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Fi, Fie, Foe, Perot: Populist Giant or Grim Illusionist?

A close analysis of a Texas Twister.

by Richard Purcell

Ross Perot. The billionaire. The presidential candidate. The man who made three references to the Tooth Fairy and the Easter Bunny in a recent debate with the Vice President. However one chooses to think of him, Ross Perot is an amazing individual. He simply did not exist as a national political figure two years ago. Yet his simple, down-to-earth approach to economics and government ("just plain talk"), his successful business background, and his stated desire to "do what's right for my country" landed him nearly 20 million votes in last year's presidential election — 19 percent of the electorate — without the support of any major party (Fineman 34). A year later he remains the most potent political force in the United States outside the Beltway. This kind of popularity by a single, independent individual is unusual, to say the least.

But contrary to Perot's own often used expression, it's just not that simple. Ross Perot is a skilled political operator, to be sure, but there are larger social, political, and economic forces sustaining his popularity. White House pollster Stan Greenberg is right when he says that Perot is largely a creation of the voters. The Texas billionaire has reached his current level of popularity because the public is dissatisfied with the nation's leadership.

This voter discontent has been building up for some time. Although the 1980s witnessed the longest period of economic growth since World War II, many voters — indeed, many economists — worried about changes in the underlying structure of the U.S. economy. In 1981 the U.S. had a budget surplus of $8.2 billion and a foreign trade deficit of $34.6 billion dollars; by 1987 the federal budget was running an annual deficit of $143.7 billion and a trade deficit of $170.3 billion (Phillips Appendix H). American industry seemed to be losing out to foreign competitors. The increase of foreign-made products in the United States and the falling wages of factory workers fuelled these worries. And despite considerable prosperity experienced by the upper-middle class, many less wealthy households were unable to maintain their standard of living unless both parents were employed. In fact, after-tax median family income (in 1987 dollars) had actually fallen from $25,518 in 1977 to an estimated $23,508 ten years later (Phillips Appendix C). As political economist Kevin Phillips wrote, during the 1980s "many Americans on the lower half of the economic ladder had been losing ground. And even the affluent, enjoying their champagne and raspberries, wondered how real the good times were."(Phillips 5) Toward the second half of the decade, with the national debt continuing to climb and the stock market crash in 1987, fears that the U.S. economy was in a permanent decline mounted. Many of these fears were exaggerated. Some were not.

Compounding these concerns were worries about the fabric of American society and the ethics of its government. During the 1980s and early 1990s Americans watched corruption and ineptitude appear to overtake their government, with such scandals as Iran-Contra, the S&L failures, the Keating Five, and the House banking scandal. Meanwhile, the percentage of Americans living in poverty grew to 13.6 percent by 1986, up from 11.4 percent in 1978—an increase of eight million people (Famighetti 371). Crime also spread unchecked; the number of murders in the United States increased by 25 percent over a five year period, from 17,971 in 1988 to 22,540 in 1992 (Famighetti 967). AIDS, drug abuse, teen pregnancy, and other societal problems further helped undermine the security and stability of America's all important middle class. In the face of this uncertainty, the federal government appeared gridlocked, unable or unwilling to act on any of the nation's ailments.

Yet there was no political upheaval during the 1980s for several reasons. One was that, despite long-term fears, the overall economy was performing well. Many Americans prospered during these years or, at the very least, held their own with a reasonable amount of job security. The popularity of Ronald Reagan also helped forestall political upheaval. Reagan stood for clear principles: less government, Christian morals, and a strong military. He was a likable man and a likable leader, optimistic, jovial, and resolute. His confidence served as a counterweight to the uncertainty of the Eighties boom. The reality of the Cold War and its assurance of American importance in international matters — reinforced by Reagan's patriotic, anti-communist image — also made many voters reluctant to make great changes in their government. Thus, in the 1988 elections Americans chose a Republican president and a Democratic Congress, reinforcing the status quo.

Voter Revolt. By the fall of 1991, however, the state of the nation had changed considerably. George Bush had taken over the White House and Ronald Reagan had departed for his California ranch once and for all, taking his eternal optimism and his firm leadership with him. The Soviet Union and its communist allies no longer existed, leaving America questioning its position in a radically changing world. Worst of all, the United States found itself in a
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nationwide recession. Although not as deep as previous economic downturn, the recession unmasked the country's concerns which had gone unaddressed during the previous decade. An entire litany of accumulated national ailments, coupled with economic and social problems, quickly rushed to the forefront of the nation's consciousness. As unemployment rose to 7.4 percent and a gripping economic uncertainty took hold of the nation, Americans began to worry not only about their job security, but also about how they would be able to afford such basic things as health care, college for their children, and owning their own home (Famighetti 133). Frustrated with a government that seemed incapable of decisive action, the electorate became consumed with an anger toward conventional politics that knew no ideological bent.

And so the anti-incumbent movement began. President Bush's approval ratings plummeted from almost 90 percent in the spring of 1991 to below 40 percent by the end of the year, and conservative commentator Pat Buchanan declared that he would run against Bush in the Republican primary. Simultaneously, Harris Wofford, a dark horse candidate for Senate in Pennsylvania, defeated former attorney general Dick Thornburgh, a Bush appointee who was considered by many to be a virtual shoe-in. In Louisiana, former Ku Klux Klansman David Duke edged out reform governor Buddy Roemer in the state's open primary and gained 39 percent of the vote (and 55 percent of the middle class white vote) in the general election (Maginnis, 342). It was also around this time that the idea of term limits for elected officials began to gain in popularity. The electorate was showing unmistakable hostility toward conventional politicians.

What made this voter discontent distinctive was the fact that it had little to do with specific government policies. Rather, it stemmed from a deep feeling among voters that government simply did not belong to them any longer, that instead it was controlled by lobbyists and politicians out for their own personal gain. The populism of the 1992 campaign reflected this feeling. Jerry Brown, with the campaign slogan "We the People," and Pat Buchanan, running on the idea of "America First," ran surprisingly successful grass roots campaigns in the 1992 primaries. The advent of "town hall" discussions of national issues between candidates and ordinary citizens was another indication of the populist nature, as was the emphasis on "outsiders," candidates with few connections to the Washington establishment. As a result, Princeton history professor Sean Wilentz explains, this mood among voters "has no specific location on the political spectrum . . . And because it is a mood, it is a singularly effective tool for politicians who would build their careers out of the accumulated social injuries of an uncertain time." (Wilentz, 35)

By early June, 37% of the voting public said it would vote for Perot if the election were held then, even though he had not even formulated a clear set of proposals indicating how he would govern.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. Enter Ross Perot. All it took was a casual appearance on Larry King Live by the folksy Texan in February of 1992 to send droves of private citizens into action, collecting signatures across the country in an effort to put him on the presidential ballot in each of the 50 states. By early June, 37 percent of the voting public said it would vote for Perot if the election were held then, even though he had not even formulated a clear set of proposals indicating how he would govern (Barrett 33). Far more than Jerry Brown or Pat Buchanan, Perot filled a void left by more conventional political figures: he would get things done for the people. In an interview in April of 1992, Perot said, "The point is whether the American people want to talk about it or do it. All Washington does is talk about it. If you want to talk about it, I'm not your man." (Carroll 27)

Unlike most other politicians, Perot appeared as a man of action and he made action look easy, at one point claiming the country could get rid of its budget deficit "without breaking a sweat." (Church 39) Confident and decisive, he ignited unhappy voters by appearing as someone other than an ordinary politician.

Thus, Ross Perot became the Opposition, the opposition to everything that Washington had come to stand in the minds of many Americans. Yet, however much as by whom he is not as much as who he is. He is not a Washington operative, nor is he affiliated with a political party. Perot's apparent lack of political experience is an asset to him: where it would be a liability for a candidate. As he likes to say of himself, "I don't have any experience running a four trillion dollar debt." Disaffected voters like to hear such statements. They don't care so much about specific proposals for fixing the country's problems as they do knowing that Perot wants to fix them. The more detailed becomes, the more he sounds like an average politician. His explosion on the national scene as the Washington movement gathers momentum was not mere happenstance. Ross Perot is as much a historical phenomenon as a product of his own genius.

His political talents, however, should not be ignored. He has a deep understanding of the alienation voters feel from their government and he made use of this knowledge to sustain his popularity. His explanation of Washington no longer serves the American people, for instance, dovetailed with this feeling of disappointment. Perot says, "The one thing I know about this policy, if I ever get stuck [in Washington], I can stay inside the Beltway. It's like living in a bubble. If you want to serve the people, you've got to listen to real people, you stay inside the Beltway, the special interests become the real people." (Cam 27) Perot demonstrates his loyalty to "real people" by emphasizing the fact that his wealth frees him from the constraints of special interest groups. He also emphasizes his overriding desire to set his country, that he is only acting on his wishes of his grass roots supporters.

Perot likes to further distinguish himself from other national figures by emphasizing issues that the two political parties have merely glossed over. For instance, during the presidential campaign he seized on the budget deficit as a major focus of his campaign, linking it to the severity of the recession while other two candidates paid it only lip service. This strategy made him look like the only one of the three willing to tackle the country's fundamental problems. After Bill Clinton's deficit-cutting bud was enacted this past August, Perot shifted his emphasis to attacking the No.
American Free Trade Agreement. In doing so, he again sought to portray himself as the lone champion of the people, uninfluenced by big companies or foreign lobbyists wanting to transfer American jobs to Mexico. Similarly, his continued harping on the need to curtail the influence of Washington lobbyists underscores his image as a man trying to return government to the voters.

"I DON'T HAVE A POWER DRIVE" figuring out Ross Perot's motives is no easy feat. His supporters believe that he is acting purely out of patriotism, just as he claims, and certainly he has done a lot to strengthen the political process. His focus on the deficit during the 1992 campaign alerted voters to its tremendous importance to the American economy. He is also right to raise the issue of special interest influence in Washington.

His most important contribution, however, has been his psychological effect on the electorate. The petition drives that placed him on the ballot energized citizens—many of whom had long since given up on government—into participating in the democratic process. He reminded many Americans that the government belongs to them. Regardless of what one thinks of him personally, these things must be counted in Ross Perot's favor.

Nevertheless, it is easy to question whether or not Perot's actions have been examples of complete selflessness. His manipulation of facts and issues indicates that he enjoys the attention and power his recent notoriety have conferred upon him. "I don't have a power drive," he told an interviewer once, "yet his actions indicate otherwise" (Parker 26). Not long after the election, Perot said he hoped he didn't have to run again in 1996, that he would prefer to see Bill Clinton's face on Mt. Rushmore. Then, just a few months after Clinton's inauguration, Perot claimed that the new President wasn't suited for any job above a "middle-management position" in a "medium-sized company." (Fineman 24)

But this was not the only time he contradicted himself. After arguing loudly for reducing the budget deficit during the presidential campaign, the Texas billionaire was wholly unsupportive of President Clinton's effort at deficit reduction. During this summer's debate over Clinton's budget, he criticized the Clinton for relying too much on tax increases, even though his own plan would have raised taxes twice as much.

Perot was simply unwilling to allow the President to steal the issue away from him. To endorse Clinton's budget proposal would have diminished his own importance in national politics, and that was something he was unwilling to do.

Perot is undeniably a threat to the two political parties. During the 1992 election he siphoned off votes from Bush and Clinton roughly equally, and his loyal following composed of roughly one fifth of the voting public allows him to play the two parties off against one another without committing to either. This ability gives him considerable leverage in national politics. Moreover, the fact that Perot is a manifestation of voter opposition to traditional politics forces him to keep anti-political sentiments alive. Thus, he must continually point out and even exaggerate the flaws in the nation's leadership if he is to remain a political figure. Ultimately this is counter productive democracy, since it makes the electorate even more divided than it already is and reinforces gridlock. Yet despite this threat from Perot, neither party seems sure how to deal with him.

It is clear, however, that responsibility for discrediting Perot (and sole power to do so) rests with Bill Clinton and the Democratic Party, since they are the party in power. In order to undermine him, the Democrats must not be afraid to attack Ross Perot personally.

Clinton has been reluctant to do this so far, primarily out of fear of offending Perot's supporters, although the November debate between Al Gore and Perot indicates that this reluctance is abating. Polls show that Perot's followers are more dedicated to what he stands for than Perot himself. Attacking Perot would likely dislodge more of these supporters while making it easier for Clinton to popularize his own policies.

But if the Clinton Administration is to thwart Perot's desire to dominate American politics, it must do more than attack Ross Perot the man: it must attack Ross Perot the phenomenon, the underlying reasons for his popularity. 1's vs 2's mote 3's and more important than engaging in day-to-day verbal sparring, Clinton must show that government can take effective action against the nation's problems. In plain English, this means legislative successes and an expanding economy. The President must get a significant number of his proposals enacted into law and be able to convince the public that his ideas work. If he can do these things, Clinton will put Perot in a lose-lose situation. Should Perot choose to endorse Clinton's actions, he will be admitting that the need for him as a political figure has diminished. On the other hand, if he belittles White House policies which are popular with the general public he will look as though he is only out for personal gain. In order for Clinton to succeed he must not only achieve success in Congress, but also convince the public that his proposals will help remedy the nation's problems. He has yet to do these things, and as a result Perot still looms large on the political horizon.

The Republicans are in a tougher position than the Democrats. Because they are the minority party, they are forced to share their opposition status with Perot.

The Republicans are in a tougher position than the Democrats. Because they are the minority party, they are forced to share their opposition status with Perot. If Clinton proves to be an unpopular president, the Republicans will benefit—but so will Perot. The Republicans would like to see him undermined, but the most likely way for this to happen involves higher approval ratings for Bill Clinton. Currently the Republican Party is divided as to how to handle Perot. Some believe they should accommodate him as a fellow opponent of President Clinton. Indeed, House Minority Whip Newt Gingrich is an official member of United We Stand America. One of the downsides to this approach is that it gives Perot indirect influence with the Republican Party. Others want to keep their distance from him, but this strategy would divide anti-Clinton voters, benefitting no one but the Democrats.

All three participants are already jockeying for position in 1996. Despite a recent drop in his approval ratings, Perot still commands support from roughly a quarter of the electorate. Will he run again? The answer probably

Continued on page 9
An End to the War of the Woods!

Recent developments in federal policy toward Pacific Northwest forests may mean an end to a divisive environmental dispute.

by Brad Meacham

TREE-LINED U.S. HIGHWAY 101 in Washington State is a long way from the noisy streets of New York City. The route meanders through magnificent stands of old-growth trees that have stood for centuries, and through vast farms of trees that have been planted to replace those already cut. Logging trucks still dominate the road but are less prevalent than they were just a few years ago. Towns are depressed because of the decline of the industry; a general feeling of anxious frustration fills the air. There was a time when this area bustled with activity and families prospered along with it. The American archetype of the rugged outdoorsman was widespread and no one worried about any endangered species.

To the majority of America this mildewy corner of the country is very far away indeed. Wood products are taken for granted. No one thinks about where they come from. Outside the spotlight, this area suffered as the forests thinned and there were fewer and fewer trees to cut. For years, the balance between preserving the livelihoods of the human inhabitants and protecting the natural integrity of the region was a quiet political contest waged in Washington D.C. and in the board rooms of the forest products industry.

No more. With the widely publicized spotted owl controversy and the ascendance of an avowedly environmentally-minded Presidential team, the region is finally on the nation’s front burner.

President Clinton’s recent appointment of Jack Ward Thomas as Director of the National Forest Service is the most recent indication of this attention. With 27 years of experience as a biologist with the Forest Service, Thomas is no “career” forester but rather a leader with strong scientific credentials. Since its inception, the agency’s leaders have always been accomplished career veterans of the field who are ideally immune to political pressure in managing the forests. Many environmental groups supported Thomas’ nomination and he was cheered by the Association of Forest Service Employees, a dissident group of forestry workers who have been frustrated with the agency’s recent policies. They accuse the previous management of stifling internal dissent, harming fish and wildlife by overemphasizing timber cutting, abetting timber theft and manipulating timber data to increase harvest amounts (Kenworthy and Schwartz). While many hope the new appointment will improve morale at the agency, others have called for a continuation of the previous career-based appointments instead of establishing a precedent for politicization of the office that could put control of the agency into the hands of an anti-forest administration.

The fact that Clinton opted for Thomas over this cautious objection is noteworthy because it indicates that a major policy shift is underway, exemplified by the administration’s support of qualified leaders who will act with the best interests of science in mind. After years of malignant neglect, Northwest forests are finally being paid much-needed attention and the effects will be felt across the nation.

TIMBER COMMUNITIES VS. ENVIRONMENTALISTS

The land that provided the foundation for legends of the rugged Western woodsman longer exists. Ninety percent of the original temperate rain forest in the lower 48 states has been logged. The original romance of cutting trees by hand saws has been replaced by real images of high-technology logging performed with the benefit of helicopters and government-funded roads that reach far out of the public view.

Even though the original legend turns out to be a fantasy, real communities have become directly tied to the industry that removes the trees. State and local governments receive 25 to 50 percent of National Forest revenue, becoming dependent on the money for their sustenance. Timber sale revenue directly funds the construction of new schools in Washington, and forest products is the largest industry in (logging activity was to stop). An exaggeration to say that towns and industries in sections of the region would die.

Between 1980 and 1991, more than 14,000 jobs directly related to logging were lost in the Northwest. Roughly 10,000 processing jobs were also lost (Meyer). Several factories were caused by the relocation of her company activities to the South, where farm trees were more plentiful.

Ninety percent of the original temperate rainforest in the lower 48 states has been logged.

Some were lost to the increased industrial activity in a historically dangerous occupation. A chief cause of the loss was the processing sector was the practice of shipping one-quarter of all harvested raw logs overseas for processing in foreign mills. Though the federal government blocked the export of federal timber in 1973, the foreign market was so lucrative that private owners supplied their own logs and put pressure on the American government to open public areas to satisfy domestic demand.

The supply of trees dried up even more quickly after the Fish and Wildlife Service listed the Northern Spotted Owl as an endangered species in 1990. The elusive animal command more significance than its 16-inch frame would suggest because it is known as an “indicator species” that can act as a barometer of the health of an entire ecosystem. Since the owl is high on many ancient forest food chains, its endangered status means many other species may also be in trouble. Excessive cutting has threatened the viability of species besides the spotted owl, from salmon to banana slugs. While measures to protect other species are under consideration, land for the owls has been set aside, cutting the amount of timber and...
pinching logging communities that were already heading toward economic depression. The owl soon gained the ire of the timber community.

The frustrations of the logging community run squarely against the increasing outdoors ethic of urban dwellers who turn to the forests for refuge from the city. Just as the number of timber jobs have declined, the number of visitors to wilderness areas has increased appreciably. As a result many

Excessive cutting has threatened the viability of species besides the spotted owl, from salmon to banana slugs.

parks require campsite reservations as much as eight months in advance and permits are required before hikers can enter some wilderness areas. With the region's population growing, more pressure will be put on land that was once the exclusive preserve of logging.

Until recently, the scramble for forests continued virtually unaddressed. While economic downturn has hurt the regional economy, the question of what to do with the trees has not been conclusively answered. While the environmentalist forces appear to have the upper hand, the timber-dependent communities are left to wither on the vine.

A typical clash between the two groups occurred in 1989 when hundreds of loggers and members of their families descended on the Washington legislature in Olympia to vocalize their disgust over a plan to limit logging access to state-owned forests. At packed hearings involving suited timber executives and neatly-scrubbed environmentalists, the throngs of citizens clogged the town and caused everyone to formulate an opinion about the issue. If it was not the legal facts that persuaded them, it was the smell of the proudly unwashed loggers crammed into the marbled hallways. In a state where loggers used to stay in the woods and everyone else minded their own business, this conflagration brought the hostilities of the threatened communities to the consciousness of the majority of the state. There has been no easy fix for the problem.

The debate over the use of forest lands goes back to the late 1800s when the federal government encouraged western settlement with generous land grants for homesteading and mining. The timber equivalents of the eastern industrial magnates began to gain control over millions of acres of prime virgin forest through government railroad grants and clearing house sell-offs. At bargain rates, the land was quickly claimed and much of the forested west was occupied within a few years, concentrating control in only a few hands. For example, almost 71 percent of private timberland in western Oregon was occupied by only 68 people in 1913 (Dietrich 21).

What has become today's 191 million acre National Forest System began in 1876 with an obscure congressional appropriation (Robinson 4). For the first time, public domain was set aside as a publicly-managed reserve of trees to be controlled by a government agency instead of by private corporations. Under the auspices of the larger Department of Agriculture, the organization had a "multiple use" mandate to manage the forests for several purposes. One aspect was to ensure that there would always be an adequate supply of trees to furnish the industry so that the market-driven demands of private enterprise would never decimate the resource. The first Forest Service Director, Gifford Pinchot, pioneered the idea of "sustainable yield" forestry to minimize the waste of logging practices that left more refuse timber rotting on the ground than was available in entire eastern forests (Ervin 64). Instead of letting companies sloppily harvest only the choicest trees in a stand and leave the rest, they began cutting all the trees in the allotted area.

As a result of this early conservation measure, by 1969, 61 percent of timber from western forests was being "clear cut" (Robinson 76). The final product was a more efficient system for the harvesters, but altogether inadequate one for the environment: It left entire mountainsides bare, allowed soil erosion, and threatened stream organisms which relied on the forest canopy for shade and protection from siltation.

Another crucial factor in the current forest crisis was the obscure Knutson-Vandenburgh Act of 1930 that established the current perversive funding mechanism for the Forest Service. Under the "K-V" rules, taxpayers still fund the cost of site preparation and road building when the Forest Service sells land to logging companies. The Forest Service then keeps the fee that the buyer pays. In 1930, the average cost to the government of preparing a sale was about 50 cents per thousand board feet, so the law specified that a 50 cent reimbursement would have to be paid to the treasury. Even though the average cost is now over $50 per thousand board feet, the same 50 cents rule still applies. The national treasury ends up absorbing the extra $49.50 per thousand board feet and the Forest Service takes the rest of the fees to fund its activity, providing jobs for small dependent communities. Consequently, logging is beholden not to the sustainability of the cut, but to political pressure to provide employment. Today this system means that hundreds of millions of dollars are lost annually with this taxpayer subsidy of the industry, creating dependent communities that are resistant to reform and rapidly depleting the forest stocks (Baden).

By the 1960s, national parks and wilderness areas were established to meet the public demand for recreational space. As the public mood shifted toward an increased awareness of the recreational aspects of the outdoors, the forest management mandate for "multiple uses" became increasingly important. The environmental movement beginning with the Wilderness Act of 1964 demanded that the forests be managed as some-

Joan Reiss-
"When you're talking about ancient forest, new forestry is voodoo forestry."

thing more than giant tree farms. At the same time, the pace of logging began to pick up and accelerate the decimation of the stocks.

This brewing crisis came to a boil in the 1980s when the Reagan Revolution applied laissez-faire economic ideology to natural resource management. The bargain basement forest sales under K-V rules continued even though the value of trees had skyrocketed. When the leveraged buyout boom hit natural resources companies, the forests became the victim of profit-minded pri-
vate management policies that did not consider the long range health of the resource. The Maxxam Corporation exemplified this behavior when it sought to pay its $750 million debt by cutting old-growth timber in California even though there was no way that the cutting rate could be sustained (Meyer). Without environmentally-minded managers in control, the forests soon started paying the price for this corporate activity.

With the declaration of the spotted owl as endangered, the economic constraints were compounded by environmental ones. When the administration appeared unenthused with the idea of enforcing that law, the issue was dragged into court. Injunctions then locked up the land even more and all activity stopped on large tracts. The resulting economic slump inspired populist politicians to foster the belief that the system could continue without change. They encouraged the idea that the owl was to blame for the economic depression, that somehow the agenda of the environmentalists was directly hurting the timber communities' way of life. No mention was made of the short-sighted management policies of the timber companies.

The Bush Administration billed a plan developed by an Interior and Agriculture Departments task force as a compromise between the various interests. In response to the previous listing of the owl as endangered, the plan called for 3.2 billion board feet to be logged off forest service land annually, protected areas for the owl as long as environmental groups promised not to obstruct logging with court challenges, and sought a complete review of the endangered species laws (Sampson and Gray 17). The plan was criticized as totally unacceptable by both sides. Timber interests wanted even more trees (they were accustomed to around 4 billion board feet in the roaring 1980s) and environmentalists wanted drastic reductions. Since 3.2 billion board feet was about all the trees that could be cut according to endangered species laws, the plan did not seem to be a compromise at all for the environmentalists.

Without either side willing to back down, the matter came to a standstill. Courts prevented much activity from taking place and timber-dependent communities waited in limbo. While all sides knew that change had to happen, there was apprehension about the form it would take.

**CLINTON'S CHANGES: SEEKING A COMPROMISE**

Into this fray stepped Bill Clinton. Having picked Al Gore as a running mate, he inherited the environmental concerns that Gore had expressed as a Senator. These were met first with the appointment of several environmentally-minded leaders to land management posts, a move that caused a collective sigh of relief among employees in the agencies that had been forced to carry out the earlier mismanagement policies. The new Secretary of the Interior, environmentalist/lawyer Bruce Babbitt, began a crusade to reform the governance of 503 million acres of public lands under his control. For forests, the first step to create a new policy was a forest management conference last April in Portland. Modeled on the economic conference he had held after the election, Clinton invited the leaders of environmental, industrial, and governmental organizations, as well as scientists and affected citizens to participate. The input was to be blended into a comprehensive solution to the problem.

In early July, Clinton announced the first honest attempt at satisfying the competing needs of both sides. His compromise proposal reduced the amount of logging permitted on 22 million acres of federal forest land in Washington, Oregon, and northern California to 25 percent of the high 1980s levels. Under Clinton's plan, the logging industry may cut 12 billion board feet over 10 years, or about 1.2 billion per year. By requesting $1.2 billion in economic aid to the depressed timber-dependent communities over five years, Clinton's program would provide eco-

- nomic development grants, training grants, and job training to employ displaced loggers in watersheds damaged by clear cutting. To stimulate as much as possible, a tax change would encourage domestic milling of forests which are deemed should be protected by being 6.7 million acres of "reserves" to maintain the ecological integrity. Instead of the court's method of preserving land under guise of saving an owl, the r would seek to preserve who intact. Specified areas would be labeled "experimental" locations and some old growth would be opened to further logging.

In spite of this bold attempt at comprehensive solution, environmentalists who wanted to protect all re-growth felt betrayed by the new forestry," said Joan Re Wilderness Society's regional director in San Francisco. "But when you're about ancient forests, new forest policy is not a subject for light discussion.

On the other hand, industry advocates felt that the plan was not bold enough. They predicted the loss of tens of thousands of oil jobs directly result of the president's proposal. The president didn't make go-

**Bill Clinton**

"We are doing the best that we can with the facts as they now exist, the Pacific Northwest"

either half of his promise for a balanced solution. This ain't balanced and ain't a solution," said Mark Rey of American Forest and Paper Association. "There is nothing in this plan that gives any hope to the people in the Pat West who depend on the for products industry"(Diringer). Loggers paradigms of capping federal agency policy by the Forest Service. Portland on the day of the announcement. Exemptions for timber harvesting were threatened to seek court action.
increase timber allotments, and have indicated that they will seek congression-
al support to weaken the Endangered Species Act in order to open protected
land to the industry.

For his part, President Clinton was disappointed with the final plan
because it upset his consensus-seeking sensibilities (Egan 23). He conceded that

Jim Bayley-
"We should support these ideas while there's still
the opportunity. It's probably the best chance
we're going to get." 

not everyone would be happy with the
compromise but he believed it to be the
best possible arrangement. "We have to play the hand we were dealt," Clinton
said. "Had this crisis been dealt with years ago, we might have a plan with a higher (timber) yield and with more...protected areas. We are doing the
best we can with the facts as they now exist in the Pacific Northwest" (Diringer). The implication is that all sides could have seen a better outcome if
earlier administrations had tried to resolve the issue.

Though extremists on both sides of the issue insist that the battle
over the forests is not yet over, many accept the president's assessment. One
eample is the community of Hayfork, California, where citizens agree that a
compromise must be reached to preserve the forests and reduce the area's 23 per-
cent unemployment rate. As the community closest to the experimental logging
area, the town will pioneer techniques to log specific areas in a manner that is less
ecologically devastating than the original method and restore environmentally
damaged hillsides and streams. While the generated timber will be less valuable
than that from big, ancient trees that used to be cut, townspeople are relying on
skilful marketing to ensure success.
"A lot of people in timber still don't trust the environmentalists," said Jim Bayley,
a small businessman in Hayfork, "but I don't think there's much choice. If the
mill shuts down, we could lose half the
town's population. We should support
these ideas while there's still the oppor-
tunity. It's probably the best chance

The missing link in this attempt-
ed solution is money. According to a
spokesperson for an involved senator,
moot congressional appropriations bills
to provide the funds have been passed. While some of the Clinton proposal's
components can go into effect, most
forests are still being held by court
injunction until public comment on the
plan is concluded in March. After revi-
sions are made, the plan will be fully
enacted by Executive Order.

With the leadership of reform-
minded Babbitt and Thomas, the chances
for a long-term resolution are brighter
than ever before. As a result of the presi-
dent's leadership on the issue, communi-
ties will be stabilized and logging will be
curtailed in environmentally sensitive
areas. Instead of chaos, peace may finally
return to the much-maligned
Northwest forests.
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depends on Clinton's popularity. If his
support is lukewarm, Perot will probably
throw his hat into the ring once again.
He recently told a crowd of support-
ners/"We're going to go marching down
Pennsylvania Avenue one day."(Ayres)
Indeed, UWSA could act as an effective
vehicle for a second run at the presiden-
cy. Newsweek describes it as "a carefully
crafted legal entity—a not-for-profit
'civic league'—that allows Perot to raise
funds and act the role of an undeclared
candidate without having to disclose his
list of contributors."(Fineman. "Ross," 24)
Even if he doesn't run again, it's
unlikely he will leave the spotlight on his
own accord. Perot clearly likes being an
influential figure, and if the Democrats
are unable to demonstrate their ability
to govern he will continue to be a headache
for both parties for some time to come. •

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Ayres, B. Drummond, Jr. "Spoiling to
Debate Gore, Perot Puts Up His Dukes.
" New York Times 8 November 1993, late
ed.: A12.

Barnes, Fred. "The Undead." The New

Barrett, Laurence I. "Perot Takes a

Clift, Eleanor and Carrol, Ginny. "Perot:
Pulling the Race Out of the Mud.
" Newsweek 26 October 1992:34.

Church, George J. "The Other Side of

Fanighetti, Robert. The World Almanac
and Book of Facts. 1994 ed.

Fineman, Howard. "Perot: Rattling the
White House." Newsweek 10 May 1993:
34.

Fineman, Howard. "Ross Perot's New
Army." Newsweek 7 June 1993: 24-25.

Maginnis, John. Cross to Bear. Baton

Perot, Ross. Interview, "I Just Wanted to
Do the Right Thing." Newsweek. By

Perot, Ross. Interview, "It's Up to You,
Folks." Newsweek. By Ginny Carroll. 27

Phillips, Kevin. Boiling Point. New York:
Random House, 1993

Phillips, Kevin. The Politics of Rich and

Thomas, Rich. "A Deficit Plan That's No

van Biema, David. "Gored but Not

Wilenetz, Sean. "Pox Populi." The New
Managing the Transition: 
Defining Government's Role in the Defense Conversion

by Jeffrey Li

The sheer military/industrial capacity of this nation shames any historical comparison. For a stretch of forty years, America allocated trillions of dollars to confront the Soviet threat, building five complete branches of the military, as well as their supporting research and industrial bases. Today, the "military-industrial complex" stands as the largest agglomeration of capital and industrial labor resources in America. It saps 15 percent of America's scientific brain power, employs three million people, and funds 32,000 prime contractors and 100,000 subcontracted facilities. One million civilians and 1.9 million in uniform work under the Pentagon(Melman 11). Nevertheless, the bipolar world and concomitant arms race has dissolved. The Cold War is a tepid artifact and defense expenditures on a Herculean scale can no longer be justified. These days politicians, columnists, and economists are buzzing about a "once-in-a-lifetime" peace dividend. They argue for a comprehensive conversion of the national military-industrial base, where the resources exploited for defense purposes are redirected toward civilian ambitions.

So goes the popular concept of defense conversion or whatever you call it (diversification, economic adjustment, military transition, defense reinvestment...). The central tenet of conversion asserts that companies which produce goods for the defense market can be "retrained" with a little effort, toward a successful civilian market. The benefits to the country could be immense. Labor and machinery reserved for defense could be retrained and retooled for civilian use. Rebuilding the infrastructure, developing civilian technologies, and shoring-up the nation's economic competitive edge are all plausible options.

However, those grandiose designs of a new civilian economy are not the reasons why conversion is a favorite in Washington. The real motive for conversion is jobs. Defense cutbacks will have a crippling effect on private industry. Everyone knows that the Department of Defense(DoD) is a tremendous stimulant to the economy. Along with the Pentagon, it practices a de facto industrial policy, subsidizing key technologies and investing in basic and applied research and development (R & D). This high-tech research is spun-off, giving the products of civilian firms a competitive boost over foreign products. But as defense funds begin to taper off, bases will close, military personnel dismissed, and defense contractors starved for income, triggering a new wave of unemployment. Worse, defense downsizing generates a ripple-effect—three subcontracting jobs are lost for every one prime contracting job(Ellingstone 7).

Higher unemployment with short-term industrial; particularly at a parochial lates into extended lackadaisic growth. Thus, defense can be an integral and defining component of President Clinton's administration.

Here are the basic nil Clinton budget allocates $246 billion in defense in fiscal year 1999. From FY1993 to FY1997, funds are projected to lower from $273 billion(Dept. of Defense) to $217 billion newly liberated funds, Clinton announced a $1.7 billion package, already approved by Congress, and wants to spend $50 billion over five years for retraining helping contractors switch to civilian products, and other defense conversion programs. The President has promised to use the funds to clean-up the bases, provide retraining, retire defense workers, and assist in community development where bases close. Most importantly, the funds will be strategically invested to enhance US commercial competitiveness by 1) integrating the national and civilian technology base, 2) special project to assist defense conversion, and 3) shifting R & D efforts.

White House officials agree on a new approach as a cornerstone for a broad, revolutionary "technology j
dn
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duce dual-use technologies, products that have both defense and non-defense applications. More investments via the Advance Research Projects Agency (ARPA) will be made in information and process technologies, advanced materials, and microelectronics. ARPA—America's answer to Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry—will cultivate a government/industry partnership and aggressively push dual-use and defense conversion initiatives to dampen the shock when the DoD's contractors switch to commercial-oriented goods and services.

The idea is credible—aiding the conversion of defense firms, fostering technologies and incorporating them into commercial products. If conversion is successful, when the downsizing is complete, jobs will be saved, communities will rebound, and American business will be lean and mean.

But will defense conversion work? Past performance would indicate "no." The economy naturally contracted and entered a prolonged slump after World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. Each time the military cuts came, defense contractors, even the biggest and most respected, attempted to diversify in commercial markets. Boeing and Grumman tried their hand in the urban-transportation market by building electric trains and buses—a flaming catastrophe. The maker of the F-15, McDonnell Douglas, went on a short and (disastrous) escapade into the civilian sector by manufacturing medical systems and microelectronics controls. General Dynamics was eaten alive by commercial firms when it dived into telecommunications (Lundquist). The truth is, most defense contractors have a woefull record when it comes to conversion.

Indeed, the euphoria over converting legions a defense firms is short-lived. There is a realistic, sobering side to the defense transition, and it is imperative that federal policies reflect that. In confronting the economic validity of conversion, we need to avow the gaping cultural dichotomy between the commercial and defense sectors. It's a whole, new ball game.

Successful conversion will be difficult because of two factors: government procurement practices and the business culture of the commercial market.

Simply put, the DoD procures products differently from their contractors than we civilians do from ours. These acquisition standards along with regulatory barriers result in a type of product that only has utility in a defense market and cannot be directly applied in commercial fields or easily utilized by commercial consumers.

Military buyers tell defense contractors what they need and how it is to be manufactured with exacting standards. Furthermore, these specifications are frequently inordinate relative to commercial standards. For example, military equipment must operate in severe (however unrealistic) environmental conditions, such as in a thermonuclear explosion. Pushing such standards involves a bureaucratic army of acquisition personnel and volumes of procurement laws and regulations. These standards, cost-accounting problems, and incessant acquisition reviews are also the key barriers to developing dual-use technologies. Moreover, defense procurement emphasizes optimum performance at whatever expense. So the Pentagon will dole out exclusive contractors and cost-overrun guarantees in search of state-of-the-art technology, even if there is the smallest incremental rise in performance (Leopold 4).

Ironically, the same factors that produce success in the defense industry, engender failure in the commercial sector. What we get are fat, inflexible companies that are shielded from market place operations and cutthroat competition. We get a different corporate strategy, one that de-emphasizes cost-efficiency, quantity-quality trade-offs, and market adaptability. The overhead onsus and inefficient processes that are the legacy of present procurement practices make entry into the commercial market precarious.

And what of this market? It is a market obeying different rules and operating under a different culture. The environment is proactive, not reactive. The consumer doesn't give the firm a recipe to follow, the firm makes up the recipe and lets the consumer pick the cheapest one. Commercial companies are entrepreneurial, excessively competitive, and prefer to manufacture not the most advanced product, but the most cost-effective. Although technology is important, distribution channels and just plain business savvy will be the decisive factors.

A good reason for why converting is so hard, is that defense companies are ignorant of how the commercial marketplace functions. They are sorely lacking of such rudimentary business skills as marketing, strategic planning, market research, and management and product development. They need marketing staffs and sales staffs, their accounting systems need to be overhauled (Lundquist). In short, they have no idea what they are getting into.

If conversion is successful, when the downsizing is complete, jobs will be saved, communities will rebound, and American business will be lean and mean.

One vital fact should not be overlooked: most markets are already filled. Today's defense industry, and hence its products, is becoming increasingly divergent from the commercial industry. For instance, what civilian needs stealth technology? Even if a convertible technology such as night-vision optics does find a way into the market, consumer demand will be trivial in contrast with the DoD's former needs. Many contractors will decide conversion is simply not worth it. It is better to tailor to one, predictable five-sided cus-
customer than millions of civilians that are more volatile and less distinct.

Thus, beating swords into profitable plowshares is at best problematic. And therefore the question which ineluctably follows is: "Is a sweeping conversion initiative in the country's best interest?"

The Bush Administration argued that it was not. Granted, defense downsizing would close factories and programs, and the economy impact would be severe, even crippling, to some areas, but the pain would be localized and not likely to be widespread. After all, the defense industry now comprises a smaller share or the national economy, a $6 trillion economy that can readily absorb $50 billion in defense cutbacks.

We also should not forget that the US financed the military/industrial complex on borrowed money. With deficits so titanic, it makes sense to use the peace dividend to pay our dues, not waste it on government conversion programs.

And why is it that there exists programs that give special treatment to defense workers while none existed for others when their industries faltered? Defense conversion smacks of industrial policy. The whole idea of playing favorites is unfair and many times inefficient, for the government is inept at picking winning technologies and has a propensity to prop up decaying industries. The party is over. Defense firms and their employees got rich from the government, so why should the government throw in more tax money and intervene as they restructure and relocate? Let market forces, however ruthless, run their course, and ultimately the right resources will be shifted to the most sensible areas.

Of course, we need to be realistic. Although Americans cringe at the thought of more government, they refuse to follow a strict laissez-faire prescription, especially when jobs at home are at stake. And with a liberal ideological slant, the Democratic Administration will be too accommodating. SHU history makes abundantly clear that an unfeathered market system will outperform any socialist agenda.

So which brand of economics should you country's policies reflect? More specifically, what should be the government's role during the defense transition, and what would private-sector contractors do to help themselves?

These questions will define the conversion debate, but before they are answered, we need to list the objectives of our conversion/economic adjustment policies: To keep people and communities working, to improve the global competitiveness of US industry, and to preserve the most essential elements of the defense industrial base.

Achieving all three objectives would imply a successful conversion effort. Unfortunately, the doctrine of laissez-faire accepts the inevitability of major job loss and iron-handed industrial contraction when supply and demand forces strive for equilibrium. Thus, each goal would be severely jeopardized, barring any government "meddling."

This warrants at least a limited form of government intervention. To begin, it makes sense for the government to cultivate an economic climate favorable for conversion and military-commercial integration. Federal policy could extend targeted incentives to the defense industry to pursue new markets and provide civilian R & D tax credits. But by far, the best approach is simply to ensure a growing, robust economy, where new markets and opportunities can emerge for the defense firms.

Military-commercial integration and dual-use technologies offer an unprecedented chance to promote long-term economic growth and unrivaled US competitiveness. Merging with civilian technologies, which are becoming more advanced and less expensive than military counterparts, would maintain the viability of the defense industrial base and make it more cost-effective. Therefore, it is imperative that the DoD encourage the flow of technologies, products, and processes commercial and defense revamp or rescind procurement regulations that obstruct them. This includes streamlining notices and acquisition procedures, information disclosure requirements, and discarding excessive process specifications (Leopold 29).

The objective of a healthy defense industry deserves special attention. It would be unwise to leave this critical sector, since there is no reason that an adequate defense industry will remain. The challenge is to downsize while ensuring defense manufacturing can retain sufficient industrial capacity to meet our national security.

After World War II downsized with such impetuosity was left relatively unprepared. It took years to reconstitute military production capability. In the process of beating plowshares to swords, the DoD should activate a policy of continuous modifications, extend production delivery of foreign military sales, and whatever capital is needed in a military maintenance, research and development, and manufacturing facilities. But these are necessary steps in defense industry. Contractors need unnecessary defense orders.

It simply is not feasable for Lockheed to manufacture basketballs and drinks.

in business and will retain the plant equipment, and resources when the national security is contingent upon Howbeit, preserving defense industrial base is not the thing as direct assistance to trouble contractors. Although federal funds soothe the transition, firms must mately learn to turn to themselves help.

What can the contractors do? There are typically four corporate strategies for survival during a transition: solidification, diversification, selling other government markets, or sell overseas.(Dept. of Defense.)
Consolidation, restructuring to stay in or get of the defense business, involves reducing employment and cutting R & D and capital expenditures. Diversification occurs through conversion or acquisition of other business divisions. Both are the dominant strategies. Selling products overseas or to other government agencies such as NASA, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Drug Enforcement Administration offers some respite from the defense buildup but revenues are meager compared to the DoD's former contracts.

The US defense industry is a heterogeneous amalgam of different sized contractors manufacturing different products. Due to flexibility, small defense companies generally convert better than big, ones, yet they lack the resources to exploit new-found opportunities. The larger contractors will set modest goals for diversification. But for the rest, the best option may be to ride out the transition and stay in the lucrative defense business, despite reduced profits and layoffs.

Whatever the government does to intervene, contractors must concede the imminent and painful process of shrinking, restructuring, and shedding thousands of jobs. There is no escape, for the fate of the defense industry is ultimately for market forces to decide. Yet, there is opportunity for a judicious government role in the transition by providing short-term assistance and promoting long-term economic growth.

The aforementioned policies of preserving key elements in the defense industrial base mandate some form of direct government intervention. These policies are not to be applied to defense contractors when national security is not directly at stake—which is most of the time.

So what is needed is concerned but detached government, a government which merely ensures an economic climate favorable for conversion, but does not actually manage a firm's conversion itself. It is wrong and unfair for legislators to turn the peace dividend into a jobs program. Outright grants or direct subsidies that rescue firms and back conversion ventures is wasteful. Conversion policy should remove barriers to allow companies to help themselves. For example, Congress should rescind antitrust laws that prevent companies from merging to survive. Government can encourage firms through incentives to explore integration and dual-used, and it can identify, not "pick" and develop, key technologies. A new emphasis on civilian R & D is not a bad idea too.

Clinton's sweeping conversion initiative has merit, but it must be based on the rational assessment that conversion offers limited success. It simply is not feasible for Lockheed to manufacture basketballs and soft-drinks. But clearly, government action can help. Funding programs that assist dislocated workers and aid communities disproportionately hurt is tantamount to disaster relief and should be done. Policies that help defense firms acquire the flexibility to survive the transition also make sense.

Great military powers tend to spend excessively on armaments. However, this diverts resources from other sectors of the national economy, and results in the general decline of a nation's commercial competitive advantage. It would be tragic if the US did not seize the opportunity to reverse this trend. But it would be equally tragic if we wasted the spoils of victory on ill-conceived and misguided conversion efforts.
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The following is an edited version of a speech given by Senator Moynihan (D-NY) to the New York Publishers Association on August 29, 1993.

by the Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan

Five years ago during a speech to the Publisher's Association in Albany I cited a passage from The Deficit and the Public Interest by Joseph White and Aaron Wildavsky in which they state:

Whatever one thinks of the Reagan era, one thing is clear: the debate and politics of the deficit have been among the most stultifying and frustrating experiences in our political history.

A new administration. Democratic or Republican, would soon take office. I argued that if it stepped right up to the issue and put in place a balanced operating budget, we would find ourselves the beneficiaries of a $3 trillion surplus in the Social Security trust funds that would accumulate between then and the year 2015. This could be used to pay off the national debt, which in turn would double the national savings rate.

Nothing of the kind happened. The stultifying debate groaned on. Now another administration has come along. In 1992 promises were made which this new administration is trying to keep. And in the Budget Reconciliation bill signed by President Clinton on August 11, these promises were generally kept. As much as promises in politics ever are. The debate was as stultifying as ever, but still had its moments. On the final day, August 6, when the Senate voted, at mid-morning I took the floor with no greater purpose than to run the clock on the prescribed ten hours of debate, equally divided. Every vote save one was settled. Nothing said on the floor would make the slightest difference in the outcome.

So, I waxed a bit academic and a bit historical. When I finished, a page brought me a Senate Calendar on which my Republican friend, Senator Phil Gramm of Texas, had written:

Your grade
A
good content
somewhat wordy

Senator Gramm is, of course, a sometime professor of economics. He had listened to what I had to say, corrected me on occasion, but thought the performance credible. Allow me then to expand on it.

My central theme was that the debate had been so long because we are caught up with the language and the concepts of another era, one in which we no longer live, and have not developed the language and concepts to deal with the era in which we do live.

The era which is past is one in which it was thought—correctly—that the great task of fiscal policy was to maintain a level of demand in the private sector of the economy such that the economy as a whole tended towards full employment and full utilization of industrial capacity. These goals are set forth, for example, in the Employment Act of 1946, which gave us the Council of Economic Advisors, the Economic Report of the President and the Joint Economic Committee. From the mid-19th to the mid-20th century, the great issue of the industrial world was whether and how this could be done. Many thought that it could not, that the "contradictions of capitalism," to use but one formulation, were such that the system was radically unstable. So much that the confiscation of private property, as in communist doctrine, or state regimentation, as in fascist assertion, was necessary and inevitable. Either way, the state grew immensely powerful and the citizen all but disappeared.

The great depression of the 1930s, the world war that followed, and the communist expansion that followed in turn put western civilization itself in jeopardy.

In the nick of time, Keynes figured out that the problem was not western civilization but fiscal policy. Governments had typically responded to a downturn in the business cycle by cutting expenditures such that the downturn deepened. (The third statute enacted in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt cut Federal salaries by 10 percent.) Now it was argued that government should follow counter-cyclical policies, spending more when demand fell off. (And less when it peaked.) This was counterintuitive for the time. Read the editorials of the 1930s, once the New Deal began to absorb the first inklings of what we would come to know as Keynesian economics. The idea of government deliberately spending more than it took in seemed to defy common sense.

And yet the idea was a correct one, or such was the judgment of economists, now pretty much confirmed by experience. The learning curve was pretty steep here. The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money was published in 1936. Our Employment Act came but ten years later. In 1947, Herbert Stein, working at the blue-chip Committee for Economic Development in Washington came up with the idea of a "full employment budget." This is a budget with a built-in deficit equal to the difference between anticipated revenues and revenues at full employment. The extra government spending would tend to stimulate the economy toward full employment. Those who think of this as a Democratic, or even liberal Democratic policy simply don't know what they are talking about. Stein, a Republican, elaborated his theory in his fine work The Fiscal Revolution in America which appeared in 1969, with an introduction by George P. Shultz, also a Republican, written when he was dean of the University of Chicago School of Business. Stein, later, became a member, and then chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors under President Nixon; Shultz became Secretary of Labor, and then

The Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan is a senior member of the US Senate and chair of the Senate Committee on Finance.
Director of the Office of Management and Budget in 1970. I was then Counselor to President Nixon, and listened with great interest and advantage as these two wonderful teachers explained the theory of the "full employment budget" which Shultz put together and the President sent to Congress.

A budget with a deliberately built-in deficit. The problem was that successive Congresses didn't much like this idea. A few years earlier Walter Heller, chairman of the Council under President Kennedy, saw this as the source of the problem of "fiscal drag." As the economy approached full employment, Federal revenues rose, but Congress wouldn't spend them. Thus, the economy never attained to full employment. Dr. Heller's solution was revenue sharing. The governors would spend the money even if Congress wouldn't. Revenue sharing was begun under President Nixon.

All this seems a long way off, and it is. In the 1970s we crossed over from one era of public finance to another. The decade began with government trying to create deficits; it ended with deficits almost out of control, and not just at the Federal level, but at all levels of government. Where a half century ago we were seen to have a permanent crisis of the private sector of the economy, this has now been supplanted by a permanent crisis of the public sector.

What happened? I offer the proposition that during the Johnson-Nixon presidencies, overlapping in New York with the Governorship of Nelson A. Rockefeller and in New York City with the administrations of Robert F. Wagner and John V. Lindsay, government began to take on commitments in areas where relative costs were beginning to explode. This is to say they were infected with the "cost disease of personal services." This is a term from Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma by William J. Baumol and William B. Bowen, published in 1965. Why, they asked, was the Metropolitan Opera always broke and the orchestra always on strike? Because, they answered, there is simply no increase in productivity in open production, unlike other sectors of the economy. Cosi Fan Tutti, which was performed at the Glimmerglass Opera in Cooperstown this summer required the same number singers, took the same amount of time, and played to about the same size audi-

ence as in Vienna two centuries ago. A spring issue of The New Yorker noted that in the year that magazine "hit the stands" in 1923, some 228 shows appeared on Broadway. Today there are nineteen (Although somewhat more in the course of the year.) By a nice serendipity, 1965 was the year Congress enacted "The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act." It was also in the year of Medicaid, the legislation, as Meg Greenfield has written, "that holds would find themselves at wit's end trying to pay off the school bills, grade school, high school, college possibly. Current costs and old debts. Because the relative cost of education continuously goes up. In New York today increasingly one farmer milks one hundred cows, but teachers still teach classes of twenty-four kids or so. Not for lack of energy, but because you can't teach a class of one hundred teenagers anything worth learning. Baumol speaks of The Stagnant Services, be they teaching, lawyering, doctoring, policing, or, for that matter, reporting.

I have proposed a corollary to Baumol's text. Activities with cost disease migrate to the public sector. Let us go back to our thought experiment for one moment. On or about the date that the median indebtedness of the median household with children and parents with college degrees reaches $234,321.13, I suggest that some member of the State Assembly will propose that government promote free public schools in addition to free lunch.

Baumol makes the point that because the overall productivity of the economy is going up, we can afford The Stagnant Services and still have plenty of everything else. The Economist recently observed: "For $7,000 anyone can buy a personal computer today that is twice as powerful as a $4 million mainframe was ten years ago ") Baumol expects that by 2040 we will be spending 35 percent of the gross national product on health care and 29 percent on education; almost two-thirds of our income will go to the public sector, paid for by taxes, handed out by government, government will have become too big and politics too important.

Even so, if these concepts, assuming them to be valid, can win general acceptance, we have a way out of the "stultifying and frustrating" debate on and politics of the deficit. I was very much heartened when an extensive commentary on this set of propositions appeared in The Washington Post in August, written by James K. Glassman. It was the first of its kind. Conservatives, he noted, "have long argued that we have two economies: the private sector which is highly productive, and the public sector, which is highly unproductive." Not so, of course, if we are correct. The public sector is not inherently unproductive, it is just that it collects economic losers. There is plenty of waste and no market discipline. But that's not the real
I know, for example, what I would do in New York City. I would recreate Pennsylvania Station in Charles McKim's great Post Office across 8th Avenue. On August 5, Mayor David N. Dinkins wrote me to say he wholeheartedly agrees.

As we have discussed, the demolition of McKim's Pennsylvania Station marked a low point in our City's architectural history. The opportunity is now at hand to rehabilitate the Farley Post Office Building and to restore Penn Station to its previous glory as a true gateway for New York City.

Thanks to the flexibility of ISTEA, federal funds are available to build both an important intermodal transportation facility and to create a monument that will testify to our generation's interest in revitalized public spaces.

I would then build a magnetic levitation train system that would make the round trip to Kennedy over to LaGuardia and back, in say, 12 minutes. En route, travellers would get a glimpse of the Throgs' Neck Bridge where maglev was thought up in 1961. They could then go back to their own countries having seen something new in the new world for a change.

Helvidius would like to thank the office of the Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY) for providing us with the transcript of this speech.
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of sexual harassment, especially in the recent Harris case, Ginsburg focuses on the inherent inequality of the rule that women must prove they have been psychologically damaged by an incident. She believes that women survivors should be commended and not condemned. Just because they refuse to be victims does not mean that they should have to put up with harassment.

One can only speculate about Ruth Bader Ginsburg's future role on the Supreme Court. It seems likely that in most decisions she will not greatly alter the Court's balance since she tends to be moderate on issues like criminal law. However, on gender issues, civil rights, and civil liberties, she can be expected to be a voice for continuing progress. The most likely change in voting patterns on the Court should be in decisions about religion in the schools, an issue on which the Court generally divides 5-4, and upon which Ginsburg's predecessor, Byron White, generally voted conservatively. On most other issues, it is difficult to predict exactly how Ginsburg will vote. In the end, will Ruth Bader Ginsburg become a feminist heroine or a modest jurist? We believe that the answer is both.

You know, I'm not sitting here [as] some little woman standing by my man like Tammy Wynette. I am sitting here because I love him, and I respect him, and I honor what he's been through, and what we've been through together. And, you know, if that's not enough for people, then, heck, don't vote for him.

-Hillary Clinton.
DC Statehood: Its Time Has Come

by Joel H. Samuels

On December 16, 1773, a party of men boarded British ships, threw dozens of crates into the water and chanted, "No taxation without representation!" Those Boston Tea Party-goers have been transformed into icons of the Revolutionary War: irate citizens pouring tea into the Boston River to express their opposition to extortionate tax laws passed down from England. If we are to be taxed, they said, then we must have some say in the process of governance.

Perhaps no idea is more fundamental to the establishment of the United States. But more than 200 years after the gathering at Boston Harbor, the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia embody precisely the wrongs Americans fought the Revolutionary War to eradicate.

For three years, Norton has served as a delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia. As delegate she has the same powers as any other Representative to Congress to serve on and chair Committees, introduce legislation, and participate in floor debates. Unlike full Representatives; however, she is denied the right to vote on final passage and some floor amendments. Even this restricted representation is denied DC's shadow Senators in the Senate.

While on Capitol Hill, Congresswoman Norton has dedicated herself to what a fellow democrat called "an uphill battle through molasses in a blizzard." Norton wants to add one more star to the American flag—a 51st for the District of Columbia. And in a historic vote last November, Rep. Norton was able to muster 153 votes for statehood, not enough to pass the resolution, but far more than even her most ardent supporters had expected. The final tally on H.R. 51, the statehood resolution, was 277 nays, 153 ayes. But for Rep. Norton, success came two days earlier when the bill finally reached the floor of the House of Representatives. Norton is glad that "the debate gave the first sustained national exposure for DC Statehood...." Virginia, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, which at least have local self-governance, but do not pay federal taxes.

The colonial character of the current arrangement was underscored two months ago when some representatives tried to deny the citizens of DC the right to spend their own money as they see fit. Following a tense debate, the District budget narrowly passed the House, with amendments to meet the demands of representatives from as far away as Montana.

The District's budget for the coming year totals $3.7 billion. A full $3 billion came from District taxes, which are among the highest in the nation. The Federal Government pays the remaining sum to account, in part, for occupying 41 percent of the district's land, on which it pays no taxes. In all, conservative estimates point to more than $2 billion in lost tax revenues on that land for the District. In addition, Congress has forbidden a commuter tax on the hundreds of thousands of federal employees who work in Washington but live in Maryland and Virginia. Many other cities, including New York, levy such a tax. With a population of 640,000, the District has more residents than Wyoming, Alaska, Delaware or Vermont. Nonetheless, its Mayor and City Council have only marginal control over the city's affairs. The city cannot even reschedule garbage collection times without Congressional approval.

If District residents seem stoic in the face of these inconsistencies, it is because they are accustomed to the status of second-class citizenry. Residents of the District were not allowed to vote in Presidential elections until until the 23rd Amendment to the Constitution was approved in 1964. And it was not until the Home Rule Act of 1973 that they could elect a mayor and city council; until then, both had been appointed by the Congressional committee which oversees District affairs. The Home Rule Act was primarily a token symbol of sympathy. Congress still retains the authority to overturn any law the City Council passes.

On paper, the issue of statehood seems clear. The District meets three traditional tests for statehood: the support of the people, an agreement to adhere to a representative form of government, and sufficient resources to ensure the economic viability of the District of Columbia. But in practice, the debate over statehood is complex and prone to heated confrontations. Opponents claim that the District can only become a state through a constitutional amendment. This path, however, has already proven unsuccessful. In 1978, Congress proposed an amendment to give DC full voting representation in the Senate and the House of Representatives, but only 16 out of the necessary 38 states had approved the proposal before the ratification period ran out ten years later.

Original Intent. Debate over the constitutional amendment has been bogged down in rancorous partisan disagreement over the original intent of creating the District of Columbia. Statehood opponents argue that the framers of the Constitution did not foresee the creation of a federal city with inhabitants other than the President and members of Congress. Thus, they argue, when the Constitution provided for a federal district, it assigned full legislative control to Congress. But, according to counter-arguments, that decision was taken before the capital became a major city with a population exceeding that of several other states in the Union.

If one unravels the arguments against statehood for DC, more basic issues appear. The real issue at stake is the formation of a 51st state which will be overwhelmingly...
Democratic. Republican legislators recognize that statehood will mean two additional Democratic faces in the Senate and oppose DC statehood for partisan grounds.

When the seat of the federal government first moved to the District in 1800, the largest city in the United States was

The city cannot even reschedule garbage collection times without Congressional approval.

New York with 60,000 inhabitants. For those who wonder what the Framers would have thought of the current debate, another historical question might be raised. What would Madison have said if he knew that 600,000 citizens were being denied the right to vote? While the intent of the framers is always subject to debate, the American Revolutionaries were explicit in 1776 in their demands for the sovereignty of a colonist population only four times larger than today's Washington, DC. They wanted to exercise the right of self-governance and made these principles the guiding light for a new nation.

Following November's vote in the House, Rep. Norton indicated that she might temporarily abandon the all-out statehood push temporarily in order to use the momentum "to pursue gains that are achievable in the shorter term. Those gains include budget autonomy for the District, new revenues and the elimination of congressional review of Council legislation. But these measures still ignore the blatant injustice in the District: 600,000 American citizens pay federal taxes do not have a voting voice to participate in government.

At a town meeting last spring, President Clinton pointed out, "The District of Columbia now has more people than four other states, pays more taxes than ten other states and sent more soldiers to fight in the Persian Gulf War than twenty other states. And yet, every time they turn around, Congress can overturn anything they do through their elected officials."

The time has come for Congress to set aside partisan differences and resolve the statehood issue. In their efforts fully include the District's residents in the democratic process which began 220 years ago, political representatives should remember that "no taxation without representation" is a concept for the Twentieth Century as well as the Eighteenth.
A Call to Arms for the Fairness Doctrine

Hozy the electronic media's self-invoked free speech ails our democracy.

by Mieko Joan Okamoto

This trend towards conglomerate control of the television screens poses a creeping threat to well-informed citizenry.

Betraying predictions made when cable systems joined the market, the three major networks, ABC, CBS and NBC have successfully weathered the threat of the cable takeover and still garner three-fourths of the audience despite declining prime-time viewing and corporate turbulence.

Particularly threatening to effective democracy is the quiet takeover of the "new media" by familiar media giants—RCA, Times Mirror, Westinghouse, Turner Broadcasting, and the Big Three. While the number of outlets of public information in America—over 10,000 radio stations and 1,400 television stations—is unrivaled in any other country, the ownership of them remains disproportionately homogeneous. Over 97.2% of the electronic media is white-owned, and the figure has even increased in the past few years (Legal Times). Moreover, conglomerate control means abiding by the interests of the owners. For example, the editorial policies of NBC can be freely manipulated by its owner, General Electric. This trend towards conglomerate control of the television screens poses a creeping threat to well-informed citizenry.

The FCC's repeal of the Fairness Doctrine in 1987 neglected, if not overlooked, this ominous force. Masked by the beaming faces of Sam Donaldson and
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which were considered a scarce public resource at the time, Congress passed in 1934 the Communications Act, or posthumously the Fairness Doctrine. It stipulated that radio news programs must "cover controversial issues of public importance and broadcast opposing points of view on them" (Abramson 245) in order to be granted license renewal by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). To ensure fair coverage of federal elections, two amendments to the Communications Act were enacted in 1959 and 1971 to provide equal opportunity for candidates to buy a reasonable amount of time during prime time broadcasts. License could be revoked if stations do not abide by these rules. The value of autonomy and editorial independence accorded to print journalism was deemed inapplicable to electronic media; the FCC saw a need to prevent domination of this "scarcity" by the few.

But in 1987, broadcasters disenfranchised by governmental regulation found political support when President Reagan, in keeping with his deregulation policy, vetoed Congressional legislation expressly codifying the Fairness Doctrine. Later that year, heavy lobbying by the broadcasters prompted the FCC to declare the doctrine counterproductive and unconstitutional. Claiming that "explosive growth" (Abramson 246) in the new media technologies invalidated the original scarcity rationale for the fairness requirements, the FCC argued that "...Fairness is too fragile to be left for a Government bureaucracy to accomplish" (Abramson 246).

Governmental regulation, the FCC testified, discouraged radio and television stations from covering controversial issues and produced a "chilling effect" (Abramson 246) on unfettered public debate.

THE REALITY UNRAVELED

Despite the opposition's euphoria about loosening governmental regulation under the doctrine, the issue must be soberly reassessed in the light of revealing facts. First, the proliferation of the media that the opponents of the doctrine like to point out as outdating the doctrine is not as widespread as one would think. The advent of the nascent "new media"—cable television, videotext, teletext, VCR, etc.—gives the impression that Americans utilize the highly-diversified media. Although the number of households that subscribe to cable systems has more than doubled since 1983, still only 62% of the households subscribe to cable networks (Abramson 36). Moreover, those who do subscribe only view cable about 30% of the time (Abramson 40). The high cost of wiring a cable system inhibited many cities from even considering adding cable to their homes.

I

T HAS LONG BEEN A TRADITION in this country to hail free speech under the aegis of the First Amendment. From the early days of childhood, we are taught to laud it as the very cornerstone of democracy. Even the gaudy headlines in tabloids—which have become all but a hackneyed convention of the media—are evidence of Americans' unswerving support for rampant free speech. Perhaps more than any other individual right, it is treasured as the capstone of liberty, and its censure is rebuked as anti-democratic.

Thus, it is no surprise that the recent media hype surrounding the debate over the reinstatement of the Fairness Doctrine has provoked concerns over the sanctity of free speech. Repealed in 1987, the doctrine decrees that the electronic media have a responsibility to air issues of public importance and in doing so must provide a balanced discussion of contrasting viewpoints. The opponents to the Fairness Doctrine relentlessly argue that any government intervention of the press will severely encroach upon First Amendment rights. They have labeled its proponents—conspicuous among them Senator Ernest Hollings and Representative Edward Markey—as leaders of a "Hush Rush" movement to restrict free speech and accomplish their own political agendas.

But hidden from our ken in this so-called "war against the Big Brother" of government are the covert atrocities of the media that skilfully betray our faith in the freedom of the press and exploit its power as the conduit of public information to propagate their own interests.

A "SCARCE" PUBLIC RESOURCE

The history of the Fairness Doctrine harkens back to the golden age of radio in the 1930s. Fearing that broadcasters would exploit the airwaves, Mieko Joan Okamoto is a junior at Columbia College and an Executive Editor of Helvidius.
Dan Rather is the top executives' penchant for emphasizing ideas and information congenial to their political interests. On one occasion, several broadcasters have refused presidential requests for time to address the nation on matters of national urgency (Abramson 227). In keeping with its political interests, during the 1984 Presidential election, Capital Cities, Inc., owner of ABC, prohibited directors at ABC News from airing stories on several Reagan administration officials who had illegal connections with organized crime.

In keeping with its political interests, during the 1984 Presidential election, Capital Cities, Inc., owner of ABC, prohibited directors at ABC News from airing stories on several Reagan administration officials who had illegal connections with organized crime. Without the Fairness Doctrine, broadcasters have complete discretion over what and who gets coverage.

Political interests are not the only cause of attrition. According to the logic of the economic market, news budgets will shrink if consumers prefer entertainment. In a market where one percentage point in ratings can mean a difference of $30 million in profit each year and 1,600 advertising messages are aimed at a consumer in an average day (Bagdikian 202), broadcasters are forced to appeal to consumer appetites.

SHOCKING FIGURES

A case in point is analysis of news coverage by 36 random local news shows on Thursday, March 10, 1988, the week of "Super Tuesday" primary elections. The results unearthed an appalling fact: local and state issues comprised less than five minutes per local news hour (Entman 112). Research done in three cities, Mobile, Alabama, Pensacola, Florida, and Chicago, Illinois revealed that news of local and state government or politics and political campaigns averaged about two minutes per show on each of the three stations (Entman 112).

Moreover, contrary to FCC's assertion that there is no longer any danger of having Americans "left uninformed on public issues" (Entman 106), the number of public affairs programs has drastically decreased since the repeal of the doctrine; and when they are shown, they are usually relegated to air times of low viewership because entertainment programs bring in more revenue. The amount of American commercial networks' serious programming in prime time is only 0.05% of the amount of regular current affairs and documentary output of public service organizations abroad such as BBC in Britain, ARC in Germany and NHK in Japan (Abramson 213). "News isn't the main business of the networks; entertainment is," one NBC News official said. "So when the licensing requirement is removed, network corporate officials ask, 'Why should we spend more money on something that is losing us money?'

(Hertsgaard 181)

AN ICONCLASM?

Despite these compelling facts, we still may ask: Why do we need more public affairs programming? If Americans prefer to watch Amy Fisher and her hidden-camera sex videos than to watch local politicians ramble about a parking violation policy, on what grounds can the government say to the Americans that too much of the former is bad? The Fairness Doctrine immediately strikes us with its "subversiveness" to the traditional autonomy of the media.

But we must first note that the glib comparisons of the electronic and print media ignore the former's inherent limitations. Television and radio rely tremendously on audial and visual gratification. Emphasis on conflict, personality, and seductive images achieves more significance than a thorough analysis of a story. Thus, however superficial a topic may be, audial and visual appeal often becomes a gauge of "newsworthiness"; crucial issues can always be deemed unimportant if they lack capturing sounds and pictures. They "exert strong control over the flow of the narrative and juxtaposition of stories; one cannot read or clip as with a newspaper story" (Entman 121). The very challenge that broadcast journalists face everyday is to surpass these limitations, not to get a front row seat in the White House press room. Often, time constraints and the perpetual need to please advertisers with high ratings inevitably force journalists to forget responsible reporting.

Given our tradition of protecting First Amendment rights, we react impulsively to any government regulation of the press. We somehow equate regulation with an oligarchic censorship that threatens to transform America into George Orwell's 1984. When prominent opponents of the doctrine such as David Bartlett of Radio-Television Directors Association and Eddie Fretts of the National Broadcasters attack the intent of the doctrine as "purely political" (Los Angeles Times), the notion becomes all the more convincing. But what the legacy of the expansion of the electronic media and the repeal of the doctrine in 1987 have shown is that without government intervention, the antagonism between the profit-seeking goals of the broadcasters and the public informational interests of democracy is not easily resolved.

Aside from the political and cultural saliency of the doctrine, broadcasters complain that small stations "in the nooks and crannies of the nation" (The Arizona Republic) will suffer. The contention is that keeping a log of all opposing views aired can become too burdening.

Sensationalism becomes imperative for survival, and the market pressures the news broadcasters to prioritize stories that attract viewers, such as accidents, sports, scandals, crime, and sex, rather than specific community or policy issues.

some, especially for small stations with limited budgets. But the doctrine does not say that opposing views must be presented simultaneously or in the same format; shows like Rush Limbaugh's do not necessarily have to be balanced out by Howard Stern. Moreover, only one station ever lost its license on the doctrine's grounds—and that station allegedly purveyed one-sided anti-Semitic analyses of public issues (Entman 105).

Continued on page 36
The Emergence of Nationalism under Gorbachev

Changes in the political structure of the former Soviet Union led to its demise.

by Allegra Wechsler

Why did nationalism emerge in the Soviet Union under Gorbachev? At first glance the answer seems deceptively simple: nationalism emerged because of policies like Glasnost and perestroika. The republics had always had a nationalistic sentiment, but the Soviets had repressed this feeling, and once restrictions on free speech abated, nationalism simply burst forth. This hypothesis, sometimes called the "sleeping beauty" theory, is not satisfactory, however, because it does not explain why some areas were more nationalistic than others. Most importantly, though, the theory paints too simple a picture of the event and does not address other factors that played a key role.

To start at the very beginning, nationalism must be defined along with its basic characteristics. The Collins English Dictionary says that it is "a sentiment based on common cultural characteristics that bind a population and often produces a policy of national independence or separatism." Gellner adds that, in such a case, ethnic boundaries should not cut across political ones. (Gellner 2)

What are these vaguely mentioned characteristics to which the Collins dictionary refers? People desire their own land where they can speak their own language, practise their own religion, control their own economy, protect their own environment, make their own rules, and surround themselves with their own culture.

All ethnic groups, however, do not have these nationalistic desires. If some ethnic communities can live together peacefully and happily, why does nationalism occur? This is not a simple question, but it is central to understanding why nationalism developed under Gorbachev. There are a number of reasons why nationalism emerges, and many, but not all of these different preconditions must be present in order to

ignite the feelings of a group. First of all, a people need a religion; a common language, spoken and written; an area they claim as their homeland that preferably has historical and cultural significance; an ethnic elite who can lead the people, and an intelligentsia who can organize the movement. (Smith 48) These conditions, though, are not enough, since many groups have them but are not nationalistic. In addition, a people need to become conscious of themselves as a group. (Smith 50) This sometimes occurs when an ethnic are repressed or when there is a power vacuum or some other type of uncertainty that brings the people's physical and economic security into question.

If all ethnic are not nationalistic, is nationalism then natural? Gellner and Snyder, two authorities in this field, believe that the movement is natural because of the pressures of the modern era. In today's world, only nation-states function on the world stage. (Snyder 11) Moreover, industrialization creates a need for a nation-state because a modern economy demands a high culture and an educated workforce where all people speak the same language. (Gellner 40) Only nationalism can provide these pre-requisites to afequence which all people and states desire.

If nationalism is natural for developed or developing countries, then it ought to have occurred in the republics. It is therefore important to mention that this sentiment did exist before the Soviet takeover, especially in the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia, and it provided important roots for its later emergence under Gorbachev and his predecessors.

If nationalism did exist in a number of places, why did it not emerge before Gorbachev came to power? The "sleeping beauty" theory claims that it would have developed earlier and that only forced repression restrained it. This, however, is not true. As explained above, nationalism needs a number of preconditions, and many of them did not exist in the republics from 1925 to 1988. The main reason nationalism did not occur during the Soviet era is due to the fact that Stalin did his utmost to destroy it and worked to replace it with an all-encompassing, uniting, Soviet nationalism.

Stalin understood that nationalism needed a religion, a language, elites, customs, and an identity with a homeland in order to emerge or continue, and through his policies in the 1930s he systematically eliminated each precondition. He banned religion and closed churches and mosques; he destroyed languages by imposing the language of one group over that of another; he separated people from their homeland by deportation, collectivization, or execution. (Hosking 238-55)

As Stalin destroyed, however, he also built, and his new institutions and programs further undermined individual group identity by creating Soviet nationalism. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine claimed that separate group nationalism was the enemy, since it was bourgeois and linked to capitalism. (Bescancon 16) National differences were now subordinate to class differences, and the Soviet system created a "new socialist person" who was not motivated by patriotic attachments to a nation-state, but to the membership in an "international community of soviet peo-

The main reason nationalism did not occur during the Soviet era is due to the fact that Stalin did his utmost to destroy it and worked to replace it with an all-encompassing, uniting, Soviet nationalism.

pie." (Gleason 83)

If it is true, however, that nationalism could not have materialized during the Stalin era, how did it emerge under Gorbachev? The paradoxical answer lies in Stalin's and his successor's policies. As they destroyed nationalism
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with one hand, they accidentally built it with the other. Their programs created native elites, an intelligentsia, and a literate people united by one language who associated themselves with a particular territory. Therefore, since these characteristics are the earlier mentioned prerequisites for nationalism, it is not surprising that nationalist sentiment could put down its roots. It is important to note briefly that in general Stalin's predecessors' policies furthered cultural ethnicity and strengthened the republics' foundation which later enabled them to seek their independence in the late 1980s.

The evidence from the preceding paragraphs shows that nationalism had taken root during the Stalin era and then continued to grow under his successors. Yet, an important difference must be made between ethnic consciousness and ethnic nationalism. It is one thing for a group to want its own language and culture, and quite another for it to want independence in the form of a nation-state. Under Gorbachev's predecessors, the republics desired their own culture, but that did not mean they wanted to sever their ties with the Soviet Union itself; this desire only emerged under Gorbachev. Certain events and policies occurred during 19XS-1990 that catalysed this ethnic consciousness and turned it into nationalism.

Gorbachev's policies under perestroika helped create nationalism in a number of ways. Glasnost, the policy which allowed for a degree of free speech and sought to uncover the truth about the past, revolutionized the country and helped lead the republics towards independence. First, by calling attention to past and present problems, Gorbachev showed that the Party was not perfect and that the history of the Soviet Union was not entirely glorious. (Goble 3) Many people had no idea that such horrible atrocities had occurred, and Gorbachev's disclosure angered the population and accentuated national conflicts and differences. Due to glasnost, people were able to debate, to express national sentiment, and to air their grievances; they could even hold demonstrations without the former fear of punishment. (White 143) Along with glasnost, Gorbachev's refusal to use force as a method of control allowed people a mental and physical freedom that they had never known.

Secondly, Gorbachev's policy of the devolution of power from the center to the republics also fostered nationalism. Formerly, leaders of the republics took their orders and received their legitimacy from Moscow since the center had the power to appoint and dismiss officials. Gorbachev, however, changed the balance of power when he decided that people ought to be involved in politics. Once people were given the right to vote, leaders of the republics suddenly found themselves responsible to their constituents, not to Moscow. In order to gain legitimacy the party secretaries found themselves championing their own regional interests instead of those of the Soviet Union. Lastly, the new economic policy of khozraschetchet, or self-financing, which stated that each republic should pay its own way, created a feeling of independence, separateness, and autonomy.

Gorbachev's new policies alone, however, probably would not have transformed ethnic consciousness into nationalism. However, the ideological break up of the Communist Party along with the further economic decline cemented the fate of the Union and pushed the Republics towards freedom.

All people need to believe in something whether it is a god, a goal, or a mission. Early empires were bound together by Christianity, and people of different groups submitted to their ruler because he had been appointed by God. Although the USSR claimed to be an atheist country, in a sense it had its own religion. It replaced God with an ideal - Communism. All people should submit not to a king or to a god, but to this bright and shining vision. Moreover, Communism created its own "gods" by forming cults around their leaders - especially Lenin. Marxist-Leninist ideology and the Communist Party were the glue that held the supranational union together. (Sakawa259) Once the Party fell and its ideology was discredited, the disillusioned republics searched for an alternative and found their replacements within themselves.

The economic and political situation in the country also propelled the republics towards nationalism. As "perestroika staggered from crisis to crisis" and as the economic situation worsened, some republics began to think that they would be better off on their own. (Sakawa 265) Moreover, as people learned more about the environment and uncovered the wasteful and destructive policies of the USSR, they wanted to protect their land from further harm. This, of course, meant that republics wanted more autonomy. The republics had been moving in that direction ever since the earlier mentioned policies of khozraschetchet and popular voting, and these additional inadequacies of the state only strengthened their rebellious feelings.

Lastly, one other factor that created nationalism at this time was the "domino effect." (Bowker) As countries in Eastern Europe gained real independence from Moscow in 1989, the Baltic republics began to agitate for freedom. As the Baltics sought independence, the Ukraine and Byelorussia and the republics in the Caucasus became interested as well. (Brzezinski 4) Finally, as these republics moved towards autonomy, the remaining republics joined them. Thus, when the Baltic Republicans, who had always been nationalistic because they had not been incorporated into the

Due to Glasnost, people were able to debate, to express national sentiment, and to air their grievances; they could even hold demonstrations without the former fear of punishment.

Soviet Union until World War II and had formerly been independent, autonomous states, grabbed at the chance for independence which Gorbachev's policies offered, they created a precedent which other republics decided to follow.

In conclusion, nationalism emerged under Gorbachev for four reasons. The preconditions needed to spark the movement were in place. Secondly, Marxist-Leninist ideology, the glue hold-
of these problems, the economic situation worsened and many republics began to think that they would do better funding for themselves. Lastly, once one republic obtained self-rule, other republics began to consider the idea, and nationalism simply spread. Nationalism was not as strong in all republics, nor was autonomy always desired at first, but as other republics left the Union, pressure mounted on those who remained. In the end, it is also important to remember that the Soviet Union was not doomed to break apart when Gorbachev came to office. The end of the Empire was the result of a combination of its history and Gorbachev’s policies. Nationalism could not have emerged without both of these factors.

The ideological break up of the Communist Party along with further economic decline cemented the fate of the Union and pushed the Republics towards freedom.
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Fairness

continued from page 26

 Why should anyone be upset about being fair? " CNN’s Larry King said, “It forced us to deal with communi-
 ty issues and began out of a great need when for a long time black issues weren’t brought up in Montgomery, Ala.; Catholic parishes in New Orleans never [heard] a show in which someone [favored] birth control” (Los Angeles Times).

A STEP TOWARDS CHANGE

The campaign financing bill passed by the House on November 22, 1993 included one of the doctrine’s pro-
 visions of guaranteeing equal campaign time by providing candidates vouchers to buy advertising time. This marked a significant step towards the reenactment of the doctrine. Still, the reenactment of the Fairness Doctrine is a delicate issue that must be approached with caution. The public needs to discard its fear of an omnipotent “Big Brother” government and realize that their right to information is being nibbled away by the very symbol of free speech. Hopefully, the bipartisan effort will break fetters on the long-awaited compromise that free speech goes hand in hand with government regulation.
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The Unfinished Search for Nobility

The following is an excerpt from The Good Fight (Random House 1993).

by The Honorable Gary Hart

egalitarian democracies understand reform to be the price periodically paid in order to avoid revolution; the persistent frustration of reform can lead to dangerous consequences. Reform itself can usually be postponed as long as economies are expanding and standards of living are rising. But when institutions and structures fail to adapt to changing times, when elites become selfish, when justice is too long deferred, and when aspirations are constantly frustrated, the sweep and scope of necessary reforms must expand accordingly and with greater urgency if more dramatic measures are not sought by a restless, angry citizenry.

According to Hannah Arendt, failure to remember that the United States and the foundation of freedom were born out of revolution "is largely responsible for the intense fear of revolution in America," and "fear of revolution has been the hidden leitmotif of postwar American foreign policy in its desperate attempt at stabilization of the status quo." This fear led us to support obsolete and corrupt political regimes that were hated and held in contempt by their own people.

Revolutionary American principles were further distorted when cold war competition came to be seen as a life-or-death clash between antagonistic economic systems rather as a contest between diametrically opposed political value systems. Thus, instead of focusing the world's attention on America's revolutionary emphasis on individual rights and political freedom versus a totalitarian Soviet political model, we permitted the contest to be identified as free-enterprise capitalism versus the Soviet economic model. The unchained, unbridled private initiative of capitalism — essentially laissez-faire economics — flourished under benign American democratic governments as much as anything because of our nation's enormous natural wealth. Ironically, given time and opportunity, it could well flourish in Russia for the same reason. But preservation of a particular economic philosophy closely associated with preservation of the status quo is not necessarily the same as preservation of a revolutionary political philosophy closely associated with evolutionary reforms.

History will consider it odd, to say the least, that America, victorious without bloodshed in the most prolonged, potentially most dangerous ideological struggle ever, demonstrated adamant insistence on Russia's adoption of a market economic system and seemed apathetic about Russia's adoption of a democratic constitution. Late-twentieth-century America seemed sadly ignorant of, and unconcerned about, its true contribution to world history: revolutionary democratic emphasis on constitutionally guaranteed individual freedoms and human political rights.

This failure to remember our revolutionary heritage might have its reasons — having to do with insularity, rampant individualism, the privateer-buccaneer entrepreneurial spirit, and most of all, latent awareness and avoidance of the civic duty necessary for the survival of a democratic republic. Americans prefer to see the opportunities and rights that their form of government offers rather than the obligations and responsibilities it requires. No more need be said on this theme than that the political debate of the 1990s has much to do with entitlements and little to do with civic duty. Political candidates cast their campaign rhetoric in the mold of government programs and services but are largely too fearful of their constituents to remind them of their own civic responsibilities. For as Arendt says, "Political freedom, generally speaking, means the right 'to be a participant in government' or it means nothing at all."

The eighteenth-century principles motivating the American revolution were public freedom, public happiness, and public spirit. After the revolutionary spirit was lost in the nineteenth century through the failure of thought and remembrance, these principles gave way to 'civil liberties, the individual welfare of the greatest number, and public opinion as die greatest force ruling an egalitarian, democratic society,' according to Arendt. By the late twentieth century, these principles had given away to values of rampant private interest, with the government as guarantor-of-last-resort (but otherwise as enemy), and to values of materialism, scorn for the public interest, and disinterest for social justice.

The latest national election focused almost exclusively on economic concerns. George Bush was fired by the voters because his laissez-faire philosophy — largely left over from his predecessor — permitted no government intervention to jump-start an economy that was struck in a dormant, recessionary cycle. What is a president to do when his belief system is anti-government and the voters demand government action? President Clinton's victory was attributable not only to the generational contrast his candidacy represented after twelve years of geriatric conservatism but even more to the sense that he represented moderate change by means of a leaner but more active government. The motto on his campaign headquarters' wall—THE ECONOMY, STUPID—seems to have said it all.

Arguably, given the political values of the age, President Clinton will be judged a political success (and the sure winner of a second term in office) if he is able to stimulate or even simply be fortunate enough to preside over another cycle of economic growth as well as a stable, if not rising, standard of living for middle America. This would be a suitable and deserved reward for the skillful and increasingly delicate
manipulation of the fiscal and monetary levers and gears that is required in treacherous economic currents.

But a more profound measure of leadership lies beyond this. It rests in a new government's willingness to undertake fundamental reforms, reforms deferred for a half century by assassinations, the genuine political scandals of Watergate and Iranagate, the fiasco of the savings and loan associations and Bank of Credit and Commerce International, the Vietnam War, and most of all, the seemingly interminable cold war. Major modifications of health-care systems, federal support of and incentives for public education, campaign financing laws, and job-training programs have succeeded, are underway, or soon will be. The more serious question surrounds our willingness and our ability to restructure national energy policies, reform military institutions, replace consumption with incentives for productivity, rebuild our national communication and transportation infrastructures, convert excess military production to non-military production, clean up nuclear and toxic wastes, reduce deficits, and redirect our foreign policies. All are now possible for one historic reason: the end of the cold war.

But even beyond these huge reform efforts, there remains the challenge to reawaken America's revolutionary spirit, with its principles of public freedom, happiness, and spirit and its commitment to the national interest. The whole idea of reform is based on the notion that virtually all citizens possess within themselves the ideal of a better society. At its furthest extreme, this ideal is Utopian. But wars, assassinations, political pragmatism, and repeated violations of the public trust by political leaders have hummedled the dreaminess from the Utopian vision as though it were stuffing a rag doll. Instead, the American people have been left with the belief that there may be no solutions to urban decay, racial disharmony, crime, drug use, and other current maladies. Thus, the challenge for contemporary political leadership, namely the Clinton administration and current Democratic Congress, is to reawaken the belief that progress is not a myth but is indeed possible, that government can be both active and benign, that the public and private sectors are not natural enemies, and that public support for a new round of revolutionary experimentalism—what the urbanologist Jane Jacobs calls "the esthetics of drift"—may be required to solve intractable social problems.

Looking back on this time from the future, we shall come to see how for tuitous — almost divinely so -- was the coincidence of the cold war's end with the need for America - and much of the Western world — to manage the transition from a manufacturing to an information-based economy. Indeed this transition has been dangerously delayed in America by the perceived imperatives of the Cold War militancy. But that militancy, to the degree it ever was as important and openness in adapting to international immigration demographics. We must continue to become more Asian, Latin, and Caribbean in cultural and ethnic complexion. The national dialogue must be to absorb the best of all these cultures, even as we did with nineteenth-century European immigrants.

But the post cold war reform America must also include the continued dismantling and restructuring of the administrative complex. We must protect the lives and prospects of hundreds of thousands of skilled workers, their families, and the communities in which they live and work. This calls for work to be done in infrastructures, rebuilding, in the invention of new medical, environmental, and communications technologies, in information building, in health care delivery, and in development of great variety of similar activities. But the challenge lies in the management of transition. Safe, renewable energy supplies must be developed. Research in new building materials and manufacturing techniques must be carried out. Our military forces must be restructured and reformed. All these demands, long deferred for national security reasons, now rise up to be addressed. Consequently the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries could become a historic era, one rivaling the revolutionary eighteenth century, but only if leaders in government, business, and society at large arise to seize the opportunities.

In the end, it is never a question of opportunity but always a question of will and imagination. Great leadership inspires both. It has nothing to do with the tedious ideological quarrels between conservatives and liberals over the size and power of the government, but everything to do with the vision of public leaders for the nation's future and their ability to summon our better instincts in the national service. This is the arena that separates a Washington, a Jefferson, a Jackson, a Lincoln, a Franklin Roosevelt from their more numerous, ordinary predecessors and successors. Almost never in a generation and seldom in a century is a society or a nation given the rare chance at redefinition and reinvention. That is precisely what the post-cold war era offers. But this opportunity will not tarry forever. Either we grasp out destiny, or fate and circumstance will dictate it for us.

Given the still-uncelebrated
victory of democracy over communism, why does America seem so hesitant about reawakening its dormant revolutionary spirit? This question is inextricably intertwined with the multitudinous barriers conservative America has erected against reform. From the Founders' insistence on not simply a balance of power but an almost absolute dispersal of power down to today's attempt to exhum and reinstate the mythologically independent Western hero, America constantly finds new ways to escape its revolutionary roots. Liberalism is demonized; government is ridiculed and mocked; activism is made marginal; the idealism of youth is discouraged; and social justice is made a Utopian dream. Rewards are granted for cleverness, triviality, and sensationalism. Why is any recollection of a nobler time dismissed as nostalgia for Camelot?

The more attention the reformer gave to the question, the more he would become convinced that late-twentieth-century America is in search of that lost fragment of its own revolution, human nobility. But nobility is inseparable from that equally rare quality, integrity, and a nation whose integrity is hostage to a frantic search for material success, ease and comfort cannot be a noble nation.

The reformer could not see the country that he deeply loved, his homeland, apart from Jesus' parable of the prodigal son. Seeking its ease, metaphorically, in a foreign land, America forgot its soul, its home, its family. It desperately needed to return to the home of its Founding Fathers, not those who thought democracy to be another name for economic determinism and capitalism's most fantastic excess, but a democracy that meant justice, equality, and opportunity for all.

The reformer's historically insignificant efforts at reform, his faults, and his failures were but a single frail human measure of distance between the real and the ideal, the immeasurable space that represents an instinctive human search for nobility. His mature life was chasted by religious belief and family training to the immutable rock called justice. Justice was an unforgiving teacher; she was blind, and she was relentless. She would not let go, and she permitted no compromise.

But this reformer's personal struggles were a trivial matter on the great scale of human injustice and in the context of a society's search for its unrealized nobility. If the reformer's belief is correct, that the seeds of injustice were planted by the conquistadors, Pilgrims, and slave traders, then the roots of national discontent go deeper than any late-twentieth-century reformer, or president, could ever hope to reach. The nation's founders, unable to resolve age-old struggles between property rights and human freedoms, markets and social cohesion, capitalism and justice, simply passed those struggles down through each generation to the present age.

When faced with far-reaching misery, as in the Great Depression, America would seek to deal with these tensions. But occasionally, as in the eighties, the country turned selfish and mean to a sufficient degree to dismay a mature but still idealistic reformer. The values of its popular culture — sensationalism, triviality, and mass exploitation of private lives — would be incomparable with national integrity and any serious sense of true nobility. For his children's and his nation's sake this reformer would hope with considerable desperation that this represented but a passing phase, a sacrifice to the insatiable gods of amusement and consumption, a temporary detour from a just and moral crusade in search of national integrity and nobility.

No single election, including that of 1992, could immediately alter America's course. But it might represent a turning point, a creaking shift of the compass point on the great ship of state. Even at two hundred years of age, America is too young to succumb to the erosion, decline, decay, and collapse that have characterized history's many cultures. America is not finished yet. Its reformers and disciples of national nobility will not let it slide beneath the surface of history's turbulent waters without one last struggle to realize a better national destiny. However flickering the candle of justice, the effort has to be made. The prospect of a brighter destiny has to be preserved for yet one more generation.

It is devoutly to be hoped that President Clinton's soul will be stirred by Jefferson's radical notion of generational revolution, by the better angels of our nature so dormant since Lincoln, by Wilson's Utopian vision of a family of nations, by Franklin Roosevelt's belief that we are all in this together. Sometimes, even in the crude arena of politics, a leader's soul may be stirred by the mystical chords of a nobler future, a more just nation, a better people. When it happens, it is magic.

May such magic descend on America, at least once more. No president, especially in today's age of leveling and reduction, can ever wish for the hero's mantle, and it should not be expected. But there is still a chance, against great cultural odds, that some spark of inspiration so rare and unexpected as to seem almost divine might visit even the most political of politicians and grant them the courage to seek the grail of national nobility. Only a people with some spark of idealism left, after decades of pragmatism, realpolitik, and cynicism could even imagine such a crusade for social justice. More mature peoples, more sophisticated nations had given up such an idealistic quest long ago.

But not the American soul. It is like Sancho Panza, merely awaiting the quixotic call for one more, perhaps last, crusade in search of a dream that will never die. And even if we fail to find the dream, we must still fail better.

HELVIDIUS

11 "IT 7e do not yet have justice, equal and practical, for the poor, for the members of minority groups, for the crim-
VV inally accused, for the displaced persons of the technological revolution, for alienated youth, for the urban masses, for the unfortunate consumer - for all, in short, who do not partake of the abundance of American life. The goal of universal equality, freedom, and prosperity is far from won. Ugly inequities continue to mar the face of the nation. We are surely nearer the beginning than the end of the struggle."

Justice William Brennan
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Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

by Richard N. de los Reyes

THE WOODROW WILSON SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND International Affairs is designed to enhance policymaking skills for those who are dedicated to public service. The past year has proven the Woodrow Wilson School's dedication to public service as over a dozen men and women associated with the School were chosen to serve in President Clinton's administration. These individuals include the National Security Adviser, the Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, the Director of the National Economic Council, and the Assistant Secretary for Defense. In addition, four graduates, two former Mid-Career Fellows, and two faculty members are serving on the Health Care Task Force headed by Hillary Rodham Clinton.

The Woodrow Wilson School shows its devotion to developing analytical skills for policy making through its two year program for the degree of Master in Public Affairs (M.P.A.). The curriculum contains four types of courses: those devoted to analytical skills, those in the four fields of specialization, policy workshops, and electives. The development of analytical skills is achieved through four courses taken in the first year: Public Management- Political and Organizational Analysis, Quantitative Analysis, Microeconomic Analysis, and Macroeconomic Analysis. These four courses comprise the core curriculum. At the same time, students take courses from their chosen field of specialization. The four fields are International Relations, Development Studies, Domestic Policy, and Economics and Public Policy. Each of these fields has a list of its own required courses. In addition, all students participate in policy workshops. According to the School's bulletin, these workshops "provide a structure in which students, under faculty leadership, work as a group to solve a concrete policy problem or institutional dilemma." This gives students the opportunity to learn the art of policy-making while working with other students.

Students may also opt for a joint degree program, combining the study of public policy with another field. Within the School, the Masters in Public Affairs can be combined with a degree in Urban and Regional Planning, Population, or Science and Technology. In addition, the School offers a joint degree program of law and public policy with the law schools of Columbia University and New York University. In this program, students spend five semesters studying at their chosen law school and three semesters at the Woodrow Wilson School, thereby reducing by two semesters the amount of time normally needed to earn the two degrees. Students must apply separately to both schools and be admitted to both. In addition, the Woodrow Wilson School requires joint degree program applicants to submit an additional essay explaining their reasons for pursuing both degrees.

The Woodrow Wilson School has many resources available to aid students in their research. The Woodrow Wilson School Library houses a collection of texts that support the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. The Library also contains up-to-date periodicals from the social sciences. Other libraries throughout the university, such as the Urban and Environmental Studies Library and the Library of Economics and Finance, are available for use to all students. Computer facilities are located on the lower level of the School, and the School even offers small group instruction in order to help students gain computer literacy.

Admission to the Woodrow Wilson School is highly competitive. Applicants must submit a transcript of all grades received from each college and graduate school attended and scores from the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). The average grade point average of the most recently admitted class was 3.5, and the average scores on the GRE were 670 on the verbal section, 695 on the quantitative section, and 700 on the analytical section. In addition, applicants must submit a policy memorandum concerning some problem that relates to the applicant's area of interest. According to the School bulletin, this is an "exercise in analysis and writing, and is considered carefully by the Admissions Committee." Applicants are also required to submit three letters of reference, and a resume. Students planning to study international subjects are expected to demonstrate an ability in foreign languages.

As a result of these strict admissions procedures, the students at the Woodrow Wilson School are nearly all very competent. "There's a lot of helpful and constructive interaction," said second-year student Lisa McNeily, "It's not cut throat at all." Overall, students report a great deal of cooperation among the students and less of a feeling of competition. Because the school has group activities, such as policy conferences, students are accustomed to cooperating with each other if they hope to accomplish anything.

The emphasis on policy making is what has drawn many students to the school. According to second-year student Alex Cohen, "This is a school for policy-makers, not politicians. That's a definite contrast to the Kennedy School." Students view the School as a place to learn the tools of policy making in order to take roles in public policy.

In addition to taking classes, students of the Woodrow Wilson School gain practical experience in a professional work-

Workshops "provide a structure in which students, under faculty leadership, work as a group to solve a concrete policy dilemma."
ing environment. Students can opt to participate in a work-study program during the academic year in place of one course. In the past, work-study jobs have ranged from working for a community development organization in Trenton to an internship with the United Nations. Students take these jobs very seriously, and in many cases they are able to turn their work-study jobs into full time careers after graduating. In addition, the School requires that all students gain experience through an internship with a public agency during the summer between their first and second years in the program. Many students use this time as an opportunity to work for an agency in another part of the country or overseas.

Studying at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs is very rewarding, but its reward has a price. The 1993-1994 Graduate School tuition is $19,040. However, the school has a need-blind admissions policy and is very generous with financial aid. According to the bulletin, the school prefers grants to loans, ensuring that graduates take the jobs they want to take, not the ones that they have to take to pay back their loans. Over 75 percent of students receive financial aid and a relatively large percentage of students have their full tuition paid for them.

Most graduates of the Woodrow Wilson School pursue careers in the government. According to the bulletin, they "work in public agencies of all levels—in international, national, state, and local—in the United States and abroad." Although the job market has been very tight due to the recent recession, the Office of Career Services works diligently to ensure that graduates are able to secure employment. Career Services maintains close ties with contacts in numerous public agencies and with many of its alumni. Career Services also provides career counseling and information sessions to make students more marketable. Typical first jobs of Woodrow Wilson School graduates range from a Foreign Service Officer for the State Department to a Legislative Assistant for a Senator to a Business Writer for The New York Times.

All students of the Woodrow Wilson School are guaranteed housing by the University. Students have many housing options. Because the School is so small (only about 160 students) most can live in the Graduate College, but some students live in annexes or other University-owned housing.

The smallness of the School can actually be one of its drawbacks. Some students feel that the smallness of the School limits the number of classes which can be offered. In addition, the School's size limits the amount of social activity for graduate students. "There's not a very good social scene," says Alex Cohen. "If you restrict your social scene just to the program it's going to be pretty limited." The town of Princeton offers very little to students socially, and most of the social activities on campus are directed toward the much larger undergraduate community. As a result, graduate life can seem very stifling and claustrophobic.

At the same time, the smallness of the School is what makes its program so strong. It allows for small classes and policy conferences led by some of the most esteemed professors in the world. In addition, it allows for a great deal of informal interaction between the students and the faculty. The combination of these factors makes a Woodrow Wilson School education beneficial and worthwhile for all of its students.
Only Eight Subway Stops

aways, in the heart of Greenwich Village, lies the young and energetic Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law. Part of Yeshiva University, Cardozo occupies ten floors of a seventeen story building on 12th Street and Fifth Avenue. The school admitted its first class in 1976 and has grown immensely in size and acclaim since. According to an admissions brochure, U.S. News and World Report recently named Cardozo as one of the top five "up and coming" law schools in the country.

When I made the short trip to Cardozo on a rainy Monday morning, I expected to wait a long time in order to speak to an individual in the Admissions Office. However, when I arrived, I was ushered in extremely promptly and treated kindly. As one walks through the halls of the School, a definite sense of community and good-will seem to exist.

The diverse and flexible Cardozo curriculum is, as the School's bulletin states, "designed to provide students with a broad, traditional legal education as well as with a variety of innovative courses in specialized areas. All first-year students may only take required courses. The purpose of this rule is to provide each student with the basic principles of Common Law and to help the student develop opinions on what roles they want to play in the profession. Courses in the first-year curriculum include Contracts, Torts, Property and Civil Procedure. All are full-year classes. Also required are Moot Court and the Legal Writing Program, which are designed to sharpen the writing and speaking skills of students. Each first-year student is placed into two sections of 45 students each. The bulletin states that these sections create an atmosphere "that serves to reduce some of the strain of the first year, while enhancing the quality of the educational program."

Second and third year courses are mostly elective. Students can choose a traditional legal education and choose from any number of areas such as corporate law, commercial law, or taxation; or they may select courses in developing areas including Bioethics and the Law, Corporation Counsel's Appellate Externship, the Criminal Appeals Clinic, the Criminal Law Clinic, the Immigration Law Clinic, the Intensive Trial Advocacy Program, the Mediation Clinic, the Program in International Law and Human Rights, the Prosecutor Practicum, and the Tax Clinic.

One of the key departments of the college is the Center for Professional Development. It oversees the clinical
programs, internship programs, public interest funding, and placement services. The Center reports that 54 percent of graduates work in private practice, 14 percent work in the government, 11 percent work in corporations, 7 percent work in judicial clerkships, 5 percent work in public interest, and 2 percent teach.

One aspect of the Law School that the Admissions Office and the bulletin both stress is the school's renowned faculty. The school has nearly fifty assistant and full-time professors from varying backgrounds. A brochure states that the School was recently included among the top twenty law schools for faculty scholarship in a survey by IIT-Chicago Kent.

A modern, clean, and spacious library, the Dr. Rebecca Chutick Law Library occupies three floors of the School's building. It contains more than 350,000 volumes and is open until midnight on most days.

Housing is not provided by Cardozo, but there are extensive programs to help students find affordable housing. Limited space is available for first year students at New York University's Law School dormitories. Also, several spaces are available at one of Fordham Law School's dormitories in Manhattan. "Overall, Cardozo is a commuter school," stated Ms. Gewirtz.

Admissions to Cardozo is based on the applicant's personal statement and recommendations, but the most important factors are LSAT scores and G.P.A. The average LSAT score is 160, while the average G.P.A. is 3.28. The September 1993 class consists of 250 individuals out of an application pool of approximately 2,200. 52 percent of the students are male, 48 percent are female. The students range from the age of 20-57. Applicants must hold a baccalaureate degree, and must have taken the LSAT.

A special admissions program which Cardozo has is the Accelerated Entry Plan (A.E.P.). Students in this program begin studies in January or May, and their class size is smaller (45 students) than September's class. This plan allows flexibility for "non-traditional" students such as those who are working on other post-graduate degrees. A Columbia undergraduate education "certainly has value" according to Anita T. Walton, the Director of Admissions, and several Columbia graduates currently attend Cardozo. Various need and merit based scholarships, as well as many loans, are available for students who need financial aid to help pay for the tuition of $16,375 per year.

Students have a generally positive view of Cardozo. The majority of the students with whom I spoke said that the school is extremely competitive. Jay Bohenski, a graduate of Touro University, stated, "I've never experienced a more competitive environment than the first year here." Bohenski said that the environment becomes more friendly after the first year. Jeff Bloom, a Northwestern graduate, said that, overall, he enjoys attending Cardozo, but he said that one area in which the college seems to be lacking is the Placement Department. He said, "Nevertheless, academically [Cardozo] is excellent. It is well worth the investment."

One facet of the School which is readily apparent to any visitor is the obvious lack of minority students. Yeshiva University is a Jewish-affiliated school, and according to Ms. Walton, this is a problem in recruiting minorities. Only 10 percent of the current students are minorities, but that is an increase from recent years. The School has a Black, Latino, and Asian Law Students Association which recruit minority students, and the Admissions Department conducts targeted mailings, attempting to increase the minority population.

Along with the obvious advantage of its location in New York City, Cardozo offers a wide range of options for its students. Cardozo is quickly gaining international respect as quality law school. Ms. Walton summed up most of the feelings of the students by stating, "New York and Cardozo are simply great places to go to school." Jeremiaa Manning, a Columbia College graduate of 1990, expressed the same sentiments, saying that the other law schools close to Cardozo help in research. He said that the School's location in New York City was a very important factor in his decision to attend Cardozo, basing this on his experience at Columbia. "I think the reason I chose Cardozo was my four years at Columbia," he said.
Cornell Law School

by Jennifer Kim

As one third-year law student said, "there isn't that typical cutthroat atmosphere that you would usually find at an Ivy League institution." Students are a 3.55, while the average LSAT score placed the entering class of 1992 in the 94th percentile, or a score of 165. Other statistics include the following: 50 percent had full-time job experience other than summer jobs, 25 percent had been actively involved in student government or politics, 15 percent were editors and reporters on college publications or had journalism experience after graduation, and 10 percent had done graduate work.

Admission to Cornell Law School is highly selective; the acceptance rate is 22 percent. About 4200 applications for admission were received for the 180 places for the fall of 1993. According to the Admissions Committee, evidence of intellectual ability, motivation and character come into consideration. Faculty recommendations, undergraduate transcript, the LSAT score, and the personal statement play important roles in the application process. The Committee also gives considerable weight to work experience, extracurricular and community activities, graduate study, and other special circumstances that are brought to its attention. In the catalogue and the application, minority-group status is regarded as a positive factor.

Cornell Law School also offers specialized and combined degrees. J.D./M.B.A. (Masters of Business Administration) in four years rather than five. J.D./M.I.L.R. (Master of Industrial and Labor Relations) can be acquired within two semesters after Law School. J.D./M.R.P. (Master of Regional Planning) or the J.D./M.A. in philosophy also takes four years instead of the traditional five. The J.D./Ph.D takes seven years instead of the traditional eight.

When asked about why she chose Cornell Law School over others, Carol Hobson, a third year law student and current employee of the Admissions Office said: "I was most impressed with their International Legal Program (Berger International Legal Studies Program; J.D. with Specialization in International Legal Affairs), but didn't want to attend a school that I hadn't visited. After I visited and talked to students, I believe my choice to attend Cornell was a wise one."

Hobson also talked about housing preferences: "You usually get what you are looking for. There is on campus housing, but most students choose to live off campus, because renting is very inexpensive and reasonably comfortable. There is always sufficient housing for students."

With regards to the social scene, Hobson replied, "There isn't much of a night life as there is, I presume, in New York City, but as a first year student, you don't have the time for one." According to the Cornell Law School catalogue, "The study of law, especially in the first year, demands so much time and energy that it is not advisable for a student to try to earn a large proportion of the expenses incurred during the academic year."

The social life for a first-year law student is on the average very limited. However, there is more time to spare after all of the first-year required courses such as Civil Procedure, Constitutional Law, Contracts, Practice Training I and II, Torts, Criminal Law, Legal Process, and Property are completed. "The social scene is definitely better in the second and third year," Hobson concluded.

Tuition for 1993-1994 came to a sum of $19,200. About 50 percent of the students receive scholarship awards, while 70 percent receive loan assistance. The estimated expenses for a student, including tuition, room, board, books, and incindicents are about $30,270 for an academic year.

Cornell Law School's average starting salary was $69,276 and was ranked by U.S. News and World Report at twelve for job placement success. In the past few years, 70 percent of the graduating class were hired directly after graduation and 80 percent of the class after the bar exam, according to Hobson.
Cornell Law School also has their own law journal which gets published regularly throughout the school year. This gives students and faculty a chance to express opinions and ideas.

Due to the difficulties that Helvidius had in trying to request and receive information from the Admissions Office, it is advised that you request an application about the law and its various interpretations.

Hobson was courteous enough to give Helvidius an interview while the Dean of Admissions went off on sporadic road trips and couldn't be reached. Due to the difficulties that Helvidius had in trying to request and receive information from the Admissions Office, it is advised that you request an application early. It is also recommended that when you apply, you give yourself enough time to be able to check and see if they received your application.

The Cornell community is very relaxed compared to the high impact stress that one feels in NYC. Not only does the community have a more relaxed tone, but there is also a sense of serenity when one is surrounded by such scenic areas. The campus' natural element, such as the waterfalls and gorges, allow the student to be able to work at a slower pace than the hurry one usually feels in NYC. There isn't less work, in fact some might say there's more, but since there aren't as many distractions as there are in NYC, you can focus more on your priorities. Hobson agreed by saying, "The campus complimented the facilities. If you are considering getting away from the city, give Cornell very strong consideration."

**HELVIDIUS**
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**New York Race**

Continued from page 45

In the disturbance, Yankel Rosenbaum, a Jewish scholar was killed by a crowd allegedly screaming "kill the Jew". The disturbance lasted for three days. In the aftermath of the crisis, mayor Dinkins was accused by the Jewish residents of Crown Heights of not sending in the cops soon enough and allowing a "pogrom" (state sanctioned violence) to occur. He gained a reputation in some circles as a man who was inherently out of touch and who was more concerned with protecting the Black community than any other group. While this reputation was based on rumor, falsehood and half truths, no matter how much it was dispelled, its gut theme, that Dinkins cared for blacks more than anyone else, hung around his neck like an albatross.

In New York City, there are over 7.5 million people competing for scarce government resources such as health care, housing, education, placement of facilities, police protection and jobs, to name a few. Voters understand that city government cannot meet all of their needs, so they will vote for the person who they believe will meet more of their needs. There is an underlying belief that if the person you elect to governmental office is like you — i.e. of the same race, religion or ethnic background — the services you receive will be better. They know firsthand about your relationship with the police and thus they know how you expect this critical body of public servants to tend to your needs. The person who is like you will protect you.

**For the first time in 74 years, the nation's two largest cities, New York and Los Angeles have Republican mayors. And the question that lingers in New York City is why.**

This is the theme that Crown Heights echoed and the voters took it to the polls with them. They wanted their quality of life to improve and in their minds, the mythological lesson of Crown Heights was that the person who will improve your quality of life the most is the man who looks like you. He knows inherently the problems you have because due to his race, they are his too. Is the myth true? Probably not. Anyone who runs for citywide office does not run as a power trip; they run because they want to tackle the big problems for all of the people. It is too thankless of a job to run for any other reason.

---

Columbia Law School has graduated six Associate Justices and three Chief Justices of the United States Supreme Court.

*Courtesy of the Collection of the Supreme Court Historical Society*
Founded in 1801, Yale Law School in New Haven, Connecticut is a private institution with the primary purpose of training lawyers while encouraging research in law. With the long tradition of taking a broad view of lawyers and law in society, the Law School has sought to train lawyers for public service and teaching as well as for private practice, to "advance inquiry at the boundaries of the law as well as to inculcate knowledge at the core," as the admissions bulletin states. Consistently ranked among the top law schools in the nation, one wonders just how great this school really is.

Admission to Yale Law School is the most selective in the country. Eight percent, or 407 of the 5391 applicants, were accepted in the most recent first-year class. The School tries to maintain a class size of around 175 students, with 183 in this past year's entering class. The median LSAT percentile of that first-year class was 97. The median GPA was 3.8. The lowest LSAT percentile accepted was 79. Eleven Columbia College graduates enrolled, as compared to fifty-seven Harvard graduates and thirteen Brown graduates.

The matriculating class at Yale is demographically diverse. 46 states are represented, with 38 percent of students from the Northeast. 22 foreign countries are represented, including Cameroon and Ukraine. 42 percent of the student body is female. Nine percent of the class is Asian, eight percent African American, two percent Latino/American, and one percent Native American. The average age of the entering student is 24, ranging from 20 to 44. A very high percentage of the student body remains to receive a law degree, with one percent withdrawing after the first year for academic or personal reasons. The faculty consists of 59 full-time instructors and 34 part-time instructors, thirteen of whom are women. The ratio of full-time faculty to full-time students in an average class is one to ten.

The total yearly bill at Yale Law School is $19,780, not including necessary expenses such as books, food, housing. etc. Admission is need-blind, and according to the Law School bulletin, "the average financial aid award places the students' net costs below that of other schools with high tuition". Approximately two-thirds of the student body receive some form of need-based financial assistance. Living accommodations for a limited number of students are available in the Law School dormitories, at an annual rental fee of $2,830 to $3,480 per academic year. The University assists in locating housing for married students and others who cannot be accommodated in the dormitories.

To earn the Juris Doctor degree (J.D.), candidates must complete 82 total credits, 19 of which are for required courses. First-years are required to take courses in Constitutional Law, Contracts, Procedure, and Torts. Each student is assigned to a seminar of not more than seventeen in one of these subjects. The only requirements after the first term are Criminal Law and Administration I, to be taken before graduation, three units of supervised analytic writing, and a substantial paper of at least two units of

Chris Thomas is a first-year student at Columbia College.
Virtually all Yale Law graduates have their choice of jobs when they graduate...first and second-year law students accept jobs in law firms, the government, or public interest organizations.

Foreign and International Law Annex connected to the Law School building. At the end of each semester, the library is open twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

Student organizations include the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Law Students' Association, Project SAT, which conducts an SAT prep course for financially needy New Haven public school students, and the Yale Federalist Society, which provides the Law School with a forum for discussing conservative and libertarian ideas. Publications include the Yale Law Journal, the Yale Journal of Law and Feminism, the Journal of International Law, and the Yale Law and Policy Review.

Placement services are available through a specialized law school placement center. This center employs a staff that provides comprehensive services and educational programs for the students. Virtually all Yale Law graduates have their choice of jobs when they graduate. Of the 95 percent of the class of 1992 who reported their employment, 42 percent took judicial clerkships, 44 percent took jobs with private law firms or business organizations, eleven percent took public interest or government jobs, and three percent took academic jobs, fellowships, and miscellaneous positions. Virtually all first and second-year law students who seek summer legal employment accept jobs in law firms, the government, or public interest organizations. The average starting salary range for 1991 graduates was $35,000 to $85,000.

New Haven has more to offer than just Yale, though the University does dominate the city. The University has responded to the problems of urban crime with more thorough security measures. There are many diverse ethnic restaurants, and New Haven is the birthplace of both the hamburger and the American pizza. New Haven has institutions such as the famous Toad's Place, where bands such as the Rolling Stones have been known to hold impromptu concerts, the low-key Daily Caffe, and the Shubert Theater, once considered the testing ground for new Broadway plays. New Haven is an inexpensive two hour train ride from New York City and a mere 3 hour train ride from Boston.

Unfortunately, law students hardly ever get to enjoy any of these offerings. When I asked one student about social life at Yale, he just laughed darkly before a wave of melancholy passed over his face. Few law school students anywhere choose going to law school for its social life, and Yale is no exception. Some law students complain of "cabin fever", feeling cooped up in the one little Law building all three years. Others note that University social activities are aimed primarily at undergraduates, but most law students are a serious, purposeful group of people who never lose track of their main reason for being in New Haven: to receive what is possibly the finest legal education in the world.

New Haven has more to offer than just Yale, though the University does dominate the city.