senator Kennedy, I do believe, took offense. Correct me if I'm wrong. (Laughter)

CADDELL: Look, we knew what our greatest strengths were. We were, at that point, at least somewhat aware of what Senator Kennedy's weaknesses were. As later we would prove, you can take these things even further. I would think that the first round of advertising that was prepared was, in fact, basically just playing up what we knew to be the president's strengths. Later, in Iowa, we would play up the international situation. In a campaign, you walk the tightrope between—and this is always the problem with primaries—those things that will continue to plant the seeds of division and hostility and also being successful. At that stage, it was a perception that we were certainly going to play to our strengths, obviously not without some subtle overtones, but that the major thrust at that point was mainly positive.

BODE: Carl, what was the reaction of Senator Kennedy and the Kennedy campaign to that whole wave of advertising that came out around that time, both on the senator's record and the advertising that seemed to suggest personal liabilities?
WAGNER: I think there were two reactions to the negative campaign run by the president, early and late—it was tougher late than early. One was the reaction of the candidate and the staff. But I think a far more consequential reaction was the reaction of many of the constituencies supporting the Kennedy campaign. I think there were negative feelings very strongly held. That was the reaction I would get from a state campaign manager who was in contact with either trade union leaders or liberal activists. I remember the reaction in western Pennsylvania when very heavy negative media hit. While it was very effective for the Carter campaign, the response by the Kennedy base in that state was very resentful, I think far more negative than it probably even was among the staff. That is not to say it wasn't also objected to there.

WALSH: I've got to add one thing, Carl. The problem with the general election thing, that David brought up, in the knock-out theory was this. The knock-out theory didn't come from the Carter campaign. All of the questions to us from the press through the fall were, "Can you survive the knock-out? He's gonna get you in Illinois." Kennedy says privately, "You'll be out of it in Illinois." Will you survive it? It was unbelievable the way it came at us. So the solution to the general election problem was "Get out by Illinois." Y'know, that's the way it was pushed at us.

HUNT: I want to pick up on something that Pat said a few minutes ago. When you filmed these commercials, whether we describe them as negative or not in the beginning, it was just a small group that really looked at them. I think it's accurate to say a rather small group made all the major decisions. Was there any fear on the part of you who were not part of this small group that the feelings they had about Senator Kennedy were making them go too hard? Or was there any effort on the part of any of you or on the part of the vice-president to try to convey a somewhat different and more positive message in the beginning?

LES FRANCIS (executive director, Democratic National Committee): Well, we're taking it back eleven months ago. While Bob Keefe is correct—we had hoped that we could have the thing over with within a two- or three-month period—the fact of the matter was that nobody was betting that we would. In fact, in January of 1980, and in February and March, we were fighting for our lives because it wasn't at all clear that the thing was going to go our way. And I don't recall ever having raised questions about the contents of commercials. The ones that I saw before Illinois . . . we had a couple minor suggestions to make, but nothing major.

KEEFE: I think there was a bit of a sense in the campaign that, gee, this guy picked a fight, he doesn't get to set the rules. That really was a rather widespread feeling and I don't think that there was tremendous internal dispute over what the advertising was and so forth, what the message content was. I didn't participate in it, if there was.
The Press, Politics and Public Policy
by Jonathan Moore

Our political system in the United States is undergoing a profound transition, one of the dominant features of which is the vast and increasing power of the press. With its tradition of independence, the press has not been subjected to comprehensive and intensive study, as have more formal public policy institutions. We have scholarly research on the First Amendment, but there is a dearth of literature analyzing the press' impact on government policy and process. We have discussion about press rights, but too little thoughtful examination of the concomitant responsibilities. As the world gets more complex, as issues become more confusing, the quality of information needed for a responsible citizenry dramatically increases.

The last fifty years have seen a technological revolution in communications which is transforming the process by which individuals seek and win office, and the process by which they govern. These changes have significant implications for the kind of leaders we select, the importance of public opinion in government, and the opportunities politicians have to inform and educate the electorate about public policy. The press functions not only as reporter but also as actor in our political process. It affects popular perceptions and ultimately the climate in which political institutions function and policies are decided, simultaneously informing the people about government and government about public opinion. Yet we do not adequately comprehend the power of the press, how it selects and shapes the priorities upon which government ultimately acts.

Conversely, government's influence over the press must also be more carefully examined, not just in a contemporary or legal context, but in terms of the future behavior of political institutions and the public. What are the ways in which government does and may in the future affect what is reported, not only through the courts and the FCC, but in the legislatures and bureaucracies, and through the whole panoply of regulations and informal constraints which affect access to information? Immediate challenges faced directly by the press itself which require more study include loss of public confidence, the effect of economic pressures on content, govern-

*This excerpt is from the Prospectus for the Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, a proposed new educational enterprise at the John F. Kennedy School of Government which the Institute is currently working to establish. Jonathan Moore has been Director of the Institute of Politics since 1974.*
ment's reaction to new media technologies, and the special vulnerability of the broadcast industry to government intervention constricting its already limited independence.

In short, if we are to understand the governmental process and to teach about it to others, we must know much more precisely than we do now how the press affects politics and governing and vice-versa, and with what results. At a minimum, students training for positions of responsibility in government must be educated about these issues. Ignorance of the vital role of the press in affecting understanding and support for public policy is too large a handicap for government officials to bear. By enlarging understanding of the manifold interactions between the press and government, the Harvard Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy should increase public appreciation of the critical importance of the press in our form of government. It should help to build a capacity for better evaluating the trade-offs between freedom of information and "the people's right to know," and privacy rights, national security, and marketplace realities; for comprehending the complexities involved in public policy formulation and implementation; and for fostering better, more complete press coverage of public policy matters. Recognizing, rather than obscuring, the inevitable conflicts between "freedom of the press" and other legitimate social concerns, the Center should manifest the importance of public understanding of the quality of our First Amendment order and the extent to which it has served this nation's needs.

In designing the Center's program strategy, subjects must be carefully selected from several broad categories which suggest themselves for attention. These will form the basis for the development of ongoing research projects. They will also be useful in designing curricula for present and future public servants — to enable them to understand the nature and value of a free press, its roles at different stages of public policy-making, and ways they might effectively deal with it — and in the special educational programs about government for journalists themselves. For purposes of illustration — and within the broad parameters of press impact on the electoral process and governance, and government impact on the press — here are some areas for consideration:

The First Amendment

Most scholarly work on the First Amendment is reactive, not anticipatory, tending to deal with questions after the fact in the context of judicial decisions. First Amendment research largely has addressed restrictions on particular forms of expression in relatively narrow terms. Today and in the future, the threat to First Amendment values engages a broad range of issues reaching across the society. It encompasses not only competing Constitutional concerns, but also our political
structure, government bureaucracy, public interest groups, commercial factors, and public attitudes more generally. Pressures on Congress and regulatory agencies for greater government intervention and greater access to the media for certain viewpoints, macro-economic policies which may encroach on media interests, exploitation of the media by political actors, insufficiently trained reporters and editors, and advancing technology all provide new challenges to the principles of an open society.

Regulation of New Technologies

New communication technologies — including videotape, cable television, microwave, computers, instant data retrieval, communications satellites, and international telecommunications systems — need to be examined to determine both their impact on government and politics in and of themselves and the legislative and regulatory options for dealing with them. These technologies already are affecting our political process in major but inadequately understood ways. The legislators, regulators and judges charged with the responsibility for determining and maintaining an acceptable balance between the availability and the withholding of information have little to go on as far as the new techniques are concerned.

The Communication Business

Academic study of press organizations tends to give greater attention to their role as transmitters of information within a First Amendment context than to their basic structure as commercial enterprises. This is not sufficient, in part because the Supreme Court has shown a willingness to consider them in their corporate profit-making personae and in part because regulation of and public attitudes toward the media as business enterprises affect their role as political institutions. Legislative decisions affecting public broadcasting and failing newspapers, for example, deal in both worlds with too little in the way of scholarly work to enable the public or the decision-makers to understand the implications of policy options.

The Media and the Political Process

The relationships between the media and government officials and agencies need to be more fully studied, with regard to inhibitions accepted by the media in order to sustain the flow of information, in addition to the obligations of the government to be open and the media's need to protect confidential sources. We are just beginning to examine the impact of the press on the electoral process, even though it has been clear for a long time that decisions made by the press may be as important in determining who gets elected as the laws, the issues, and the candidates themselves. We do not sufficiently understand the influence of the press in shaping public opinion.
about complex government problems or the consequences of low public regard for media institutions themselves.

Ethics

The media has been able to postpone serious consideration of ethical questions and standards of conduct. Scholarly examination of ethical matters can benefit and encourage the press in its own efforts to reflect on standards of professional conduct at the individual, company, and even industry levels.

* * *

City Upon a Hill
by Alexander Kaplen

In a city upon a hill lived a community of saints. From John Winthrop to Ronald Reagan, Americans have led our nation on a divine mission, a mission conceived by God and executed by earthbound saints. We have seen America not only as a lone refuge for decent men and their ideals but as a unique model of decency itself, "which the eyes of the world are upon." Since the war in Vietnam, that mission has been more difficult to maneuver. The eyes of the world no longer see us as a community of saints, and, like Oedipus finding the source of the plague, we have realized that this fall from grace originates in our own sins. Not in the sins of those members of the community who really do not belong, those whom we have branded as outsiders, but in the sins of those who have conceived and executed this mission. In fact, we have discovered that the greatest sin is the mission itself, the mission that has marked us as morally superior and therefore uniquely fit to lead the world into glory.

If the return of the hostages from Iran has had any effect, it has pushed America back up the hill. Commentators as diverse as Marvin Kalb, Tom Hayden, and Eric

This article was the "Opening Shot" column from the Spring, 1981 issue of the Harvard Political Review. Lex Kaplen served as President of the HPR from January, 1980 to January, 1981.
Sevareid have seen the hostage crisis as a situation in which the heroes and the villians are distinct; we are the heroes. The return of the hostages has returned America to the moral side of the ledger. It has been an excuse not merely, as so many have claimed, "for America to feel good about itself again," but for America to see itself once again as fit for the mission that was interrupted a dozen years before.

In our celebration of national renewal, most Americans have paid scant attention to the facts that compromise this view. Where are the gadflies to remind us what caused the Iranians to take hostages? Where are the commentators who can explain the source of Iranian indignation, the scars of a people who suffered under a brutal dictatorship, the years of American complicity with a repressive regime? They have been buried under a collective wave of self-delusion and self-righteousness that precisely fits the needs of Americans too long separated from the task we have been told is ours. Where are the analysts who can unravel why this hostage-taking is unique? Where are the historians who can recount how a President under siege from his own party created an international issue in order to shield himself from the attacks of a surging opponent? They have been silenced by the jubilant shouts of Americans unwillingly to sully with facts a convenient story of heroism.

It is no accident that Americans are reacting with such a conspicuous communal enthusiasm in a year in which they elected Ronald Reagan President. Each time President Reagan tells us that "America is the greatest nation on earth"—as if someone had just announced a contest and Mr. Reagan were entering our country—he repudiates the message we found in Vietnam. He declares that hubris is not our problem, that "Vietnam was a noble war," that our mission is not dead, that we are still a community of saints.

But Mr. Reagan and his fellow conservatives have had difficulty measuring the importance of the community and defining its composition. On the one hand, one might assume that these standard-bearers of laissez-faire have little use for the concept of the community; on the other hand, these are the men who demand that we abide by and uphold the moral "standards of the community." They explain that the scope of social welfare programs must be reduced because "a government cannot lead a nation of individuals who cannot lead themselves," and they declare that a government cannot integrate a fragmented society. Yet these pronouncements do not stop our conservative leaders from advocating the passage of anti-pornography, anti-sodomy, and anti-abortion laws. Surely, this is a loose definition of the community of saints, but it is an exclusive definition nonetheless, cutting off the poor, the unassimilated, and the morally iconoclastic from their communal base. Such a definition delineates between saints and sinners, between those who are fit to participate in the American mission and those who are not.
This attempt to find the true saints of our community is only the latest attempt of American conservatives to direct their global view inward. Throughout American history, our leaders have distinguished American virtue from European (later Soviet) moral corruption; some have taken this distinction further and have isolated moral Americans from their immoral countrymen. The Puritans, for example, created a community of the elect within their society, allowing the rest of that society to drift without the security of church membership or, in a more general sense, inclusion in the Puritan community. More than 300 years later, Joseph McCarthy tried to do the same. From early nineteenth-century pre-millenialism to the Ku Klux Klan to much of contemporary fundamentalism, American history is filled with efforts, both sophisticated and primitive, to recode the community of saints in order to identify those Americans worthy of life on the hill.

The fervor over our returning hostages will soon fade, but our restored national egotism will not dissolve as quickly. Americans enjoy our special status; we treat it as a birthright and resent anyone who examines its fallacies. But Americans must understand that, hidden behind our successes, our history shows the danger of living on a hill. We must never again treat the war in Vietnam as a freakish example of weakness or as an embarrassing tragedy. Instead, we must continue to recognize that it illuminates our national folly which perpetuates the myth of moral perfection. The sooner we descend willingly from our hill the sooner we can see our position in the world without the distortions that result from the delusion of national superiority. Moreover, we must resist the impulse to carve out of our nation a community of saints. Many conservatives today, afraid of an organic society, prefer first to define the limits of the community and then to bid farewell to those individuals who do not fall within their guidelines. They have seen America with its problems, understood that those problems tarnish their vision of an idyllic land, and, in an attempt to save that vision, blamed the sickness of our land on the faults of a few. In essence, the need to isolate our national failings in the actions of "societal misfits" has compelled conservatives to try to shape an exclusive community. But where does that leave the rest of our citizens? It leaves them looking up at the community of saints upon the hill. It leaves them resentful and alienated. And it leaves America a fragmented nation divided by an obsession with glory that is not only vain but in vain.

* * *

---
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Trust Me
by Art Buchwald

I've traveled all over this country, and everywhere I go people ask the same question: Why, out of a country of 220 million people, can't we find an outstanding person to run for president? Well I'm going to explain it to you tonight. There are 144 million people in the United States over 18 or eligible to vote, but at the moment there are only 99 million registered voters. Out of this 99 million, 38 million are under 35 years of age, and are therefore ineligible to run for the presidency. Now one million were not born in this country so they can't run either. This still leaves us 60 million people to choose from. But about half this number are women, and whether we like it or not, this country is not ready for a woman president. So we're down to 29 million presidential prospects. We have to take out three million because they're afraid to fly. So we're down to 26 million. We have to take out two million because their wives don't want to move to Washington. And then there are two million more who are being audited by the IRS. And then there are 12 million who are mentioned in Elisabeth Ray's book. So we're down to seven million. Surely, you say, we can find one outstanding person in seven million. We could, except that this country will never accept a president who has had a mental disorder or has been treated by a psychiatrist. There have been 6,999,998 people in this country who have had psychiatric treatment. So this left us with a peanut farmer from Georgia and a movie actor who played the lead in "Bedtime for Bonzo."

I guess you're wondering, "Is this guy a Democrat or a Republican?" Well put your mind at ease: I'm against whoever is in power. People ask me what am I trying to do with my column? Well it's quite simple. I consider myself the cruise director of the Titanic—we may not get there but we're going first class.

People ask me how I operate in Washington. Well I don't talk to anyone because facts get in my way. And I discovered what ever is on the front pages of the newspapers is far wilder than anything you could possibly make up.

Take Jimmy Carter's interview in Playboy, in which he said he had lusted after women in his heart, but God had always forgiven him. I could not make that up. And we now have a bumper sticker in Washington which says, "In his heart, he knows your wife." We have had presidents in the White House who have done it.

---

Syndicated columnist Art Buchwald was a Visiting Fellow of the Institute of Politics on September 23 and 24, 1980. This article is excerpted from the address he delivered in the Forum.
and we have had presidents in the White House who haven't done it, but this is the first time we have a president who doesn't do it, but thinks about it a lot.

You pick up the paper and you read about John F. Kennedy's peccadilloes at the White House. Many people have asked me how I feel about this, and I can only quote Shirley MacLaine, who said, "I'd rather have a president do it to a woman than to a country."

I swear to you I can't make up anything. Just the other month, Ronald Reagan told an ethnic joke about Italians and Poles. And when the reporters printed it Reagan was very upset. And he said the only reason he told the joke was to show how evil ethnic jokes were. I could not make that up.

And then you take the FBI's recent sting operation. When they caught Congressman Kelly of Florida with a bag load of money in the trunk of his car, his explanation for this was that he was hoping to catch the person who gave it to him. I could not make that up.

My favorite one happened a couple of years ago when Senator William Scott of Virginia was listed in the magazine New Times as "the dumbest senator in Washington." Now New Times has a circulation of about 40, so Senator Scott called a press conference to deny it, which made him the dumbest senator in Washington.

Now the thing that scares you about this business is when you make something up and it turns out to be true. And this is happening all the time. Not long ago I got tired with all these stories about supersonic planes that could fly two and three times the speed of sound. So I decided to do a spoof, and I wrote about a secret plane the Air Force was working on that could fly so slow that nothing could shoot it down. And two days later I got a call from the Pentagon saying that I had violated security.

Now, I don't think it's the role of the columnist to criticize what is wrong with this country. I think he should come up with solutions to solve the problems of our times, and I am proud to say that I am constantly doing this. Let me give you some illustrations. There's a great deal of concern in this country now about the high cost of hospital rooms. My solution to this problem is for the hospitals to go condominium, because it's cheaper to buy one than to stay there for three weeks, and then you can always sell it at a profit.

There's a great controversy going on over saccharin: whether we should be permitted to use it or not. And it seems that scientists have fed white rats an enormous amount of saccharin and they develop cancer. Now my solution to this problem is not for the drug companies to come up with a substitute for saccharin—they have to develop a stronger rat. This country can't keep doing experiments on weak rats, who keep getting sick every time we give them too much to eat.

Now I'm not afraid to face up to our country's defense problem. The Air Force is
now asking $30 billion to develop an MX system. Now this would be a series of underground tunnels so they could move our Nike missiles around, so the Soviets couldn't pinpoint where they are. And the Air Force describes this as a giant shell game. Now I'm for fooling the Soviets as much as anybody else, but I think $30 billion is a little too high to pay for an underground tunnel system. So my solution to this problem is to give the contract to Amtrak—they don't know where their trains are at anytime anyway. And all we have to do is give the Soviets a train schedule, and they'd never find a Nike missile again.

* * *
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The Economics of Aging

by Maggie Kuhn

I cite what I am to say tonight in the context of the writings of C. Wright Mills, who was not an economist, as you may remember, but a very distinguished sociologist from Columbia University. One of the last books he wrote was The Sociological Imagination; it impressed me deeply and I've reread it several times since he wrote it, way back in 1959. He said in that book that biography and history intersect, and that we cannot think of any social issue — war, peace, economic malaise, unemployment — in any kind of human, political, economic, or social terms without recognizing what those global issues, controversial as they are, do to people. And the flip side of the coin is that we cannot look at any predicament, any personal problem that any human being might have, without looking at the economic, political, social context of that person's particular agony and oppression, and recognizing that social justice can be done only in the context of social reform and social change. So the personal and the private, and the public and the societal, are interchanged, and intertwined, and it's in that wholistic context that I will speak tonight.

The Grey Panthers have been engaging, in the past ten years, in comprehensive social analysis. It's hard to interpret this to people who are single-issue people. We believe that our society is sick, that it suffers from some pervasive social, economic, and political illnesses that have no easy, blithe solutions. That they are economically determined in large measure — and that ageism, racism, sexism, and economic imperialism are all linked in this social pathology, and all have their own dynamics, and must all be addressed if we are to have a human, just and peaceful world.

We're reaching, in this tumultuous age, for some new strategies for change, for some new ways in which we can, as a so-called free people, govern ourselves and remain free. The economics of aging seem to me to be determined and influenced by pervasive ageist attitudes, which reinforce stereotypes and discriminatory practices,
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and are equally oppressive to the old and the young, both of whom are marginalized, and both of whom need each other in order to stay alive. Discrimination and ageist attitudes increase the social isolation and marginalization of people who are old and young, and bear heavily and oppressively on the people in the stressful middle years.

There is widespread discrimination by employers and unions against older workers in hiring and in career development. Retirement should be flexible and optional — we should be free. I would hope very much that there could be a new understanding of what retirement could be. Training for second and third careers, linked with a new kind of continuing education that enables people to live and work and be productive and socially useful, right up to rigor mortis. That's the goal, for all of us...

Discrimination against older women is rife. Women are the survivors in our society. At the age of 65 for every 100 men there are 138 women; at the age of 75, for every 100 men there are 150 women. We are the survivors, and the kind of economic oppression that we encounter, as we enter the labor force as young women, and as we re-enter the labor force after child-bearing and wifely duties are set aside, those discriminations are oppressive and they continue without any real effort to abate them...

There is also the very great economic decline, particularly in the northern cities, of the Midwest and the East Coast. You can't talk about the economics of aging without recognizing it and calling it for what it is: the irresponsible flight of American capital and the exportation of hundreds of thousands of jobs every year to the Third World and the sunbelt. Unless there is some kind of very strenuous effort to correct this flight of capital in a multi-national, conglomerate, board-room style operation, there will be continued economic decline, and there ought to be a corporate judgement on it. Very, very profitable firms.

I cite one of the two large companies in my state, Pennsylvania, that are being shut down, and workers being moved out, because the margin of profit that they have yielded has been between 10 and 15%, but that capital invested in the Phillippines and Taiwan would yield upward of 30%. Now, I think there's a corporate judgement on that that has to be proclaimed. The competition that is endemic in that kind of flight of capital, between the old and the young, has to be recognized not in terms of its ageism, but in terms of its economic determinism. If there was corporate responsibility for creating new jobs, for the development of new products, for diversifying American industrial productivity, I submit that there would not be this job loss. I'd like very much to hear Harvard economists expound on that. I think that it's terribly important for a prestigious school like the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, with its concern for ethics and its ex-
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extraordinary gifts in developing the leadership of corporate America, that that kind of corporate evaluation of social responsibility and accountability be built into the curriculum. (applause) . . .

There is also the influence of the self-rejection and self-segregation and stereotyping that older people impose on ourselves, largely because we have been conditioned by society to hate our wrinkled hands, to use some cream to rub out the brown spots. It's just into our heads that we are useless . . .

We need to use the skills of older Americans, and we need to encourage and train a large group of older Americans to be the risk-takers, the change-agents, the ones who wade into social controversy, because we have nothing to lose. And out of a historical perspective, raise the ultimate social questions that people in their middle years can't raise — they risk too much. What are we waiting for?

The economics of aging involve change and reform, and in my old age, I dare to say things that are controversial. And I encourage you who are my peers — I'm 75 — to take some risks. It's great fun — and you have nothing to lose!

I've spoken earlier about the holistic analysis bringing together the various kinds of oppression that put us down and make life a problem for many. But I think we've got to, across the board, in all human groups, recognize with a new kind of fresh awareness that aging is the one thing that all living things share. All the plants, all the animals, everything that lives is born of seed, flourishes, bears fruit, flowers, and progeny, and withers and dies, and in the process replenishes the earth — only American funeral practices rather defeat that. But the possibility of moving toward a holistic view of aging — a common, human situation — no hate, no fear about it, but a celebration of triumph over all the vicissitudes that have put us down when we were young and middle aged. And the possibility of looking at age and aging as a human condition, rather than a disease or a disaster, is part of our continuing social analysis.

* * *
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Future Directions for the Lesbian/Gay Community
by Ginny Apuzzo

There are only two groups in America who really believe that lesbians and gay men will force significant political changes: the “New Christian Right,” and the gays themselves. At this moment, they’re both wrong. The New Christian Right is wrong, but it doesn’t matter, because it’s working for them. Gays and lesbians are wrong, and it does matter. We’re wrong because we believe our successes will come merely if we have more of what we already have. More money for organizations, more volunteers, more support from within our community. More of what we have already is not going to bring us into political influence and power with any purpose. At this point, the benefits we have earned over the past ten years are still overshadowed by the failures we refuse to acknowledge. And that is what will prevent us from becoming anything more than we are now: an interesting new group with vital things to say, but ultimately not yet a serious political movement for real social change. What we lack is a willingness within our movement to assess, to evaluate, and to demand accountability. Those are the tools used to take corrective steps, points on a compass used to pilot a course. Without those points, we can only become a machine turning out energy but not set to accomplish a real purpose.

It is not that the past ten years have not brought us forward, for they have indeed. It is that we must not mistake where they have brought us, and confuse that sense of progress with a sense of real direction, which is what I feel we still lack. The major difference between today and a decade ago is that gays and lesbians, as has been said in this panel, really have become a community, and not just simply an issue. It is still a controversial community to be sure, but increasingly it is an acknowledged community. Most important of all, we have acknowledged it to ourselves through our community service programs, our newspapers, our churches, our literature. Ten years ago we could not have gathered a panel who could speak
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of their particular experience in a gay community. They could speak of their own gayness, their own beliefs about politics, but not of a community they participated in which visibly existed. It's that sense of community, carried in each individual, that has brought most of us if not all of us the way we have covered over the past ten years. It is our visibility as a community and as individuals that accounts for the increasing public acknowledgement that we are all a part of America's diversity, more than the resolutions passed in city councils, more than the proclamations put forth by mayors ....

In our major cities, gays and lesbians have made some important gains. But we have failed to grasp them as a national movement. At times we have even contradicted their importance. Why is it, for example, that gays and lesbians in Washington, D.C. can win more city appointments and more complete guarantees of their rights than gays and lesbians in San Francisco? Why can gays in Los Angeles boast of a gay community services center with a staff of dozens, an annual budget of over a million dollars when gays and lesbians in New York City can claim nothing? Why can gays and lesbians in Minnesota claim the largest percentage of gays and lesbians in its delegation to the Democratic National Convention of any state and gays in Massachusetts can't claim even one delegate?

Nor is it just our successes we are failing to learn from. We are also ignoring the lessons of our failures. We have yet, for example, to even assess the failure of our movement to gain from the Carter administration what we needed and what was indeed possible. We failed to even see it as a failure that as a movement we took no position on Congressional proposals to repeal the Voting Rights Act, and days later we were forced to accept an anti-gay provision. Indeed, we failed to see the relationships between those events and the intent behind them. The political game is being played around us, and we have yet to learn what cards are on the table and how to play them. What is even worse is that after the election, one increasingly hears that there is not too terribly much wrong with this, that perhaps, very little is lost. The answer to the New Right's takeover in national politics we are told is for us to retreat to our cities and their local agendas, leaving behind the national effort before we have even put it to the test. There are local agendas and they must be pursued, but they must be understood as a part of the national effort, for that is truly what they are. There is no mistaking the fact that those who oppose us know and understand this. Time and again the New Christian Right has mustered its national strength to attack us on the local level, and they will continue to win as long as we abet by standing alone. The victory in Oregon for a gay rights supporter opposed on that issue is a victory that extends beyond the borders of one congressional district. The loss in Norfolk, Virginia of a referendum against gay publications in the public libraries is a loss that extends far beyond that city.
Our local groups must also grasp the fact that their agenda is national. The advances of the four years at the national level were possible because local politicians who knew local groups were graduated to the national level. More was not accomplished because our local groups did not continue their dialogue and maintain their access; because they took a limited view of their role and their agenda. Our national leadership partook of that failure as well when it sought to usurp the role that our local groups had carved out with politicians who became national leaders. We can no longer patronize the shortcomings of our national organizations as though they were beloved children who are incapable of reaching maturity. We must begin to demand accountability from them, and when they prove themselves incapable, we can no longer accept a shrug or a smile. At the local level we must dispense with the politics of tantrums. We don’t need it, we can’t afford it, and it will not get us where we need to go. It is so clear to me that now that the national power is in the hands of those who will willfully misunderstand us and want the nation to believe that our goals are threatening, we can no longer afford to be ambiguous or ambivalent about those goals.

Until we do those things, we will not have started to become a national political force. Until we demand that our gay newspapers give us honest and factual reporting we will not be able to use them to assess reality. Until we focus on an agenda, a specific set of steps that can be accomplished, we will have no vehicle to participate in national political change, no way for us or others to evaluate our goals and our strategies. Until we are willing to take the responsibility for assessing and evaluating, we will have no basis for holding our national leadership to a standard of accountability. Otherwise our willingness to contribute or a decision to deny support to them will be as random and yet as damaging to ourselves as is the violence done to us on the streets or through the whimsical enforcement of laws against us. Above all, we must know that we do not have an unlimited span of time ahead of us to begin this process. We will be held responsible, all of us, within a very short period, as we either exhibit the sophistication and power we claim, and that we ought to be able to claim, or pay the price of forfeiting. It’s not the decade ahead that holds the answers, or even poses the questions. It’s ourselves.

*   *   *
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Charter Reform in Boston
from an ad hoc study

Two battle cries ring down through American history when the composition of legislative bodies is being considered: the founders' demand of "no taxation without representation," and the somewhat more modern ideal of "one man, one vote." As Chief Justice Warren wrote, "To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen." Under the changes being proposed as ballot questions for this fall's municipal election, instead of being represented by nine councillors and five School Committee members, each voter would look to one councillor and committee member from his or her own area, with four more at-large. Few if any voters under such a plan should sense that they lack representation; under the present system, by contrast, many citizens feel that way. With districts of between 60,000 and 70,000 inhabitants, representation across voters should be more nearly fair. Moreover, the proposed reforms compare favorably with some past efforts in at least one important respect: they make no pretense of trying to take the "politics" out of government. Instead, they represent an effort to find a "better politics," one which aligns more closely with the values we cherish.

The most obvious effect of a plan which includes district representation would be to bring representatives closer to the city's neighborhoods. For most representatives, the neighborhood, not the city, would become both the constituent and political base. This effect is virtually assured by the provision of the law which would require a representative to be an inhabitant of his or her district.

But even if we make the tenuous assumption that switching to a district system will provide equitable representation, what would the value of that be?

One can value equitable representation solely as an end in itself, expecting no further benefits from it.

Or, one can view its benefits as primarily psychological. It may help ameliorate minority alienation; it may present a more viable option for minorities to work for change within the system rather than outside of it; it may offer minority youths additional role models to respect and emulate. The counter-argument to this, however,
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holds that the opposite might happen. In the inevitable political hyperbole necessary to bring about electoral change, hopes might be unrealistically raised. If equitable representation brings little or no change to their lives, minority alienation and frustration might actually increase.

Theoretically, one can view equitable representation as a way to ensure equitable policy, but one cannot be positive it will work out this way in practice. On the one hand, if the political structure created by district elections gives nobody a stable majority, then every group will have to interact with each other and minorities will have some bargaining strength with which to influence policy. On the other hand, it seems at least as likely that racial minorities might align themselves with "liberal" non-minority members and still fall short of a majority. And remembering that the proposal at hand is not for district representation, but rather for a mixed system, it should be recognized that the moderating influence of the at-large representatives might enhance the establishment of a stable majority, unshakable by the few minority members likely to be elected.

A mixed system is also complicating in other ways. The possible effects its passage might have in terms of perceived or actual equitability are more difficult to assess than a simpler proposal. It becomes difficult to support this plan with the necessary enthusiasm while calling attention to its limitations.

Any move for "neighborhood representation" also raises the converse possibility, the liability of a harmful parochialism placing the interests of a district's residents over those of the city as a whole. The presence of at-large representatives might tend to mitigate this problem, as might the recent experience of totally at-large bodies, but parochialism could become a factor in any plan which includes districting.

One especially important aspect of the many-sided nature of parochialism is ethnic and racial tension. It may be that the at-large election method has tempered the inclination of officials to pander to the prejudices and hostilities of their "natural" political bases; as inflammatory as some rhetoric has been in the past, the need to be sensitive to the entire at-large electorate probably kept things from being even worse. District elections may remove that subtle check, and in fact reward the sort of pandering which in positive contexts would be considered laudable populist representation.

The danger of fanning this ethnically-charged parochialism and racism seems to us quite real in Boston today. Nevertheless, this risk is probably outbalanced by the possibility of improving the fairness of neighborhood, ethnic, and racial representation on the School Committee and City Council. Even if lapses in political leadership and behavior exacerbate community tensions, democracy seems more likely to flourish over the long run if we pursue the one man, one vote principle, a corollary
of which is that the electoral system must give communities and ethnic groups fair and effective representation. Establishing a system of elections which includes district representation can be argued on balance to be a step in that direction.

Social science cannot provide any simple, concerted solution to the question of the relationship between methods of election and minority representation. There is no sure-fire equation into which we can plug Boston’s condition and come out with a confident answer. One fact which ought to be kept in mind, however, is the key difference between election methods and most of the other variables involved: election methods can be changed by government action comparatively easily; such socioeconomic variables as education, income, and region are far less amenable to government intervention.

* * *

Political Education
by Kwame Ture

Capitalism, which is a backwards system, seeks to confuse the masses of people, especially the intelligentsia, by letting them think that the individual can by himself, by herself, isolated from society, develop and become a product and a use to society. On the contrary, we say it is the people who teach us everything. It is from the people that we learn everything, and if we do not study from the people, we do not learn from the people, we will not come to understand life at all. In order then to understand properly human beings, we must come clearly, and look at the area of political education.

It is the education of the individual that will show his or her understanding of humanity, and come to fulfill their responsibility to humanity. A capitalist system, whose material reality is a structure in which a few people own and control the means of production, allows but for one philosophical persuasion, one ideological reasoning, and that is that when a system is built where a few own and control everything, the only motivating force can be profit by any means necessary. The capitalist system, this backwards system, which everywhere seeks to confuse, is the
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system that you as intelligentsia must come to struggle with ruthlessly and uncom­promisingly...

A few days ago I met a man. He said, “Kwame Ture, are you still organizing?” I said, “My people are not free, obviously. And until they’re free the struggle con­tinues. Clearly. Yes.” He said, “Are you still organizing just Africans?” I said, “Oh, yes, just Africans.” He said, “You’re a racist.” I said, “Really? Why is that?” He said, “Just Africans?” I said, “But Africans are part of humanity. They’re a suffering part of humanity. Logic tells us that if you better any part of suffering humanity, you have bettered all of humanity.” Yes, and there must be no confusion, we’re clear. We come to use our energies toward the African population here. We come to instill upon them the motivating force, that they must come to understand that the interest of the masses of their people must at all times, under all conditions, reign supreme over the individual interest. We come to hammer home the point. We understand, of course, here, at this institution, this citadel of capitalism, that the most backward education comes forward. I met an individual here who told me, “Well, first I must get my stuff together, and then I will come and help the people.” You see they don’t understand, and they think they do. The capitalist system makes them think they are thinking when in fact they are not thinking.

Our remarks come to the Africans, clearly. Of course we are revolutionaries. Revolution is based on veritas, truth, of course. Truth is universal, not particular, never. Therefore even if we come to speak particularly about the African revolu­tion, those who are concerned with humanity in general will come to understand and extrapolate from this particular situation universal truths which they can apply in their own situation...

For the African student at Harvard University, their entire life is tied up to the destiny of their people, whether they know it or not. And it cannot be assumed that the people’s destiny is tied up to the students at Harvard University. Today at Har­vard University we can find a substantial number of African students. Significant. Not substantial, significant. And when we say significant, all things being relative, we mean significant compared to the ’60s, of course, not significant compared to the population in society, we don’t want to confuse that point. These African students, who are to be found here in quantity, let it be properly understood, did not get here through their own individual struggle, and their own individual intelligence and brilliance. Of course, the capitalist system will seek to impress that upon them, make them think the reason you got into Harvard was ‘cause you’re special from the others. Of course. The only reason they’re here at Harvard is because the masses of their people struggled, shed their blood, and opened up positions to put them here.

Once therefore this is properly understood, there is no question that the students at Harvard University must occupy this position only for the benefit of the masses of
the people so they can go forward and raise the quality of life for others.

Simply, then, it is not a question of passivity, it is a question of positive action. Even by standing still, one is against the people. Therefore, here, the struggle takes on horrendous proportions. Let it be clear. This struggle cannot be waged on an individual basis. Again, this backward capitalist system, with its backward culture, showing people Superman, and Bionic Woman and $5 million man, so that individuals themselves, dreaming of this nonsense, come to think they by themselves can come to free the masses of the people. Not at all. The masses can only be freed by the masses themselves. The masses must be properly organized in order for them to be free.

This then is the second crucial cornerstone that we come to inculcate into the minds of our young brothers and sisters. First, number one, that you have a responsibility and that responsibility is not to Harvard University, but to the masses of the people, who in spite of Harvard put you here. One.

Secondly, this responsibility cannot be properly implemented, unless it is implemented in an organizational form. Of course, we need not say that a thought without action is empty. We said in the very beginning we only know truth by implementing it in its concrete reality. Therefore we’re not speaking here of those who think nice thoughts of the people, those who say, ‘I wish we could come together, oh how I wish we could be free.’ We’re not thinking of those, we’re not speaking of those, we’re speaking of those who come with their concrete action, coming to make their proper contribution to pushing the masses of the people forward.

It is in organizing the masses of the people that the intelligentsia comes to play its proper role. This theory of the role of the intelligentsia in organizing the masses of the people is a theory and a question which has troubled revolutions everywhere in the world. This is the crucial element that is lacking from our struggle, this organization. Our people everywhere rise up. Our people like every people struggle everywhere against injustice, but we are not organized. It is the task of the intelligentsia to come, use their skills and their knowledge, to bring forth proper principles to help organize the masses of the people. But these principles must be based on the actions of the masses of the people. You cannot learn about the people isolated. If they trick you into that trick-bag, you’re acting like a dog. You can only “get yourself together” in the society, because it’s in the society that you are going to live, or the society in which you’re preparing to live. But certainly one doesn’t prepare to live alone. There’s no need to do that at all.

We say organization is a crucial issue. In the African revolution itself, we can see this struggle constantly. Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, who himself went to Harvard University, raised this question as early as 1902, when he called for, in a very hazy manner,
the "talented tenth." What he meant by the "talented tenth" was those Africans who from the sweat of the mass of the people have gained access to certain positions in the society that allow for technological knowledge to be acquired, must acquire this technological knowledge, and use it for the masses of the people. Of course.

We say it's to be everywhere found. But even today, here we have a constant struggle against the capitalist system. The capitalist system seeks to take our intelligentsia and make them be wrapped up in their own individual problems, let them think that their person and the person of their family is more important than the interest and the struggle of the masses of the people. The struggle is a struggle which must be waged by every individual, but it's a struggle which can only be waged collectively, in an organized manner.

Here then we must come to understand properly all of these things when we come to speak of political education. We must begin to educate ourselves, by ourselves, learning from ourselves, and then spread this education to ourselves. No one allows their young to be educated by the enemy. And if there is no alternative but to let the young be educated by the enemy, at least we must tell the young, go to the enemy, get the skills of the enemy, but not the ideology of the enemy . . . .

Our people must be organized. Those of you who are serious about organization, at the end of our question and answer period, we will ask you to stay, and we will discuss with you a little about our party, the All African Peoples Revolutionary Party. Our party is revolutionary. That means it's uncompromising, and it's not afraid of anybody or anything . . . .

If you do not agree with our party, if you think it's too revolutionary, we won't argue with you, we understand it. But we will say to you this: each man, each woman has a responsibility to humanity. This responsibility for an oppressed people can only be found in their working to liberate the people. This responsibility will only manifest itself by an oppressed people in they themselves by taking on their shoulders the responsibility to work to liberate the people. We say, you may not join the All African Peoples Revolutionary Party; as a matter of fact, you may disagree with everything our party has said here this afternoon. But one thing you cannot disagree with: our people must be organized.

We are disorganized everywhere. Even here at Harvard, the few of you, as intelligent as you are, you are disorganized. Our people everywhere are disorganized, and you cannot disagree when we say that in order for us to be liberated, we must be organized. You may disagree strategically and tactically — that is to say, you may not want to be a member of the All African Peoples Revolutionary Party. Fine. But there are many organizations here. There is the NAACP, there is the Urban League, the Republic of New Africa. Oh, there's a host of them. And not only that, if you look, it is your responsibility as a student of an oppressed people to examine
all of these organizations which seek to speak on your behalf, know their ideology, know their strategies, know their problems, know their objectives. You must now come into the organization which you find is closest to what you consider to be the truth. If you don't find any organization fulfilling these requirements, then you have a responsibility just like anybody else to create the organization which will help lead the people to freedom. But one thing is clear. If you want to help your people, you must be in an organization. We can say the converse of it, and that is to say that, if you are not in an organization, and your people are oppressed, by your very inactivity, you are against the people.

Here then, organization is the only answer. We urge the African students to organize. We urge all the people who love justice and freedom to organize into revolutionary organizations, to organize into radical organizations, to organize even into reform organizations, but to organize to deal blows against the system.

* * *

Do We Want a Gender-Free Society?

by Phyllis Schlafly

Now we have the feminist movement promoting the drafting of women when men are drafted, and this is really the cutting edge of the gender-free society that the feminist movement has been promoting. . . . When the U.S. Congress was debating this issue last year, they had some hearings before the Senate Military Personnel Subcommittee, and the Carter administration's witness was one day asked the question, "Well, the present law applies to nineteen- and twenty-year-olds, and we draft by a lottery, and suppose the number comes up first of a young woman who's a wife and mother of a six-month-old baby. Who goes?" And obviously, if you understand the feminist ideology, you know what the answer to that question has to be, and the answer of the Carter administration's witness indeed was, "If her number comes up first, she goes, and her husband stays home with the baby." (applause) Of
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course, that answer was no surprise to me, having been debating the feminists for a number of years, but I might say it was a big shock to a number of the men in the Senate (applause) and Senator Nunn said, "Anybody who thinks this society is going to put up with that must be living in some different kind of world from what the rest of us are living in." (laughter and applause)

So I think that this matter of the military is, of course, not the only area of the feminist ideology, or not the only area that's related to this proposed constitutional amendment, but it is the most interesting because it is where the argument for the gender-free society really is shown for what it is. The people who want it want to pretend that there is absolutely no difference and that women can do anything men can do, but it just sticks in their throat when it comes to the matter of combat, and they are having a hard time even putting that over, and even their lawyer representing the drafting of women just couldn't quite swallow that all the way.

It certainly is the thrust of those who are working for the gender-free society to change our educational system so that it will be fully sex neutral. They've been working for a number of years directly on the publishers to censor our textbooks of what they call the sexist words. (applause) This country has never had such a ruthless, Gestapo-type censorship brigade (boos and jeering) as the feminist organizations that have gotten the major textbook publishers to issue lists of words, concepts, phrases and pictures that must be censored out of textbooks, else they will not be published. And if you want to find out what censorship really is, you ought to get some copies of these censorship lists put out by the major textbook publishers. For example, you know it kind of all depends on which four-lettered words you're against, but in the Macmillan guidelines, the worst word, the one that will not be tolerated in any textbook published by that publisher, is the word "lady." (applause) They won't tolerate it, because it might connote ladylike behavior, and they consider that sexist. And of course, they have blacked out such words as "chairman," and you have to say "chairperson" (applause); and you can't say "founding fathers," you have to say "precurors" (applause); you can't say "brotherhood," you have to say "humanity" (applause); and you can't say "man the sailboats." They really must have choked on giving the alternative for that, they just couldn't quite put it in, but obviously it has to be "person the sailboat."

And then they tell the types of pictures that you can't have: you have to show a man in an apron every time you show a woman in an apron. (applause). You're supposed to use the textbooks to bring about role reversals, and they tell you how, if you really want to get your textbook published, you should have such pictures as showing little girls playing with snakes (laughter), father using hair spray (laughter), mother working at her desk while father does the dishes (sustained shouting and applause), and again, they proceed from the psychology of compulsion. It is a censor-
ship rule. You cannot have the proscribed words or pictures or concepts, else your book won't be published. There isn't any academic freedom to have it different.

Any of these young women, who want to be treated like a man, who think it's their moral obligation to serve equally, are invited to go sign up. The recruiting office has got a welcome mat out for you. They will take you in, they will treat you like man, from the time you wake up in the morning 'til the time you go to bed at night. And you've got your choice. But the compulsion of what the gender-free advocates are asking for is to deny us all of those areas in which we make reasonable differences of treatment.

They all got together a few years ago with five million or so of our federal tax dollars under something called the Commission on International Women's Year. That was the whole leadership of the women's liberation movement, they were all in it — you name it, they were there: all their organizations, all their leaders, all their spokespersons. And they all got together and they got five million dollars of our tax money and they went down to Houston and they had a big consciousness-raising session and they passed a lot of resolutions. And the bottom line of all of them is to use federal money to force us into the society they want. Of course, what they want with the Equal Rights Amendment is a constitutional amendment to prohibit us from making any reasonable differences of treatment between men and women in any federal law, any state law, any regulations at the federal or state level, in anything that's touched by public funding or anything that's touched by the school system, and then, of course, section two of the Equal Rights Amendment would give the final decisionmaking power to the federal government to make it all happen. And that is one of the principal reasons why they are supporting it, and fortunately, they've not been able to get it. They've now had nine years, the ninth anniversary has passed, and they cannot persuade the American people to accept it, for which I'm very grateful.

* * *
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Self Interest and Political Integrity

by Joel Fleishman

If I am not for myself, who will be for me? If I am only for myself, what am I?
— Hillel, Ethics of the Fathers

For the administration of the government, like the office of a trustee, must be conducted for the benefit of those entrusted to one's care not of those to whom it is entrusted.

— Cicero, de Officiis

Watergate has bequeathed to American politics a new legacy of rules to constrain the behavior of politicians and their backers. The first major reform in the laws regulating political activity in a half-century has established a comprehensive set of restrictions that is not diminished in its significance simply because all of the goals of reform have not been attained. We have provided public monies to — and imposed enforceable ceilings on expenditures by — candidates for the presidency, limited the amount individuals and groups can legally give to all federal candidates, greatly extended the scope of public disclosure of contributions and expenditures, and created a federal agency to police the new regulations. We have tightened the laws regulating potential conflicts of interest in actions of government officeholders, and, by “sunshine” and “freedom-of-information” acts, have substantially enlarged the capacity of the public to scrutinize the behavior of its elected and appointed officials. As each new regulation has gone into effect, it has seemed to spawn its own evasions which, at least to the ears of some, cry out for even more regulation.

Many lawmakers, political activists, columnists, and members of the public are beginning to wonder if any end of regulation is really in sight. Unsure of exactly

what the objectives of such political regulation are, and exasperated by our seeming inability to attain such of them as we can agree upon, one hears it said with increasing frequency that a better course of action would be to junk the entire regulatory apparatus — laws, regulations, and regulatory agencies — and focus our energies upon identifying and electing to office public servants of character, men and women of integrity.

Even if that argument is a "cop-out," the subject of political integrity is surely worth examining irrespective of what should or should not be done about diminishing, retaining, or extending the specific regulations governing behavior of politicians or officeholders. If public officials lack integrity, no laws or regulations can infuse them with it, or indeed protect the public from the abuses of trust they feel free to commit, simply because they are without it. Surely, regulation can discourage the most egregious defaults, and does provide at least a modicum of protection to the public's interest, but no regulatory edifice, however far-ranging or minutely detailed, will ever be an adequate substitute for integrity in officials.

Such an assertion is likely to be unexceptionable, at least until we try to define what we mean by "integrity." What is conduct of good character in politics? How does society decide that it is so? What should an individual officeholder do when he is pulled in one direction by what he believes the public interest as a whole requires, and in the opposite direction by his desire to increase his program's budget or get himself a promotion? Wouldn't those who worry about politics be better off if there were some thoughtful discussion of these questions, and if we were able to attain some measure of agreement about what political integrity is, so that persons of pretty-good character, which is to say most people, would have touchstones when they come to hard turnings? In this essay I propose an interpretation of political integrity and attempt to define it in such a way as to make it useful to those who are engaged in politics, whether by voting, running for or serving in office, or otherwise thinking about it from time to time.

Simply put, "integrity" means having a genuine, wholehearted disposition to do the right and just thing in all circumstances, and to shape one's actions accordingly. There is no code of conduct declaring society's view of the right course of action in every situation, so each of us must puzzle out for ourself the moral solution to each dilemma we face. Some people seem to know instinctively what right conduct is, but they do not have a monopoly on integrity. Individuals may also be said to have integrity if their guiding intention is to do what is right, even if they require effort and time to unravel each knotty choice honestly in accordance with that criterion.

If public officials are to have integrity, they must therefore act ethically, insofar as they are able to know what is right, in each circumstance. That is exceedingly hard to do because doing right in politics so often conflicts with doing well. The reason is
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that, at their root, many of the hardest cases in political ethics, just as in ethics in general, are conflicts between self-interest and the interests of others. For their ethical reasons, they require one to weigh the legitimate obligations one has to oneself, against what one owes to others who will be affected by what one proposes to do, and to adopt a calculus for choosing between them when the two sets of obligations clash. And how strenuously and frequently they do clash in political life! For example, every request to an officeholder by a political supporter is such a potential conflict. If the request is for appointment to a particular office, to grant it may or may not serve the public interest. To deny it will surely compromise the supporter’s enthusiasm for the officeholder, and may even turn a supporter into an opponent. Similarly, every time a legislator’s aid is sought by a prior or potential supporter or contributor, the same potential conflict is present.

The essence of politics is the exercise of power over others. Politicians exist because every organized society requires someone to wield that power for its survival and for the implementation of its wishes. Long before Lord Acton distilled his aphorism, politicians and their critics knew the many different faces of power. Some are lured; others repelled. To some, it is the very reason for being in politics, to others only a necessary means of achieving the goals — personal or public or both — that attracted them to politics in the first place. Some, even if only a few, seek political office expressly to turn to their own uses that power over others. A larger group is sometimes tempted to do so. With power the essence of their existence, and with human nature so frail, it should be no source of wonder that many political actors succumb to that temptation.

But ethical dilemmas in public life are more complicated than the simple choice between serving oneself and serving others. Ethical dilemmas in public life nearly always arise in the context of a web of conflicting obligations created by the nature of the political system itself. Whenever one begins to act politically, one implicitly assumes, whether explicitly or not, a range of obligations to institutions, other individuals (who may or may not be politically active), other candidates, other officeholders, and a variety of interest groups, some yet to be born. While not terribly different in kind from the similar network of obligations that any person undertakes upon entering other varieties of continuing relationships — marriage, a particular profession, or an organization of any kind — the political network of obligations is more extensive because it embraces all of the others and then some. In fact, the actions of a political actor affect the lives and well-being of all other citizens who live, or who will live in the future, in the jurisdiction in which he chooses to act politically, and frequently beyond.

In addition, therefore, to the obligations that political actors may legitimately have to themselves, their conscience, their family, their relatives, and their friends,
they also have obligations to a very large number of others. Consider, for example, elected American legislators. When they take the oath of office, they assume obligations to the Constitution, to the laws that may at any moment be on the books even if they seek to alter them, to the principles that animate their political efforts, to the majority views at any particular time on the issues coming before them, to individuals or groups who may be accorded special protection by the Constitution or by statutory law, to their own political supporters, to the members and the formal commitments of their political party, and to persons living in other political jurisdictions.

Obviously, so many obligations are bound to clash, and it is in such clashes that dilemmas are created for political actors. The obligations to which politicians give priority in such clashes tell much about the kind of people they are. For while such an intricate web of obligations indeed entails choices that are more complicated than choosing between oneself and others, it is surprising to note how most of them do boil down to that choice in the end. A "reputational survey" of some sixty present and former members of Congress to identify the characteristics of those among their colleagues whom they regarded as ethical exemplars suggests the following conclusions.

Whether political actors have integrity is determined by how they solve conflicts among competing obligations, and the key ingredient of political integrity is the extent to which persons give undue weight to their self-interest in reconciling them. To the extent that they are influenced by how particular reconciliations will affect their own career, wealth, or well-being — to the extent, in other words, that they are dominantly motivated by self-interest — the less political integrity they have. It follows, then, that any particular decision determined by the self-interest of a public official should be described as unethical. Whether the influence of self-interest on political action is the only determinant of political integrity is considered elsewhere. For our discussion here, suffice it to say that it is the central one.

Is this, then, to suggest that there is no legitimate space for self-interest in a politician of integrity? Obviously not, as we shall see. For the moment, however, this can be said. I do not refer here to self-interest in its ultimate or generic sense. For example, the pursuit of excellence in any field of endeavor — art, science, literature, or politics — is powered by a yearning for satisfaction in the pursuer; seeking that satisfaction is self-interested behavior at the most fundamental level, simply because it gratifies the self. To deny that self-interest would be to deny the basic spring of the most laudable of human action.

There is a less profound sense, too, in which self-interest may activate politicians of integrity. That is behavior that genuinely serves the interests of others, but is regarded by some philosophers as self-interested because it springs from the actor's
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preference for satisfaction through altruism rather than direct self-gratification. One might very well believe that an important goal for a civilized politics, as well as perhaps civilization itself, would be to increase the number of citizens and politicians who are self-interested in this sense.

But there is also a mundane sense of self-interest which may be tolerable in politicians of integrity. That is, to borrow from the law, what we might call for now an ordinary, reasonable, prudent degree of self-interest. We might define that as the amount of self-interest the public would find tolerable, perhaps even praiseworthy, and, in fact, the absence of which the public would find incredible in a human being, whether in politics or not. The task of distinguishing between this ethical form of self-interest and that which we would condemn as being unsuitable conduct for a public official of integrity would require more space than is available here. It seems enough, for now, simply to justify the self-interest criterion as useful, even if more work is needed in order to define it exactly.

* * *

Is There a Future for Liberalism?
by Daniel Yankelovich

Everybody in my type of work, sooner or later after you've been involved in it for a few years, has to be impressed by the fact that the center of gravity in American politics really does lie at the dead center of the political spectrum. Those people who consider themselves liberal, who define themselves as liberal, who espouse the ideas that have dominated the American political scene since the 1930s, have never throughout this almost half century represented more than a minority of the electorate. If you ask people today whether they consider themselves liberal or moderate or conservative, about 15 or 16 percent define themselves as liberals. In the ’70s it was 17–18 percent, and throughout the ’40s, ’50’s and ’60’s, it was in the 22 to 25% range, and the normal distribution was 25% liberal, 50% moderate, and 25% conservative. That shifted somewhat, but that’s been roughly the pattern over the years.

This excerpt is from the remarks of Daniel Yankelovich, president of the polling firm of Yankelovich, Skelly and White, who spoke in the Forum on October 6, 1980.
But I think that the term “liberal consensus” has been a correct one, and it derives from the fact that for several generations certain key ideas set forth by this liberal minority from the left of center made sense to the center, and were provisionally accepted by them as long as they delivered the goods. The goals of the liberal consensus revolved around economic growth, full employment, reduction of poverty, greater equality of opportunity, and these were endorsed by virtually all Americans. I would single out particularly four ideological elements of the liberal consensus that were means to this goal, and that never were as clearly understood, or as wholeheartedly accepted by the center of gravity of the American electorate, as the goals themselves were. First, a doctrine of social justice that maintains that basic human needs should be mapped as a matter of right and entitlement: the right not to go hungry, the right not to be excluded from education or health care simply because you couldn’t afford it. Secondly, a special concern for the vulnerable of society: the victims, the sick, the blind, mental patients, the old and the poor, disadvantaged, minorities. Third, an activist government in relationship to the private sector, to guarantee those rights by means of legislation and regulation, and a system of moderately progressive taxation, that in effect redistributed some wealth. And fourth, a belief in spending, as such: spending for social welfare for the vulnerable, spending for economic growth, spending for improving the quality of life — a kind of expansiveness and risk taking and energizing effect that is this element of activism.

During these past two generations, these doctrines were embodied in certain specific programs of legislation endorsed by 70 to 80% majorities, which is, in this country, an operational definition of consensus. The liberal minority believed in these elements as principles, the center accepted them because it made sense under the prevailing conditions, and because the goods were delivered. Now the reason I make a point about this distinction between the liberal proposals and public acceptance is that with each passing year there is less and less acceptance of key elements of the liberal doctrine, effectively separating the liberal minority from its centrist constituency. So that what you have is the sets of points of view that are still held by this minority who consider themselves liberal, but are no longer bought, as it were, no longer endorsed by the center.

Now, the second point that I want to make, which is also obvious, and also tends to be easily overlooked, is that some of our most serious problems today come not from the failure of the liberal consensus, but from its spectacular success. Jonathan Moore of the Institute of Politics was kind enough to send me the other day the transcript of the Godkin lectures that Shirley Williams, former member of British Parliament, and former minister of Education in the Labor party, gave this spring. And it includes a doughty defense of the liberal consensus, where Mrs. Williams
utterly rejects the idea that our present problems are due to the failure of "the pro-
gressive liberal generation." "On the contrary," she says, "the liberal consensus
brought the best generation ever seen by the ordinary man and woman in the
western world." She credits the liberal consensus with several massive ac-
complishments, pointing out that between World War II and 1974 there was no year
in which there was not an improvement in the standard of living of the average man
and woman. She points with pride to the reduction of primary poverty, and the
establishment of pensions and health service and other benefits, and other forms of
security. She points to the extension of opportunities through the expansion of
higher education, home ownership, and consumer goods, and she speaks of "a
widening of opportunities and a narrowing of differentials in the quality of life that
has never been seen before." She points to the stable economic conditions and in-
sstitutions within a Keynesian economic framework that worked for a very long
period of time.

I would simply point out that from social research you can see an impressive
documentation of what she's saying as reflected in people's attitudes in this way: last
year, two of your most distinguished sociologists, Davis and Rainwater, published a
book called Social Standing in America and their findings show that some 90% of
the American public feel that they are better off than their parents were, and that
subdivides into 60% who feel that they have a higher social standing, and 31% who
feel they have the same social standing but they're living better.

My own data shows almost the same pattern. I find 80% of the public who say
that they're not happier than their parents, necessarily; they're not necessarily better
people, they say, emphatically; but they feel that they have more choice, that
they're better off, that they have more control over their lives, which they do not
want to give up. I think that is one of the central political facts of this time. People
feel on the one hand, "well, we've just made it, we've just got it, and we don't want
to give it up," and on the other hand, they are truly afraid that they're being asked to
give it up.

So you have 62% of the public who feel that the standard of living that they have
achieved is the highest that they will be able to and that their children will not be as
well off as they, contrary to their experience with their parents, and an overwhelm-
ing 72% who say, "well, this land of plenty is now becoming a land of want." So
you have this profound ambivalence on the part of people who feel that thanks to
the sacrifice of their parents they're better off, that they have more choice, and they
want to hold on to it; and at the same time you have this terrifying fear that they're
going to have to give it up. And it's in that climate of ambivalence and fear that this
election campaign is being run.
Equality: An Appropriate Goal for the Black American?
from the Cox Lecture Series

DR. GLENN LOURY: I think there are actions that Blacks might take to seek equality that are not wise actions to take within the context of the political reality in which we find ourselves. Pragmatism of this kind isn't popular, especially in one's university years, but I find it necessary as time goes on in sorting out the world. Let me try to justify this a bit. History notwithstanding, I believe that the principle that people be treated procedurally equally is the first principle, is a prior principle to the principle that equal outcomes be achieved. And I think that that principle, while it's important to everyone in a free society, is most important to Blacks and others of like circumstance. The reason is that, as everyone knows in recent months, political fashions shift. You can be in today and out tomorrow. It can be popular to march and support your cause and very unpopular to support your cause tomorrow. History is replete with this lesson. We ignore it only at our peril. Thus, establishing principles that are widely shared by all members of a society becomes of fundamental importance to those people who might be likely to find themselves out at some point. So it's for that reason that procedural principles must take priority in whatever intellectual framework buttresses political action of Blacks in this country.

There's another sense in which I think that doing anything in order to achieve equality might be a risky and not appropriate action. And that is that there is a danger, I think, of Black people, of the underclass of which we've talked, finding themselves in a situation of shifting the responsibility for its circumstance, for its behaviors, onto the State, or on to "the man," or on to the system. I'm not ignoring the fact that people's circumstances are determined by systemic influence, I'm not making that naive mistake. But I want to . . . assert that Black people in this country are basically free. That doesn't say there doesn't exist injustice; that says that you

This article contains excerpts from the remarks of two of the speakers in the first Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series panel discussion, held in the Forum on March 5, 1981. Co-sponsored by the Institute and several other campus organizations, the Cox Lectures were organized by the Black Caucus of the Kennedy School Student Association to "precipitate greater intellectual awareness of legitimate Black-oriented perspectives on the role and effects of public policy." Glenn C. Loury is Professor of Economics at the University of Michigan. William A. Darrity is an Associate Professor of Economics at the University of Texas at Austin.
basically have the wherewithal to formulate and pursue your own life plan. Therefore there is an importance in recognizing the potentials of that freedom. Now, again, there are many examples of oppression. I think that the experience of Blacks in American society constitutes one such example. I think it’s also easily demonstrated that it’s not the leading or most outstanding example of that oppression, but I’m not interested in making that comparison.

The point I want to make is that the existence of oppression is a fact of life. The existence of racism is a fact of life. I see no trend suggesting that racism in American society will go away. Therefore, pragmatic action suggests formulating a plan in light of those facts. The doing of that requires a sense of individuality, a center, a sense of command over the events that affect your life. It is not to assert that “systemic influence is necessarily condemning me to poverty” in a circumstance where you’re basically free — that is, basically free to go out and do something, not basically free to be protected from all possible negative things. People are going to swindle you, people are not going to like you, and they won’t like you to live next door to them. But you are basically free to pursue your life’s plan. To abdicate that responsibility is a kind of existential escape from freedom, a kind of bad faith. And I would just like to close by observing in light of that, that strategies which are grounded on the observation that inequality between Blacks cannot go away until such other things are done as to make America a fit and just society, while perhaps harboring more than a grain of truth, [make me] concerned about the possibility in the long run that they might be destructive of those individual qualities that could potentially override a negative circumstance.

DR. WILLIAM DARRITY: We have three great social classes in modern society: the managerial class, the capitalist class, and the working class. When I refer to a class I do not refer to it in the Weberian sense of income, of occupational categories, but by the functional position of the group in the process of social reproduction. And from the perspectives of the managers, both capital and the working class must be managed or contained for the general social good. Social welfare functions and idealizations of pluralist Democracy epitomize managerial thinking on conflict containment. The Reagan presidency represents a resurgence of the capitalist class: the reassertion of pure big business politics, an effort on capital’s part to reassert control over the managerial class by curbing its agency of independent action, the government. For reasons I won’t pursue here, the reassertion of capitalist control is likely to be temporary, hence the character of U.S. society, I will argue, is predominantly managerial.
Comparable class divisions exist within the Black community. They are more pronounced because of the relative smallness of the Black elite. There are two components to the Black elite: first, a Black managerial class as a subordinate adjunct to the White managerial class. This constitutes the Black professionals whose task is largely the supervision or management of the Black masses. The second component of the Black elite are the Black businessmen who comprise small Black capitalists, and if you take the two groups together you get about five to seven percent of the Black population as a whole. The remainder of the Black population is of working class status, and that is the overwhelming majority of the Black population. The divisions do correspond to income inequalities within the Black community, although as I said that's not the class conception that I'm attempting to use. Within the Black working class the most desperate group is viewed with some accuracy by William Wilson's term, "the underclass".

Now both factions of the Black elite want equality. But the managers espouse Black liberalism and look forward to a new age of equality within managerial society, while the petit Black capitalists look backward to the dying age and want equality within bourgeois society. In both cases it means ascendency of a small few while the rest of the Black community sinks deeper into despair. Perhaps a plague should be visited on both of their houses and start fresh with guidance and direction coming from below rather than from above. Racial equality thus becomes a class-specific ideology that serves both elements of the Black elite in preserving their position at the top of the Black community. The advocacy of a Black presence in a formerly all-white corporate world follows directly from this ideological perspective. The tragedy in all of this is that it is at best a pretense that these advances propel all Blacks forward. They do not. Racial equality has been a slogan attached to programs for development of the Black elite, creating more middle class Blacks in the vernacular, and not a program for the advancement of the Black masses. Neither the managerial program nor the bourgeois path appears to represent the dominant sentiments of the Black working class. Only that class can define the valid content of the Black struggle.

And the last things I want to say are the following, because no one else is going to say these things. The managerial path idealizes the attainment of an ostensibly pure meritocracy: social hierarchy based upon selection by the sheer ability of individuals or individual quality. The contradiction they're confronted with in promoting affirmative action is that they're stuck with a selection process that suggests that they're inferior from the outset. To challenge this idealization of a meritocracy is to challenge the ideological thrust of managerial society, to challenge its tendency to sort people between desirables and undesirables. After all, for some to have merit, others must not. Some must remain outside salvation and they will not be among
the chosen few, they will reside among the unelect. The bourgeois path idealizes the
attainment of a pure wealth hierarchy, a social hierarchy based on possession of
money. But for some to be capitalists, others must be unable to become capitalists,
and they too must remain outside salvation.

Now the dangers are deep if we stay on this course. Pursuing the dream of being
equal racially within society is based in a fundamental way upon inequality in
power between classes. Unless the Black elite can subordinate itself to the will of the
Black masses, I fear we will have open class warfare within the Black community.
The Black working class will eventually shove the Black elite aside. As class distance
widens, the ominous days are approaching. Rudolf Borro writes, "When contact
with those below is broken, the hour of rebellion is not far off." The further promo­
tion of strategies to develop the Black elite only hastens that hour. Will we be able to
avoid an imminent Black holocaust? The central problem is one that I can't answer.
But we can recognize that the class position of Blacks who have been dubbed leaders
has created or promoted this critical problem. Their class interests have prevented
them from criticizing their own actions. Black scholars like E. Franklin Frazer and
Oliver Cox, after whom this lecture series is named, warned us about all of this
years ago, and we have to start to listen.

* * *
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Religion and Politics
from a panel discussion

DR. WILLIAM MARSHNER: There has been, within the last 20 years perhaps, a significant shift in the social consensus or public orthodoxy upon which our society rests. As recently as a generation ago it was taken for granted that a central part of the public orthodoxy or social consensus of the United States was Biblical in origin, what are broadly referred to as Judeo-Christian principles. It was part of the moral conformity of the '50s that these matters could be taken for granted. In recent years, however, there has been a shift in this consensus. The attempt has risen to base American society on a set of agreed principles which have no substantive moral content at all. The attempt has been made to suppose that American society can rest purely on a consensus which deals with procedural matters. We will agree to disagree peacefully even about the most burning and passionate and deeply held and intimate moral issues, we will agree to reconcile all our differences through the ballot box, period, end of consensus. The argument has been made that we can have, even on fundamental or moral matters, a kind of tolerated, indeed celebrated, pluralism in our nation. And I submit that there is no social science of any kind which backs up the proposition that a society can remain, exist, produce and grow stably on that thin a public orthodoxy. We think that there is no alternative for our country but to move to one or another social consensus. Either we are going to go back to a social consensus which has more of our historic and traditional Christian elements in it, Judeo-Christian elements, I should say, or else, we are going to go in another direction and develop a social consensus which is explicitly secularist, explicitly what I call therapeutic liberalism.

Therapeutic liberalism is a mutation of the old liberalism. The old liberalism was primarily an economic ideology which was interested in redistributing the wealth in certain ways, interested in levelling out some of the inequalities in the society. Current liberalism, therapeutic liberalism, is the conviction that social ills can be cured by a battery of manipulative social and psychological techniques. It is the belief that the so-called helping professions, especially social workers, are able to improve people's lives in important ways by changing their values, by giving them something

This excerpt is from a panel discussion entitled "Religion and Politics," sponsored by the Student Advisory Committee in the Forum, April 6, 1981. The two panelists excerpted are William Marshner, Professor of Theology, Christendom College, and Paul Deatz, Professor of Social Ethics, Boston University.
more like the values of the typical upper-class secularist. We think that that latter possibility for the new American social consensus will be fatal. There is no evidence that therapeutic liberalism works, there is no evidence that people are better off psychologically or socially, or in any other way after they have had more and better orgasms.

So there has been a mutation of liberalism; it is this very mutation of liberalism which has called our movement into existence. If there had not been massive programs in the public school system to use the public school system to inculcate a new secular humanist ideology, very few of the Christian voters who turned out in such interestingly record numbers in 1980 would have in fact turned out. It was on the alteration of the content of public schooling, it was the judicial imposition of liberalized abortion on the country, that for the most part had not accepted it legislatively, and a number of similar things, which produced this Christian movement, really a Judeo-Christian movement, more or less out of the woodwork. People became energized when they saw that the moral consensus they believed to exist in this country was in fact rapidly being replaced by one with which they could not live. All sorts of dangers to the survival and religious liberties of ecclesiastical institutions are in the offing and why? Because significant sections of our governing bureaucracy thought that there was a new vision, a new hope for man, that Christianity as a matter of fact, was dangerous to the human person, that it is a repressive thing that needs to be replaced by some better vision of humanity. It was that warfare against us which called us forth, so here we are.

PROFESSOR PAUL DEATZ: I was invited here to speak tonight as a liberal, I'm still going to speak as a liberal, neither as an economic one, nor a therapeutic one, because I will try to define some of my terms. I'm a religious liberal insofar as that means that I exercise my religious faithfulness in a self-critical and not a self-righteous manner, and I'm casting no aspersions — that's defining what I try to do. I discovered in Latin America that I was an evangelical, insofar as I understand the gospel of Jesus Christ to be good news, of liberation for the poor and oppressed. I have tried for 25 or 30 years to get some kind of working relationship between my religious convictions and my political involvement.

You can tell by my accent that I'm the only native here, and I wanted to welcome these people from out of town, and Lieutenant Governor, if you stay around, we may have an office that we'll open up for you, if you just give us a chance here, okay? But my welcome in all seriousness is not just to Boston, to Cambridge, not just to politics here, but it's also particularly to Ed and Bill, welcome to political participation. We're glad you came out of the woodwork. I'm convinced, as George is,
that democracy rests on the informed participation of those who are governed, and we suffer from the fact that too few of us voted in the last two elections, and so we welcome you. But you belong in politics. You belong in politics because your political judgement should be influenced by your faith in your religious Lord. You belong here also because it is your right and your duty to make religious informed views available to your members and available to other persons in our political process, and it's right and proper that you should seek to influence a person into how you feel in favor of or against certain legislation.

Now, that doesn't mean we're going to roll over and play dead. We're not going to say the rules will be changed. You will find some of us disagreeing with you on positions; on interpretations of God's will; on which side of legislation we ought to place ourselves. I agree with the evangelicals for social action that there are certain Biblical principles which have profound importance for politics, and I guess I have to say I think they have profound importance for all politics. It's not certain things which are left out because they are not entailed by St. Paul, but it seems to me these Biblical principles have to come to terms with all of the issues that come up in politics...

I find myself genuinely puzzled by the apparent inconsistency of those fundamen­talists, and others who use them, who decry the exercise of government power, who argue that government has no role in securing economic justice, or in protecting civil rights, but have no qualms about the growth of government through increased defense spending, which makes us not beloved throughout this earth, but feared by some of the poor and most oppressed peoples of the world. In this regard, I am deeply concerned that the new Christian right seems preoccupied with building barriers, with separating us right-thinking Christians from "them," whoever they are, whether "them" is a domestic enemy — holding office, running a school — or a foreign enemy — much more interested in imposing negative and punitive judgements. What I understand to be the real heart of the gospels lies in breaking down the barriers that divide human beings, reconciling our differences, not overcoming our enemies, but overcoming the enmity which divides us. And I say this in the hope that, as you move in to the political process, we can talk with you in political debates as well as in church arenas, that you will join some of us and help us understand what genuine reconciliation means, because that's what this country and this world needs today.

* * *
Peony
by Robin Morgan

What appears to be
this frozen explosion of petals
abristle with extremist beauty
like an entire bouquet on a single stem
or a full chorus creamy-robed rippling
to its feet for the sanctus—
is after all a flower,
perishable, with a peculiar
history. Each peony
blossoms only after
the waxy casing thick around
its tight green bud is eaten literally
away by certain small herbivorous ants
who swarm round the stubborn rind
and nibble gently for weeks to release
the implosion called a flower. If
the tiny coral-colored ants have been
destroyed, the bloom cannot unfist itself
no matter how carefully forced to umbrage
by the finest hothouse gardeners.

Unrecognized, how recognizable:

Each of us nibbling discreetly
to release the flower,
usually not even knowing
the purpose—only the hunger;

---

Robin Morgan, Editor of Ms. magazine, was the featured artist at a special session of Marilyn Waring's student study group, entitled "Going Even Further — A Night of Women's Culture," held in the Forum on April 13, 1981. This is the last of the several poems she read.
each mostly unaware of any others,
sometimes surprised by a neighbor,
sometimes (so rarely) astonished
by a glimpse into one corner
at how many of us there are;

enough to cling, at least, swarm back,
remain, whenever we’re shaken
off or drenched away
by the well-meaning gardener, ignorant
as we are of our mission, of our being
equal in and to the task.

Unequal to the task: a word
like “revolution,” to describe
what our drudge-cheerful midwifery
will bring to bear—with us not here
to see it, satiated, long since
rinsed away, the job complete.

Why then do I feel this tremble,
more like a contraction’s aftermath
release, relax, relief
than like an earthquake; more
like a rustling in the belly,
or the resonance a song might make
en route from brain to larynx—
as if now, here, unleaving itself of all
old and unnecessary outer layers

    butterfly from chrysalis
    snake from cast skin
    crustacean from shell
    baby from placenta

something alive before
only in Anywoman’s dreamings
begins to stretch, arch, unfold
each vein on each transparency opening proud,
unique, unduplicate,
each petal stiff with tenderness,
each gauzy wing a different shading flecked
ivory silver tangerine moon cinnamon amber flame
hosannas of lucidity and love in a wild riot,
a confusion of boisterous order
all fragrance, laughter, tousled celebration—
only a fading streak like blood
at the center, to remind us we were there once.

but are still here, who dare
tenacious to nibble toward such blossoming
of this green stubborn bud
some call a world.

* * *
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The Personal Side of the Institute

The Fellows Reflect
Institute Fellowship Evaluations

Susan B. King
For most political people, the only sabbatical ever available is the rude kind in which one suddenly finds oneself out on the street. Enter the Institute, which is unique in American political life in recognizing the activists' particular need for time off and time out. This program only underscores the wisdom of those businesses or professions which do allow an opportunity for contemplation and renewal at a different pace and in a different environment. Perhaps not everyone will view being a Fellow as an appropriate career goal, but it certainly was something I had aspired to for a long time, and, I hope, for the right reasons. My semester was a rich and stimulating experience, and a growing experience which provided time not just for thought but also for serious self-questioning... priorities, values and long term objectives.

Chase Untermeyer
In the time-line of my life, this fellowship will be seen as a neat middle step between active involvement as a grassroots politician in Texas and as George Bush's assistant in the White House. As such it was the ideal way to brush up on national and international issues and to meet a variety of people, all of which will make the personal transition to Washington an easier and more fruitful one. But when I applied for and received the fellowship, this special opportunity (as preparation for working in Washington) was only a daydream. Then — and still today — the fellowship was a means of gloriously retreating from the workaday world of politics back home for a few months, recharging my spiritual and intellectual ions for a prospectively tumultuous session of the Texas Legislature in 1981 and a long and unpleasant Republican primary campaign in some new district in 1982. Practically every day of the fall prior to 2 December (when I met with the Vice President-elect

These excerpts are from evaluations written by five of the Institute's Fellows from this past year. Consult the section on Institute Fellows for biographical details.
in Washington), I reminded myself to enjoy every minute of what I was doing, for I would no doubt look back with yearning for it when locked in the midst of a long, dull debate on the House floor. Depending on how well or ill the new administration does in Washington, I am equally confident these past few weeks will seem sweet — as indeed they were.

Patricia Keefer

The IOP fellowship will certainly be one of the most broadening and enriching experiences of any four month period of my life. I found the fellowship to contain the appropriate balance of intellectual stimulation, an enhancement of my political perspective and a challenge to personal growth. Not only am I appreciative of what I obtained from this experience but I am also enthusiastic about what I was able to share with others.

The one disconcerting aspect of the last four months was the institutional and attitudinal discrimination towards women within the Kennedy School. It is obvious in the faculty, student body, staffing, cases, and the public and private events. It is extremely disturbing for an institution that wants to be on the cutting edge of public policy in this country. For me personally, it was an exposure that I had very rarely encountered in politics and public interest associations and resulted in the development of some very definite feminist sensitivities.

Robert Manning

In my case the four-month interlude was a God-sent opportunity to pause and contemplate a major change of career after 16 years of editing The Atlantic Monthly. In addition to the established parts of the Fellowship program, the traffic in and out of the Institute and the mingling with faculty and students at the Kennedy School adds immensely to the excitement. Perhaps I did not venture as far as I might profitably have done beyond the Institute and Kennedy School activities, but that is for the very good reason that so much nourishment could be found in that one building.

Marilyn Waring

I made it quite clear, selfishly at the outset, that I had waited 5½ - 6 years for this four months, that there were many ideological bridges I had come to in my work as a Member of Parliament that I had not been able to cross because I had not taken time out to think them through.

My invitation to the Study Group was that they could come along while I tried to thrash myself by fair means or foul across those bridges. The task I set myself led to a global examination of the dominant theories of economic, philosophic and
religious oppression of women; to examination of how these theories of oppression work in practice; to a celebration of how and when we are different and what we have to offer, in the Women's Culture Night; and to the tactics one adopts to survive and use the system on behalf of other women, and for the betterment of us all.

I think it would be fair to say that Study Group participants found this a radicalising experience. It pushed their minds to areas that they had previously been afraid to go. It dared them to ask the questions they had only thought about before. It dared them to question everything. It reassured them that in their thoughts that they were not alone and that there were millions who shared the indignities and intimidations that they felt.

* * *

A Columnist Looks at the Institute

by Nick Thimmesch

At the Institute, within the past month, 43 freshly elected members of Congress were briefed on policy issues by professors and former congressmen; the key technicians in the Reagan, Carter, and Anderson campaigns conferred to analyze the decisions they made and how they affected the election outcome; Donald Hewitt, producer of CBS' "60 Minutes," spoke on how that program "makes reality as popular as make-believe"; Ernest Stern, senior vice president of the World Bank, lectured on the recycling of petro-dollars and on underdeveloped nations; a panel discussion on the Massachusetts' version of 'Proposition 13" was moderated by that droll liberal, John Kenneth Galbraith; and a transition study, the third to be prepared by the Institute, was delivered to President-elect Ronald Reagan.

So it goes at the Institute, now a part of the larger John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. Week after week, Republicans, Democrats, Andersonites and Libertarians, liberals, conservatives, moderates, Zionists,

---

Nick Thimmesch was an Institute Fellow in the Fall of 1980 and has a nationally syndicated column with the Los Angeles Times Syndicate. This piece is excerpted from his column of December 31, 1980.
Palestinians, businessmen, labor leaders, journalists, elected and unelected officials, those for and against abortion, diplomats, militants, gays, lesbians and straights parade in and out of events and classes sponsored by the Institute.

The original mandate was for the Institute to bring the practitioners of politics into engagement with the scholars of politics. "To do this," says Director Jonathan Moore, "we must make academic resources and product available to those on the firing line, and, at the same time, bring the practitioners and their problems in here. Then we at Harvard become more realistic and less Ivory Towerish."

In its first years, there was, understandably, a strong Kennedy aura at the Institute. After all, it was the first department at Harvard named after a donor, although the $10 million endowment was virtually all donated by admirers of J.F.K. A Harvard official admitted that it was unusual to name a school for an individual, but added: "It is unusual to have a Harvard graduate assassinated while serving as president..."

Today, there is less Kennedy aura at the Institute than across-the-board discussion and probing of the entire American political system. The budget has grown to $1 million, three-fourths of it endowment earnings, and the rest raised each year. A host of bright Harvard students work free in developing the program, and the Harvard faculty also performs gratis.

Nowadays, Director Moore is busy trying to establish a "Press-Politics Center" at the Institute. "The press is ubiquitous, powerful, intervening and terribly influential," he says. "It is a juggernaut which doesn't know the effect it has on politics, and people in the political process don't fully understand it. We would like to establish major research programs in the media."

And away they go. Those Institute of Politics people (only 12 on staff) never stop, perhaps, because politics never stops.

* * *
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An Intern's Experience
by Maxine Pfeffer

I walked inside, a little hesitantly at first, not knowing quite what to expect. Was Ralph going to appear in his eternal blue suit and quiz me on the merits of airbags? Was George Riley, who was to supervise my project at the Center for Study of Responsive Law, serious when he joked about my “leaving so early” as I walked out at 8:30 P.M. that first night? I found myself, several days later, desperately wading through piles of information unselfishly provided by, it seemed, everyone in the office. After a week I still didn’t know what to expect. I was, however, fast coming to live in a world different from any I had previously known.

Though much of the work done by Nader employees is done in isolation from other members of the same group, the physical nature of the Center counteracts that tendency towards segregated labor. Partitions create individual spaces, yet sound penetrates wherever there is air. Subsequently, one learns not only from one’s own reading and research but is exposed (in accordance with or against one’s will) to everything else going on in the office, from television shows being taped and people being interviewed to the speeches being rehearsed and direct action campaigns being organized. The atmosphere most closely parallels that of a newsroom where people consider it part of their jobs to know what’s going on everywhere and are simultaneously engaged in diffusing that knowledge so that it can be effectively used. The lack of privacy, therefore, transforms what could be a very solitary experience to a more engaging and cooperative one.

The organizational or administrative structure of the Center also contributes to the development of a heightened awareness and appreciation of other people’s activities. Because there is virtually no secretarial help, interns and staff prepare their own papers, order supplies, make their own xerox copies and naturally coffee, in addition to writing, researching, and publishing books and articles, testifying before congressional subcommittees, lobbying, and making their case for more money to Ralph. People are forced to take responsibility for their projects from beginning to end. In the process one realizes the extent to which we depend on others to do the things we least like to do. An intern or staff member at the Center learns to appreciate human versatility, and to recognize our ability to accomplish that which we

Max Pfeffer, ’81, received a Summer Internship Stipend from the Institute to support her during her work at the Center for the Study of Responsive Law in Washington, DC, during the summer of 1980. This article is excerpted from her evaluation of that experience.
were not specifically trained to achieve. Though opposing the trend towards increased specialization may sometimes be inefficient (as is attested by the two-year-old letter that lies at the bottom of a three-foot-high pile of Ralph's mail in the front office), it also provides a unique opportunity for personal growth and development.

Whether or not a total commitment to one's job must, should, or can be sustained over long periods of time, as has Ralph Nader's, can be questioned in a classroom. It cannot, however, be answered there. The response can be fairly derived only through experience. Part of that experience necessitates foregoing the benefits of better pay and more free time in favor of consciously recognizing the limits of personal need. One should not live to make money, but should instead make money to live. Not only was the writing, lobbying, organizing and researching which I did worth its opportunity cost in terms of another, better paying job, but being forced to bring one's desires into line with one's needs makes one think twice about goals that are often taken for granted in our society. The money provided to me by the Institute and the small stipend from the Center was just about enough to live on. The necessity of living within limited means was part of the experience which really can't be considered apart from the formal aspects of the job itself. It was not a matter of self-deprivation but of becoming aware of what is necessary and important and what is not.

In addition to coming to know a little more about the public interest network and the lifestyle of many who are part of it, I completed a report on hydroelectric power in Southwest Tasmania; wrote two sections of a book profiling the 1980 Presidential candidates; and wrote a book on the problems of the elderly, how food cooperatives can help solve some of those problems, and what can be done to develop such cooperatives.

The last project, one which I proposed to the Center, involved a short trip to food cooperatives in the New England and Middle Atlantic states in addition to research done in Washington libraries. It involved meeting and talking to people I would never have otherwise met, from Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, and Binghamton, New York, from Ann Arbor, Michigan and San Jose, California. It involved exposing my ideas to the criticism of those I was trying to help and those who had years of cooperative experience. It meant becoming not merely a competent writer, but a good rewriter. But more than concrete products or the acquisition of new skills, I came back to Harvard with renewed sense of the importance and potential for the survival of democratic government if individual and collective responsibility is encouraged. I am currently doing a thesis on the viability of consumer cooperatives as an alternative form of business organization in the United States.

Attending Harvard and Radcliffe requires an adjustment of the perspective that accompanied high school life. But too often in that realigned world we forget that
we retain the ability to change the institution and the perspective necessarily adopted to become a part of it. The people at the Center believe in the power of the individual to control the environment. And, they are aware of the importance of collective decisions in structuring the use and awareness of that power. Working with them reminds one of the impact of such decisions on one's own life and of the capacity for more effective control over them.

No one but Ralph has lived at the Center very long. His assistant is only twenty-six years old. And, indeed I don't think I could spend more than a few years there. That is not to say, however, that devoting one's life to such an organization is not worthwhile. It is to admit that the degree of personal commitment it requires is contrary to habits built up in most people since their birth. In part, the transience of the staff reflects the Center's inability to universalize its message of responsibility. Most people cannot understand or appreciate the level of Ralph Nader's commitment to principle, nor can they comprehend working for $30 a week, even if that's all you need to live on in addition to what you already have. If too much time is spent laboring within the walls that divide the Center from the outside world, not enough will be spent on breaking down those walls. People will continue to behave as subjects rather than citizens, while a few, isolated and apart from the rest, fail to see the puzzle they present to those they are trying to reach.
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"The Soviet Threat: Five Views"
Robert Bathurst, consultant and writer; Associate, Russian Research Center, Harvard University

Guests:
Commander Steven Kime, Assistant Dean, National War College
Ni Shi-Hiong, Professor of International Relations, University of Shanghai, China
Raju Thomas, Research Fellow, Center for Science and International Affairs
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Robert Carr, U.S. Representative (D-Michigan)
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The Student Program
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Gary Orren, Associate Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Catherine Mackin, ABC News
Tom Pettit, NBC News
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Jules Whitcover, The Washington Star
Rick Stearns, Chief of Delegate Selection, Kennedy for President
Steven Stockmeyer, Executive Director, Republican Congressional Campaign Committee

"An Imperial Judiciary? Entry of the Courts into the Preserves of Government"
Levin H. Campbell, U.S. Court of Appeals Judge for the First Circuit, Boston

Guests:

Herbert Gleason, attorney
James Breedon, Senior Officer, Massachusetts Office of Planning
John Leubsdorf, Professor of Law, Boston University
Nathan Glazer, Professor of Education and Sociology, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Linda Glenn, Assistant Massachusetts Commissioner for Mental Retardation
Boisfeuillet Jones, Vice President and Counsel, The Washington Post
Stephen Rosenfeld, former Assistant Attorney General, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Ellen Schall, Deputy Commissioner of Corrections for Program and Legal Policy, New York
Clarence Sundram, Chairman, Commission of the Quality of Care for the Disabled, New York
Alvin Bronstein, Director, National Prison Project, American Civil Liberties Union
Paul Garrity, Associate Justice, Massachusetts Superior Court

"Literature and Politics: All The King's Men and American Populism"
Robert Coles, Professor of Psychiatry and Medical Humanities, Harvard Medical School

No guests
"Decision-Making in the Field of Economic Policy"

Robert Eisenmenger, Senior Vice-President and Director of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston

Guests:
- Richard Syron, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury
- Richard Manley, President, Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation
- Robert Kuttner, Editor, Working Papers for a New Society
- Lois Pines, Regional Director, Federal Trade Commission
- Christopher Hill, Center for Policy Alternatives
- Frank Morris, President, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
- Gerald Corrigan, President, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis
- Frederick Salvucci, former Secretary of Transportation, Massachusetts
- Kenneth Guscott, President, Ken Guscott Associates
- Philip Herr, Associate Professor of Planning, Department of Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

"African Diplomacy in the 1980's: Problems and Prospects"

Major General Joseph N. Garba, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former Foreign Minister of Nigeria

Guests:
- Jean Herskovits, Professor of History, State University of New York at Purchase
- B.A. Clark, Nigerian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations
- J. Victor Gbeho, Ghanian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations
- Robert Hoen, former Vice-President of Chase Manhattan Bank, African Region

"Women and Third World Development"

Natalie D. Hahn, Ph.D. candidate, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University; Women's Program Officer for the Middle East and Africa, Food and Agricultural Organization, United Nations

Guests:
- Kathleen Newland, Senior Researcher, Worldwatch Institute
- May Rihani, Director of the Secretariat for Women in Development, New Transcendence Foundation
- Nadia Youssef, Research Director, International Center for Women
- Kaval Gulhati, President, Center for Population Studies
- Sabiha Syed, Deputy Secretary, Women's Division—Cabinet Secretariat, Government of Pakistan (Karachi)
Pierre Adossama, Director, International Labor Organization to the United Nations
Nancy Barrett, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor
Joyce Miller, Vice President, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union
Adrienne Germain, Program Officer, Office of the Vice-President, International Division, Ford Foundation
John T. Dunlop, Lamont University Professor, Harvard University
Constantina Saflios-Rothchild, Visiting Senior Associate, Population Council
Jane Threatt, President, American Rural Women
Roger Ernst, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, University of Hawaii
Abe Weisblatt, Director of Research and Training Network, Agricultural Development Council, New York
Elise Boulding, Chair, Department of Sociology, Dartmouth College
Mary King, Deputy Director, ACTION
Ulla Olin, Principal Officer, Bureau for Program Policy and Evaluation, United Nations Development Program
Gloria Scott, Women's Program Officer, World Bank
Sheila Barry, Assistant Secretary, UNICEF Executive Board
Perdita Huston, Regional Director, North Africa, Near East, Asia/Pacific, Peace Corps
Norma Walmsley, President, MATCH International Center, Ottawa
Margaret Snyder, Senior Officer, Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women
Vina Mazumdar, Director, Center for Women's Development Studies, New Delhi
Helvi Sipila, Assistant Secretary General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, United Nations, Vienna
Arvonne Fraser, Coordinator, Office of Women in Development, U.S. International Development Agency,
Virginia Trotter, Vice-President, Academic Affairs, University Of Georgia
Elinor Barber, Program Officer, International Division, Office of the Vice-President, Ford Foundation

"The Role of Interest Groups in the 1980 Elections"
Patricia Keefer, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Vice President and Director of Field Operations, Common Cause

Guests:
Russ Hemenway, Director, National Committee for an Effective Congress
The Student Program

Peter Thomas, Field Director, Conservative Caucus
Paul Quirk, Secretary Treasurer, Massachusetts AFL-CIO
Judy Meredith, political organizer
John Baraniak, Vice-President and Director for Industrial Relations, Northrop Corporation
Ann Lewis, Administrative Assistant to Representative Barbara Mikulski
Richard Conlan, Director, Democratic Study Group
Tom Rooser, Vice-President for Government Relations, Quaker Oats Company
Jack Walsh, political consultant
Michael Ford, political consultant
Mark Shields, The Washington Post
David Nyhan, The Boston Globe
Fred Wertheimer, Vice-President, Common Cause
Barney Frank, U.S. Representative-elect (D-Massachusetts)
Joseph Farmer, Director, Council of Young American Political Leaders
David Cohen, President, Common Cause
Les Francis, Executive Director, Democratic National Committee

"Public Interest Politics"

Dolores Mitchell, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, Economics Area, and Manager of State and Local Marketing, Abt Associates

Guests:

John Eller, former Executive Director of Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
David Liederman, Director of Public Affairs, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
Charles Atkins, former Undersecretary of Human Services, Massachusetts
Peter Trapp, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Municipal Supplies, Department of Public Services, New York
Robert Turner, political columnist, The Boston Globe
Leon Shull, Executive Director, Americans for Democratic Action
Patricia Keefer, Vice-President and Director of Field Operations, Common Cause
Jay Hedlund, lobbyist for Common Cause
Sally Corwin, attorney
Richard Mastrangelo, Public Affairs Director, Associated Industries of Massachusetts
Gerard D'Amico, State Senator (D-Worcester)
Teri Bergman, former Special Assistant to Deputy Undersecretary for Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Alexis Pierre Kisteneff, Director of National Rural Community Facilities Study, Abt Associates

"Diplomacy, Diplomatists, and the New International (Dis)order"
Ambassador Hewson A. Ryan, Murrow Professor of Public Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Guests:
Ambassador E.A. Gullion
Ambassador W. Cutler
Ambassador G. Cooke
Ambassador G. Parson
Ambassador Douglas Henderson
Ambassador William Vandel Heuvel
Takeo Iguchi, Counsul General of Japan for New England
Ambassador William Macomber
Ambassador Leonard Unger
Ambassador John Reinhardt, Director, U.S. International Communication Agency
Dana Bullen, former Foreign Editor, The Washington Star
William Payeff, former Assistant Director, U.S. Information Agency
Robert Amerson, Director, New England International Business Center
Thomas McDermott, Managing Partner, Arthur Young & Co.
Randall Teague, Attorney, Cabot Corporation
Ambassador Jack Vaughn, Administrator, USAID for Latin America
Ambassador Marvin Weissman, U.S. Ambassador to Bolivia
Arpad von Lazar, Professor of International Development, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Lawrence Weiler, USACDA
Joseph Siracusa, Professor, University of Queensland, Australia
Uri Ra’anah, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Ambassador Theodore Eliot, Dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Ambassador Barbara White, formerly Deputy Director of U.S. Information Agency

"Transportation Politics of the 1980's"
Frederick P. Salvucci, Lecturer, Center for Transportation Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Guests:
Joseph Bosco, former Assistant Secretary of Transportation, Massachusetts
Michael Meyer, Professor, Center for Transportation Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Emily Lloyd, former Traffic and Parking Commissioner, City of Boston
Jay Steptoe, staffer, Senate Judiciary Committee
Tom Downs, Executive Director, Urban Mass Transit Administration
Alan Altshuler, Professor and Chairman, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

"The Workings of the American Media"
Nick Thimmesch, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; columnist, Los Angeles Times syndicate

Guests:
Charles Mohr, Special Correspondent, The New York Times
Ron Kriss, Assistant Managing Editor, Time Magazine
Robert Achorn, Editor, The Worcester Telegram
John McCutcheon, Editorial Page Editor, The Chicago Tribune
Gordon Manning, Vice-President for News and Special Programming, NBC News
Reese Schoenfeld, President, Cable News Network
Lou Boccardi, Executive Editor, Associated Press

"Getting There: A Practical Guide to Preparing for a Career in Politics"
Chase Untermeyer, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Texas State Representative

Guests:
Robert Hall, Massachusetts State Senator (R-Fitchburg)
Dick Douglas, Labor Member of Parliament
Joe Wyatt, U.S. Representative (D-Texas)
Andrew Card, Massachusetts State Representative (R-Holbrook)
Mary Jane Gibson, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Belmont)
Peter Beilenson
Mickey Leland, U.S. Representative (D-Texas)
John Sears, Boston City Councillor
Bill Keese, Massachusetts State Representative (D-Somerville)
Peter Shapiro, County Executive, Essex County, New Jersey
Jack Walsh, political consultant

"Being a Big-City Mayor"
Jack Walsh, political consultant

Guests:
Kirk O'Donnell, Counsel for the U.S. Congress
Jack Snedeker, Chairman, Boston Sewer and Water Commission
Tom Kiley, political consultant
John Marttilla, political consultant
Richard Berkley, Mayor, Kansas City, Missouri
Robert Ryan, Director, Boston Redevelopment Authority

Spring 1981

"The 1980's: A Decade for Hispanic Americans"
Carlos Aguilar, Nieman Fellow, Harvard University; investigative reporter, KENS-TV, San Antonio, Texas

Guests:
Erma Santaella, Commissioner, New York State Human Rights Appeal Board
Guillermo Martinez, Latin Affairs writer, Miami Herald
Enrique Hank Lopez, attorney, writer
Frank Sepulveda, political consultant, San Antonio, Texas
Ruben Munguia, political consultant, San Antonio, Texas
Rebecca Sedillo, Assistant to City Manager, San Antonio, Texas
Jane Lee Garcia, Administrative Assistant to Congressman Robert Garcia
Joaquin Avila, Attorney, Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund
Professor Richard Santillan, Rose Institute of State and Local Government, Claremont College, California
Willie Velasquez, Director, Southwest Voter Registration Project, San Antonio, Texas
Roberto Garcia, Massachusetts State Director, National Puerto Rican Forum
James Jennings, Assistant Professor, Afro-American Studies, Harvard University

"Perspectives on Urban Revitalization"
Gordon Brigham, Executive Vice-President, Charles G. Hilgenhurst Associates, Inc.; former Director of The Boston Plan and the Community Development Block Grant Program for the City of Boston

Guests:
Edward Wood, former Vice-President, Real Estate Research Corporation, Baltimore
William Goldstein, Associate Commissioner for Administration, Massachusetts Department of Mental Health
Gary Stout, former Director of Economic Development for St. Paul, Minnesota, and Portland, Oregon
William Perkins, Director of Housing Programs, Department of Community Affairs, State of Wisconsin
Skip Smallridge, former state director of planning for depression of the central artery, Boston
David Dixon, consultant and manager of transit and development study for North Station area, Boston
Emanuel Berk, Director of Commercial Revitalization, Boston Neighborhood Development Agency
Michael Tierney, former Executive Director, Worcester Cooperation Council, Inc.
John Weis, Director, Boston Neighborhood Development Agency

"Religion and American Politics"
Harvey Cox, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity, Harvard University
Guests:
Joe Holland, Center of Concern
John Cort, Chairman, Religious Caucus, Democratic Social Organizing Committee
Rev. Jimmy Allen, former President, Southern Baptist Convention
Fr. Bryan Hehir, Director, Office for International Affairs, U.S. Catholic Conference
Rev. Tyrone Pitts, Racial Justice Office, National Council of Churches
Calvin Thomas, Moral Majority, Inc.
Edward Hindson, Moral Majority, Inc.
Rabbi Herman Blumberg, Director, New England Region, American Jewish Committee

"The Changing Congress"
John C. Culver, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former U.S. Senator (D-Iowa)
Guests:
Peter Hart, pollster
Congressman Richard Bolling (D-Missouri)
Tom Korologos, former White House congressional liaison in Nixon and Ford Administrations
Paul Roger, former U.S. Representative, (D-Florida)

"The Carter Presidency: Some Early Perspectives"
Eugene Eidenberg, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Secretary of the Cabinet and Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs, 1978-81
Guests:
Michael Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts
Jack Watson, former Chief of Staff in the Carter White House
Moon Landrieu, former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development
Pat Caddell, pollster for Carter-Mondale campaign
Steven Weissman, White House Correspondent, The New York Times
Judy Woodruff, White House Correspondent, NBC News
Jody Powell, former White House Press Secretary

"Skills of Political Communication: Building a Constituency"
Sonya Hamlin, Boston television interviewer and reporter

Guests:
Jack Walsh, political consultant
Guy Rosmarin, lobbyist, Washington, D.C.
Herbert Selesnick, Group Vice-President, Harbridge House, Inc.
Dan McDougal, campaign director to Nick Mavroules, 6th Congressional District, Massachusetts
Robert Baram, Chairman, Department of Broadcast Journalism, Boston University
Tom Mahoney, Senior Vice-President, Kenyon & Eckhardt Advertising Agency
Pat Kreger, Producer of 6 o'clock News, WBZ-TV, Boston
Gail Harris, chief political reporter, anchorperson, WBZ News, Boston

"South Africa and the U.S. Connection"
William L. Jacobsen, MPA candidate, John F. Kennedy School of Government; Career Foreign Service Information Officer

Guests:
Fleur de Villiers, Nieman Fellow and Assistant Editor, Sunday Times, Johannesburg
John Burns, correspondent, The New York Times
Masilo Mabeta, Ph.D. candidate, Harvard University
Karabo Motlana, Soweto student leader
Maj. Gen. Joseph Garba, Fellow of the Institute of Politics, and former Foreign Minister of Nigeria
Robert Rotberg, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Sean Cleary, Counsellor, Embassy of South Africa
Richard Moose, former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs
Randall Robinson, Director, Transafrica, Washington, D.C.
Clyde Ferguson, Professor, Harvard Law School
Willard Johnson, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Paul Tsongas, U.S. Senator, (D-Massachusetts)
“The Politics of Regulation”

Susan Bennett King, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission

Guests:
- Howard Hiatt, Dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University
- Devra Lee Davis, Director, Toxic Substances Program, Environmental Law Institute
- Douglas Costle, former Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency
- Jack Blum, domestic and international energy expert
- Andrew Krulwich, former General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission
- Frank Greer, formerly Special Assistant to Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall
- Robert McCleary, Manager of Consumer Affairs, Corning Glass Works
- Nicholas Ashford, Assistant Director, Center for Policy Alternatives, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Kendall Fleeharty, Director, Regulatory Action Center, U.S. Chamber of Commerce

“Framed: American Politics as Hollywood Viewed It, 1939-1979”

Martin Linsky, Assistant Director of the Institute of Politics, and Michael Cornfield, teaching fellow, Government Department, Harvard University

Guests and films shown:
- Judith Martin, syndicated columnist and film/theater critic, The Washington Post
- John Culver, Fellow of the Institute of Politics and former U.S. Senator (D-Iowa), with the film Mr. Smith Goes to Washington
- Francis Sargent, former Governor of Massachusetts, with the film The Great McGinty
- Dot Harrington, political wife and mother, with the film State of the Union
- William Bulger, President of the Massachusetts State Senate, with the film The Last Hurrah
- Harold Isaacs, author and former Newsweek correspondent in China and Southeast Asia, with the film The Ugly American
- The film Dr. Strangelove
- John Marttilla, political media consultant, with the film The Candidate
- The film The Seduction of Joe Tynan

“Beyond the ‘News’: Changing Forms of Journalism”

Robert Manning, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; former Editor-in-Chief of The Atlantic Monthly
Guests:

James Greenfield, Assistant Managing Editor, The New York Times
Victor Navasky, Editor, Nation Magazine
Fred Friendly, former President, CBS News
Richard Wald, former President for News, NBC
Thomas Griffith, author of Time Magazine's "Newswatch" column
David Nyhan, Assistant Managing Editor, The Boston Globe
Alan Brinkly, Professor of History, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

"Power and Conflict in Rural America"
Richard J. Margolis, political writer and founding chairman of Rural America

Guests:

Jon Elam, former circuit-riding manager of several villages in Minnesota
David Raphael, Executive Director, Rural America
Karen Noble-Hanson, former New York State director, Farmers Home Administration
Nola Denslow, Lamoille Area Health Council in Vermont's Northeast Kingdom
Jonathan Sher, author of Education in Rural America
Gretchen Shaffer, Director, Big Laurel School of Learning, West Virginia
Barry Casper, co-author of Powerline
H.L. Mitchell, founder of The Southern Tenant Farmers Union
Gus Schumacher, agribusiness expert, World Bank
Robert Geffen, Small Farm Project, Amherst, Massachusetts

"The Persistence of World Hunger"
Thomas W. Stephens, MPA candidate, John F. Kennedy School of Government; formerly staff member, Presidential Commission on World Hunger

Guests:

Lincoln Chen, the Ford Foundation
Joseph Short, Oxfam-America
Robert Muscat, International Development Cooperation Agency
Alan Strout, Professor of Economics, Department of Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michael Scott, Director, Overseas Project, Oxfam-America
Roy Prosterman, Professor of Law, University of Washington
Martin Diskin, Professor of Anthropology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Gary Perkins, U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, U.S. Representative
Stephen Green, former UNICEF official
Leonard Wilson, Agribusiness Associates, Boston
Arthur Domike, formerly of the U.N. Center for Transnational Corporations
Gus Schumacher, World Bank
Eileen Kennedy, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service
Nancy Amidei, Executive Director, Food Research and Action Center, Washington, D.C.
Richard Critchfield, author, journalist, formerly with The Christian Science Monitor
Gillian Hart, development economist, Boston University
Stephen David, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Janet Lowenthal, Development Support Bureau, Agency for International Development

"The European Communities"
Jean-Francois Vestryne, Fellow, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University; Member of the Legal Service of the Commission of the European Communities

Guests:
Richard Burke, former member of European Commission
Claus-Dieter Ehlersmann, Director General of the Legal Service of the European Commission
Valentine Korah, Professor of Law, University College, London
Fernand Spaak, Director General for Enlargement Negotiations of the European Commission
Fernand Braun, Director General for Internal Market and Industrial Affairs of the European Commission
Wolfgang Rudolph, Political Councillor at the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the U.N.

"Feminism and the System"
Marilyn Waring, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Member of Parliament, New Zealand

Guests:
Marcella Martinez, formerly a member of Jamaican Mission to the U.N.
Susan Okin, Associate Professor of Political Science, Brandeis University
Elaine Noble, Office of Intergovernmental Relations, City of Boston
Gina Corea, author of Hidden Malpractice
Ruth Hubbard, Professor of Biology, Harvard University
Robin Morgan, editor, Ms. Magazine

"States as Laboratories of Democracy"
George Weeks, Fellow of the Institute of Politics; Chief of Staff to
Governor William Milliken of Michigan

Guests:
Thomas Cochran, Executive Director, Northeast-Midwest Institute
James Brickley, Lieutenant Governor of Michigan
Scott Bunton, Director for Human Resources, National Governors
Association
J.F. terHorst, former Press Secretary to Gerald Ford
Stephen Farber, Executive Director, National Governors' Association
Rich Williamson, Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental
Relations
Pierre DuPont, Governor of Delaware

Summer Research Awards

Each year the Institute offers a limited number of Summer Research Awards
to Harvard and Radcliffe undergraduates (juniors, sophomores, and freshmen)
for field work contributing to senior honors theses or other comparable projects.
These research grants provide financial aid during the summer months to en­
courage direct observation of political and governmental processes within the
United States.

The 1981 winners and their topics were:

Jennifer Arlen, (Economics) Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Coal-Fueled
Electrical Generating Station in New Mexico
David Bragdon, (Government) The American Railroads and Deregulation,
1973-1981
Shana Chung, (East Asian Studies) A Comparative Study of Minors'
Legal Rights to Medical Treatment in California and Massachusetts
Michael Davis, (Government/Economics) The Urban Revitalization of
Baltimore
Daphne DeMarnette, (Psychology/Social Relations) Attitudes and Self-
Perceptions of Prostitutes Involved in Political Efforts
Emily Feldman, (Economics) Economic and Political Effects of the
Electric Utilities' Involvement in Captive Coal Operations
Dorene Giacopini, (History) San Jose: the History of a Growing Post-Modern City
Michael Mills, (Social Studies) The Moral Majority: A Case Study of Interest Group Politics
Guy Molyneux, (Social Studies) The American Left and Electoral Politics
Samuel Perry, (Social Studies) Black Lung Disease: Appalachia/Scotland/Wales
Nina Schwarzschild, (History) Plywood Cooperative Communities in the Pacific Northwest
Nancy Sinkoff, (Social Studies) Female Jewish Culture and Its Effect on American Politics

Public Affairs Internships

The Institute offers a number of services in support of student participation in public sector internships: a) a job clearinghouse, through which the Institute and the Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning make available to students information about public sector employment opportunities in the United States in all aspects of politics and public affairs; b) summer internship stipends that are allocated to students whose financial needs would otherwise prohibit them from accepting an internship in the public sector; c) a series of seminars during the winter and spring aimed at educating the undergraduate community on job-hunting techniques and possibilities; and, d) the Summer-in-Washington Program that provides students holding summer positions in the DC area with help finding housing and a program of intellectual, social and athletic activities.

Summer Internship Stipends

The following students received stipends from the Institute in 1981 to accept summer internships with the organizations listed:

Robert Abedon, U.S.-China Trade Association, Washington, DC
Michael P. Adams, Senator Paul Tsongas' Office, Washington, DC
Charles D. Bloche, Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition, Washington, DC
The Summer-in-Washington Program

The Summer-in-Washington Program was coordinated by Tom Baker in 1981. In addition to developing and compiling substantial housing opportunities for Harvard students spending the summer in DC, the program sponsored a wide-ranging series of activities all summer, which included:

- Discussions with:
  Steven Weissman, White House correspondent, The New York Times
  Ron Brown, Deputy Chairman, Democratic National Committee
  Danny Boggs, Senior Policy Advisor on Energy and the Environment, The White House
  Matt Reese, President, Matt Reese & Associates
  Chase Untermeyer, Executive Assistant to Vice-President George Bush
  Ambassador Averell Harriman
  Rich Williamson, Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs

Arnaud Friedlander, Congressman Clarence Long's Office, Washington, DC
Melita Marie Garza, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC
Lauren Gilbert, the "Washington Office on Latin America," Washington, DC
Patricia I. Hansen, Organization of American States, Washington, DC
Debra Iles, Women's Equity Action League, Washington, DC
Lucy Lin, Common Cause, Washington, DC
Beverly Lucero, State and Local Relations Office, City of Boston, MA
Jennifer Notkin, Women in Community Service, New York, NY
Marc R. Paul, Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC
Walter R. Paulsen, Congressman Tony Coelho's Office, Washington, DC
James T. Polsfut, Office of the Governor, Denver, CO
Mark Reeve, The Conservation Law Foundation of Rhode Island, Providence, RI
Ann R. Scott, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, Washington, DC
Nathan S. Szanton, Congressman Edward J. Markey's Office, Washington, DC
David N. Tancredi, President's Commission on Biomedical Ethics, Washington, DC
G. Scott Williams, Democratic National Committee, Washington, DC
Charley Magee, Bureau of Personnel, the Department of State  
Rick Hertzberg, Editor, The New Republic  
Barber Conable, Jr., U.S. Representative (R-New York)  
Pat Keefer, Vice-President and Director of Field Operations, Common Cause  
Brian Lederer, People's Counsel to the District of Columbia  
Morris Udall, U.S. Representative (D-Arizona)  
Marcus Raskin, Director, Institute for Policy Studies  
Barney Frank, U.S. Representative (D-Massachusetts)  
Charles Mathias, U.S. Senator (R-Maryland)  
Peter Rodman, Assistant to Henry Kissinger  
Francois Dopffer, First Counselor to the French Embassy  
Budomir Sindelic, Acting Ambassador from Yugoslavia  
George Mamedov, Research Analyst, Soviet Center for the Study of U.S. and Canada

• Other activities included:  
  “A Short Course on the Legislative Process” with Mark Talisman, lobbyist and former legislative assistant  
  A wine and cheese reception sponsored by the Harvard Club of Washington  
  Parties and picnics with interns from other colleges  
  A bagel-making session with gourmet Mark Talisman  
  A career seminar with four recent college graduates working in the Washington area, co-sponsored with Princeton

• In addition, the program fielded a softball team, who played against teams from Princeton, Mt. Holyoke, Yale, the staff of the Office of the Speaker of the House, the Youth Policy Institute of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial, and “The Exiles” — the Carter White House team.

Job Seminars

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

December 9, 1980:  
Chase Untermeyer, Institute Fellow and Texas State Legislator  
Pat Keefer, Institute Fellow and Vice-President of Common Cause  
Charles Kireker, Director of the Executive Program in State and Local Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government  
Maxine Pfeffer, former intern, the Center for the Study of Responsive Law, Washington, DC
February 26, 1981
Eugene Eidenberg, Institute Fellow and former Assistant to the President on Intergovernmental Affairs
Susan B. King, Institute Fellow and former Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission
Rob McCord, former intern, the National League of Cities

March 17, 1981
George Weeks, Institute Fellow and Chief of Staff to Michigan Governor William G. Milliken
Christopher Edley, Research Fellow of the Institute of Politics and former Assistant Chief of Staff at the Carter White House
Helene Sahadi York, former intern to Congresswoman Liz Holtzman

In addition, Rick Howard, Government and Public Affairs Advisor at the Harvard Office of Career Services and Off-Campus Learning, served on each of these panels.

Harvard Political Review

The Harvard Political Review is a quarterly journal of political analysis published by the Student Advisory Committee. Its officers and the positions they held during the 1980-81 academic year were:

Lind Gee, Reviews Editor
Jay Hamilton, Circulation Manager; Assistant Managing Editor
Ted Janulis, General Manager
Alexander Kaplen, President
Sherill Leonard, Managing Editor; President
John Lie, Business Manager
Marc Paul, Associate Editor
Michael Rissman, Associate Editor
Katarina Sawtelle, Circulation Manager
Diane Siegel, Associate Editor
Mina Silberberg, Business Manager
Jay Smith, Assistant Managing Editor
Peter Spiro, Reviews Editor
John Kent Walker, Associate Editor
Helene Sahadi York, Circulation Manager; General Manager
Four issues of the HPR were issued this school year, and the following is a list of their articles and authors:

**Volume VIII/Number 1; Fall 1980**

Midsection: The Presidential Election

“Style and Substance: The Making of a Myth,” Helene Sahadi York
“The Conservatives Strike Back,” Jay Hamilton and Sherill Leonard
“The Turning Point: Is This the End of the Two-Party Monopoly?” Eugene McCarthy and John Armor
“Abroad Perspective,” Diane Siegel
“Russia’s Options in an Age of Scarce Oil,” Marc Paul
“Africa: A Tenuous Return to Democracy,” Peter Spiro
“Goldberg v. Tarr: Settling for Suspect Class,” John Kent Walker
“TV and the Ford Deal: Premature Speculation,” Bob Mudge

**Volume VIII/Number 2; Winter, 1981**

Midsection: The New American City

“Questioning the Stats of the CAO,” Peter M. Engel
“The French New Right: Seems Like Old Times,” Mina Silberberg
“Peace and Disorder for Zimbabwe’s Neighbors,” Peter Spiro
“Marcos’s Reign: Prologue to Anarchy,” John Lie
“Grants Under Reagan,” Bob Mudge and Jay Smith
“Small Businesses,” John Fleming and Joseph Keene
“Carter as Peacemaker: Breaking the Olive Branch,” Tony Perez
“Books of the Review”:
Radical Principles: Reflections of an Unreconstructed Democrat,
by Michael Walzer; reviewed by John J. Lie.
The Third Wave, by Alvin Toffler; reviewed by Scott Henderson
Tito: The Story from Inside, by Milovan Dijlas; reviewed by Marc Paul

**Volume VIII/Number 3; Spring 1981**

Midsection: On the Fringe of American Politics

“City Upon a Hill: Resurrecting a Flawed Ideal,” Alexander Kaplen
“Sunset Provisions and Sunbelt Conservatism,” Jay Hamilton
“The Silent Constitution Versus Vocal States,” Helene Sahadi York
“No Room at the Inn for Guest Workers,” Peter Spiro
“Rumania: A Satellite Out of Orbit,” Marc Paul
“The Fervor of the Faithful,” Joseph Keene
“It Can’t Happen Here,” Jack Porter
“The Diaspora of the Left,” Kirkpatrick Sale
“Environmentalists: The New Endangered Species?” John Kent Walker
"Decentralization Vexes City Schools," Mina Silberberg
"Books of the Review"

Personal Impressions, by Isaiah Berlin; reviewed by Tony Perez
State Politics, Parties and Policy, by Sarah McCally Morehouse; 
reviewed by Alexander Kaplen

Volume VIII/Number 4; Summer, 1981
Midsection: The State and Academia: In Search of a More Perfect Union

"Rediscovering the Democratic Ideology," Sherill Leonard
"Pariah South of the Pyrenees," Tony Perez
"Japan Protects Its Progress," Paul Crnkovich
"El Salvador Splits the Americas," Mike Lubrano
"Doing Business with the Government," Joe Keene, Sherill Leonard and John Lie

"A View from the Tower," Nathan Glazer
"Is Kemp-Garcia Enterprising Enough?" Brant K. Maller

"Books of the Review":
George Bush, by Nicholas King; reviewed by Stephen Bates
Roll Call, by William S. Cohen; reviewed by Alexander Kaplen
Anarchist Women, 1870-1920, by Margaret S. Marsh; reviewed by
Marilyn J. Waring
The Washington Reporters, by Stephen Hess; reviewed by Peter Spiro

Special Projects

The Special Projects Committee of the SAC organized and sponsored the following events, which were held in the ARCO Public Affairs Forum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government:

Viewing of the first presidential campaign debate on the Forum’s large screen television, September 21, 1980.

Viewing of the network coverage of the Presidential election returns on the Forum’s large screen television, November 4, 1980.

A discussion of the Presidential election results, entitled “Why Reagan?” with Ron Brown, former Deputy Campaign Director, Kennedy for President, and Michael MacLeod, Campaign Manager/Treasurer, Anderson for President, November 13, 1980.
A panel discussion entitled "Should Life be Patented? The Politics Behind DNA," November 17, 1980. Participants were:

Dara Demming, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility
Paul M. Doty, Director, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
David Dressier, Associate Professor of Biochemistry, Harvard University
Jonathan King, Professor of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Moderator: Marcel LaFollette, Editor, Science, Technology and Human Values

A panel discussion entitled "The World Bank and the Question of Aid to Developing Countries," co-sponsored with the AISEC, December 2, 1980. Participants were:

Edward Mason, Lamont University Professor Emeritus, Harvard University
Ernest Stern, Senior Vice-President, The World Bank
Ahmed Osman, Senior Economist, the Islamic Development Bank
Moderator: Dwight Perkins, Director of the Harvard Institute for International Development

A panel discussion entitled "Religion and Politics in America," April 6, 1981. Participants were:

Ed McAteer, President, Religious Roundtable Association
George McMiller, Lieutenant Governor of Alabama
William Marchner, Professor, Christendom College
Paul Deatz, Professor, Social Ethics Department, Boston University
Moderator: Alan Heimert, Professor of American Literature, Harvard University

An excerpt from this discussion appears in the Readings section of this issue of Proceedings.

"The Human Life Amendment: A Debate," April 16, 1981. Participants were:

Paul Brown, Director, Life Amendment Political Action Committee
Dorothy J. Samuels, Executive Director, New York Civil Liberties Union
Moderator: Claude A. Vilee, Professor of Biological Chemistry, Laboratory of Human Reproduction and Reproductive Biology, Harvard Medical School

A panel discussion entitled "Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy," April 21, 1981. Participants were:
A conference entitled "U.S./Latin American Relations: Perceptions and Policy Objectives," April 24 and 25, 1981. The conference began with the showing of two films, "Avenue of the Americas" and "Attack on the Americas." It then continued with:

A panel discussion entitled "El Salvador — Cause for U.S. Concern?" Participants were:

Robert Pastor, former National Security Council Advisor for Latin America
James Cheek, Deputy Secretary of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs
W. Scott Thompson, Associate Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
John McAward, Associate Director, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee
Francisco Alpschul, Spokesperson for the Frente Democratico Revolucionario
Moderator: Terry Karl, Professor of Government, Harvard University

A "mini-seminar" entitled "Human Rights in Latin America," conducted by Brian Smith, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A "mini-seminar" entitled "U.S. Response to Revolutionary Change in Latin America," conducted by Ernest Evans, Associate, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

A panel discussion entitled "U.S./Mexico Relations: Perception vs. Reality." Participants were:

Susan Kaufman Purcell, Policy Planning Office, Department of State
Carlos Rico, Associate, Institute of United States Studies, Mexico, D.F.
Oscar Gonzales, Mexican Ambassador; Alternate Representative to the United Nations Security Council
Fernando Perez Correa, Visiting Professor, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Guests

The Guests Committee plans and organizes the student initiated speaking events and the Visiting Fellows Program. It also leads the student role in Institute training conferences, playing a major role this year in hosting the Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress.

Guest Speakers

Ed Clark, Libertarian Party candidate for President, October 28, 1981.
Phyllis Schlafly, founder of “Stop-ERA,” gave an address entitled “Do We Want a Gender-Free Society?” April 9, 1981.
Ariane and Ralph Windle in an evening of political satire entitled “Ramifications,” April 30, 1981.

Visiting Fellows

In addition to the Institute Fellows in residence for an academic term, the Institute each year invites a few people who have distinguished themselves in active political life to spend brief periods of time at Harvard on schedules designed to provide for as much useful contact as possible with the University student community. The campus appearances of these Helfernan Fellows are planned by students of the Guests Committee, who make a special effort to cooperate on this with other interested student organizations. This year’s Visiting Fellows were:

Art Buchwald, syndicated political columnist and author, September 23-24, 1980
Forum address: “Trust Me.” (An excerpt from this address appears in the Readings section of this issue of Proceedings.)
John Lindsay, former Mayor of New York City, November 20-21, 1980
Forum address, “Thoughts for the Eighties”
Adlai Stevenson III, former U.S. Senator (D-Illinois), April 8-9, 1981
Senator Stevenson was a participant in the panel discussion entitled “U.S. and Japan: Trade Relations in the ’80’s,” held in the Forum on April 8.
The Fellows Program

The Panel on Fellowships

Lawrence S. DiCara
Archie Epps
Dan Fenn
Nancy Hoffmeier, Spring
Paul Holtzman, Spring
Bruce Ives, Fall
Richard J. Light
Michael Lipsky
A. Douglas Matthews
Ernest R. May
Jonathan Moore
Richard E. Neustadt
Don K. Price
Ann Ramsay
Antonio Norberto Rivera-Zamora, Spring
Robin Schmidt
Susan Staudohar, Fall
Stanley S. Surrey, Chair
Richard Weiner, Fall
Patricia Wright, Fall
Paul N. Ylvisaker
Helene Sahadi York

Fellows' Alumni Advisory Committee

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

Fall 1980

Julia Chang Bloch, Deputy Director, Office of African Affairs, U.S. International Communications Agency. During her fellowship, she surveyed domestic attitudes about Third World nations and their relevance to U.S. foreign policy. Ms. Bloch's study group was entitled "American Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics."

Ronald H. Brown, Deputy Chairman, Democratic National Committee; former Deputy Campaign Manager, Kennedy for President; former Vice-President, National Urban League. While a Fellow, Brown wrote a "primer" on the reform of the primary system and led a study group entitled "Decision '80."

Joseph N. Garba, former Foreign Minister of Nigeria. Major General Garba was a Fellow during both the Fall and Spring semesters. In the Fall he led a study group entitled "African Diplomacy in the 1980's: Problems and Prospects." During the spring term, in addition to being an adjunct Fellow at the Center for International Affairs, he continued work on a book about the role of the military in African development.

Patricia Keefer, Vice-President and Director of Field Operations, Common Cause. While a Fellow she developed a proposal for a conference to explore liberal political issues and strategies for the 1980's. The study group she led was entitled "The Role of Interest Groups in the 1980 Elections."

Nick Thimmesch, Columnist, Los Angeles Times Syndicate; author of The Bobby Kennedy Nobody Knows and The Condition of Republicanism. While a Fellow, Thimmesch completed an analysis of the evolution of the National Educational Association from a professional organization to a political force. He led a study group entitled, "The Workings of the American Media."

Chase Untermeyer, Executive Assistant to Vice-President George Bush; former State Representative from Houston, Texas. Untermeyer's research project concentrated on the effect of computer graphics on the redistricting process in state legislatures. His study group was entitled "Getting There: A Practical Guide for Preparing for a Career in Politics."

Spring 1981

John C. Culver, attorney; former U.S. Senator from Iowa, 1975-1981; former U.S. Representative from Iowa, 1965-1975. Culver's project focused on the area of congressional reform and he also continued his work on arms control. He led a study group intitiled "The Changing Congress."
Eugene Eidenberg, Director, Democratic National Committee; former Secretary to the Cabinet and Assistant to President Carter for Intergovernmental Affairs. Eidenberg assumed his duties at the DNC in the middle of his Fellowship and continued on a part-time basis. He completed his study group entitled “The Carter Presidency: Some Early Perspectives.”

Susan B. King, political activist; former Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission; formerly Executive Director and Vice-President of the Center for Public Financing of Elections. Among her other fellowship activities, King wrote an op-ed piece for UPI and drafted an introduction to a book on hazardous wastes. Her study group was entitled “The Politics of Regulation.”

Robert Manning, Editor-in-Chief, Boston Publishing Company; former Editor of the Atlantic Monthly. During his fellowship, Manning edited the first of a 15-volume series entitled “The Vietnam Experience.” His study group was entitled “Beyond the ‘News’: Changing Forms of Journalism.”

Marilyn Waring, Member of Parliament, New Zealand; New Zealand delegate to the U.S. World Conference for Women. During her fellowship, Ms. Waring continued her research and involvement in North-South issues and their relationship to women; and she hosted an evening of women’s poetry, music, dance, film, and theater in the Forum. Her study group was entitled “Feminism and the System.”

George Weeks, Chief of Staff to Michigan Governor Milliken; former correspondent and Foreign Editor, United Press International. While a Fellow, his research examined the relationship between politicians and the press. Weeks’ study group was entitled “State as Laboratories of Democracy.”

Fellows Luncheon Speakers

A tradition in the Fellows Program has been a series of weekly luncheons with distinguished members of the Harvard community and others. This year’s guest speakers were:

Fall

Art Buchwald, syndicated columnist
Benigno Aquino, Fellow of the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Mongol Bayat, Assistant Professor of History, Harvard University
Ross Terrill, Resident Associate, East Asian Research Center, Harvard University
Stanley Hoffman, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Jorge Dominguez, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Hays Gorey, Boston Bureau Chief, Time Magazine
John Lindsay, former Mayor of New York City
Laurence Tribe, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Archibald Cox, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
The Nieman Foundation Fellows
The Senior Executive Fellows, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Spring

Samuel Beer, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Francis Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
John Dunlop, Lamont University Professor, Harvard University
Howard Hiatt, Dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University
George B. Kistiakowsky, Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University
David Nyhan, National Reporter, The Boston Globe
Hamilton Jordan, former Chief of Staff and Campaign Manager for President Carter
Hedley Donovan, former Editor-in-Chief, Time Magazine
The Senior Executive Fellows, John F. Kennedy School of Government
The Faculty Studies Program

Presidential Transition

The Study Group on Presidential Transition was set up during the Spring of 1980 under the Chairmanship of Ernest R. May, Professor of History, and was a non-partisan effort, scholarly and professional, undertaken at its own initiative. Its work was not prescriptive in nature, either in terms of policy or process matters, but was designed to provide insights into procedural options by analyzing experiences in past Presidential transitions in selected areas and examining those experiences in light of the political and institutional context facing the government at the end of 1980 and beginning of 1981. The group’s report also included a special annex examining the unique qualities of the 1976 transition experience. The report was submitted to the staff of President-elect Reagan the day after his election.

Members of the study group were:

- Alvin L. Alm, Fellow, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Richard G. Darman, Lecturer in Public Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- J. Mark Iwry, Attorney, Washington, D.C.
- Laurence E. Lynn, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Ernest R. May, Professor of History, Harvard University, Chair
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
- Richard E. Neustadt, Professor of Public Administration, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Melanie Billings Yun, Research Coordinator, “Uses of History” Project, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Executive Director

Research assistants were:

- Vincent A. Auger, Ph.D. candidate in Public Policy, Harvard University
- R. Stephen Brent, Ph.D. candidate in Public Policy, Harvard University
- Mark E. Newell, J.D. and M.P.P. candidate, Harvard University
- Richard I. Smith, case writer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
- Susan B. Wood, Senior Analyst, Abt Associates

Summer Research Team:

- Gail Gabler
- J. Mark Lavergne
- William F. Maloney
- Robert S. Mudge
- Jay T. Smith
Campaign Finance

The Campaign Finance Study Group has chosen to direct its efforts towards a major review of the impacts and changes in campaign financing and spending wrought by federal laws upon the conduct of presidential nomination and election campaigns. The proposal, developed during this academic year, represents a continuation of campaign finance studies initiated by the group in 1971. As approved and funded by the Senate Rules Committee, this research effort will culminate in the production of a detailed report containing an analysis of the financing of presidential campaigns under the current regulatory legislation and the Study Group's recommendations for revisions in the law and/or the regulations. The report will be released in January, 1982.

Members of the study group are:

F. Christopher Arterton, Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University, Chair
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Joel Fleishman, Director, Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs, Duke University
Gary C. Jacobson, Professor of Political Science, University of California, San Diego
Xandra Kayden, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brandeis University
David A. Keene, Keene, Monk and Associates, Washington, D.C.
Susan B. King, Fellow, Institute of Politics
Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Mark H. Moore, Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University
Richard E. Neustadt, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University

Constitutional Change

This study group, an outgrowth of last year's "Chief Executives" Study Group, is focusing on the alleged needs for substantial institutional changes in the constitution of relationships among branches and levels of American government. Acknowledging increased sentiment for such reforms in both political and academic circles, the group has declared its own skepticism that formal changes in constitutional arrangements are called for, but believes that the sub-
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ject should be seriously explored. Its eventual goal is to formulate a study and research agenda which can be incorporated into the Kennedy School curriculum.

In the course of its initial work, the group has had discussion sessions with the following individuals:

Anne Wexler, Assistant to the President, Carter Administration
Eugene Eidenberg, Secretary to the Cabinet, and Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs, Carter Administration
Alonzo McDonald, Assistant to the President and Staff Director, Carter Administration
Richard Bolling, U.S. Representative (D-Missouri); Chairman, House Rules Committee
Stuart E. Eizenstadt, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy, Carter Administration
Richard Cheney, U.S. Representative (R-Wyoming)

Study Group members are:

Samuel H. Beer, Professor of the Science of Government
David Blumenthal, Director, Center for Health Policy and Management
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Hugh H. Helco, Professor of Government
Philip B. Heymann, Professor of Law
David T. Kresge, Director, Joint Center for Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University
Ernest R. May, Professor of History
Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
Richard E. Neustadt, Professor of Public Administration, Chair
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy
Don K. Price, Professor of Public Management, Emeritus

Jay Smith, '82, served as rapporteur.

Legislative Reapportionment

The Faculty Study Group on Legislative Reapportionment conducted a survey of state legislative leaders, party officials, and public interest group leaders on the subject of reapportionment, and completed a draft of its report which it hopes to publish in February, 1982. Andrew Robertson, a graduate student in history at Brandeis and Isaac Shapiro, a public policy graduate student at
Harvard, have worked on the project during this final stage, under the supervision of the Group's Chair, Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy. Professor Orren is now preparing the final report of the study group.

Moral Obligations of Public Officials

Professional Study Programs

Seminar on the Defense Budget for National Political Journalists December 7-8, 1980

The Institute conducted a two-day seminar for nineteen national political reporters and editors on the subject of the defense budget, focussing on the budget process, its structure, current issues within it, SALT, and trade-offs within the overall federal budget.

The participants included:

Robert Burke, ABC News
Richard Cooper, Los Angeles Times
Charles Corddry, Baltimore Sun
Richard Egan, Detroit News
David Ensor, ABC News
Michael Gordon, National Journal
Stewart Lytle, Scripps-Howard Newspapers
John MacLean, Chicago Tribune
Tony Marro, Newsday
David Martin, Newsweek
Jim McCartney, Knight-Ridder Newspapers
Max McCarthy, Buffalo Evening News
Ann McDaniel, Dallas Times Herald
Andy Mollison, Cox Newspapers
Ike Pappas, CBS News
Joseph Pulitzer, IV, St. Louis Post Dispatch
Leo Rennert, McClatchy Papers of California
Lee Roderick, Scripps League Newspapers
Robert Waters, Hartford Courant

The faculty included:

David S. C. Chu, Assistant Director, National Security and International Affairs Division, Congressional Budget Office
Robert S. Lockwood, Permanent Professor and Director, Law and Domestic Politics, National War College
Laurence E. Lynn, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Jan M. Lodal, Executive Vice President, Director and co-founder of American Management Systems, Inc.

The program coordinator was Martin Linsky; Charie Harris served as administrative assistant.
Program for Newly-Elected Members of Congress
December 13-19, 1980

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

The participants included:

R. Wendell Bailey (R-Missouri)
Thomas J. Biley, Jr. (R-Virginia)
Gregory W. Carman (R-New York)
James Coyne (R-Pennsylvania)
Lawrence J. DeNardis (R-Connecticut)
Jim Dunn (R-Michigan)
Bernard J. Dwyer (D-New Jersey)
Mervyn Dymally (D-California)
Roy Dyson (D-Maryland)
Dennis E. Eckart (D-Ohio)
Bill Emerson (R-Missouri)
Jack Fields (R-Texas)
Barney Frank (D-Massachusetts)
Sam Gedjenson (D-Connecticut)
Judd Gregg (R-New Hampshire)
Steve Gunderson (R-Wisconsin)
Charles Hatcher (D-Georgia)
William Hendon (R-North Carolina)
John Hiler (R-Indiana)
Tom Lantos (D-California)
Lynn Martin (R-Illinois)
Bill McCollum (R-Florida)
Bob McEwen (R-Ohio)
Guy Molinari (R-New York)
Sid Morrison (R-Washington)
The faculty included:

Al Alm, Research Fellow, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Beryl Anthony, Jr., Member of Congress
Alan Auerbach, Assistant Professor of Economics, Harvard University
Francis W. Bator, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Robert Bell, National Defense Specialist, Congressional Research Service
Ed Bethune, Member of Congress
Stephen J. Breyer, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Ron Brown, Fellow, Institute of Politics
John M. Collins, Senior Specialist for International Affairs and National Defense, Congressional Research Service
Karen Davis, Administrator, Health Resources Administration, U.S. Public Health Service
Gerald Delaughter, President, Gerald DeJaeger and Associates
Charles DiBona, President, American Petroleum Institute
Julian C. Dixon, Member of Congress
Paul M. Doty, Director, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Michael S. Dukakis, Director, Intergovernmental Studies, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Otto Eckstein, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
Hermann Eilts, former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia
Rashi Fein, Professor of the Economics of Medicine, Harvard Medical School
Louis Fisher, Senior Specialist, American National Government, Congressional Research Service
Gilbert Gude, Director, Congressional Research Service
David Gushee, Chief, Environmental and Natural Resources Policy Division, Congressional Research Service
Million Gwirtzman, Chairman, National Commission on Social Security
Walter Hahn, Senior Specialist, Science, Technology and Futures Research, Congressional Research Service
Stanley J. Heginbotham, Chief, Foreign Affairs and National Defense, Congressional Research Service
William Hogan, Director, Energy and Environmental Policy Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Hendrik S. Houthakker, Professor of Economics, Harvard University
Thomas Hughes, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
William Kaufmann, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Charles Kindleberger, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Walter Kravitz, Consultant/Lecturer on Congressional Organization and Procedure
Jerry Lewis, Member of Congress
Glenn R. Markus, Specialist, Social Legislation, Congressional Research Service
Joseph Nye, Professor of Government, Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Dwight Perkins, Director, Harvard Institute for International Development
Don K. Price, Professor of Public Management, Emeritus, John F. Kennedy School of Government
William R. Ratchford, Member of Congress
Stanford Ross, Esq., Califano, Ross & Heineman, Washington, DC
Allen Schick, Senior Specialist, American Government and Public Administration, Congressional Research Service
Donna E. Shalala, President, Hunter College
John Stacks, National Political Correspondent, Time Magazine
Stanley Surrey, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Scott Thompson, Associate Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Laurence H. Tribe, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Ezra F. Vogel, Professor of Sociology, Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University
Richard B. Wirthlin, Deputy Director, Office of the President-Elect
Daniel Yankelovich, President, Yankelovich, Skelly & White, Inc.
Administrative staff for the program was:

- Charles W. Greenleaf, Jr., Conference Director and Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
- Jonathan Moore, Director, Institute of Politics
- Nicholas T. Mitropoulos, Assistant Director, Institute of Politics
- Theresa A. Donovan, Conference Coordinator
- Alan G. Mitter, Notebook Coordinator
- George H. White, Program Coordinator

Special assistance was provided by:

- Pamela Gagnon
- Micaela Massimino
- Charie Harris, Financial Assistant
- Carol Colborn, Summer Research Assistant


The Institute conducted a two-day seminar for eighteen national political reporters and editors, focusing on the concept of reindustrialization, its different definitions, an historical perspective on the subject, the international framework for U.S. industrial policy, and immediate policy options and issues.

The participants included:

- Cheryl Arvidson, Cox Newspapers
- David L. Barnett, U.S. News and World Report
- John M. Berry, Washington Post
- Jerry Buckley, Newsweek
- Robert Burke, ABC News
- Jerome Cahill, New York Daily News
- Edward Cowan, New York Times
- Lou Dobbs, Cable News Network
- William J. Eaton, Los Angeles Times
- Jonathan Fuerbringer, Washington Star
- Guy Halverson, Christian Science Monitor
- Monroe Karmin, Knight-Ridder Newspapers
- Jim Klurfield, Newsday
- Don May, United Press International
- Richard Max McCarthy, Buffalo Evening News
The faculty included:

Richard N. Cooper, Professor of International Economics, Harvard University
Stuart E. Eizenstadt, former Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy
Robert A. Leone, Senior Economist, Council of Economic Advisors
William D. Nordhaus, Professor of Economics, Yale University
Thomas K. McCraw, Professor of Business Administration, Harvard Business School

The program coordinator was Martin Linsky; Charie Harris served as administrative assistant.
Special Projects

The Advocates: Election '80

The Institute and WGBH-TV co-produced a special five-part series of the award-winning public affairs program "The Advocates" entitled, "Election '80: Who's Best for America?" Recorded in the Forum during the five weeks before the election, each show focused on a different major policy issue. The programs consisted of an hour-long, three-way, trial-fashion debate between advocates of the three major presidential candidates, each of whom called a prominent witness in defense of their candidate's views on the subject. The series was carried nation-wide on PBS; dates of broadcast are listed. Michael Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts and a Lecturer at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, served as moderator for each program.

"The Economy" September 29, 1980
Anderson Advocate: Mitchell Rogovin, Chief Counsel, Anderson Campaign
Witness: Robert J. Walker, Chief Domestic Policy Advisor, Anderson Campaign
Carter Advocate: Charles Nesson, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Witness: Alfred E. Kahn, Chairman, Council on Wage and Price Stability
Reagan Advocate: Avi Nelson, Radio and television commentator
Witness: Charles E. Walker, former Undersecretary of the Treasury

"Relations with the USSR" October 6, 1980
Anderson Advocate: Mitchell Rogovin
Witness: Alton Frye, Director of Policy Planning, Anderson Campaign
Carter Advocate: Charles Nesson
Witness: David Aaron, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security
Reagan Advocate: William Rusher, Publisher of The National Review
Witness: Alexander Haig, former Supreme Allied Commander, NATO

"Programs for the Poor" October 13, 1980
Anderson Advocate: Jack Cole, lawyer and journalist
Witness: Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., civil liberties lawyer
Carter Advocate: Charles Nesson
Witness: Patricia Roberts Harris, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services
Reagan Advocate: Avi Nelson  
Witness: Caspar Weinberger, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

"Energy Programs" October 20, 1980

Anderson Advocate: Jack Cole
Witness: Thomas Schelling, Professor of Political Economy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Carter Advocate: Charles Nesson
Witness: Stuart Eizenstadt, Chief Domestic Advisor to President Carter
Reagan Advocate: William Rusher
Witness: David Stockman, U.S. Representative (R-Michigan)

"The Best Man to Lead" October 27, 1980

Anderson Advocate: Mitchell Rogovin
Witness: David Garth, Anderson Campaign Director
Carter Advocate: Charles Nesson
Witness: Jack Watson, Chief of Staff, Carter White House
Reagan Advocate: Avi Nelson
Witness: Edwin Meese, Chief of Staff, Reagan-Bush Committee

The administrative staff included:

Peter Cook, Executive Producer
Martin Linsky, Executive Editor
Nicholas Mitropoulos, Forum Coordinator
Geri Denterlein, Forum Assistant
Frank Connolly, Associate Editor
Corinne McIntosh, Associate Editor
Diana Shaw, Associate Editor
Larry Goldberg, Media Services Coordinator
Lori Forman, Media Services Assistant
Amy Gazin Schwartz, Forum Secretary

Student interns of the Institute providing editorial and production assistance were:

Stephen Bates
Kelly Goode
Jane Smith
Loretta Lynch
Conference on 1980 Presidential Campaign Decisionmaking

On December 5-7, 1980, the Institute hosted its third post-election conference of the major decisionmakers from each Presidential candidate’s campaign organization to recount and review with each other their actions and perceptions of the long campaign. A transcript of the conference, The Campaign for President: 1980 in Retrospect, edited and with an Introduction by Jonathan Moore, will be published by Ballinger Publishing Company in the fall of 1981. An excerpt from that transcript appears in the Readings section of this edition of Proceedings.

Participants were:

Congressman John B. Anderson, Candidate for Republican nomination and National Unity Campaign Candidate
Mrs. Keke Anderson, National Unity Campaign
Douglas Bailey, President, Bailey, Deardourff & Associates
Kenneth A. Bode, Network Correspondent, NBC News
Bill Brock, Chairman, Republican National Committee
David S. Broder, Associate Editor and National Political Correspondent, Washington Post
Ronald H. Brown, Deputy Campaign Manager, Kennedy for President
Patrick H. Caddell, President, Cambridge Survey Research
William J. Casey, Campaign Manager, Reagan-Bush Committee
Adam Clymer, Correspondent, New York Times
Jo-Anne Coe, Office of Senator Robert Dole
Peter Dailey, Deputy Director (Media), Reagan-Bush Committee
Les Francis, Executive Director, Democratic National Committee
Betty Heitman, Co-chair, Republican National Committee
Albert R. Hunt, Correspondent, Wall Street Journal
Robert J. Keefe, Political Consultant, Carter-Mondale
David A. Keene, National Political Director, Bush for President
Paul G. Kirk, Jr., National Political Director, Kennedy for President
Tim Kraft, Campaign Manager, Carter-Mondale
Catherine Mackin, Network Correspondent, ABC News
Michael F. MacLeod, Campaign Manager-Treasurer, National Unity Campaign
Eddie Mahe, Jr., Campaign Director, John Connally for President
Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary, Reagan-Bush Committee
Martin F. Nolan, Washington Bureau Chief, Boston Globe
Tom Quinn, Campaign Director, Brown for President
Special Projects

John Rendon, Convention Manager, Carter-Mondale
Joanne Symons, Cofounder, Draft Kennedy Movement
Richard G. Stearns, Chief of Delegate Selection, Kennedy for President
Robert M. Teeter, President, Market Opinion Research
Carl Wagner, Director of Field Operations, Kennedy for President
Jack Walsh, National Political Director, Carter-Mondale
Richard B. Wirthlin, Deputy Director of Strategy and Planning, Reagan-Bush Committee

Elizabeth Pleasants served as principal coordinator for the conference and in the production of the book. Other Institute staff members who contributed to the project were:

Nick Mitropoulos, Assistant Director and Forum Coordinator
Alan Mitter, Staff Assistant
Geri Denterlein, Staff Assistant to the Forum Coordinator
Amy Gazin Schwartz, Forum Secretary
Larry Goldberg, Media Services Coordinator
Lori Forman, Media Services Assistant

Dana Stein was coordinator of student assistance for the conference.

Television Documentary on the Reagan Transition

In association with the Institute, WGBH produced a television special, “Countdown to the White House: The Reagan Transition,” which was broadcast nationally by PBS on January 21, 1981. Through interviews, narration, and behind-the-scenes footage, a special documentary unit explored the major issues and personalities involved in the transfer of power during the 77 days between election and inauguration.

Harry Clark, Executive Producer
Phillip Garvin, Producer and Director
Hugh Sidey, Commentator
Jonathan Moore, Senior Consultant
Other Projects

Five-part series on issues facing the new administration

The Institute and WGBH co-produced a special five part series of shows, "When Reagan Takes Power," made available to the public television network for airing during the week of inauguration. Using in-studio interviews from both Boston and Washington with prominent political analysts and practitioners, each half-hour show examined a different major issue facing the incoming administration: the economy, foreign policy, the Congress, the government, and human rights.

Jack Cole, Boston Co-anchor
Margaret Osmer, Washington Co-anchor
Seth Rolbein, Boston Producer
Kat Harding, Washington Producer
Jonathan Moore, Associate Editor
Nick Mitropoulos, Consultant

Charter Reform Project

In the Spring of 1981, an ad hoc research group prepared a discussion paper on the issue of charter reform in Boston and specifically the ballot initiatives which would institute district representation for the City Council and the School Committee. The paper was prepared at the request of the staff of The Boston Committee, an independent organization established to address racial and cultural tensions in the city, for use in its internal consideration of what position to take with regard to the issue and was submitted to it in June of 1981. An excerpt from this paper appears in the Readings section of this issue of Proceedings.

The project was supervised by Jonathan Moore, Director, and Nick Mitropoulos, Assistant Director; the paper was written by Stephen Bates, Harvard '82, Alan Mitter, Staff Assistant, and Richard Tofel, MPP-JD candidate, and project consultants were Manuel Carballo, Lecturer in Public Policy, and Christopher Edley, Jr., Institute Research Fellow.

Weekly suppers

Every Monday and Wednesday evening during the fall and spring semesters, the Institute hosts suppers for people from the academic and political worlds to come together to "wine, dine and opine" in an informal setting. Student study group leaders and their visiting guests join with undergraduates, graduate students, fellows from other programs, faculty, administrators, political activists, local elected officials, journalists and others, invited on a rotating basis. These relaxed and lively gatherings each last from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. and involve
from 25-35 people. They are part of the Institute's continuing effort to encourage interchange among various kinds of people interested in politics.

A history class from Eisenhower College visited the Institute on January 28, 1981, as part of their month-long Independent Study Project on "the historiography of the 1960's." They met with a group of staff and students and discussed the history of the Institute and its current activities.

The International Institute of Public Management sponsored a visit by a delegation of Nigerian state-level civil servants to the Institute on April 2, 1981, as part of their three-week seminar/study tour on public management in the United States. They met in an afternoon discussion session with representatives of different programs of the Kennedy School to discuss the goals and purposes of the School and the Institute.

A Study Exchange team from the Rotary Club of New Zealand visited the Institute on April 27, 1981. The six visitors, hosted by the Rotary Clubs of Boston and Cambridge, took a tour of the School's building and spent an hour in discussion with Institute fellows and staff.
The Forum

The ARCO Public Affairs Forum is the multi-tiered central area of the John F. Kennedy School of Government building. It serves, as Edward M. Kennedy remarked in his dedication address, as a "crossroads by day and a meeting place by night, an arena for debate where democracy can come alive, a forum where citizens can meet with presidents and kings, or poets debate with secretaries of defense."

The Institute administers all formal programs held in the Forum, which this year included:

"Energy in the Eighties," a panel discussion as part of the Class of 1930 Reunion, June 4, 1980. Participants were:

Al Alm, Research Fellow, Energy and Environmental Policy Center
William Hogan, Professor of Political Economy
Joseph Nye, Professor of Government
Henry Lee, Executive Director, Energy and Environmental Policy Center

"Iran: New Solutions to Old Problems," a panel discussion, July 9, 1981. Participants were:

Mary Anderson, Professor of Urban Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Charles Kimball, Ph.D. candidate, Harvard Divinity School
George Wald, Professor of Biology, Emeritus, Harvard University
Ira Jackson, Associate Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government


"The Republicans Choose a Nominee," a panel discussion, July 16, 1981. Participants were:

John Sears, City Council Member, Boston
Jack Walsh, political consultant
Edward F. King, Chairman, Boston Finance Commission
Donna Kuha, Chair, Massachusetts Women's Political Caucus

"Afghanistan: Inside, Outside, and the Region," a panel discussion, July 22, 1981. Participants were:

Philip Morg, Afghani businessman
Howard Wriggins, Professor of Political Science, Columbia University
Abdul Ghaforuzai, former Afghan diplomat
Eden Naby, Research Fellow, Center for Middle Eastern Studies,
Harvard University

Large screen viewing of the Democratic National Convention, August 11 – 14, 1980.

A joint dinner for the participants in the Senior Managers in Government Program and the State and Local Government Program, August 19, 1981, with an address given by Joseph Califano, former Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare.

"Personal Perspectives on Politics," a panel of the Fall 1980 Institute of Politics Fellows, September 11, 1980. Participants were:

Ronald H. Brown
Julia Chang Bloch
Joseph N. Garba
Patricia Keefer
Nick Thimmesch
Chase Untermeyer
Moderator: Jonathan Moore

(Consult the earlier section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.)

"Foreign Policy and Campaign '80," a panel discussion, September 18, 1980. Participants were:

Richard Hunt, Director, Andrew W. Mellon Faculty Fellowship Program, Harvard University
Samuel P. Huntington, Director, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
Richard Pipes, Professor of History, Harvard University
Moderator: Stanley Hoffmann, Professor of Government, Harvard University

"The Great Cities of the World Conference," co-sponsored with "Jubilee 350" of the City of Boston, September 26, 1980. The day's activities at the Kennedy School included:
"Financial and Economic Resources for Cities to Support Themselves," a panel discussion with:

Narcis Serra, Mayor, Barcelona, Spain
V. D. Desai, City Commissioner, Bombay, India
Edward Koch, Mayor, New York, New York
Moderator: John Gunther, Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors

A public address by Michael S. Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts and Lecturer at the John F. Kennedy School of Government.

"Organization of City Government: Sustaining Accountability and Support," a panel discussion with:

Andonis Tritsis, Planning Advisor, Athens, Greece
Claude Ketterer, City Council Member and former Mayor, Geneva, Switzerland
Governor Chaowas, Bangkok, Thailand
Moderator: Samuel H. Beer, Professor of Government, Harvard University

Closing remarks by Kevin H. White, Mayor of Boston

"Reindustrialization and Jobs: Save the Plant or Save the Economy?" a panel discussion co-sponsored with Working Papers magazine, September 29, 1980. Participants were:

Lester Thurow, Professor of Economics and Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Bennett Harrison, Professor of Political Economy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Robert Kuttner, Editor, Working Papers magazine

A public address by Constantine Mitsotakis, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Greece, co-sponsored with the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, September 30, 1980.

Videotaping of the WCVB-TV public affairs program "Miller's Court," October 2, 1980. Subject: "The Right to Die"; guest: David Richards, Professor of Law, New York University; host: Arthur Miller, Professor of Law, Harvard University.
"The Role of the Board of Trustees in Non-Profit Organizations," a panel discussion held at the Forum as part of a conference hosted by the Institute for Open Education, October 4, 1980. Participants were:

Peggy Dulaney, Chairperson, Board of Trustees, Institute for Open Education
Warren Bennis, Professor of Business Administration and Research, University of Southern California
K. Dun Gifford, President, Great Bay Company; Director, Conservation Law Foundation; President, Nantucket Land Council
David Washburn, member, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind and Garrison, New York; Trustee, Rare Animal Relief Effort, Inc.
Blenda Wilson, Senior Associate Dean and Lecturer on Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Eileen Moran Brown, Dean, Institute of Open Education

"Does Liberalism Have a Future?" a public address by Daniel Yankelovich, President, Yankelovich, Skelly and White, co-sponsored by The Center for Science and International Affairs, October 6, 1980. Excerpts from this address appear in the Readings section of this issue of Proceedings. Respondents were:

John K. Galbraith, Professor of Economics, Emeritus
Richard E. Neustadt, Professor of Public Administration
Thomas C. Schelling, Professor of Political Economy
Moderator: Dorothy Zinberg, Director of Special Projects, Center for Science and International Affairs

"Should the presidential term of office be limited to a six-year term?" a debate co-sponsored by the Foundation for the Study of Presidential and Congressional Terms, October 7, 1980. Speaking in favor of the resolution was Jack Valenti, President, Motion Picture Association of America; speaking in opposition was William Schneider, Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

"Priming the Pump for Synfuel," a public address by Kathryn Schirmer, Associate Director for Natural Resources, Energy, and Science, Office of Management and Budget, co-sponsored by the Energy and Environmental Policy Center, October 9, 1980.

"To Form a Government," a public address by Lloyd Cutler, Counsel to the President, October 10, 1980.
"In Cold Ink," a panel discussion among political cartoonists, October 14, 1980. Participants were:

Jules Feiffer, Field Syndicate
Paul Szep, The Boston Globe
Tony Auth, The Philadelphia Inquirer
Jeff MacNelly, The Richmond News Leader
Doug Marlette, The Charlotte Observer
Moderator: Jonathan Moore


A public address by Kwame Ture (formerly Stokely Carmichael), Pan-Africanist and former Director of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, co-sponsored by the Harvard Black Students Association and the W. E. B. DuBois Institute, October 17, 1980. Excerpts from this speech appear in the Readings section of this issue of Proceedings.

"John F. Kennedy School of Government Third Annual Alumni Day," October 18, 1980. The day's activities included:

"The State of the Economy: The Energy Crisis and Reindustrialization," a panel discussion with:

Al Aim, Research Fellow, Energy and Environmental Policy Center
Josh Gotbaum, MPP-JD '78, Assistant Director, White House Domestic Policy Staff
Susan Irving, MPP '74, Ph.D. '76, Special Assistant to the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors
Phillip Odeen, Partner-in-Charge, Management Consulting Services, Coopers & Lybrand, Washington, DC
Moderator: Richard Darman, Lecturer in Public Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Changes in the Quality of Life and Political Processes," a panel discussion with:

Manuel Carballo, MPA '67, Lecturer, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Anthony Oettinger, Professor of Applied Mathematics, Harvard University
Brunetta Wolfman, Executive Planner, Massachusetts Department of Education
Moderator: Badi Foster, Lecturer on Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

"Career Development," a panel discussion with:
Greg Lipscomb, MPA '78
John Lundeen, MPP '78
Skip McKoy, MPA '78
Sueanne Pfifferling, MCRP '78
Moderator: Norman Smith, Assistant Dean and Director of Career Services, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"Strategic Initiatives of the School — The Next Ten Years," a presentation by:
Hale Champion, Executive Dean
Ira Jackson, Associate Dean


"Women in Campaign '80," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Massachusetts Women's Political Caucus, October 23, 1980. Participants were:
Anne Wexler, Assistant to President Carter
Evelyn Cunningham, Co-Chair, Women for Anderson National Committee
Karen Keesling, Women's Policy Advisory Board, Reagan-Bush Committee

A public address by Robert A. Frosch, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, October 24, 1980.
A reception as part of a research conference of the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management, October 25, 1980.

The 1980 Tanner Lecture, "Do Countries Have Moral Obligations? The Case of World Poverty," delivered by Brian Barry, Professor, Departments of Political Science and Philosophy, University of Chicago, October 27, 1980.

"Science and Technology in Developing Countries," a panel discussion, November 5, 1980. Participants were:

Raymond Vernon, Professor of International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Jerome Weisner, Institute Professor and President Emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Edmundo Flores, Science Advisor to President Lopez Portillo; Director General, National Council of Science and Technology, Mexico
Moderator: Harvey Brooks, Professor of Technology and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

A public address by William Ruckelshaus, Senior Vice-President, Weyerhauser Corporation, and former Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, November 6, 1980.

"The Native American Challenge: New Social Paradigms for the 1980's," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the American Indian Program of the Graduate School of Education, November 12, 1980. Participants were:

Frank Ryan, Director, American Indian Program, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Rennard Strickland, Visiting Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
Ron Trosper, Professor of Economics, Boston College
Arthur Zimiga, Director of Educational Programs, Oglala Sioux Tribe

"The Refugee Crisis in East Africa," a panel discussion, November 18, 1980. Participants were:

C. Payne Lucas, Executive Director, Africare
Ahmed Faraj, East African Field Director, OXFAM, USA
Abdi Artan Adan, First Secretary, Somali Mission to the United Nations
Moderator: Rita Breen, Executive Officer, Committee on African Studies, Harvard University
President Bok and Dean Allison each hosted receptions in the Forum before and after the Yale game, respectively, on November 22, 1980.

"Using Admissions Tests Fairly," a panel discussion sponsored by the Kennedy School Students Association, November 24, 1980. Participants were:

- **Douglas Porter**, Principal Associate in Medicine, Harvard Medical School
- **Warren V. Clack**, Associate Professor of Medicine at Beth Israel Hospital
- **Walt Haney**, Project Director, Huron Institute, and Staff Director, National Consortium on Testing
- **Beverly C. Glenn**, Policy Analyst, Center for Law and Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
- **Dean K. Whitla**, Director of Instructional Research and Evaluation, Harvard University

"Future Directions of the Lesbian/Gay Community: A Decade of Growth and a Decade of Uncertainty," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard-Radcliffe Gay Students Association, December 4, 1980. Participants were:

- **Ginny Apuzzo**, Co-Chair, Lesbian/Gay Caucus, 1980 Democratic National Convention
- **Diane Green**, Lesbian and Gay Media Advocates
- **Ed Haugen**, Minister, Metropolitan Community Church
- **Audre Lorde**, author, The Black Unicorn
- **Benjamin Schatz**, President, Harvard-Radcliffe Gay Students Association

Moderator: Gaye Williams, President, Radcliffe Lesbians Association

An excerpt from the remarks made by Ms. Apuzzo appear in the Readings sections of this issue of Proceedings.

"Institutional Racism and Sexism in the University," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Kennedy School Students Association and the Kennedy School Women's Caucus, December 9, 1980. Participants were:

- **Denise Carty-Benia**, Professor of Law, Northeastern University
- **Derrick Bell**, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School
- **Alan Counter**, Professor of Biology, Harvard University

"Coping with 2½: Can Cities Like Cambridge Survive?", a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Cambridge Civic Association, December 11, 1980. Par-
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Participants were:

Helen Heller, Coordinator, Educational Priorities Panel, New York City
Suzanne Tompkins, Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation
Arlo Woolery, The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
Moderator: John Kenneth Galbraith, Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard University


A dinner for the Harvard Community Health Plan, January 14, 1981.

Large screen viewing of the Super Bowl, January 25, 1981.

"Conflict in the Caribbean: Socialism and the New Right," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Caribbean Club, February 2, 1981. Participants were:

Selwyn R. Cudjoe, Assistant Professor of Afro-American Studies, Harvard University
Orlando Patterson, Professor of Sociology, Harvard University
D. Williams, Ambassador to the United States from Granada


"Personal Perspectives on Politics," a panel of the Spring 1981 Institute of Politics Fellows, February 4, 1981. Participants were:

John Culver
Gene Eidenberg
Joseph Garba
Susan King
Robert Manning
Marilyn Waring
George Weeks
Moderator: Jonathan Moore

(Consult the earlier section on Institute Fellows for biographical detail.)
"Internal Iranian Politics: Class Struggle, the War with Iraq, and the National Questions," a panel discussion, February 5, 1981. Participants were:

**Thomas Ricks**, *Professor of History, Georgetown University; Co-Editor, Review of Iranian Political Economy and History*

**Paul Saba**, *J.D. candidate, Northeastern University*

**Joe Stork**, *Co-Editor, Middle East Research Information Project Reports*

The Kennedy School Student Association held a party in the Forum on February 6, 1981.


"One View from Two Bridges," a public address by **Shirley Hufstedler**, *former Secretary of Education*, February 17, 1981.

"The Rise and Fall of Neo-Conservatism," a public address by Peter Steinfels, *author*; co-sponsored by the Harman Lecture Series, February 18, 1981.


"Change in the Philippines," a panel discussion, March 2, 1981. Participants were:

**Benigno Aquino**, *Fellow, Center for International Affairs, and former Philippine Senator*

**Evelio B. Javier**, *former Governor, Province of Antique, Philippines*
Raul S. Manglapus, former Foreign Minister and President, Christian Social Movement, Philippines

"South Korea: The Prospects for Democracy," a panel discussion, March 4, 1981. Participants were:

Edward Baker, Research Associate, East Asian Legal Studies Program, Harvard Law School
Tae Hyuk Hahm, Consul-General, Republic of Korea, Boston Consulate
Gregory Henderson, former Professor of Political Science, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Edward Wagner, Professor of Korean Studies, Harvard University
Gregory Winn, Research Analyst, United States International Communications Agency
Moderator: William Shaw, Research Associate, East Asian Legal Studies Program, Harvard Law School

"Equality: An Appropriate Goal for Black Americans?" a panel discussion of the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series, sponsored by the Kennedy School Student Association, March 5, 1981. Participants were:

Ronald A. Johnson, Economist, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
Glenn Loury, Professor of Economics, University of Michigan
Ralph Smith, Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School
William Darity, Professor of Economics, University of Texas
Harvey Mansfield, Jr., Professor of Government, Harvard University
Michael Piore, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Moderator: Don Davis, U.S. House of Representatives, District of Columbia Committee

An excerpt from this discussion appears in the Readings section of this edition of Proceedings.

"Equality Before the Law?" a panel discussion of the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series, March 12, 1981. Participants were:

Junius Williams, former President, National Bar Association, and former Institute of Politics Fellow
Ronald Bailey, Professor of African-American Studies and Political Science, Northwestern University
Samuel Myers, Economist, Federal Trade Commission
Millard Arnold, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, State Department
James Q. Wilson, Professor of Government, Harvard University
Harrington Benjamin, Assistant Professor of Afro-American Studies, Harvard University
Moderator: David Nelson, U.S. District Court Judge


"Equality in the Quality of Life: The Cases of Health and Housing," a panel discussion of the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series, March 19, 1981. Participants were:
Lenneal Henderson, Professor of Business and Public Administration, Howard University
Carolyn Arnold, Professor of Afro-American Studies, Northeastern University
Robert Bullard, Professor of Sociology, Texas Southern University
Julia C. Malveaux, Professor, Graduate School of Management and Urban Professions, New School for Social Research
Hale Champion, Executive Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government, former Undersecretary of Health, Education and Welfare
Wilhelmina Leigh, Assistant Professor of City and Regional Planning, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Moderator: Randolph Kinder, former Executive Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services

"The State of Public Sector Unionism," a public address by Jerry Wurf, President, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, co-sponsored by the Harman Lecture Series, March 30, 1981.

"Equality in Education and Employment," a panel discussion of the Oliver Cromwell Cox Lecture Series, March 31, 1981. Participants were:
Mickey Burnhilm, Economic Policy Fellow, Brookings Institution
Juliet E. K. Walker, Professor of History, University of Illinois
Edward Thompson, Co-Director, Energy-Equity Task Force, Environmental Action Foundation
Lawrence Morse, Research Associate, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC
Nathan Glazer, Professor of Education and Social Structure, Harvard University
Denise Carty-Benia, Professor of Law, Northeastern University Law School
Moderator: Richard Freeman, Professor of Economics, Harvard University

"Political Realities for Blacks in the 1980's," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Nieman Foundation, April 2, 1981. Participants were:
Robert C. Maynard, Editor, The Oakland Tribune
Chuck Stone, Senior Editor, The Philadelphia Daily News
Lewis Stokes, U.S. Representative (D-Ohio)
Gloria Toote, former Assistant Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development

The Kennedy School Student Association Talent Show, April 3, 1981.

A public address by Arturo Rivera y Damas, Archbishop of El Salvador, April 7, 1981.

"U.S. and Japan: Trade Relations for the '80's," a panel discussion co-sponsored by AIESEC, April 8, 1981. Participants included:
Michael J. Calhoun, Vice-Chair, U.S. International Trade Commission
Alonzo McDonald, Lecturer, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University; former Deputy Special Trade Representative
Katsuhiro Nakagawa, New York Representative, Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry
Adlai Stevenson, former U.S. Senator; Institute of Politics Visiting Fellow

"Going Even Further: A Night of Women's Culture," an evening of all-women performances of dance, music, theater, film, and poetry, produced and hosted by Marilyn Waring, Fellow, Institute of Politics. The evening's special guest was
Robin Morgan, poet, and Editor of Ms. magazine, April 13, 1981. Other performers included:

Katherine Triantafillow, singer, songwriter, and a Boston attorney

Maggie Ayers, a New Zealand dancer

The Thombird Jazz Quintet, led by Edwina Thorn, a trumpeter from New Zealand

One of the poems read by Ms. Morgan is included in the Readings section of this issue of Proceedings.

"New Directions in Collective Bargaining in the Communications Industry," a public address by Glen Watts, President, Communications Workers of America, co-sponsored by the Harman Lecture Series, April 14, 1981.

A debate between the Harvard Debate Council and the Boston College Debate Council, "Resolved: that the United States should ban the deployment of the MX missile," April 15, 1981.


"Can America Compete? From High Tech to Autos," a public address by Philip Klutznick, former Secretary of Commerce, April 23, 1981.

A reception for the Legal Defense Fund of the National Association of Colored People, with an address by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, April 26, 1981.

Harvard Debate Council vs. Princeton Debate Council, April 30, 1981. "Resolved: That the United States should consider its national interests as more important than human rights in the formation of its foreign policy."

"Waging Peace," a two-day conference co-sponsored by the Boston-Cambridge Ministry in Higher Education, May 1 and 2, 1981. The conference was comprised of:

"The Renewal of Hope in the Nuclear Age," with presentations by:

Robert J. Lifton, Research Professor of Psychiatry, Yale University
Dorothee Soelle, Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary

"Weapons, The Economy and Nuclear Disarmament," a panel discussion. Participants were:
- Harvey Cox, Professor of Divinity, Harvard Divinity School
- Randall Farsberg, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies
- John Kenneth Galbraith, Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Harvard University
- Dick Greenwood, Special Assistant to President Wimpisinger, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers

"Evangelical Response to the Nuclear Arms Race," a public address by Vernon Grounds, President Emeritus, Denver Theological Seminary.

"The Third World Looks at Nuclear Disarmament," a public address by Ernesto Cardenal, Minister of Culture, Nicaragua.


A dinner for the Harvard Community Health Plan, May 14, 1981.

"New England Labor Conference on Safe Energy and Full Employment," a conference co-sponsored by nine different labor organizations, May 16, 1981. Conference activities were:

Opening remarks by:
- Jerry Gordon, Coordinator, National Committee for Safe Energy and Full Employment
- Edward Markey, U.S. Representative (D-Mass.)
- Kevin Mahar, IUE Local 201

A panel of speakers, each on different subjects:
- "Safety and Health Aspects of Nuclear Power," Dr. Michio Kaku, Professor of Nuclear Physics, City College of New York
- "Economic and Employment Aspects of Coal, Nuclear, Solar, and Oil Power," Charles Komanoff, economist, and energy consultant

“Energy-related Union Struggles in the U.S.”:
  Tom Twomey, United Mine Workers
  Al Sweitzer, Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks
  Dorine Levasseur, President, SEIU District 925

“Who Controls Energy?” a workshop with:
  Michael Schippani, New England Organizer, ILGWU
  William Worthy, Professor of Journalism and Afro-American Studies, Boston University
  Winona LaDuke, Native American activist

“Energy Alternatives and Jobs,” a workshop with:
  Charles Komanoff, economist and energy consultant
  Paul Eustis, President, Machinist Lodge, Logan Airport
  Edwin Vargas, President, Greater Harford Labor Council
  Reggie Williams, Third World Jobs Clearinghouse, Boston

“Anti-nuclear Organizing in New England,” a workshop with:
  Guy Chichester, UBJCA Local 1836; co-founder, Clamshell Alliance
  Peter Kellman, Maine AFL-CIO Runaway Shop Project; labor organizer for Maine referendum on nuclear power

“Great Vocations: Issues in the Professions,” a panel discussion, May 31, 1981. Participants were:
  George H. Williams, Hollis Professor of Divinity, Emeritus, Harvard Divinity School
  Arthur J. Goldberg, former Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court
  Philip Morrison, Institute Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

“Water Resources,” a panel discussion as part of the Class of ’31 Reunion, June 3, 1981. Participants were:
  Evelyn Murphy, former Secretary of Environmental Affairs, Massachusetts
  James Smith, Acting Administrator for Water and Waste Management, Environmental Protection Agency
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Nancy Laney, author
Douglas Costle, former Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency

"The Afghanistan Tribunal: Issues of War Crimes and Aggression," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School, July 9, 1981. Participants were:

Akbar Ahmed, former political officer for the Northwest Frontier, Afghanistan
S. Farhang, Afghan exile
George Wald, Professor of Biology, Emeritus, Harvard University
Eden Naby, Research Fellow, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University

"The Effects of Proposition 2 1/2," a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School, July 16, 1981. Participants were:

Barbara Anderson, Executive Director, Citizens for Limited Taxation
Donald Marquis, Town Manager, Arlington, Massachusetts
James Segel, Executive Director, Massachusetts Municipal Association
Francis Duehay, Mayor of Cambridge, Massachusetts
Helen Ladd, Associate Professor of City & Regional Planning, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"SALT in the '80's," a panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School, July 23, 1981. Participants were:

W. Scott Thompson, Professor, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Everett Mendelsohn, Professor of the History of Science, Harvard University
Albert Carnesale, Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

"The Future of the Voting Rights Act," a panel discussion co-sponsored by the Harvard Summer School, July 30, 1981. Participants were:

Ron Brown, Chief Counsel, Democratic National Committee
William Danvers, Assistant to Congressman Robert Garcia (D-New York)
Henry Monaghan, Professor of Law, Boston University Law School
Robert Brinson, City Attorney, Rome, Georgia
Gary Orren, Associate Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government

“Public Policy and Private Education: A Future of Harmony or Discord?” a panel discussion as part of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Education Commission of the States, August 28, 1981. Participants were:

Chester Finn, Professor of Education and Public Policy, Vanderbilt University
John Porter, President, Eastern Michigan University
Moderator: Michael Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts and Lecturer in Public Policy