

RIPON

forum

VOL. XXV NO. 2

MAY 1989

THE WORLD ACCORDING TO NEWT



*A Conversation with
Newt Gingrich*

Editor's Column

On March 22, fiercely conservative Georgia Congressman Newt Gingrich was elected House Republican Whip, a feat which many in Washington considered the coming to power of a new Republican guard. The irony in the Gingrich election was that a number of moderate Republicans supported his candidacy. The central thread seems to be that Gingrich supporting moderates favored his take-charge style.

In his interview in this **Forum**, the six-term congressman talks about his new post and of the need to develop a "caring, humanitarian reform party." Gingrich claims that he wants a "big-tent" party. This means a group with diverse views and healthy arguments. Of course, who controls the debate will tell much about how diverse the Republican Party can become. Whether he and his followers, who will be instrumental in putting together House coalitions, will be genuinely inclusive of moderates on future issues remains a legitimate question.

Also in this issue Ripon president Mark Uncapher and New York attorney Russell George present a plan to expand upon prior immigration reforms. Their aim is to provide incentives to private, voluntary organizations for sponsorship of immigrants, which includes responsibility for an immigrant's health and educational needs.

New **Ripon Forum** editorial board member David Fuscus reports on U.S. policy developments regarding the Sudan, a country in which Fuscus has traveled extensively. He suggests that the changes provide a model for the different approach George Bush brings to foreign policy.

Newly-elected Ripon chairman Bill Clinger also outlines his hopes for the Society, which includes promoting work on urban issues. And in this issue we spotlight the work of two members of Ripon's Congressional Advisory Board, Constance Morella and Peter Smith, on education reform and the Peace Corps. Along with regular reports on the ideas and players of the Bush administration, the **Forum** will carry out Clinger's pledge to further the policy debate.

—Bill McKenzie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITOR'S COLUMN	2
PROFILES AND PERSPECTIVES:	
<i>A Conversation with Newt Gingrich</i>	3
EDITORIALS :	
<i>The FSX, America and Japan</i>	8
A "GOLDEN BORDERS" PROPOSAL:	
Mark Uncapher and Russell George	10
THE GOP'S STAKE IN A "GOLDEN BORDERS" IMMIGRATION POLICY: Kenneth J. Grossberger	12
FOOD AS A WEAPON OF WAR:	
<i>Has the United States Done Enough to Stop It?: David A. Fuscus</i>	14
THE EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT:	
Peter Smith	16
TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE:	
Constance A. Morella	17
FREDERICK McCLURE : BEHIND THE "NEW BREEZE" :	
William P. McKenzie	19
THE CHAIRMAN'S CORNER:	
<i>Goals for the '90s:</i>	
William Clinger	20
WALTER N. THAYER, IN MEMORIAM:	
Thomas E. Petri and Lee W. Huebner	21
PUBLIC HOUSING:	
<i>Of the People, By the People and For the People:</i>	
Mariann Kurtz	22
6 LIBRARY COURT	23
WASHINGTON NOTES AND QUOTES	24

RIPON *forum*

Editor: William P. McKenzie
Associate Editor: Dale E. Curtis
Editorial Assistants: Robin Bramwell,
 Christine Strum, Bradley Kendall
Editorial Board:
 Terrence M. O'Sullivan
 David A. Fuscus
 Stephen A. Messinger Mariann Kurtz
 Alfred W. Tate Steven Klinsky
 Gem E. Meyer Gail Slocum
Design Consultant: R.J. Matson

THE RIPON FORUM (ISSN 0035-5526) is published bi-monthly in 1989 by The Ripon Society. Contents are copyrighted 1989 by the Ripon Society, Inc., 6 Library Court, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003. In the publication the Society hopes to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well researched proposals, and a spirit of creative criticism and innovation in the Republican

Party. Manuscripts and photographs are solicited, but do not represent the views of the Society unless so stated.

Second class postage and fees paid at Washington, D.C. and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Ripon Forum, 6 Library Court, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.

Subscription rates: \$25 per year, \$17.50 for students, servicemen, Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas, please add \$6. Please allow five weeks for address change.

The Ripon Society Inc., Mark E. Uncapher, president, is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are business, academic, and professional men and women. It is headquartered in Washington, D.C., with National Associate members throughout the United States. Ripon is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions, and revenues from its publications.

A Conversation with Newt Gingrich



Congressman Newt Gingrich

Newt Gingrich was elected to the post of House Republican whip, which makes the controversial Georgian the second-ranking House Republican. It also puts him in charge of building support for Republican initiatives in the House.

Some skeptics wonder, however, if the outspoken partisan is qualified for this role. In addition to initiating ethics charges against House Speaker Jim Wright, he has antagonized many Democrats with his attacks on the "corrupt, liberal welfare state." Even a considerable number of Republicans seem to be disgruntled with Gingrich's style. The best example is House Minority Leader Bob Michel, who quietly campaigned in favor of Gingrich's opponent, Ed Madigan, in the March whip election.

But Gingrich, a former history professor, is clearly comfortable with ideas. As a founder of the Conservative Opportunity Society, he has led that group of House Republicans in their aim to replace liberal notions of equality with conservative ideas about opportunity.

*On a sunny Washington morning last month, at six a.m. to be exact, **Forum** editor Bill McKenzie joined Gingrich to hear more of his ideas. During their 90-minute walk down the Mall linking the Capitol and the Lincoln Monument, they discussed the symbolism of the whip election, House Speaker Jim Wright, GOP rules and the new whip's ideas about the party's future. It is clear that no matter what the GOP's future may hold, Gingrich will play a prominent part.*

Ripon Forum: To some degree your recent election to the post of House minority whip was the result of support by such moderate Republicans as Olympia Snowe, Claudine Schneider and Bill Frenzel. How do you plan to involve moderates in formulating legislation?

Gingrich: There's no question that I would not be House Republican whip if activists in the moderate wing had not supported me. I carried New England by seven to three; I was nominated by Bill Frenzel; Olympia Snowe seconded my nomination; and others like Steve Gunderson and Claudine Schneider played major roles. So I regard my election as a coalition victory for activists of all the ideological views of the Republican Party.

One other reason we created two chief deputy whips was to harness the party's potential energy. By selecting Steve

Gunderson, a moderate from Wisconsin, and Robert Walker, a conservative from Pennsylvania, we sent the signal that both wings would be represented.

Ripon Forum: But beyond personnel selections, on what issues will you involve moderates?

Gingrich: To really understand my hopes, let me give you an outline of my way of thinking. Activities occur at four levels. The top level is vision, the next level is strategy, and after that follow projects and tactics.

Our larger vision is to develop a caring, humanitarian reform party. That's an interesting term, by the way, because [former White House chief of staff] Ken Duberstein said it ought to be caring; my wife said it ought to be humanitarian; and Steve Gunderson said it ought to be reform.

We have to become a party which cares about the nine year-old saying the Pledge of Allegiance, but then also cares about how that child spends the rest of the day. Even in the most conservative Orange County audiences I've received spontaneous applause about our duty to all our children.

Ripon Forum: Let's stop there, because child care is already a controversial issue. Last fall George Gilder took Utah Senator Orrin Hatch to task in **National Review** for the Hatch-Johnson bill that would provide tax breaks for day care. Gilder said that the tax break concept was too much, that government

shouldn't be involved at all with child care.

Gingrich: Certainly some conservatives have said that government should do nothing. But my view is that since 1968 the country has pretty decisively decided it does not want a left-wing president. The result has been a center-right governing coalition, which includes Jimmy Carter, who was an aberration.

The country wants that coalition to govern, not juxtapose. So they're going to ask "What are your answers for so many working mothers? So many single heads-of-households?" A party which says "We have no answer" or "Our answer is a cultural revolution which will take generations, so in the meantime you'll just have to suffer" is going to be in a minority status.

What you're going to see is an argument between a governing conservatism, which is pro-active and willing to solve problems with conservative values, and a more theoretical conservatism. That's not to speak ill of Gilder, because his job as an intellectual is to develop a yardstick for cultural change. But developing solutions such as the Orrin Hatch-Nancy Johnson tax credit for child care, which provides a powerful, pro-family position based upon parental choice, is a vastly more realistic response. It is based upon the real world and seeing people in real pain and real need.

Since 1968 the country has chosen a center-right coalition to govern, and it does not want that coalition to juxtapose.

Ripon Forum: But what happens on such issues as urban development, where conservatives historically have opposed government spending? Will the center-right coalition hold? Or will it splinter when more activist, government-oriented solutions are needed?

Gingrich: There's going to be a lot of arguing, but I don't think it will splinter. In Teddy White's "The Making of The President" from 1960, you will find a description of Theodore Roosevelt and an active conservatism. That is the model I've had in my mind for 28 years.

For example, we now have a great

concept in tenant management and ownership of low-income housing. That empowers citizens, and says "You're not just a client, you're a citizen. You have real responsibility and real authority." If you're truly going to be a citizen, you have to have both opportunity and responsibility.

On these issues we have a common bonding around a couple of premises. The first is that the corrupt, liberal welfare state has failed. Read "City for Sale" by Jack Newfield and Wayne Barnett, or "Honest Graft" by Brooks Jackson. You can see that there is a systemically corrupt, liberal welfare state. The process of giving some people enormous power and calling them bureaucrats, while depriving other people of power and making them clients, rather than citizens, is in the long run corrupting. That is best expressed by Mario Varga Llosa in his introduction to "The Other Path" by Hernando DeSoto.

There is almost a new synthesis evolving with the classic moderate wing of the party, where, as a former Rockefeller state chairman, I've spent most of my life, and the conservative/activist right wing. You have work being done by the Heritage Foundation as well as by such moderates as Tom Petri. Petri has extraordinarily broad support for his living wage concept, which represents an empowerment/citizen choice replacement for the bureaucratic/corrupt, liberal welfare state.

Ripon Forum: But how do you determine what a corrupt, liberal welfare state is? For example, Tom Kean, the Republican governor of New Jersey, supports affirmative action and minority hiring quotas. He took that message into Newark's ghettos in 1985 and won 60 percent of the black vote. Is he part of the corrupt, liberal welfare state? And how is the Republican Party going to attract more black votes, when many of the middle-class blacks it is targeting have benefited from programs you might call part of the liberal welfare state?

Gingrich: This will get the party into a very healthy and fundamental debate. But let me say that Tom Kean is a good example of the complexity of where we're going. He challenged the corruption of Jersey's city school systems, and in taking the state's school districts over from the local machines he highlighted

the existence of a corrupt, liberal welfare state. Tom Kean has also helped me formulate thinking on a variety of issues, and many conservatives have come to respect his innovative leadership.

But of course, we're going to have arguments. This, frankly, should be exciting to Ripon Society members because I believe in the party of the "big tent." If you're large and energetic enough, you better wake up each morning and think about conflict management, not conflict resolution.

There is almost a new synthesis evolving with the classic moderate wing of the Republican Party and the conservative-activist right wing.

Ripon Forum: So does this signal a shift in your style? As you know, you've been criticized by many as being abrasive.

Gingrich: Clearly, I am comfortable taking on Democrats. I would suggest to moderates that the best example of this is Theodore Roosevelt.

If you're the minority party, you better be able to generate attention. You have to convince people that it is worth being part of your group. By definition, that means a willingness to fight with the Democratic Party. If the Democratic Party is okay, then why do we need Republicans? If the Democrats do some things that are not okay, then isn't it our job to point that out? I just do that more enthusiastically and energetically than has been the tradition in the last 40 years.

Now, the other 95 percent of the time, I've been bipartisan. Norman Mineta, Jim Oberstar or Frank Anunzio can tell you that. I've worked with them on House committees. I also helped found the Military Reform Caucus, although the **Washington Post** doesn't put that on page one. If you get involved in a controversy, then that becomes the mesmerizing event that people remember you by. In general, where confrontation is needed, I'm willing to do that. But where honest bipartisanship is possible, I'm going to be real practical.

Ripon Forum: Where will that be?

Gingrich: It starts with the mechanics

of running the House. I also think the Democrats look forward to working with someone who is part of the party's activist wing. Democrats were concerned that if the activist wing had been frustrated by the recent whip election, it would have been impossible to have working agreements. Now, we'll have a whip system in the classic sense of the word. We'll be able to work the entire Republican Conference and get it to sustain Bob Michel's leadership. For example, we'll be able to make an agreement on how to bring the contra bill to the floor and support that agreement.

Of course, we're going to have arguments. This, frankly, should be very exciting to Ripon Society members because I believe in the party of the "big tent."

This just makes running an important institution like the House easier.

Ripon Forum: But it's also going to require building consensus, which requires compromise.

Gingrich: We're now at the vision level of developing an honest, conservative opportunity society. Any Democrat who wants to help in that grand adventure, we want in the room. Any Democrat who wants cooperation only at the cost of a corrupt, liberal welfare state, we frankly don't want. We want to fight and we want to say that. The single greatest change you're going to see in domestic politics in the next three years is the rising legitimacy of challenging the Democratic National Committee chair Ron Brown and other Democrats to take responsibility for 50 years of misgoverning America's cities.

Ripon Forum: But again, isn't a corrupt, liberal welfare in the eye of the beholder? Doug Bandow, a libertarian columnist, wrote recently that you supported domestic content legislation, which was a protectionist measure for the auto industry, and that you also consistently favor farm subsidies. Some might argue these are part of the corrupt, liberal welfare state.

Gingrich: Sure, you can find issues where members of Congress voted a certain way for tactical reasons. It's true

of everyone except the most rigidly ideological. Even Barry Goldwater used to say about the Central Arizona Project, that there are moments when conservatism has to be rethought.

But the fact is that Newt Gingrich doesn't run New York, Jersey City, Newark, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Detroit and Chicago. For my entire life the Democrats have.

The collective responsibility for the Democratic Party as an institution for the destructive misgovernance of America's major cities has been one of the great secrets and scandals of 20th century America. They have convinced all of us in the Republican Party that it is somehow necessary to look at children suffering in the South Bronx, but you're not allowed to look at the city government which has crippled children, destroyed families, ruined neighborhoods and exploited the taxpayer. All of those machines are Democratic.

Ripon Forum: Several years ago you described yourself as a "Jeffersonian populist." Could you please explain that?

Gingrich: It's one of the points I make to conservatives who often describe themselves as "Jeffersonian conservatives." It usually means they want passive, lean, inactive government. That I would never favor, nor did Jefferson. He bought half a continent, sent the Navy to Tripoli, and sent a scientific expedition half-way across the U.S. when that was a longer trip than going to Mars today.

The Founding Fathers were practical men who wanted a system that remained free and worked at a practical level for human beings. Their vision of America was a successful, working America, and that's why a century later William James called "pragmatism" the one uniquely American contribution to philosophy.

What I'm suggesting is that it's possible to be a conservative in the broad sense - i.e; the world is dangerous and some men are evil, so government must repress those instincts and protect us from those dangers - and hold that private markets and the rule of law are essential to economic prosperity. One can hold those broad values and still believe in the cooperative efforts of Americans - whether it is building the Transcontinental Railroad, populating

the West through the Homestead Act, setting up the Agricultural Agent system, or any of the innovations which made this such an extraordinary place.

My challenge to all Republicans is to invent the systems and the approaches that allow human beings to help themselves, to think through the replacement for the misgovernance of New York City that will allow its citizens to help themselves. Then you'll have a remarkable explosion of energy and opportunity. Centralized government giveaways through politicians and unionized bureaucrats just guarantee the focus on the acquisition of power and invites the systemic corruption which now dominates all big cities and is at the core of our domestic problems.

Ripon Forum: Our former chairman, Jim Leach, has said that Republicans have a traditional base in individual rights and that during the early part of this century Democrats were the party

My challenge to all Republicans is to invent the systems and approaches that allow human beings to help themselves, to think through the replacement for the misgovernance of cities like New York.

of opportunity. Now, Leach says, Republicans are properly stressing opportunity, but are at risk of losing some of their individual rights tradition. The party has backed off its support for the Equal Rights Amendment, Ronald Reagan belatedly supported the Voting Rights Act extension, and during the last administration the Civil Rights Commission lost much of its independence. Are Republicans in danger of losing this base?

Gingrich: Let me say first that one of the gravest mistakes the Reagan administration made was its failure to lead aggressively in civil rights. It cost the Republican Party. It helped cost us control of the Senate in 1986 and it created an environment in the African-American community which was so severe that you can only fully appreciate it when you see the current approval ratings of George Bush. He is seen as a

post-Reagan president by African-Americans, who feel he and Barbara are truly committed to their well-being.

None of us in the conservative wing of the party appreciated the degree to which we were sending the signal to African-Americans that we inadequately appreciated their fears of re-segregation and of being deprived of the rights which they've held for less than a generation. I give credit to people like Jim Leach who understood this. He made a contribution to a very healthy debate within our party and our country.

Having said that, let me pick up the argument. The Republican Party has to be the party of individual rights and individual opportunity. It should be for affirmative action but against minority quotas. There's a big difference. If a young person of any ethnic background is inadequately educated in math, we should find a way to have compensatory math so that person can try for the best math or engineering scholarship in America. The problem with quotas is that they say, "For reasons that have nothing to do with you as a person, we're going to punish you. We're going to punish you if you come from one ethnic background in order to reward you if you come from another ethnic background." Quotas are contradictory to the desire for an integrated America because they put a premium on figuring out who you are ethnically.

The liberal commitment to ending segregation and the colonization of the Third World are liberalism's two great contributions to the 20th century.

Ripon Forum: I don't know anyone who can defend quotas as a theoretically sound concept, but on the other hand black Americans were not allowed into white corridors until the 1954 school desegregation decision and the 1960s civil rights movement. Those actions were only a generation ago, so have we really had enough time to test the experiment in desegregation?

Gingrich: All Americans owe liberalism a great debt for having fought so passionately to end segregation. The liberal commitment to ending segrega-

tion and the colonization of the Third World are liberalism's two great contributions to the 20th century. And they often did that in the face of conservative indifference or hostility.

But quotas are wrong on three grounds. First, they suppress individual abilities in the name of a block mentality which is antithetical to the "American Dream." Second, they send the signal that the way you get ahead is to manipulate a political system. This is connected to corruption because you end with people who hire one African-American to head a storefront operation. That is misleading, and the African-American gets involved in deceiving the government so that the company can maintain the contract.

Third, quotas send exactly the wrong signal to poor people. It says that they are going to get justice through political action and that justice is going to redress the past. That is simply, historically, not true. It's not the way the world works. The more power there is in a political system, the more the powerful exploit it. New York hasn't ended up a dream world for the poor. It has become a place where Donald Trump manipulates the game.

The message that a poor African-American ought to be getting is: "You're right, you're poor. You see it every morning; therefore you better work longer hours, go to school longer, do more homework, study harder, and save more because only by intense personal and family effort will you climb out of the ghetto." Every group in American history which has applied those values, including West Indian blacks, have risen within a generation and a half.

Ripon Forum: But the black culture has been the only one to live with the residue of slavery, and real barriers stood in the way of those who worked hard. This has led to the failure of some blacks to become fully integrated into America society.

Gingrich: That's statistically not true. The average African-American family was vastly more likely to stay more united in 1960 and was rising out of poverty. Read Charles Murray's indictment in of the war on poverty and the welfare state in "Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980."

Ripon Forum: If those black Americans were rising out of poverty,

then why were there mass problems in the cities in the 1960s? Why was there a push for initiatives like urban development?

Gingrich: You had a massive disruption in the '60s because of the energy surge of the baby boomers, the lack of civil rights, the Vietnam War, the qualities of Johnson and Nixon as communicated to the younger generation, and the left's critique of American society which said basically, "If it's authority, you ought to spit on it." Those things became a cocktail disorder which affected whites in Columbia as much as they affected African-Americans in the ghetto.

As the speaker and the whip, Jim Wright and I work together. We are formal and polite, [but] he wishes that I weren't in the room, and I wish that he weren't the speaker.

There also was a belief in government power which had been fostered by the First World War and refocused by World War II. It's no accident that John Kenneth Galbraith's formative experience was being in Washington during the Second World War. For a very brief period, well-educated people at the center of national power can order an economy and gain a surge of unbelievable energy. That doesn't last more than five years, but if we had to mobilize the nation next week that kind of centralized command bureaucracy is unbelievably powerful.

The difficulty is that, beyond three-to-five years, it begins to develop feedback mechanisms of distortion and inaccuracy. What we've discovered over the last 20 years is that the world that enriches politicians is the world that enriches a handful of millionaire developers.

Ripon Forum: Let's shift to some questions about the Republican Party. After eight years of perhaps the most conservative administration in American history, what empirical evidence exists that the GOP has actually broadened its base? There has been some increase in voter identification with the GOP, but the party lost control

of the Senate and has fewer House seats than in 1980.

Gingrich: Well, first, to say "some" increase is an understatement. We have gone from being clearly the minority party by almost two-to-one in the late 1970s to near parity.

But in large part the realignment did not build below the presidency because of [former Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee chair] Tony Coelho's brilliance as the second most successful politician of the 1980s after Ronald Reagan. Also, there is the fact that the Republican Party is tragically too small, too unprofessional and too weak to be the governing party. We need to triple the size of the current GOP — not the Republican National Committee, but the actual party. The local level has to triple in size before we're



Bill McKenzie, I., Newt Gingrich, r.

I will be very surprised if Tom Foley is not speaker by the end of summer.

seriously competitive. That's a huge job and nobody has tackled it.

Ripon Forum: How do you do that?

Gingrich: By developing a positive agenda of a caring, humanitarian reform party, and by developing and winning the argument over the existence of a corrupt, liberal welfare state, you could rally over 80 percent of the vote. Then you could convince people it's their job to be active.

Ripon Forum: Let me ask you a specific question about party growth. GOP delegate allocation rules have a bias towards smaller, non-industrial states. Larger, industrial states such as California, Pennsylvania and Texas have fewer delegates per capita. They also have more minorities than smaller states. There's been a movement to reform this bias, which could open the party to more minorities. What is your view of this change?

Gingrich: I don't know how I would vote. I haven't looked at the issue very much.

I would say that the Republican Party in most states is sufficiently small enough, so that if you went and recruited a new generation of people, you could have a remarkable impact getting minorities involved. Look at Helen Barnhill, the African-American

from Milwaukee's inner city who ran for Congress last year as a Republican.

If those people who want to focus on bringing minorities into the party were to focus on electing delegates in those states, they would have the votes to change the rules. Much like the McGovernites, we look for mechanical change to allow us to avoid hard work.

Ripon Forum: But this is reminiscent of what people said about civil rights during the 1960s. Just work hard and you'll get there. That sentiment ignored the arcane rules that prohibited integration, even if people worked hard and tried to get ahead.

Gingrich: To say that segregation, which was a pervasive, government-enforced discrimination, was wrong, and to conclude from that you should focus on inherently minor rules, doesn't get you far. I'm not saying this in defense of the rules, but in defense of the argument that if you went to Georgia and organized Hispanic, Asian and African-American voters, you would probably control five congressional districts in a year.

Ripon Forum: Yes, but why not do both? Why not have rights and opportunity?

Gingrich: Given limited resources, I don't think many people, outside those passionately committed to the Republican dialectic, will ever respond to a battle cry over the rules. I'm in favor of recruiting good candidates and developing good ideas. Then the rules

will change under their own weight.

Ripon Forum: Let's go to a final subject. Now that you're the House Republican whip, how will you deal with Jim Wright, against whom you've been instrumental in developing ethics charges?

Gingrich: As the speaker and as the whip, we work together. We are formal and polite, and we are able to talk to each other. Obviously, there's no personal friendship. He wishes that I weren't in the room, and I wish that he weren't the speaker. In that sense, this is not going to be a friendly relationship, but it can be a professional relationship.

Ripon Forum: You recently told a television interviewer that you thought Jim Wright would not be speaker by June. Do you still think that is true?

Gingrich: I will be very surprised if Tom Foley is not speaker by the end of summer.

Don't You Think It's Time You Resubscribed To The Ripon Forum?

Or Maybe Share Our Magazine With Your Friends?

For \$25 You Can Do This Today!

Send A Check or Money Order To:

The Ripon Society
6 Library Court S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

The Ripon Educational Fund's Mark O. Hatfield Scholarship Is Now Accepting Proposals For Summer And Fall 1989.

For Details, Please Contact:
The Ripon Educational Fund,
6 Library Court, S.E.,
Washington, D.C. 20003.

The FSX, America and Japan

(In which confusion spawns hostility and poor public policy)

The raging controversy over whether the United States should cooperate in developing Japan's next-generation jet fighter, the FSX, is acknowledged by both sides as merely the tip of the iceberg. What seemed at first like a simple matter of Japanese aircraft procurement is creating shock waves that rattle U.S.-Japan ties, as well as American defense and trade leadership towards friendly nations all over the world.

In our opinion, a decision by the U.S. or Japan to withdraw from co-development, or to sharply restrict the cooperative nature of it, would be disastrous to American interest. The anti-FSX hysteria induced by large trade deficits is driving us further from the real U.S.-Japan challenge, which is achieving closer ties that strengthen our economies and mutual security.

In the mid-1980s, Japan announced that by 1997 it would replace its aging wing of ground support fighters with an all-new, independently-developed plane. Pentagon and U.S. officials quickly made the case that American fighters like the F-15 and F-16 are the best in the world, and could be acquired at one-half to one-third the cost of an independent Japanese effort.

Under American pressure stemming from growing trade imbalances, the Japanese finally agreed to "co-develop" a new plane, buying the F-16 blueprints and sharing 35-45 percent of the \$8 billion project with U.S. firms. But the jet will feature advanced Japanese "stealth" wings and miniaturized radar. Since November, agreements have been signed by the two governments, and by Texas-based General Dynamics and Mitsubishi Heavy Industries of Japan, specifying licensing fees, royalties, technology swaps, and the division of labor during the development phase.

Suddenly, the sound of Japan-bashing became an intoxicated roar. A "hand-out" to Japan, thundered an op-ed by former Reagan trade official Clyde Prestowitz, Jr., who warned that Japan will use the latest U.S. technology, developed at great cost to the taxpayer, to poach on the global aerospace industry. Prestowitz also accused Japan of "diverting scarce defense dollars" rather than truly expanding its defense of East Asia and other trouble spots. Congressional resolutions of disapproval gained wide support. The Pentagon power vacuum and jostling within the Bush administration meant intragovernment advocates were heavily outgunned by opponents, including Commerce chief Robert Mosbacher and Trade Ambassador Carla Hills.

While most public comment is highly critical, it is riddled with faulty reasoning and inaccurate facts. One mistaken idea is that the FSX will actually increase the U.S. burden in defending Japan and allied interests throughout Asia.

But while most public comment is highly critical, it is riddled with faulty reasoning and inaccurate facts. For example, Congressman Mel Levine, a California Democrat, insists that if the Japanese were "serious [about] reducing their massive trade surplus with the United States, they would buy these planes directly from us." What Mr. Levine and others who make the same plea fail to realize is that Japan produces more than 90 percent of its own weaponry, and has not bought a foreign-

built military aircraft in more than 30 years.

Neither do most U.S. allies. The common practice is to build U.S. designs under license; indeed, according to former Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci, ten nations are currently involved in building the F-16. There was no jingoistic outcry several years ago when an European consortium rejected co-development of a new fighter based on the F-16, and opted instead for independent development. **The Economist** noted the double standard and called it "Nippophobia," adding: "It is hard to imagine America quibbling about [the FSX] if its partner were, say, West Germany."

Another mistaken idea is that the FSX will actually increase the U.S. burden in defending Japan and allied interests throughout Asia. Japan should spend more on defense, say some, but not on wasteful projects like the FSX. This reasoning is flawed in two respects.

First, few realize that Japan already spends nearly as much on defense as Great Britain, France or West Germany (more — if, like the Europeans, one includes the cost of veterans' pensions). Some 300 combat aircraft protect Japanese airspace (about as many protect the continental United States); the island nation possesses more than double the number of U.S. destroyers and submarines in the Western Pacific. During the 1980s, the Japanese have also begun to pick up the entire tab for basing U.S. forces in their country. While the Japanese defense effort, still only about one percent of GNP (compared to 6-7 percent for the U.S. and 3-4 percent for Europe), may need to be larger, most do not realize it has grown steadily since the 1970s.

Second, there is something arrogant and contradictory in the way U.S. legis-

lators demand that Japan spend more on defense, and then attempt to dictate that country's defense policies. One congressional report, expressing the conventional wisdom on "burden sharing," blandly noted that "burden sharing is also power sharing, and...as the allies pick up more of the responsibility for defending themselves, the United States should be prepared to cede some decision-making power and control."

Well, where is that humility now? FSX opponents like Mr. Levine claim Japan needs the new plane right now, not sometime in the 1990s, a statement which has never been made by the Japanese themselves. If anything, fanning the flames of mistrust and resentment will make it tougher to reach agreement on more equitable burden-sharing.

The most troubling argument made by FSX opponents is that it will undermine the American aerospace industry, currently the nation's top exporter with a \$17.1 billion surplus in 1988. Over the last five years, Japan has been America's largest single customer in both commercial and military aviation, but our share of the global market is shrinking, and Japan has long sought a healthy aviation sector of its own.

The anti-FSX hysteria induced by large trade deficits is driving us further from the real U.S.-Japan challenge, which is achieving a stronger consensus on policies that strengthen our economies and mutual security.

In this area, FSX critics needle one of the rawest nerves in America: the steady decline of once-healthy industries like electronics, autos, computer chips and others at the hands of mercantilist, exporting nations like South Korea and Japan. There is also a lingering headache from the 1987 incident in which high-tech items were sold by Japanese and Norwegian firms to the Soviets, helping them to leapfrog ahead in the high-stakes submarine arms race.

As currently written, the FSX agreement requires Japan to share innovative technology developed for the fighter,

free of cost, as well as a share of the design and production work. On paper that's an excellent deal, and U.S. defense contractors are salivating for Japanese high-tech advances. But critics like Prestowitz scoff at American naivete, pointing to a history of joint ventures in which the Japanese gained ascendancy using U.S. technology, targeted industrial policy, slow-to-non-existent cooperation, and home market barriers.

Based on experience, therefore, the U.S. should drive a hard bargain. President Bush is entirely correct to seek a clearer understanding from Japan on the "co-" part of development and production. But Bush's diplomatic touch and follow through will be important because again, the petulant, "hard-liner" position is based on something flimier than the facts.

First, as Harvard professor Robert Reich has explained, the "techno-nationalist" notion of "American" technology which we can protect behind national borders is meaningless in a world of telecommunication, open universities and tight defense alliances. A policy of value to everyone concerned would put more investment in our engineers, workers and productive capacity, rather than hindering those of our trading partners. Second, no one has offered a satisfactory explanation of how the manufacture of battle radar, supersonic engines or "stealth" wings poses any threat to the production of commercial aircraft here — and incidentally, the U.S. commercial aviation industry favors this deal and more cooperative ventures with the Japanese.

Finally, under Japan's anti-military constitution (which we wrote), government policy and public opinion staunchly prohibit the export of war materiel. Only a major shock in consensus-orientated Japan would allow for the export of jet fighters or their components, which means, paradoxically, that U.S. withdrawal from or drastic limits on the FSX deal could lead to the very policy -- development of an independent Japanese aerospace industry -- feared most by U.S. critics.

At the bottom of all the fuss is the fashionable idea that the U.S. is locked in an inevitable economic and military decline. Two recent events, the publication of Yale historian Paul Kennedy's "Rise and Fall of the Great Powers," and

Japan's rise beyond the U.S. in creditor status and per capita GNP, have combined to convince many in Washington that we must retrench militarily and fight back economically to try and reverse the bleak prospects ahead.

We need a good, enforceable FSX deal because industry in both the U.S. and Japan can make good use of advances in technology.

There is a kernel of truth in these movements, but taken to their extremes, as they have been in the case of the FSX, they are a form of jujitsu on the ideas that led to our postwar security and prosperity. It was not just "circumstances" like American hegemony that led to 40 years of peace and unprecedented economic growth and defense cooperation among the sphere of nations who championed free minds, free trade and cultural exchange. The astounding success of that enlightened policy is what has led to relative U.S. decline, but an obsession with absolute decline ignores sources of strength and policies aimed at reinforcing them.

We need a good, enforceable FSX deal because industry in both the U.S. and Japan can make good use of advances in technology. As Mr. Carlucci pointed out, it is difficult and entirely speculative to see how torpedoing this deal will materially help American workers. By working together, Japan will acquire a better aircraft that provides better defense to Japan, and therefore, to the entire region.

And finally, we need a positive outcome on the FSX because as President Bush told then-Prime Minister Takeshita in January, "We need each other." Japan needs our military protection and diplomatic assistance as it adjusts to a growing role in the world. The United States needs Japanese support as we devote more resources to the long-term health of our economy. We're teaching Japan about American openness and innovation, while Japan teaches us something about consensus and teamwork. The nasty spat about FSX, if not reversed, will be a setback for those imperatives to confirm, rather than reverse, U.S. decline. ■

-Dale E Curtis

A "Golden Borders" Proposal

BY MARK UNCAPHER AND
RUSSELL GEORGE

America's protectionist immigration policy fails the test of American values and should be replaced with a new policy to better identify and assist new Americans who can contribute to our country. Our current immigration admissions policy, which seeks to shelter current Americans from competition by successful immigrants, reflects "zero-sum" thinking that regards any success as inevitably coming at another's expense. For a nation that celebrates the spirit of freedom and opportunity that attracted so many, such an immigration policy is the antithesis of American principles.

Perhaps because of the large influx of illegal aliens, Americans are generally unaware of the difficulty faced by potential immigrants in obtaining legal permanent admission to the U.S. The existing admissions process is, in fact, a complex and legalistic maze.

The first step toward citizenship, permanent entry as a resident alien, is limited under a tightly defined system of quotas. Eighty percent of the 270,000 annual entry slots are reserved for family reunification. These are for the immediate relatives of Americans, such as their spouses, children, brothers and sisters. The remaining 20 percent of the entry slots are restricted by occupational quotas for either those of exceptional ability in the arts and sciences, or for workers with skills in short supply in the U.S. Still others may qualify under a difficult labor certification process, requiring the alien and his or her employer to prove that no qualified U.S. workers are available to fill the entrants job. Those qualifying under the family reunification and occupational quotas are also subject to an annual ceiling of 20,000 from any one country.

Yet consider how few of the millions of immigrants who have come to

Consider how few of the millions of immigrants who have come to America throughout our history could have qualified under our current admissions system.

America throughout our history could have qualified under our current admissions system. Many of our most talented and productive immigrants would have failed to meet the occupational or family reunification quotas. Still more would have been kept out by the annual ceiling of 20,000 from any one country.

The basic weakness of the current system is twofold: it does not seek to identify potentially productive future American citizens and secondly, it does not establish any process designed to assist immigrants to make an effective transition to citizenship. (Family relationship alone is a weak basis for concluding a potential immigrant is likely to contribute to the U.S.) The basic purpose of our proposals is to broaden the objectives of our immigration policy to incorporate these two alternative objectives.

We propose that private, voluntary social service, heritage groups, employers and local governments be permitted to sponsor individual immigrants for admission into the U.S. The sponsoring groups would undertake to assist these immigrants with job and language training, medical care and remedial education. The sponsors would help their selected aliens make a quick transition to becoming fully productive American citizens. Individuals entering under this program would not be subject to family, occupational or country quotas. In effect, the program operates as a voluntary three-way contract among the immigrant, the sponsor and the U.S., the

purpose of which is to help new Americans achieve productive citizenship.

IMMIGRATION REFORM ATTEMPTS

During most of the early eighties, Congress grappled with the emotionally charged immigration question. The result was the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. While the law addressed the widespread frustration with the immigration system, it failed to address directly the admissions process. Instead, it left in place unrealistically low quotas and restrictive admissions requirements.

The law can best be understood as a political compromise between two groups: 1) those attempting to regularize the legal status of millions of undocumented aliens through the amnesty program; and 2) the group seeking to discourage illegal immigration through more effective enforcement of existing law with legal sanctions against employers who hire undocumented aliens. The amnesty provisions recognize the inescapable fact that millions of undocumented aliens are leading largely productive lives in the U.S., but face potential deportation in the event of detection. The regularization of their legal status is a substantial benefit of the law.

Employer sanctions require employers to verify the citizenship of newly-hired employees with the inspection of documentation of citizenship. Employees who persistently hire undocumented aliens are subject to criminal sanctions. The sanctions issue raises a variety of deeply troubling issues, however, and whatever their purpose, they threaten serious long-term social costs for the country. The sanction requires employers to perform a law enforcement function which a specially-denominated law enforcement agency has largely failed to do. This is

Mark Uncapher is national president of the Ripon Society and Russell George is an attorney in New York.

because our immigration process has largely been swamped by illegal immigration. And that immigration is a function of the fact that few opportunities exist for legal entry other than family reunification.

We believe that employer sanctions are not likely to significantly deter illegal immigration. Millions of the undocumented aliens now in the U.S. have subjected themselves to the risk of arrest and deportation in the event of detection. In 1987 over one million aliens were deported. Illegal immigration has continued because many presented with the choice of living illegally in America, or remaining in their home country, have chosen to come to the U.S.

We propose that private, voluntary social service organizations, heritage groups, local governments and employers be permitted to sponsor individual immigrants to the U.S.

Mounting evidence indicates that many employers have responded to the new immigration law by discriminating against "alien" looking job applicants. This is true even though the Immigration Control Act specifically prohibits discrimination based upon national origin or citizenship. A commission appointed by New York Governor Mario Cuomo found that many employers now avoid hiring employees whose appearance suggests they may be aliens even when they are legally qualified to be hired.

By retaining the admissions quota system, the Immigration Control Act fosters the development of an illegal, unemployable underclass. While employers in mainstream enterprises may comply with employers' sanctions, many undocumented aliens do find ready employment in such enterprises as sweatshops or "off-the-books" employers. The unintended effect of the Immigration Reform and Control Act is that a substantial segment of our permanent population will remain completely outside the economic and cultural mainstream, and will have few avenues for escape. Those trapped in

this underclass are likely to grow cynical about American laws, institutions and values. The members of this subculture will have strong incentive to avoid any sustained contact with the mainstream of American life. This non-assimilation of a large segment of our population is the exact opposite of what an immigration policy should accomplish.

PROPOSAL

Successful reform of our immigration system should begin with the admissions process. Our recommendations are directed towards identifying those potential Americans who are most likely to contribute to American life and establishing a process to encourage their swift transition to productive citizenship. Such a change in objectives requires a fundamental shift in the philosophy of our immigrant system. By welcoming more immigrants who would have been denied admission under the strict quota system, we will reduce the number of illegal immigrants. This will enable us to focus better our law enforcement resources toward apprehending undesirable illegal entrants.

We propose that private, voluntary social service organizations, heritage groups, local governments and employers be permitted to sponsor individual immigrants to the U.S. These sponsored immigrants would not be subject to the annual ceilings contained in the admissions quota system. The sponsoring group would be responsible for the necessary health and social services of the immigrant for a transitional period of five to seven years. In return, the sponsored immigrant would cooperate with the sponsor, using its resources, such as job training and language education, to reach economic self-sufficiency and full participation in American life.

Many voluntary organizations already perform a diversified range of services for immigrants. Historically the voluntary sector has been very active in helping new arrivals adjust to American life. The sponsorship program is a logical extension of the role already performed by these agencies.

Initially sponsors would present the Immigration and Naturalization Service with a plan of assistance for potential immigrants, demonstrating the neces-

By retaining the admissions quota system, the Immigration Control Act fosters the development of an illegal, unemployable underclass.

sary financial wherewithal to carry out their financial plan. Sponsors who have had continued success in assisting immigrants would be permitted to sponsor additional immigrants. Unsuccessful programs would be denied further sponsorship opportunities.

A sponsorship program would be flexible enough to adjust the numbers admitted to accommodate the capacity of sponsoring agencies to assist immigrants and with the potential of the immigrants themselves. Resident aliens participating in the sponsorship program would not be subject to the annual ceiling of 270,000 resident aliens. The sponsorship program would operate in addition to the opportunities for admission to the U.S.

The manner of initial contact between the sponsoring group and the immigrant would depend upon the sponsor. Some may rely upon referrals from the U.S. government. Others could develop their own networks of agencies in home countries to assist in the referral process. The sponsoring groups would be free to make their own determination about whether to sponsor an immigrant. We expect that many sponsoring groups would specialize in assisting immigrants of particular nationalities, drawing support from many who have already come to America from these countries. The program would also be open to employers, such as employers who wish to help a valued foreign national emigrate to the U.S. Once the sponsoring group decides to put forth an individual, the INS review would be limited to determining that the immigrant does not fail to meet the basic non-quota requirements for entry.

The specific range of services provided by the sponsoring group would depend on the needs of the sponsored immigrant. Clearly those with readily marketable skills will require less than someone needing job training and language education. Most all will

require health insurance coverage until they can obtain it on their own or through an employer. The objective of all these services is to help the immigrant reach economic self-sufficiency and full participation in American life. The latter objective generally includes English language skills, since English proficiency expands the immigrant's ability to participate fully in American life. The "full participation" objective is also intended to give weight to non-economic measures of an individual's contributions to American cultural, scientific and civic life. We need to recognize the success of immigrant children in the educational system, or the successful entrepreneurship of an immigrant employing others.

CONCLUSION

U.S. immigration policy must demonstrate America's willingness to accommodate positive change in the future. The current standards for admission indicate an unwillingness by policymakers to consider the many contributions that ambitious, innovative men and women could make to our nation if provided with an environment that fosters this initiative; an atmosphere in which the only limitations that an individual faces are those an individual places on himself or herself. We reject the implicit assumption of our current immigration admissions system that Americans need to be protected

from newcomers, or that immigrant success must come at the expense of other Americans.

Throughout American history, our society has been distinguished by a willingness to welcome immigrants into our midst. The Founding Fathers foresaw the need for manpower in their new nation, and early immigration policies show an awareness that newcomers to America could enrich us all. It is incumbent on current American policymakers to draw upon the success of earlier immigration policies to ensure growth and opportunity. Our proposal, relying upon private initiative by Americans to assist new immigrants to become productive Americans, reflects the spirit of American values at their best. ■

The GOP's Stake in a "Golden Borders" Immigration Policy

BY KENNETH J. GROSSBERGER

Immigration reform should make Republicans take a long hard look in the mirror. Consider for a moment immigration reform's philosophical and political implications. We value free and open markets, individual opportunity free from government intrusion and a cosmopolitan international perspective. When these values are applied to immigration policy, don't they demand support for less restrictive immigration laws?

Ripon's "golden borders" proposal reflects Republican values at their best. It draws upon the private and non-profit sector to sponsor and assist aliens to become fully productive American citizens. It also reduces the complex system of quotas that now exist.

The Ripon proposal enlarges freedom of opportunity, without unleashing mass stampedes that America cannot accommodate. It is based upon the philosophy inherent in the Statue of Liberty, not the statute of limitations.

Kenneth J. Grossberger was national president of the Ripon Society from 1985-1987 and is a business executive in New York City.

Despite the inescapable conclusions that Republican values lead us to support less restrictive immigration, few have embraced the issue. If we are honest with ourselves, we must acknowledge that too many Republicans are most comfortable politically with their socio-economic peers. Yet if being a Republican is about values, then we must show more vision. Many party conservatives have often been more vocal than progressives in pressing for the inclusion of those outside the "country club set." Jack Kemp in particular has expressed a broad vision of our party as an instrument of opportunity for millions not affiliated with us.

Of course, opposition to freer immigration also comes from many liberals, Democrats and labor leaders who fear possible job competition. They assume that the best way to help the underclass and less advantaged is to deny opportunity to others. They believe the economy is static; that one person's gain must come at another person's expense. This opposition to freer immigration reflects an anti-market, pessimistic, paternalistic orientation towards social and economic policy. Immigration opponents fail to appreciate the opportunities created by immigrants who

generate jobs, markets and ideas.

Republicans of all stripes can unite behind the "golden borders" proposal of private sponsorship of immigrant entry. It expresses our common Republican values on behalf of economic and individual opportunity and contains none of the social and rights issues that divide us. The sponsorship idea, in fact, is an excellent expression of the "thousand points of light" that President Bush has promoted.

Republicans can emerge as the authentic advocates for millions of new Americans. Consider that in about two decades Asians, blacks and Hispanics will make up more than half of California's population. Millions will embrace the American dream of opportunity for themselves and their families. Immigration reform defines Republicans not as the party of white, upper-middle class men, but as the champions of expanded opportunity. When Republicans stand up for rights and opportunity, we reaffirm our values. When we reaffirm our values, we are the most likely to attract others to share our politics. ■

THE RIPON FORUM

“Celebrates the Middle. . .”

The Washington Post

“Required reading for progressive Republicans”—TIME Magazine

“Positioning itself to be the voice of the Party’s future”—The Boston Globe

Read by Members of Congress, leading journalists, political activists, and especially those interested in the direction of the Republican Party.

The *Ripon Forum* brings you six issues a year filled with fresh & provocative debate on the subjects of our day, profiles of outstanding mainstream Republicans, book reviews, and political news from around the nation.

The *Ripon Forum*. The only magazine of its kind. Don’t miss an issue.

Subscribe Now to the Ripon Forum

Yes! Send me a full year of the *Ripon Forum* for only \$25

Enclosed is a contribution to the Ripon Society:
\$ _____

Name

Address

Apt. #

City

State

Zip

(optional)

Occupation

Political Interests/Activities

Phone #

*Foreign orders, please include \$6 for overseas postage.

Please make checks payable to: **THE RIPON SOCIETY**
6 Library Court, SE
Washington, DC 20003

“A search for values in the post-Reagan era.”

—The Des Moines Register

The Ripon Society
offers

“A provocative collection of essays...brimming with new ideas.”

—The Washington Post

A NEWER WORLD: THE PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN VISION OF AMERICA

EDITED BY REP. JAMES LEACH
AND WILLIAM P. MCKENZIE

Written by Members of Congress, Ambassadors, Cabinet Members and Ripon Forum Editors.

This book proposes *solutions* for today’s problems
And a *guide* for tomorrow.

For your copy, please send \$14.95 to:
The Ripon Society
6 Library Ct., SE
Washington, DC 20003

FOOD AS A WEAPON OF WAR

HAS THE UNITED STATES DONE ENOUGH TO STOP IT?

BY DAVID A. FUSCUS

Last year a quarter of a million Africans died because relief planes didn't land, food convoys didn't roll and both sides in a nasty civil war used food as a weapon. This year the situation is improving but as many as 100,000 human beings stand to die a horrible death from disease, war and starvation.

The United States government has helped fight this tragedy, but if enough had been done, why did Congressman Gary Ackerman (D-NY) recently pose this question during a congressional hearing: "When the history of this whole thing is written, are we [the United States] going to be regarded as accomplices in this horrendous policy of using food as a weapon and starving people...?"

Is he correct?

Perhaps.

THE SUDAN: THIRTY YEARS OF WAR, FAMINE AND UNREST

The Sudan is the largest country in Africa, with a land mass almost one-third the size of the United States and 24 million people. The northern Sudan is Arab and Islamic and is considered part of the Middle East, at least culturally, while the southern portion is black African and Christian/Animist. The nation is located next to Ethiopia and across the Red Sea from Saudi Arabia. The capital, Khartoum, sits at the confluence of the Nile, watching the river flow north into Egypt.

Strategically situated in the Horn of Africa, Sudan has been a U.S. ally for 20 years. However, a survey of U.S. policy leaves two principal questions unanswered: why was so little done by the Reagan administration to avert a

David A. Fuscus is a member of the Ripon Forum editorial board and has traveled extensively in the Sudan.

Sudanese famine and how has the Bush administration managed to accomplish more in four months than Reagan did in four years?

Sudan has been riddled with many problems over the past 30 years: two civil wars, a dictator, ethnic problems, lack of economic development and famine. Yet the Sudanese have abundant natural resources like undeveloped oil reserves and large tracts of fertile land. In fact, the Sudan could have become a breadbasket for Africa, a potential that has never been realized.

The situation is tragic with an estimated 250,000 people having already died from famine and war. Another 100,000 are at risk this year.

Since 1983, the Arab controlled government has been at war with black African rebels in the South; it's a costly conflict that has killed thousands and put major portions of the population at risk of starvation. The war is not secessionist, the rebels only want a larger share of political power, shared benefits from economic resources and a secular constitution. One of their main complaints is the strength of Muslim fundamentalists and the system of Islamic religious laws known as "Sharia."

Sharia law was instituted in 1983 by the now deposed dictator of Sudan, Gafar Nimeiri. At the time, Nimeiri was seeking a better relationship with his Arab neighbors, notably Saudi Arabia, and to quell unrest among Muslims. So he put into place the harsh system of religious law that calls for punishments of whipping, amputations and even crucifixion; but he made a mistake by not realizing how the South would react

-- they saw it as the last straw and rebelled.

In 1984, I spent several weeks in Sudan and recall my first day in the country. I had just completed a three day trip down the Nile from Egypt on a crowded steamer and landed in a dusty village called Wadi Halfa. After an hour in Sudan, I saw 10 people whipped, one until he was unconscious, from drinking alcohol.

"Sharia" is a harsh system of law that can prevade and define a society.

At the beginning of the war, hostilities were small and consisted mainly of sporadic encounters between forces and the rebels, the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA). From the beginning, the rebels have been led by Colonel John Garang, who holds a Ph.D in agricultural economics from the University of Iowa.

Since the overthrow of Nimeiri in April 1985, the conflict has grown worse and the SPLA now controls almost all the South except for garrisons in cities and towns.

Over the past two years, 1.3 million people have been displaced by the war and the production of food has been drastically reduced. To compound the problems both the government and the rebels have hindered and stopped relief efforts, in effect using food as a weapon of war.

The government is fearful that large scale relief efforts will aid the insurgency by supplying food and supplies to the rebels. Also, since it is the civilian population that sustains the SPLA, food supplies help them remain a threat to Khartoum.

The SPLA is suspicious that convoys and airlifts present an opportunity to resupply government forces in the South. The result has been a stalemate in which thousands die of disease and starvation.

THE STRATEGIC SUDAN: THE VIEW DURING THE REAGAN YEARS

In a world often viewed by the Reagan administration as dominated by a continuing Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union, nations in the Horn of Africa were viewed as pieces in a crucial chess game.

Superficially, the region could be a classic cold war model: the U.S. has given the Sudan large amounts of foreign aid and has supported Ethiopian rebels; the Soviet Union has for years propped up Ethiopia, Sudan's traditional rival, while the SPLA relies on Ethiopia for supplies and bases. They also receive support from Cuba.

It now seems clear that during the Reagan administration the basis for our policy was to act as a counterweight to Soviet influence and to ensure access to an ally that would prove vital should Middle Eastern oil routes ever need protecting. The pursuit of these policies led to strong support for Gaffar Nimeiri, especially in direct military and economic assistance. Nimeiri's successors have resented this support.

Thus, when Nimeiri was ousted in 1985, the new government moved away from the long-standing Sudanese-Egyptian-American alliance and attempted to make the Sudan non-aligned. The new prime minister, Sadiq al-Mahdi, thought that the new government should neither become involved in the internal conflicts of Sudan's neighbors nor in superpower politics. This new policy had major implications for American interests in the region and Washington became concerned that non-alignment would turn into realignment against the United States.

A good example of the "be friends with everyone" foreign policy was the reestablishment of relations between Sudan and Libya, relations that had been broken by Nimeiri. Also, the new government resented Egyptian support for the deposed dictator and moved away from the two nations' traditionally close relations. The situation was aggravated by Egypt's refusal to extradite Nimeiri (he presently lives in a Cairo suburb).

Naturally, the United States was concerned by the increasingly cool relations between the Sudan and Egypt and subsequently Washington, but Libya's

new role was of special concern. After the coup, Colonel Ghaddafi shifted his allegiance and backed the Sudanese government, even signing a military agreement with them. However, a Ghaddafi proposal to form a union with the Sudan was turned down by al-Mahdi.

Throughout these events, the United States still viewed the Sudan as a major strategic ally and sought to preserve its influence. Washington was worried about the U.S.-Sudanese relationship and its standing in a very volatile region.

Top officials of the U.S. government and the State Department have begun to speak out on the Sudanese war and to apply pressure on the combatants to stop using food as a weapon.

After 1985, when the civil war began to intensify, the Reagan administration still worried about relations and did not criticize the Khartoum government for its conduct of the war. Roger P. Winter, the director of the U.S. Committee for Refugees (a leading non-profit group which seeks to educate the public on the plight of refugees), observed: "The policy the United States adopted was to avoid criticizing the government in Khartoum to avoid driving the Sudanese towards Libya."

Ethiopia and her Soviet supporters were also a concern. Their alliance was viewed as bad for U.S. interests. As Winter put it, Ethiopia was viewed by the State Department as the "Big Bugaboo." In his view, State made the mistake of using Sudan's regional relations as a basis for policy. Instead of recognizing the conflict as strictly inter-Sudanese, they saw it as a struggle for regional influence.

"We would have done much better calling a spade a spade. While both sides have done bad, most of the people who have died have been in government-held areas. It was the government that had the policy of using food as a weapon," said Winter.

As the U.S. continued to worry about Libya and Ethiopia, the war intensified. From 1985 to 1988, the SPLA made gains and today controls much of the South. Refugees surround the towns and

flood refugee camps. By some estimates, up to 85% of the population has been displaced.

In many villages, children under the age of three are non-existent -- they've all died from starvation. Almost all families have been stricken while those still alive are malnourished and in danger.

To complicate matters, the Sudanese government has armed the southern Rizeigat Arabs to fight the SPLA and the Dinkas, the major tribe from which the rebels draw support. In March 1987 the Rizeigat slaughtered over 1,000 starving Dinkas in the southern town of Ad-Daien and according to Amnesty International, 200 people were burned alive in railroad cars.

The situation is tragic with an estimated 250,000 people having already died from famine and war. Another 100,000 are at risk this year.

Relief groups have been frustrated in their efforts to get food into the Sudan by both the government and the SPLA. In Khartoum, these groups were leery of trying to provide help to rebel-controlled areas, especially after three major organizations, ACROSS, World Vision and Lutheran World Services were expelled for their southern activities. Many relief groups have long accused the government of a lack of urgency in helping facilitate food shipment to the South; Prime Minister al-Mahdi claims that this happens because they are fearful of supplies falling into rebel hands. Throughout the past several years, the government has strongly opposed all efforts to help rebel-controlled areas, even at the cost of devastating the population.

The SPLA has also used food as a weapon by attacking convoys and shooting down two civilian aircraft. Relief planes presently flying into the South are still fearful of renewed attacks. The rebels defend their attacks citing a government policy of mixing troops and weapons in with food shipments.

While the war and famine continued to rage, the Reagan administration was concerned about its relations with Khartoum, and failed to forcefully apply pressure to change Sudanese tactics; it did not go against al-Mahdi's wishes and support cross-border operations from Kenya to Uganda. Foreign aid shipments continued and the State

continued on page 21

The Education Performance Agreement

BY PETER SMITH

Don't look now, America. But your schools may finally change for the better. After 30 years of false starts, grand claims, hand wringing and mixed signals, it looks as if we are at last going to do the one thing we haven't done before: treat communities, parents, teachers, principals and school boards as if they were important in the process of improving education for all children in America.

Since the Russians first shocked us towards action with the launching of Sputnik in 1957, America's schools have endured a series of false starts aimed at reforming and rejuvenating a public education system that was unresponsive to the needs of the times. The approach to reform has been short term, urgent, intense and almost without exception, predicated on the notion that schools could be fixed from above.

It's been almost 30 years since Sputnik. And still the debate about education reform continues. But there is a difference this time. We are in the sixth year of a reform movement that has been building in its focus and intensity steadily since the 1983 report, "A Nation At Risk."

It is a national policy that understands that until we improve the quality of work life in our public schools for teachers and administrators, we cannot possibly improve the learning life for the students who go there every day. It is a policy which says we should respect parents, community people and school workers so much that we ask them how they would like to restructure their schools in order to produce higher and better results for each and every student in their schools.

Just what are the stakes in this latest

debate about excellence in America's schools? Many of us believe that the ability to deliver a distinctively better and more appropriate public education for every American youngster is the leading national security issue of the 21st century.

Ten years ago we could talk about improving our schools. But now, because of a changing demography, changing family structure, changing skills needed in the work force, and a changing global economy, we need to not only do a better job, but a different job for our children. Amidst a rate of change that mocks our traditional notion of skill development when preparing children for the work force of the future, our demography as a nation and the background of young people entering kindergarten is changing radically.

For example an increasing percentage of our youngsters comes from disadvantaged households. They are children who historically have not prospered in our educational institutions; specifically the rural poor and ethnic minorities. This means that, for the first time in our history, the consequences of failing to educate all of our children well and appropriately will directly affect our social, civic and economic capacity in the years ahead.

We face the possibility of a two-tiered economic structure that locks out those whom our schools have failed to serve. We face the possibility of businesses having to either export the good jobs they create or import skilled workers from other countries to do those jobs: not because we have been out-innovated but because we have failed to train and educate our children for the future.

The national policy which allows us to deliver the education they need relies on the extraordinary diversity which is the hallmark of American culture. Recently

The national policy which allows us to deliver the education they need relies on the extraordinary diversity which is the hallmark of American culture.

presented in the report, "To Secure our Future," published by the National Center For Education and the Economy, the policy will encourage individual schools or school districts to restructure their operations -- curriculum, staffing pattern, calendar and more -- to achieve higher and better performance for their students.

At the heart, this national policy would create an all-important trade in which the participating school district would commit to higher academic achievement in return for flexibility in dealing with federal and state regulations. In short, it's a trade of professional freedom for accountability.

The trade would be represented in a contract, the Educational Performance Agreement, which would be accepted by the local, state and federal participants. Drawn by an integrated local planning team with the resources and time to do the job well, the contract would lay out a multi-year plan for restructuring and higher achievement, including the performance expected and measurements to be undertaken.

It is important to know that, while regulations may be waived in this process, the law will not be abrogated.

Over the longer term, as models for restructuring our public schools for excellence blossoms around the country, the Department of Education would be engaged in research and development

continued on page 21

Peter Smith is a member of Congress from Vermont and a member of the Ripon Congressional Advisory Board.

To Make A Difference

BY CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

The time has come to challenge a second generation of American students. The pledge of President Bush to make kinder the face of the nation and gentler the face of the world should indeed be a national commitment. Meeting and talking with young people, I see a new idealism and an eagerness to serve others. And I see a renewed interest in programs like the Peace Corps.

Some have argued that young people today are not interested in committing themselves to service overseas, that the idealism of the 1960s is long gone. They're very wrong. Throughout the developing world there are young -- as well as older -- Americans working in Peace Corps programs and truly making a difference. They are fighting infant mortality and malnutrition in Burundi, eradicating parasitic disease in Paraguay, teaching deaf children in the Dominican Republic and training special education teachers in Nepal, developing disease-resistant vegetables in western Samoa, and constructing wells in Morocco. And they are doing something for America in the Third World that cannot be accomplished by formal treaties, accords, official proposals and diplomatic exchanges.

Recently, I reintroduced the Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Program Act, H.R. 985. My bill, cosponsored by more than 80 House Members, seeks to establish a Peace Corps training and scholarship program similar to the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC). It would be implemented in many of our colleges and universities and would be an important complement to the national youth services plans proposed in Congress.

Former Notre Dame University president Father Theodore Hesburgh sug-

gested the concept behind H.R. 985 in 1986 at a memorial service for Peace Corps volunteers who had died while serving overseas. Father Hesburgh urged that students be given an opportunity to train for peace in service to their country. He suggested "not a replacement for ROTC, but a parallel choice, another path less traveled, but no less important to America." Just as thousands of students across the country compete each year for ROTC scholarships, H.R. 985 will enable "our best and our brightest" to compete for scholarships for peace.

My bill, cosponsored by more than 80 House Members, seeks to establish a Peace Corps training and scholarship program similar to the Reserve Officer Training Corps.

The legislation will provide financial assistance in the last two years of college for students who agree to join the Peace Corps for three years after graduation. Special emphasis will be placed on recruiting minority students, who have been historically underrepresented in the Peace Corps, and preference will be given to students enrolled in those areas most needed in the Peace Corps: agriculture; urban and youth development; education; natural resource management; engineering; and health and nutrition. Peace Corps students will also study the languages, customs and history of the countries in which they will serve, and during the summer breaks they will work in community development projects in the United States.

In 1961 when President John F. Kennedy signed Executive Order 10924, the Peace Corps sent 900 volunteers to 16 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin

America. By the late-1960s the Peace Corps had over 15,000 volunteers in 93 countries. Only 6,200 serve today! Budget cuts, bureaucratic changes within the Peace Corps and economic and political change at home and overseas have all taken their toll on the Peace Corps. H.R. 985 will help redress the shortage of skilled Peace Corps candidates and further a congressional mandate to increase Peace Corps volunteer strength to 10,000 by 1992.

Working from the "bottom up," the Peace Corps has touched the lives of people in the Third World. In turn, the people of the Third World have touched the lives of all Americans. Speaking in the Capitol Rotunda last November on the 25th anniversary of President Kennedy's death, John Coyne, a returned Peace Corps volunteer who served in Ethiopia, put this so well: "The Peace Corps took us out of America, cut us loose from these shores and taught us how to be citizens of the world. Because of the Peace Corps, we are forever changed."

Hubert H. Humphrey regarded Peace Corps volunteers as our best "imports" because they came home and did for America what they had done for others abroad. How many of us know former Peace Corps volunteer who today teach children in inner-city classrooms, who tend to the sick in rural clinics and big city hospitals, who counsel drug abusers and troubled teenagers in community mental health centers, who serve overseas in the Foreign Service or with private relief groups?

This record and spirit of service is one that we must encourage. Combining academic study and Peace Corps service will prepare America's young people for an increasingly interdependent world, a world where compassion, justice and a willingness to help one another will indeed make a difference. ■

Constance A. Morella is a member of Congress from Maryland and a member of the Ripon Congressional Advisory Board.

continued from page 15

Department denied that the Sudanese government was using food as a weapon. "It is very clear the U.S. did not actively take steps to implement getting food into the rebel held areas other than the efforts by the International Red Cross," Winter noted.

In fact, last June, after Winter returned from a trip to southern Sudan, he visited several U.S. agencies and told them the only way to effectively help was to support cross-border operations. In effect, he said "Grain one [through cross border convoys] did not hit until March 1 [1989]."

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION AND THE FUTURE

In the last four months, the potential for relief in the southern Sudan has increased dramatically. The United Nations and the United States have successfully negotiated an agreement with the Sudanese government and the SPLA to allow the transportation of emergency relief supplies and have agreed to a cease fire to make sure the supplies arrive.

"Operation Lifeline Sudan" establishes several "corridors of tranquility" for the transportation of supplies, including several cross-border operations from Uganda and Kenya. Without

emergency aid, the southern Sudanese would be consigned to a horrible fate, one brought about not by nature but by man.

In the last several months, top officials of the U.S. government and the State Department have begun to speak out on the Sudanese war and to apply pressure on the combatants to stop using food as a weapon. Recently, Secretary of State James A. Baker III released a statement saying, "We call on authorities at all levels on both sides to remove remaining obstacles and do everything possible to provide emergency relief to victims."

The Bush administration recognizes that the war in Sudan is strictly internal and that by negotiating with both sides the war can end and the famine with it.

For the first time since Gaffar Nimeiri was deposed, the United States seems to be putting the humanitarian needs of millions of suffering Sudanese ahead of military and political objectives.

When the Sudanese government has objected to U.S. relief efforts, the United States has gone ahead with them anyway. For example, when the U.S.

Agency for International Development began supporting cross-border food deliveries from Kenya, Prime Minister al-Mahdi objected strongly. The Bush administration moved ahead vigorously in spite of these objections.

All of this suggests that the Bush administration recognizes that the war in Sudan is strictly internal and that by negotiating with both sides the war can end and the famine with it. While they are not publicly hailing a change in policy, the results are obvious. At the very least, Bush is willing to recognize the problem and use the influence and resources of the United States in an effort to end the war and the tragedy. At the very best, he is willing to go round the Sudanese government and view the war for what it is: a catastrophic internal conflict that does not threaten the United States.

The future for the Sudan is certainly not rosy, but with the continued support of the Bush administration, it will improve. Unlike Ronald Reagan, George Bush and James Baker realize that there is more to an effective policy in the Sudan and the Horn of Africa than power politics. Certainly, they must keep our security needs in mind, but helping starving people will never work against the U.S. It can only bring the United States good will and perpetuate a reputation as a world leader. ■

COMPLIANCE 89

- Easy-to-use software (updated to include March IRS regulations) for IBM-PCs and compatibles that processes up to 2,000 employees per plan. . .
- Documentation with a lengthy legal explanation, questions-and-answers, and glossary of terms. . .
- A context-sensitive HELP MENU with data collection forms, a flow-chart, suggestions for compliance, and a legal synopsis.
- \$595, including one year of updates

Contact: **Employee Benefits Review**
715 Eighth Street, SE, #300
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 546-3394

A CURE FOR SECTION 89 BLUES

Frederick McClure: Behind The 'New Breeze'

BY WILLIAM P. MCKENZIE

In an era in which George Bush has promised a "new breeze" of bipartisanship, Fred McClure is in a difficult spot. As the Bush administration's director of congressional relations, McClure must ensure that the "new breeze" blows across Capitol Hill, to extend the metaphor.

The 35-year old Texan's role is tricky, because he must also make sure that the presidency is not weakened. This happened under Jimmy Carter, and his presidency became irrelevant to Capitol Hill. In a Congress that is overwhelmingly Democratic, McClure must know when to make the right moves.

Of course, McClure has a distinct plus working for him in that his new boss, George Bush, knows how to work Capitol Hill. The new president has legions of friends there, and seems genuinely interested in working with them.

But McClure says that this doesn't mean George Bush will be pushed around. Consider the John Tower confirmation fight, he said during an interview in his office the morning after the Senate vote turned down Tower's bid to become defense secretary. It shows that Bush may lose on occasion, but that he can also be stubborn.

McClure was saddened by the defeat of his former mentor, John Tower, but he does not think it will have a lasting effect. The main issues Congress and the administration must face are not about personal conduct, but rather about quality education, clean air, ozone depletion and child care. And these all demand cooperation.

Even Roger Stone, a conservative activist known for his ideological instincts, agrees with this view. As Stone told an audience in February, education and the environment do not carry "a distinct left-right fissure."

William P. McKenzie is editor of the Ripon Forum.

Of course, that may sound too optimistic. News reports have been filled with complaints that the Bush administration is not moving. Some contend that it is not even addressing the major issues.

McClure responds to that charge by saying that the White House doesn't see its mission as defining a new agenda. To add emphasis, McClure says "I'm not sure that's what the public wants."

In some ways, that comment echoes what historian David Eisenhower said in an interview last year. "I don't think the Reagan era is over," Eisenhower said. "This election is more like 1940 than 1960. ... There's more to be done, and Bush represents continuity."

In a Congress that is overwhelmingly Democratic, McClure must know when to make the right moves.

In McClure's eyes, continuity doesn't imply lack of leadership, either. Look at the budget, he says. It is the first presidential budget not considered dead on arrival in eight years. And what about the savings and loan rescue, a problem which neither the Reagan administration nor Congress would touch before George Bush? Doesn't that count for leadership?

Yes, it does. But the perception that the Bush administration has no game plan, and is only responding to crises, could be deadly. Washington is a city which loves action, and the political community here can make life difficult for those not providing movement.

No one should know that better than the new president, who has been a Washington insider for over 20 years. If continuity is his goal, then his administration should do a better job of communicating that aim.

McClure contends that an area where George Bush won't represent continuity with the prior administration is civil



Frederick D. McClure

rights. As McClure, the first black student body president of Texas A&M, puts it, this administration's rights record will be different. While Ronald Reagan may have made insensitive comments about Martin Luther King and various civil rights leaders, and drug his heels in signing the Voting Rights Act extension, you will never see that in the Bush administration.

One reason, McClure says, is that black leaders are "tremendously comfortable" with the new president. But he also claims that the appointments of Louis Sullivan as secretary of Health and Human Services and Jack Kemp as secretary of Housing and Urban Development send signals that this administration will actively seek solutions to problems that affect black Americans.

About recruiting more blacks to the GOP, McClure says that the party must begin at the local level. "Cultivate people whose values are most closely aligned [to the Republican Party]," McClure says.

But there again the Bush administration, as well as the Republican Party, may run into a perception problem.

How can the new president ensure that greater fairness, a Bush campaign pro-

Continued on page 21

The Chairman's Corner

Goals for the '90s

BY WILLIAM CLINGER

Talk about big shoes to fill! For the past eight years Congressman Jim Leach has given the Ripon Society outstanding leadership and he has filled this space in the **Forum** with pieces that were sometimes provocative, often challenging and always intellectually vigorous. He has led the Society with distinction through some difficult times and has earned the profound gratitude of all of us who believe Ripon's voice must continue to be heard in public policy debates within the Republican Party.

Thus, I assume the chairmanship of Ripon with some trepidation, much humility but no lack of enthusiasm or commitment. As this is my first opportunity to communicate with the broader Ripon community, I want to discuss some of the goals I intend to pursue—and hopefully achieve—during my tenure as chairman.

First of all, I am very optimistic about the future of the Ripon Society. With the character and tone of the new administration gradually beginning to emerge I sense exciting new opportunities for Ripon to contribute to policy formulation. There is clearly a more receptive attitude toward different ideas on the part of many in the administration than has existed in recent years. We must be ready to capitalize on their willingness to listen to and consider solutions to problems that may challenge Republican orthodoxy. And so one of my first objectives is to continue developing and expanding this **Ripon Forum** as a means of suggesting new or different policy initiatives to the decision makers not only at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington but also at both ends of the comparable avenues in the state capitals and cities and towns of the nation.

There is a specific area where I believe

William Clinger is the new chairman of the Ripon Society and a member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

Ripon can make a significant contribution immediately. Seemingly the most ominous and intractable problems facing us today exist in the nation's cities. The spreading and conjoined cancers of drug addiction and violent crime, the AIDS epidemic, the crumbling infrastructure, traffic gridlock, pollution in the air and in the water, racism, homelessness, corruption are not exclusively urban problems but exist to one degree or another in all of our major cities.

With the character and tone of the new administration gradually beginning to emerge I sense exciting new opportunities for Ripon to contribute to policy formulation.

While the Democratic Party continues to prevail politically in most of our large cities, Democratic solutions to the problems have often been ineffective and in some cases have even exacerbated them. And yet there have been few alternative solutions proposed by Republicans. As a party we appear to have forfeited to the Democrats on the whole range of urban issues. Politically understandable, perhaps, because of our minority status in most cities but morally irresponsible in view of the accelerating deterioration of the quality of life in those same cities.

The Ripon Society, more than most Republican organizations, has always had an urban flavor. The active chapters have been in places like New York, Boston, Des Moines and Los Angeles. Many, if not most, Ripon members live and work in our cities and have seen the problems close at hand and have thoughts about new approaches, better answers. It is this untapped resource that I am challenging to begin contributing to the debate on urban policy. I can as-



Congressman William Clinger

sure you that the pages of this publication are open to your ideas. In addition, I would like to see Ripon provide a stimulus for scholars, politicians, bureaucrats and others to develop innovative solutions to these difficult problems by commissioning research and original papers, sponsoring seminars and focus groups and generally serving as a catalyst in generating new ideas.

It is also my goal to expand the grassroots organization of Ripon. With the help of the Congressional Advisory Board, I hope to establish a Ripon presence wherever we can generate sufficient interest. To this end I am delighted that the dormant chapter in Boston is being revitalized under a new leadership. A top priority for me will be to establish a local Ripon organization in Washington, D.C. But I am interested in seeing the Ripon organization and the Ripon banner unfurled wherever there are intelligent, engaged and forward-looking Republicans.

These are some of the things I intend to work on in the months ahead. The overall objective, of course, is to continue building the Ripon Society as a significant voice in Republican policy discussions. We do this by putting forward thoughtful constructive and realistic proposals and suggestions. I encourage readers of the **Forum** to play an active role as we strive to enlarge the membership and enhance the influence of the Ripon Society. ■

-mise, when the federal budget is constrained in such areas as public housing? Moreover, how can the GOP hope to recruit more minority voters when its "southern strategy," which has been in place since Richard Nixon's 1968 campaign, is primarily aimed at recruiting alienated white voters? And "alienated" means lower and middle class white male voters who predominantly opposed the social and racial changes of the last 20 years.

As the Bush administration tries to return the party of Lincoln to its commitment to civil rights, McClure and his colleagues are attempting to put into place private sector solutions for public problems.

Consider also the problem of the Republican National Committee. There are no blacks among its 153 voting members. As GOP rules expert Lee Auspitz wrote recently: "As long as the [RNC] is still structured as a confederation of state parties, it cannot offer equality of opportunity to minorities."

That is an essential question the Republican Party must face. While Fred McClure serves as a reminder that minorities can find a home in the GOP, the Republican Party faces a formidable task in broadening its base. Perhaps as the Bush administration tries to return the party of Lincoln back to its commitment to civil rights, and McClure and his colleagues attempt to put into place private sector solutions for public problems, the administration may have its most important task defined. ■

work to cull the results and make recommendations about the most promising practices to surface. Schools would be expected to compete for a limited number of Educational Performance Agreement opportunities within each state or each region. By making this program an attractive alternative as opposed to a requirement, it is our feeling that the effort and the results will be more enthusiastic and effective.

The Educational Performance Agreement assumes that if we give schools, the people who work in them and their extended communities what we have never given them before -- the time and the resources to plan and think -- they will be able to create a school environment that fosters the type of educational excellence critical to our children's future and to the future of our nation.

More than five years in its development, reviewed favorably by groups ranging from the National Governors' Association to the education commission of the states to numerous professional groups, supported by first the Carnegie Corporation of New York and now the State of New York and the Rockefeller Foundation, the Educational Performance Agreement concept is ready for its maiden voyage in the Congress this year.

As the House Education and Labor Committee struggles with the questions of school excellence raised by President Bush, this concept and the work which lies behind it will play a major role in the policy discussions which occur.

For more information about this idea, please contact either my office at: 1020 Longworth House Office Building, Washington D.C. 20515 or the National Center on Education and the Economy at 39 State Street, Suite 500, Rochester, New York 14614. ■

In Memoriam, Walter N. Thayer

BY LEE W. HUEBNER AND THOMAS E. PETRI

Walter N. Thayer, a great friend of the Ripon Society, died at 78 in March. At Ripon's inception in the early '60s, when our small political research group was looking for a way to be heard, the advice we received on virtually every hand was "talk to Walter Thayer." And so we did. And like so many who went to Walter Thayer through the years, we came away bright with excitement. For he listened to us. He took us seriously. And he made things happen.

From 1952, when he became legal advisor to Citizens for Eisenhower, until his death, Walter Thayer was a pivotal figure in the effort to make what President Eisenhower called "modern Republicanism" a continuing political force. He helped organize the Republican Citizens Committee, and he strongly supported the campaigns of Nelson Rockefeller, Jacob Javits and John Lindsay. He also was an adviser to President Richard Nixon, and, in the beginning, he, along with John Hay Whitney and William Coolidge, enabled the Ripon Society to establish and maintain its financial viability. Thayer knew how to raise money and, just as importantly, he knew how to organize and inspire and lead. Over a 20-year span he was instrumental in raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for Ripon.

Walter Thayer not only made things happen, he made them happen well. One of the sources of Walter's mystique was that he could extend his energies across many fields without ever losing his unflinching sense of command. His self-discipline was part of his secret. He seemed to have a system for everything; he abhorred loose ends. He wanted things buttoned up properly, he would say, the first time around.

Walter Thayer set the highest standards for himself and then met the standards he set. We shall miss his advice and his help, but we will continue to be inspired by his example. ■

Lee W. Huebner is publisher of the International Herald Tribune and Thomas E. Petri is a member of Congress from Wisconsin. Both were original members of the Ripon Society.

What's Ahead in the Ripon Forum:

- Interviews with Leading Republicans
- A Defense for the '90s
- Who's Who in the Bush Administration
- How to Resolve Environmental Conflicts

Public Housing: Of The People, By The People And For The People

by Mariann Kurtz

Just as some of America's neighbors seek to build and maintain pockets of democracy in war-torn countrysides, residents of American public housing projects are striving to take control of their own ravaged domains. Tenants of government-sponsored housing nationwide are seeking their own version of Lincoln's promise of democracy -- tenant-owned and tenant-managed public housing.

Just last fall Congress passed a bill sponsored by current Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Jack Kemp giving tenants of public housing the right to manage the housing developments themselves. In February of 1987, then-President Ronald Reagan signed legislation giving tenants the right to purchase public housing at a small fraction of the market price. These steps, combined with growing attention to a successful tenant-managed project in the Midwest, opened the door for tenants in dozens of cities to explore a new standard of living.

In the mid-1970s, residents at the Cochran Gardens in St. Louis transformed a dirty, gang-infested high rise into a sparkling, well-ordered complex. Longtime resident Bertha Gilkey joined forces with a handful of other Cochran tenants and turned despair into hope with some soapy water and a few buckets of paint.

Drug dealers who had become the unofficial managers of the complex slowly left as Gilkey and her followers organized for greater and more effective police service. The main building, once called "Little 'Nam," now has a different kind of army controlling its halls. Tenant leaders serve as floor and building captains who monitor residents' be-

havior to ensure that all two pages of rules which now govern Cochran are being followed.

"We run Cochran like a real estate manager would," Gilkey said in an interview with the *New York Times*. "The buildings aren't writing graffiti on themselves. They're not tearing themselves down. There are consequences for that kind of behavior, and the consequences here is that we're going to put you out."

The success of Cochran has bred success elsewhere. In Washington, D.C., tenant managers of the Kenilworth-Parkside project used capital from rents and a grant to create 11 corporations to employ residents. And in Boston, residents of buildings ear-marked for demolition banded together to develop neighborhoods for themselves. With the help of private investors and government aid, the group built 570 new apartments and rehabilitated 251 more.

Proponents of tenant management, however, do not claim these types of programs can work everywhere. Jane Lang of the Counsel's Public Housing Authority supports locally designed programs. "What's done in one area may be totally unacceptable in another," said Lang during a Washington-based news show, 22:26. Lang explained that residents in one project erected fences to keep non-tenants out. Similarly, residents in a Chicago project decided to wear ID badges. The key, said Lang, is the transfer of authority and responsibility to tenants.

The evidence is clear that good things happen when residents are allowed to police themselves. Robert Woodson, director of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, agrees that tenant management can accomplish more than most official interventions.

"Residents can do what police can't do," said Woodson, who also appeared on 22:26. "When the residents decide they've had enough and work together with the police, they can throw out crime and drugs."

No incident of such power may be as strong as a recent initiative by citizens of Des Moines, Iowa. Residents of the city joined with tenants of the Homes of Oakridge housing project in a march against crack. The deadly drug and its dealers which infiltrate housing projects nationwide are leaving the Homes of Oakridge.

The power of that march so struck *Des Moines Register* reporter Julie Gammack that she decided Iowans should help other cities rid themselves of crack. Gammack's idea, now refined and polished with input from Des Moines civic leaders, *Register* colleagues, and Congressman Jim Leach and staff, will culminate in a march on Washington on June 9th.

"One by One," as the march is called, will wind its way to the capital via bus convoy with stops along the way to decry the miseries of a life with crack. Once in D.C. members of the group will climb the steps of the Lincoln Memorial one by one to speak from the heart about the drug and how it has affected their lives.

Mildred Crowder will tell what she's done to kick crack dealers out of the Homes of Oakridge. Crowder will have one minute to tell her story before the next person in line has his or her minute. Just like the drug dealers in Cochran, just like the unwanteds in Chicago, one by one they will come, and one by one they will go.

Just like Bertha Gilkey, one by one, these Iowans will turn despair into hope. ■

Mariann Kurtz is a member of the Ripon Forum editorial board.

6 Library Court

On March 16, the Ripon Society honored David Rockefeller in New York City with its Jacob K. Javits Excellence in Public Service Award. The third annual presentation of this award, named in honor of the late Senator Javits for his commitment to progressive Republicanism and public service, was given to Mr. Rockefeller during a dinner for 150 people at the Tower Suite in New York City's Time-Life Building.

In presenting the award to Mr. Rockefeller, Congressman William Clinger, the chairman of the Ripon Society, cited the New York businessman's work on behalf of urban revitalization and internationalism in foreign policy. In particular, Representative Clinger praised Mr. Rockefeller's link with Senator Javits in the New York Partnership, a group of businessmen and political leaders which was responsible for guiding much of New York's renaissance in the 1970s. Clinger also noted Mr. Rockefeller's internationalist approach to foreign policy, which is being carried out through his involvement with the Americas Society and the Trilateral Commission.

After accepting the award from Clinger, Mrs. Marian Javits, Senator Javits' widow, and Joshua Javits, the late senator's son, Mr. Rockefeller addressed the group. He applauded Ripon's commitment to practical politics, and told the audience, which included six members of Congress, that Jacob Javits' legacy focuses on a commitment to fairness and racial equality. Through organizations such as Ripon, Rockefeller said, that spirit can be maintained.

Others in the audience included representatives from New York's banking, insurance and financial industries, as well as Michael DeLand, an Environmental Protection Agency regional director, who has been mentioned as a possible GOP gubernatorial candidate in Massachusetts.

Mathias Walsh Lecture

Another of Senator Javits' colleagues, former Maryland Senator Charles Mathias, spoke recently about progressive values. Mathias delivered Georgetown University's William J. Walsh

Lecture on March 30, and discussed the historical and philosophical moorings of "liberalism" in his address "The Importance of Being Liberal." According to Mathias:

"It would be an easy rationalization to dismiss the denigration of liberals as an aberration of the last presidential campaign. There is no doubt that the campaign rhetoric did a great deal to spread the attack to new audiences with increased intensity. The fact is, however, that political candidates today rarely raise novel issues or initiate new debate. Rather they capitalize on the mood of the electorate by polling to detect some unexploited worry or weakness and then consult a media expert on the most heroic way to push against an open door.

"Many young Americans who are reaching maturity and forming social and political impressions are being told that there is something wrong with liberalism; that good people just are not liberal. However, they are seldom told just what is wrong about liberalism or why it is not good to be liberal. As a result, a great many people who have reason to know better are being deluded into neglecting and even opposing an important element of the political legacy of the United States."

For more information about Senator Mathias' address, write: The Ripon Society, 6 Library Court S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.

Ripon Notes

The 1989 annual meeting of the Ripon Society's National Governing Board was held in Washington D.C. on Saturday, April 22. Congressman William Clinger chaired the meeting, during which officers were elected. Serving for the next year will be: Bill Clinger, chairman; Mark Uncapher, president; Steven Rolandi and Nancy Draper, vice presidents; John Merriman, secretary; Andrew McLeod, treasurer.

The Ripon Society's Boston chapter is revitalizing, as two meetings of over 60 people have been held since December. Both Bill McKenzie, the Society's executive director, and Bill Clinger have addressed the group. A conference on the environment is being planned for

September. For more information about joining the Boston chapter, please contact Arthur George, P.O. Box 20, Holbrook, Massachusetts 02343.

Jacob K. Javits Excellence in Public Service Dinner. March 16, 1989



Marion H. Price, l., Estelle Kessler, c.,
Marian Javits, r.



(l. to r.) Eric Javits, David Rockefeller,
Marian Javits, Joshua Javits, and Wil-
liam Clinger.



David Rockefeller, l., and Micah
Green, r.

Washington Notes & Quotes

Turmoil in ideology-land: Well, the "Reagan era" it ain't. On issue after issue, the Bush administration is showing its moderate stripes, while congressional Republicans are building bridges the right destroyed only a few years ago. If today's ideological currents could be visualized, they might resemble the swirling clouds of cream in black coffee.

On Pennsylvania Avenue, the president's team has put the finishing touches on a wide-ranging review of U.S. foreign policy, and the outlook is for more bi-partisan compromise on Central America, a fresh initiative on chemical arms, incrementalism on long range nuclear weapons reduction; in essence, a prudent, cautious course.

In domestic affairs, Bush's \$400 million education proposal offered by Senator Nancy Kassenbaum (R-KS) and Representative Bill Goodling (R-PA) emphasizes rewards to merit "and magnet" schools, student and teacher excellence, especially in science and math, and programs to fight drug abuse and dropout rates. It is less than overwhelming and has received mostly Bronx cheers from the education establishment, but the results must come, as always, from students and local leaders, not the federal government.

On the budget deficit, minimum wage, housing, acid rain and assault weapons, Bush has offered hope for saner policies. But the bottom line keeps being drawn somewhere down the middle -- to the delight of Reagan-weary Republicans and the befuddlement of the media and entrenched powers. Meanwhile Bush is achieving popularity ratings higher than anything Reagan ever enjoyed -- more proof, if any was needed, that Americans are responding to a new Republican agenda.

And speaking of the new Republican agenda, on Capitol Hill: an event that should be remembered as a watershed for GOP philosophical politicking: the election of Georgia Representative Newt Gingrich as GOP Whip, the No. 2 House Republican. Early reports cast the battle between Gingrich and Edward Madigan, an Illinoisian and ally of House Republican

Leader Bob Michel, as a test of the New Right-Gingrich coalition versus the mainstream-Madigan group.

But lo -- Gingrich earned the support of two-thirds of the House '92 Group, the moderate GOP caucus, including such Ripon stalwarts as Sherry Boehlert, Olympia Snowe, Nancy Johnson, Claudine Schneider, Tom Tauke, Steve Gunderson and Ripon's new chair, Bill Clinger. Indeed, the moderates made the difference as Gingrich won by a narrow two-vote margin. What accounted for the moderates' support?

A more accurate portrait than the media's focus on "confrontation" against House Speaker Jim Wright (Gingrich initiated the current investigation controversy) is that Gingrich would pay some attention to the growing unity on issues in the ideological hothouse called the House GOP.

The progressives appreciated Gingrich's outspoken commitment to a GOP reform agenda on the environment, education, housing, day care and urban poverty. Said Arizona Representative Jon Kyl, a leader of Gingrich's Conservative Opportunity Society, "Conservatives have learned that you can use government to solve problems. We didn't use to think that."

Mr. Gunderson, who agreed two years ago to a series of meetings with Gingrich to find "common ground," adds: "There's no question that we are redefining the Republican Party....Newt and COS today are very different. They say, 'Yes, there is a problem and there's a role for government, but we want that role to empower people not bureaucracies, maximize choice for individuals not regulators at the federal level.'"

Mrs. Johnson, one of the first to endorse Mr. Gingrich, said she supported him because he believes that the government guided by a conservative approach can also respond progressively to human concerns."

Apparently, then, if we are to believe our leaders, the Ripon message has been enshrined in the election of Mr. Gingrich. Let's hope so. Stay tuned.

George the Gentle Bulldozer: In an effort to crack the myth that George Bush is a bumbler, a wimp, a preppy --

first friend and speechwriter Vic Gold offers three new appellations for the president in **The Washingtonian**: George the Bull-headed, George the Gambler, or George the Gentle Bulldozer.

The atmosphere on Capitol Hill: Overheard at a Capitol Hill cocktail party, as Representative Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) loudly approached former senator and rejected Defense nominee John Tower: "John! What a suprise to find you at the bar! Is there any scotch left?"

Moderate Bashing: Former Senator Eugene McCarthy's advice to new Members of Congress: "Remember that the worst accidents always occur in or near the middle of the road."

Rising Star Department: Business Week asks, "Is Bill Reilly Too Nice to Run the EPA?" In 15 years at the helm of the Conservation Foundation, Reilly made his reputation as a mediator between industry and environmentalists on such complex issues as groundwater pollution and wetlands protection. Reilly emphasizes innovative, market-oriented, cheap solutions like solid waste prevention or air emissions "trading," and has created a new assistant administrator for international issues. Other new environmental faces: Robert E. Grady, a former aide to New Jersey Governor Thomas Kean and the "point man" for science and natural resources at the Office of Management and Budget; Bill Rosenberg, a Michigan Bush backer in charge of air issues at EPA; and Linda Fisher, brought to EPA by former chief Lee Thomas to deal with solid waste issues and now elevated to the no. 3 slot for policy and planning

Also in the Rising Star Department -- Thelma Duggin, named by RNC Chief Lee Atwater to head up minority outreach efforts. Duggin is a black business consultant who served as a Reagan White House aide for minority outreach in the early 1980s. ■