

Rights, Reaction, and Limits, 1968-1980

Affirmative Action in Atlanta, "Can Atlanta Succeed Where America Has Failed?"

In 1974 Maynard Jackson became Atlanta, Georgia's first black mayor. Jackson was part of growing trend that sent African Americans to city hall in record numbers. Between 1971 and 1975 their numbers grew from 8 to 135. With a new city charter that enhanced the mayor's power, Jackson implanted a series of sweeping changes. He reorganized city departments. He antagonized white people when he fired the city's white police chief and angered businessmen when his early programs called for increasing the number of black municipal employees and awarding 20 percent of city contracts to black contractors.

SOURCE: Atlanta Magazine from Eyes on the Prize Civil Rights Reader, pp. 618-624

Q: You said in an interview just after you were elected vice mayor in 1969 that you might have to do some things as spokesman the black community that would upset part of the white community. What did you mean, and is that still the case now that are mayor?

A: I don't recall the context in which I made the statement. I think that since becoming Mayor I have made my decisions based on what is good for the city as a whole, and not for one group as opposed to the other. But I would imagine, for example, in the area of equal employment, contract compliance and so forth, there might appear to be so-called "black decisions" that might not have the full consent of the white community.

An example of that is contract compliance. It is amazing to know that there is some minor - very minor - consternation among a few people in the white community about blacks' getting city contracts: getting them through the regular procedures, but getting contracts. There was some talk that last year we [City Hall] were trying to give all the contract work to blacks. In 1973, out of 83 construction contracts, four went to minority general contractors. That equals about 4.8 per cent. In 1974, out of 52 construction contracts, 13 went to minority general contractors. That's 25 per cent. Since an ordinance was passed last October, subcontractors must now comply with the EEOC regulations. And there has been a definite increase in the number of minority general contractors and subcontractors.

In dollar value, I suspect that out of the \$73 million in contracts the City let last year, approximately 1 per cent went to minority contractors. Now if anxiety attaches when the black community gets 1 per cent of all contracts the City let last year, just imagine what happens when we double it to 2 per cent this year.

Let me give you the bottom line on this thing: What we have done is to set up basic systems that will guarantee fair competition all people.

Q: Mr. Mayor, you have been in office approximately 500 days. Do you perceive that the public least understands about the way you function?

A: I think that in many sections of the white community, there is great anxiety about whether my decisions are purely racial. I think that was predictable. I think that is a natural consequence of the changes that we have seen by my election, by the election of a 50 percent black Council, of a Board of Education that has five of nine members being black. And by a city that is now predominantly black - about 55 percent.

There is a peculiar anxiety which probably nobody was prepared to deal with, black or white: That's the anxiety which must attach to a white community which for the first time is a minority community. Black people have not [over the years] rolled over and taken all the negatives that go along with being a black minority, but there is some background, some history, of dealing with the fact of being a minority. In this case, a subjugated minority; an oppressed minority.

Whites on the other hand, although not an oppressed minority, are numerically the minority. They are not accustomed to dealing with that psychological fact, that phenomenon. Nor is the black community accustomed to dealing with a white minority.

Add those anxieties on top of the fact that you've got a brand new city charter. Most people don't have any appreciation of the impact of a new city charter on government: The first in a century. A badly needed change in our

form of government. A radical change. From a weak mayor and Board of Aldermen with mixed legislative-executive powers in the executive branch - to a strict separation of powers: strong mayor and City Council.

We are the greatest city in the country, but we're not superhuman. [We have had] a complete reorganization from 26 to nine departments, a new administration. The mayor is black, half the Council is black, the mayor is new to his position, and of the Council members, eight are brand new. Package all this together in the year 1974 in America, with the economic situation the worst since the Depression. If we think that we're not going to miss a step, that we're not going to question ourselves, then we must be absolutely out of our minds.

Atlanta is, with all its questioning, with all its anxieties, still the best city in this country. And if you don't believe it, ask the folks in all other cities in the country, because they're the ones who convinced me. We still are very human, and we've got to learn to weep. We'll have to accommodate this tremendous change - more than any time in our history - with being patient with ourselves, and accommodate the new styles.

Another part of the new style is that even if there were not black people in this city, there would still be a radical change in how the white community deals with governmental issues. Because no longer is there a monolithic white community if there ever was. Because now when you talk about the Northside, you talk about Northeast and Virginia-Highland, Morningside, Hope Park and many other communities. Those people, were there not a single black person around, would have fought the Power Structure tooth and nail over I-485. And would have won.

Q: It has been agreed widely that the so-called Power Structure no longer has that degree of influence which it used to have even 10 years ago over decision-making. What role do they have? How do you get their input in the total decision-making process?

A: I seek their input pretty much as I do the input of what I call the third partner at the table. Historically, it's been City Hall and the business community. And those two groups made the decisions and others were brought to the table thereafter to ratify decisions that were previously made.

Q: Wasn't the press involved in that too? Were they not elements of that triangulation of power?

A: In my opinion, no. In my opinion, the press was ancillary to the decision-making. The press was also used as a mechanism for garnering consensus.

Q: The press became a spokesman rather than a third party?

A: Yes, I think so.

My approach is that it would be wrong to seek to exclude the business community. Atlanta would not function well that way, and I made this clear when I ran for office. I have sought in a consistent manner since becoming mayor, to pursue that end - i.e., to make sure that the business community and City Hall sat down together. I have probably pursued that more vigorously than any mayor has ever had to or has ever wanted to. Among the four modern mayors of Atlanta, Hartsfield and Allen didn't have to pursue it as much as Massell or Jackson had to. Massell, I think, in many ways chose not to because he was very heavily opposed by the white business community and only got 16 per cent of the white vote when he became mayor.

I, of course, have never played golf with those guys, have never been invited to their homes, didn't grow up with them, didn't go to school with them - so it was all uphill for me economically and racially. But I had the notion - to which I still cling, by the way, although with less fervor than I did originally - that it wouldn't matter as long as I showed my good faith, pursued honest coalitions with them, and as long as I made them understand that I wanted very much for the traditional coalition to continue with one amendment - and that was to bring the grass-roots community to the table as well.

Now grass roots to me means white and black. It means the middle-income, transportation-oriented groups, planning organizations, citywide league of neighborhoods-that whole movement-as well as blacks, middle income and low income. That's what I call the grass-roots, the masses of people.

I had to convince the business community of this: The fact that I'm bringing a third party to the table should not be taken by you as a threat. It does not mean that you and I are not going to talk. It does not mean that you and I won't consult regularly. It does mean that there is a third party here now. Then on the other hand I had to convince the grass-roots community that my frequent contacts with the business community did not mean that I was neglecting the grass-roots community. It's almost like you're in a balancing act constantly.

I feel that some of the people of the old guard, so to speak, are so inflexible that they find themselves now incapable of making the adjustment, even those who are able to say, "Let's make the adjustment. It's for the good of Atlanta."

Q: What can be done to encourage white residents and businesses to remain in the city?

A: We have a new breed of "urban pioneer" moving back in the city and re-enrolling their children in the public schools. What they say is "We don't believe all that hogwash we hear about tremendous fears of being mugged every time you walk down a city street, because we work downtown. We know that there is a serious crime problem. We also know that the crime problem in the suburbs is accelerating at a far faster rate, and we also know the name of the game if you're going to fight crime is to have people living in the city. So it's more convenient. The energy crisis, if you want to call it a crisis, helps us to see the benefits of living close in. The housing is more than adequate. We have far better services. All the benefits are there, so we're going to live in the city. I think that's a vastly significant occurrence.

. . . I think also there will ease in the course of time some anxieties that some whites have.

Q: Mr. Mayor, it would be a fault of ours if we could not ask for some constructive suggestions that you might make to ease those anxieties.

A: The first thing is to make fair decisions. I honestly believe that some people have the crazy idea that blacks in Atlanta are going to "get back at" the white community for three and a half centuries of oppression. I have never entertained the idea, and I don't know of any single responsible black figure or person who is in any public position who has.

We can make an awful lot of decisions about where people will live, and more and more I think Atlanta's becoming the kind of city that will give women a fairer chance. I have appointed the very first women department heads, for example, in city government. The Civil Service Board is predominantly female because of my appointments. So is the License Review Board. My appointments have been 50-50 white and black across the board. I have nine commissioners. Five are white, four are black. I have appointed about 38 per cent female. That may have improved with some recent appointments. But that will improve.

Q: Will you deal with a sensitive perception? It does not come from us. There is a perception that if any position is voiced in opposition to yours, your response is that it leads to polarization, that it is a racial opposition.

A: Well, that perception is the result of some very careful and highly biased work by The Atlanta Constitution. Only once since I have been mayor have I ever accused anybody of being racist. Only once. That came at a press conference during the [Public Safety Commissioner Reginald] Eaves confirmation. I had just had a meeting in my office with a white member of City Council who had said that he was going to vote for the Eaves confirmation when I first announced it. I had told him "I appreciate the support, but I think you're going to encounter some real opposition in the white community if you do it." And he said, "Oh, I think you're just imagining that." [A few days later] he came in and said "some members of my church" - and he said they were white - "approached me and said 'Don't you dare vote for Eaves.' Some of them said 'Don't you dare vote for that nigger.'"

I went from that meeting with him into the press conference where somebody asked me not just about the [City] Council, but about the whole response, public and private: Do you think there's any racism involved? Well the obvious answer is yes. At no other time have I said that.

Q: At the end of an interview, we always give a subject an opportunity to say anything he wishes, within the constraint of his time, that we have not touched on - anything you wish to emphasize. The floor is yours.

A: This period of time is probably Atlanta's acid test. We're either going to live up to our advance billings, or we're going to flunk miserably. It all depends on whether black people and white people can get along with each other, and not become consumed in anxieties that are truly without basis in fact.

I have a prediction to make: Atlanta's going to make it. But I think it's going to be rough sledding for a while until people can get over anxieties that are at an extraordinarily high pitch.

Now I think that the economy of Atlanta will reflect the national economy. When times are rough in the nation, times are going to be rough here. And that's all that's really happening. But I think Atlanta's going to prosper. I think that we're going to have to develop new forms of communication - broader, more comprehensive groups that communicate.

Betty Friedan, "The Problem That Has No Name", from *The Feminine Mystique* (1963)

A 1942 graduate of Smith College, Betty Friedan raised three children and worked as a freelance magazine writer after World War II. In 1957, she sent questionnaires to members of her Smith class, asking them to describe their lives since graduation. She combined their answers with more research and published *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. The book's pathbreaking analysis of the unhappiness felt by many suburban middle-class housewives helped spark the modern feminist movement. In 1966 Friedan helped found the National Organization for Women.

SOURCE: From *The Feminine Mystique* by Betty Friedan. Copyright © 1963, 1973, 1974, 1983 by Betty Friedan. Reprinted by permission of W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

The suburban housewife—she was the dream image of the young American women and the envy, it was said, of women all over the world. The American housewife—freed by science and labor-saving appliances from the drudgery, the dangers of childbirth and the illnesses of her grandmother. She was healthy, beautiful, educated, concerned only about her husband, her children, her home. She had found true feminine fulfillment. As a housewife and mother, she was respected as a full and equal partner to man in his world. She was free to choose automobiles, clothes, appliances, supermarkets; she had everything that women ever dreamed of.

In the fifteen years after World War II, this mystique of feminine fulfillment became the cherished and self-perpetuating core of contemporary American culture. Millions of women lived their lives in the image of those pretty pictures of the American suburban housewife, kissing their husbands goodbye in front of the picture window, depositing their station-wagonsful of children at school, and smiling as they ran the new electric waxer over the spotless kitchen floor. They baked their own bread, sewed their own and their children's clothes, kept their new washing machines and dryers running all day. They changed the sheets on the beds twice a week instead of once, took the rug-hooking class in adult education, and pitied their poor frustrated mothers, who had dreamed of having a career. Their only dream was to be perfect wives and mothers; their highest ambition to have five children and a beautiful house, their only fight to get and keep their husbands. They had no thought for the unfeminine problems of the world outside the home; they wanted the men to make the major decisions. They gloried in their role as women, and wrote proudly on the census blank: "Occupation: housewife."

For over fifteen years, the words written for women, and the words women used when they talked to each other, while their husbands sat on the other side of the room and talked shop or politics or septic tanks, were about problems with their children, or how to keep their husbands happy, or improve their children's school, or cook chicken or make slipcovers. Nobody argued whether women were inferior or superior to men; they were simply different. Words like "emancipation" and "career" sounded strange and embarrassing; no one had used them for years. When a French-woman named Simone de Beauvoir wrote a book called *The Second Sex*, an American critic commented that she obviously "didn't know what life was all about," and besides, she was talking about French women. The "woman problem" in America no longer existed.

If a woman had a problem in the 1950s and 1960s, she knew that something must be wrong with her marriage, or with herself. Other women were satisfied with their lives, she thought. What kind of a woman was she if she did not feel this mysterious fulfillment waxing the kitchen floor? She was so ashamed to admit her dissatisfaction that she never knew how many other women shared it. If she tried to tell her husband, he didn't understand what she was talking about. She did not really understand it herself. For over fifteen years women in America found it harder to talk about this problem than about sex. Even the psychoanalysts had no name for it. When a woman went to a psychiatrist for help, as many women did, she would say, "I'm so ashamed," or "I must be hopelessly neurotic." "I don't know what's

wrong with women today,” a suburban psychiatrist said uneasily. “I only know something is wrong because most of my patients happen to be women. And their problem isn’t sexual.” Most women with this problem did not go to see a psychoanalyst, however. “There’s nothing wrong really,” they kept telling themselves. “There isn’t any problem.”

But on an April morning in 1959, I heard a mother of four, having coffee with four other mothers in a suburban development fifteen miles from New York, say in a tone of quiet desperation, “the problem.” And the others knew, without words, that she was not talking about a problem with her husband, or her children, or her home. Suddenly they realized they all shared the same problem, the problem that has no name. They began, hesitantly, to talk about it. Later, after they had picked up their children at nursery school and taken them home to nap, two of the women cried, in sheer relief, just to know they were not alone.

Gradually I came to realize that the problem that has no name was shared by countless women in America. As a magazine writer I often interviewed women about problems with their children, or their marriages, or their houses, or their communities. But after a while I began to recognize the telltale signs of this other problem. I saw the same signs in suburban ranch houses and split-levels on Long Island and in New Jersey and Westchester County; in colonial houses in a small Massachusetts town; on patios in Memphis; in suburban and city apartments; in living rooms in the Midwest. Sometimes I sensed the problem, not as a reporter, but as a suburban housewife, for during this time I was also bringing up my own three children in Rockland County, New York. I heard echoes of the problem in college dormitories and semiprivate maternity wards, at PTA meetings and luncheons of the League of Women Voters, at suburban cocktail parties, in station wagons waiting for trains, and in snatches of conversation overheard at Schrafft’s. The groping words I heard from other women, on quiet afternoons when children were at school or on quiet evenings when husbands worked late, I think I understood first as a woman long before I understood their larger social and psychological implications....

If I am right, the problem that has no name stirring in the minds of so many American women today is not a matter of loss of femininity or too much education, or the demands of domesticity. It is far more important than anyone recognizes. It is the key to these other new and old problems which have been torturing women and their husbands and children, and puzzling their doctors and educators for years. It may well be the key to our future as a nation and a culture. We can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: “I want something more than my husband and my children and my home.”

1. *What does Friedan mean by “the mystique of feminine fulfillment”?*
2. *How do men contribute to the “feminine mystique” and the “problem that has no name”?*
3. *Why does Friedan think it so important to “name” the problem?*

Boston Busing 1975

In 1974, the city of Boston implemented court-ordered busing in order to desegregate its public schools. “Southie” in the title refers to the neighborhood of South Boston. At the time, Ione Malloy was an English teacher at South Boston High School, and she kept a diary of events. Her insider account is often noted for its balance and insight.

From my homeroom window I watched the school buses empty one by one, while an administrator, Mr. Gizzi, checked each student's class program to see whether the student belonged at the high school. As I watched, a girl's piercing screams rose from the front lobby. Troopers began running toward the building. Trooper squad cars blocked off G Street down the hill so the buses couldn't move. Mr. Gizzi stayed with the buses. Over the intercom the secretary's voice cried, “We need help here on the second floor. Please send help to the office.” Isolated on the second floor in the front corner of the building, in a small room attached to two adjoining rooms, I again felt the terror of not knowing what was coming from what direction, feeling unable to protect myself or

the students from an unidentified danger.

I have never had a desire to flee, just to protect the students, though I don't like the feeling of being trapped. I closed the door, turned out the lights, and told my homeroom students we would stay there and help each other. We waited—two white girls, Kathryn and Becky; James, a small, long-haired white boy; and Jeffrey, a black. In a few minutes the door opened. The gym teacher, carrying an umbrella, stood there with a trooper, their faces anxious. “Have you seen Jane?” they asked, then hurried away. What had happened? Why was the teacher carrying an umbrella? Who was Jane, and where might she have gone, we wondered, but there was no chance to ask. They had already shut the door behind them.

Then came a call for all teachers not assigned to homerooms to report to the front lobby. The call was repeated several times. About forty minutes later, I was amazed when, from my window, I saw the last bus empty. Several minutes later the intercom announced that the school day would begin. Students should proceed to their first class. Instead, everyone just sat, afraid to move, paralyzed by the unknown. There were only twenty minutes left in the first class, senior English. The seniors were upset. There had been fights in the South Cafeteria, in the third floor lavatory, and in room 303 on the third floor down the hall, they told me. Because the fights had broken out simultaneously, the seniors felt they had been planned. Just then the intercom requested custodians to report to the third floor lavatory and to the South Cafeteria. “To clean up the blood,” the seniors explained.

Although the seniors wanted to discuss the fights, I said we would first take a quick, objective, one-word test. I was a little angry. It was better to get their minds focused on something else. In the few remaining minutes, I let them take the Luscher color preference test and talk about the correlation of color with personality. Most of them chose yellow, red, or blue in their color preference. They are a good class.

When I passed room 303 a few minutes later, the students were pushing at the door to get out. A trooper was holding them in. I told two boys at the door to go in and help their teacher. They asked, “Help her?” It hadn't occurred to them that she might need their help. Jack Kennedy, administrator, passed me in the corridor, his face white and drained. I stopped in the teachers' room to comb my hair. My face in the mirror looked ghastly. It must take the body time to recover its equilibrium, even after the mind has composed itself.

As I walked around the school, and felt the mood of the school, I thought, “This school is DEATH. The mood of the school is black.”

The troopers were happy, however, I was surprised to see. One said, “This is more like it. It gets the old adrenalin going.” My sophomores, a mixed class of black and white students, also wanted to talk about the incidents. They explained how the fight before school had started at the front lobby door. A black girl and a white boy were going through the front lobby—the boy first. He let the door slam on her. She screamed; a black male jumped to her defense, and the fight was on. A trooper pushed a white boy back over a desk and dislocated his shoulder. A black student on the stairs started screaming insults at the white students—among them Michael Faith—and Faith lunged for him. Fights broke out everywhere in the lobby. Students rushed down from the classrooms, or out of their homerooms to aid the secretaries when they called for help on the intercom.

Anne was upset because a trooper in the cafeteria had grabbed a black girl and called her “nigger.” “Nobody calls me 'nigger.'” Anne said. “My friend got her comb and got a piece of his red meat.” I played dumb and, for the benefit of white students, said, “But I hear black kids call each other 'nigger,' and they don't seem to mind.” Anne said, “Nobody's called me 'nigger.' I don't care who he is.” Louis, a black student who has come to school regularly in a taxi even when Atkins called for a boycott, sat back confidently in his fine pressed suit and said, “It's all right when another black person calls me a 'nigger,' but not a white person. Then it's an insult. If I don't know a person and he calls me 'nigger,' I don't say anything until I find out how he feels about me.” Anne said,

"I hate this school. I don't never want to come back." I concluded, "We all need more understanding." . . .

There was a faculty meeting after school. Dr. Reid took the toll of casualties and names involved in fights. Unconsciously he wiped his brow with the classic tragic sweep of his hand and said, "I don't know what we can do. We were all at our posts doing our jobs. But if a youngster will insult and another responds with his fists, there's nothing we can do-except encourage them to watch their mouths and language." Dr. Reid announced he would like to have an honor roll assembly for sophomores. Mrs. Marie Folkart, the oldest, most respected member of the faculty, raised her hand: She hoped he wouldn't have an assembly. Usually very deferential to her, he disagreed, "I don't know about that. I think maybe we should." The assembly, the first this year, is scheduled for Friday, a day when attendance is the lowest. . . .

The sophomore assembly convened as planned. Classes filed to assigned seats room by room without incident. Troopers lined the auditorium. The mood was ugly. Dr. Reid entered from the rear of the hall. As he moved down the center aisle to the stage, he urged the students to stand. He stopped at my class. Martin wouldn't stand because Siegfried, behind him, wouldn't. Then James sat down-later, he told me, because the black kids-Martin and Siegfried-wouldn't stand. Dr. Reid insisted, and I insisted, but Martin refused. Dr. Reid proceeded on. Again I thought, "This school is death."

After the pledge of allegiance to the flag, Dr. Reid lectured on the courtesy of standing when a guest comes to one's home. A few students snickered. When he alluded to the troopers, the black boys in the row behind me yelled, "Get them out." Then Dr. Reid outlined the sports plan for the winter and told the assembly, "We will be together for the year. After that I don't know. But we're here, and we had better make the best of it. And let's have a little courtesy toward one another. Let's treat each other with respect and watch what we say to one another-treat each other with a little kindness. A smile goes a long way if someone accidentally bumps you, instead of pushing back."

The students listened respectfully. Then, as both black and white students crossed the stage to accept their honor roll cards from Dr. Reid, the assembly applauded. Students left the auditorium room by room. During the day, girl students traveled the school in roving gangs of blacks and whites, bursting out of classes at any provocation, spreading consternation among the police. "They're in holiday mood," I told the police, dismayed at the prospect of chasing pretty girls back to classrooms. At the end of the day in homeroom, I told Martin, "Dr. Reid has put his life on the line about desegregation because it is the law. His house in South Boston is guarded. Then he asks you to stand in the assembly, and you refuse. He is your friend, the friend of all of us, and you should know that." James said to Martin, "That's right, Dr. Reid has guards." A neighborhood crowd chanted at Dr. Reid outside the school this morning. . . .

A librarian at the Boston Public Library in Copley Square told me there are enough kids in the library all day to have school there. He doesn't know where they come from. . . .

The number of troopers in the building was increased instead of decreased, contrary to what the troopers had anticipated Friday when I talked to them. The two black boys-Martin and Jeffrey-and one white girl, Kathryn, were present in my homeroom today. Expecting a boycott, I was surprised to see any white students in school until I learned that a walkout of white students was anticipated at 9:45 A.M., when the parents, now gathering on the sidewalk, planned to walk in to protest the presence of steel combs in the school. Walkers (or white students) were permitted to leave by the side doors, if they preferred, so as not to be identified and, perhaps, intimidated by the now divided community. In South Boston families once friends are now enemies, since half support the antibusing boycott and the other half feel they have to educate their children.

Television cameras recorded Dr. Reid facing the protesters outside the building in the morning sunshine. He told them, "The black parents have elected no biracial council; the white students have elected none; the white

parents have elected none. And frankly, the number of fights last week made me afraid.”

In class Anne described the walkout. “The white kids said, 'See you Tuesday, niggers.' If the black kids had a walkout, I'd go, too. The white kids have to go, or they'll get beaten up.” Gretchen, a diligent and intelligent white student, who had attended the advanced classes of the New York public schools, listened. I give her extra reading and reports because she is highly motivated. Besides Gretchen, there were five black students in the class. I left school at the end of the day by the front lobby staircase, passing the Greek frieze laboriously painted by the art teachers in neutral dark brown last September before school began. The frieze had been nightly mutilated with spray paint and daily repaired by the art department, until finally they gave up. The frieze is now hideous: The faces are black blobs, or white blobs, or faceless with black holes for eyes. Looking at them, one teacher shuddered, “The hatred is getting to me.”

Document Analysis

1. What is it about Malloy's account that makes it so compelling? Is it simply the events she describes? What is her tone?
2. Why were white students called “walkers”?
3. Should public schools be forced to integrate by busing students across neighborhoods? Do the benefits of this policy outweigh the negative aspects?

House Judiciary Committee's Assessment of Nixon's Activities (1974)

In June 1972, five men were arrested while attempting to plant wiretaps in the offices of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) at the Watergate hotel in Washington, D.C. President Richard Nixon was facing reelection in November of that year. This event ultimately sparked an investigation into the activities of the Nixon administration. Nixon was reelected by a landslide, but by May 1973 the Senate Watergate committee had begun nationally televised hearings into the incident and a suspected cover-up orchestrated by the White House. The investigation revealed that a taping system installed in the White House had recorded all conversations in the White House offices. In a scandal that seemed to grow more complex every day, Nixon claimed executive privilege to resist turning the tapes over to investigators. However, the Supreme Court ruled against him in July 1974. When investigators finally listened to the tapes, they discovered a gap of eighteen and one-half minutes in the recordings. In late July, the House Judiciary Committee issued three articles of impeachment against Nixon, who would resign in August.

Note: The acronym "CRP" stands for the Committee for the Re-election of the President.

June 19, 1972–June 29, 1972

. . . At the meeting, on the morning of June 20, Kleindienst, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Mitchell and Dean discussed the Watergate break-in. (Book II, 240-41)

On that same morning at 9:00 a.m. the President arrived in his Oval Office. While this meeting on Watergate took place one floor above among the President's chief of staff, his chief domestic adviser, his counsel, his Attorney General, and his campaign director, the President remained alone in the Oval Office (with the exception of a three-minute meeting with Butterfield from 9:01 to 9:04 a.m.). The President left the Oval Office at 10:20 a.m., and went to his EOB office. (Book II, 243)

At his EOB office, the President met with Ehrlichman from 10:25 until 11:20 a.m. (Book II, 243) The President did not discuss Watergate with Ehrlichman, even though the President had given Ehrlichman the highest-level responsibility for investigation of the Watergate matter. (In re Grand Jury, Misc. 47-73, order, 12/19/73; Book II, 238: "Presidential Statements," 8/22/73, 45-46)

Starting at 11:26 a.m., during a meeting which lasted one hour and 19 minutes, the President did discuss Watergate with Haldeman. . . .

In July, 1973, the tape recording of this June 20, 1972 meeting between the President and Haldeman was subpoenaed by the Special Prosecutor. The subpoena was resisted by the President on the grounds of executive privilege (Book II, 258) but upheld by the Court of Appeals. (Book IX, 748, 750-54) On November 26, 1973, when the President's lawyer finally produced the recording, it contained an eighteen and one-half minute erasure. The erasure obliterated that portion of the conversation which, according to Haldeman's notes, referred to Watergate. (Book II, 249-50) The obliteration was, in fact, caused by repeated manual erasures, which were made on the tape recorder used by the President's personal secretary Rose Mary Woods. . . .

CONTAINMENT—JULY 1, 1972, TO ELECTION

PRESIDENTIAL PLAN FOR CONTAINMENT

From late June, 1972, until after the Presidential election in November, President Nixon through his close subordinates engaged in a plan of containment and concealment which prevented disclosures that might have resulted in the indictment of high CRP and White House officials; that might have exposed Hunt and Liddy's prior illegal covert activities for the White House; and that might have put the outcome of the November election in jeopardy. Two of the President's men, John Dean, Counsel to the President, a subordinate, and Herbert Kalmbach, personal attorney to the President, an agent, who had been assigned to carry out the cover-up, carried out their assignment. They did so with the full support of the power and authority of the President of the United States.

Tape recordings of Presidential conversations in the possession of the Committee establish that implementation of the plan prior to the election had the full approval of the President. . . . On the morning of March 21, 1973, Dean told the President regarding his investigation after the break-in, "I was under pretty clear instructions [laughs] not to really to investigate this, that this was something that just could have been disastrous on the election if it had—all hell had broken loose, and I worked on a theory of containment." The President replied, "Sure." (HJCT 88) During the same conversation, Dean said of the cover-up, "We were able to hold it for a long time." The President's reply was, "Yeah, I know." (HJCT 101-02) Dean said that some bad judgments, some necessary judgments had been made before the election, but that at the same time, in view of the election, there was no way.

The President said, "We're all in on it." . . .

On August 29, 1972, the President held a news conference. He discussed various pending investigative proceedings in connection with Watergate. . . .

In fact, Dean had conducted no investigation. He had been acting to narrow and frustrate investigation by the FBI. He had reached no conclusion that no one in the White House had been involved in Watergate. He made no report of such an investigation. . . .

The President and his staff had not "cooperated completely" with the investigatory agencies. The evidence, rather, shows clearly and convincingly that the President and his closest aides acted to obstruct and impede the investigations.

The President's statements on August 29 themselves were designed to delay, impede and obstruct the investigation of the Watergate break-in; to cover up, conceal, and protect those responsible and to conceal the existence and scope of other unlawful covert activities. . . .

House Judiciary Committee's Conclusion on Nixon's Impeachment (1972)

In June 1972, five men were arrested while attempting to plant wiretaps in the offices of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) at the Watergate hotel in Washington, D.C. President Richard Nixon was facing reelection in

November of that year. This event ultimately sparked an investigation into the activities of the Nixon administration. Nixon was reelected by a landslide, but by May 1973 the Senate Watergate committee had begun nationally televised hearings into the incident and a suspected cover-up orchestrated by the White House. The investigation revealed that a taping system installed in the White House had recorded all conversations in the White House offices. In a scandal that seemed to grow more complex every day, Nixon claimed executive privilege to resist turning the tapes over to investigators. However, the Supreme Court ruled against him in July 1974. When investigators finally listened to the tapes, they discovered a gap of eighteen and one-half minutes in the recordings. In late July, the House Judiciary Committee issued three articles of impeachment against Nixon, who would resign in August.

Note: The acronym "CRP" stands for the Committee for the Re-election of the President.

Conclusion

After the Committee on the Judiciary had debated whether or not it should recommend Article I to the House of Representatives, 27 of the 38 Members of the Committee found that the evidence before it could only lead to one conclusion; that Richard M. Nixon, using the powers of his high office, engaged, personally and through his subordinates and agents, in a course of conduct or plan designed to delay, impede, and obstruct the investigation of the unlawful entry, on June 17, 1972, into the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee; to cover up, conceal and protect those responsible; and to conceal the existence and scope of other unlawful covert activities.

This finding is the only one that can explain the President's involvement in a pattern of undisputed acts that occurred after the break-in and that cannot otherwise be rationally explained.

1. The President's decision on June 20, 1972, not to meet with his Attorney General, his chief of staff, his counsel, his campaign director, and his assistant John Ehrlichman, whom he had put in charge of the investigation—when the subject of their meeting was the Watergate matter.
2. The erasure of that portion of the recording of the President's conversation with Haldeman, on June 20, 1972, which dealt with Watergate—when the President stated that the tapes had been under his "sole and personal control."
3. The President's public denial on June 22, 1972, of the involvement of members of the Committee for the Re-election of the President or of the White House staff in the Watergate burglary, in spite of having discussed Watergate, on or before June 22, 1972, with Haldeman, Colson, and Mitchell—all persons aware of that involvement.
4. The President's directive to Haldeman on June 23, 1972, to have the CIA request the FBI to curtail its Watergate investigation.
5. The President's refusal, on July 6, 1972, to inquire and inform himself what Patrick Gray, Acting Director of the FBI, meant by his warning that some of the President's aides were "trying to mortally wound" him.
6. The President's discussion with Ehrlichman on July 8, 1972, of clemency for the Watergate burglars, more than two months before the return of any indictments.
7. The President's public statement on August 29, 1972, a statement later shown to be untrue, that an investigation by John Dean "indicates that no one in the White House staff, no one in the Administration, presently employed, was involved in this very bizarre incident."
8. The President's statement to Dean on September 15, 1972, the day that the Watergate indictments were returned without naming high CRP and White House officials, that Dean had handled his work skillfully, "putting your fingers in the dike every time that leaks have sprung here and there," and that "you just try to button it up as well as you can and hope for the best." . . .

In addition to this evidence, there was before the Committee the following evidence:

1. Beginning immediately after June 17, 1972, the involvement of each of the President's top aides and political associates, Haldeman, Mitchell, Ehrlichman, Colson, Dean, LaRue, Mardian, Magruder, in the Watergate coverup. . . .

Finally, there was before the committee a record of public statements by the President between June 22, 1972, and June 9, 1974, deliberately contrived to deceive the courts, the Department of Justice, the Congress and the American people.

President Nixon's course of conduct following the Watergate break-in, as described in Article I, caused action not only by his subordinates but by the agencies of the United States, including the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the CIA. It required perjury, destruction of evidence, obstruction of justice, all crimes. But, most important, it required deliberate, contrived, and continuing deception of the American people.

President Nixon's actions resulted in manifest injury to the confidence of the nation and great prejudice to the cause of law and justice, and was subversive of constitutional government. His actions were contrary to his trust as President and unmindful of the solemn duties of his high office. It was this serious violation of Richard M. Nixon's constitutional obligations as President, and not the fact that violations of Federal criminal statutes occurred, that lies at the heart of Article I.

The Committee finds, based upon clear and convincing evidence, that this conduct, detailed in the foregoing pages of this report, constitutes "high crimes and misdemeanors" as that term is used in Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the House of Representatives exercise its constitutional power to impeach Richard M. Nixon.

Jimmy Carter, The "Crisis of Confidence" Speech (1979)

President Jimmy Carter gave this speech in the summer of 1979, after his popularity ratings had been dropping for a number of months. His legislative initiatives, especially his plans to develop alternative fuel sources, had stalled in Congress. Americans believed that his administration had lost direction. This speech, which was his response to this crisis of confidence in his ability to lead the nation, further eroded popular support for the president.

Good evening.

This is a special night for me. Exactly three years ago, on July 15, 1976, I accepted the nomination of my party to run for President of the United States. I promised you a President who is not isolated from the people, who feels your pain, and who shared your dreams and who draws his strength and his wisdom from you. . . .

Ten days ago I had planned to speak to you again about a very important subject-energy. For the fifth time I would have described the urgency of the problem and laid out a series of legislative recommendations to the Congress. But as I was preparing to speak, I began to ask myself the same question that I now know has been troubling many of you. Why have we not been able to get together as a nation to resolve our serious energy problem?

It's clear that the true problems of our Nation are much deeper-deeper than gasoline lines or energy shortages, deeper even than inflation or recession. And I realize more than ever that as President I need your help. So, I decided to reach out and listen to the voices of America.

I invited to Camp David people from almost every segment of our society-business and labor, teachers and preachers, Governors, mayors, and private citizens. And then I left Camp David to listen to other Americans, men and women like you. It has been an extraordinary ten days, and I want to share with you what I've heard. . . .

These ten days confirmed my belief in the decency and the strength and the wisdom of the American people, but it also bore out some of my long-standing concerns about our Nation's underlying problems.

I know, of course, being president, that government actions and legislation can be very important. That's why I've worked hard to put my campaign promises into law-and I have to admit, with just mixed success. But after listening to the American people I have been reminded again that all the legislation in the world can't fix what's wrong with America. So, I want to speak to you first tonight about a subject even more serious than energy or inflation. I want to talk to you right now about a fundamental threat to American democracy.

I do not mean our political and civil liberties. They will endure. And I do not refer to the outward strength of America, a nation that is at peace tonight everywhere in the world, with unmatched economic power and military might.

The threat is nearly invisible in ordinary ways. It is a crisis of confidence. It is a crisis that strikes at the very heart

and soul and spirit of our national will. We can see this crisis in the growing doubt about the meaning of our own lives and in the loss of a unity of purpose for our Nation.

The erosion of our confidence in the future is threatening to destroy the social and the political fabric of America. . . .

The symptoms of this crisis of the American spirit are all around us. For the first time in the history of our country a majority of our people believe that the next five years will be worse than the past five years. Two-thirds of our people do not even vote. The productivity of American workers is actually dropping, and the willingness of Americans to save for the future has fallen below that of all other people in the Western world. . . .

Often you see paralysis and stagnation and drift. You don't like it, and neither do I. What can we do?

First of all, we must face the truth, and then we can change our course. We simply must have faith in each other, faith in our course. We simply must have faith in each other, faith in our ability to govern ourselves, and faith in the future of this Nation. Restoring that faith and that confidence to America is now the most important task we face. It is a true challenge of this generation of Americans. . . .

We are at a turning point in our history. There are two paths to choose. One is a path I've warned about tonight, the path that leads to fragmentation and self-interest. Down that road lies a mistaken idea of freedom, the right to grasp for ourselves some advantage over others. That path would be one of constant conflict between narrow interests ending in chaos and immobility. It is a certain route to failure.

All the traditions of our past, all the lessons of our heritage, all the promises of our future point to another path, the path of common purpose and the restoration of American values. That path leads to true freedom for our Nation and ourselves. We can take the first steps down that path as we begin to solve our energy problems. . . .

Document Analysis

1. Rhetorically, this was not a strong speech. Could Carter have made the same points in a more effective manner? If so, how?
2. In 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt warned the American people that they had "nothing to fear but fear itself." In many ways, President Carter's speech also was an appeal to the American people not to become despondent. President Carter's speech, however, was not successful. What reasons other than the weakness of the speech account for this failure? How were the late 1970s different from the early 1930s?
3. What did Carter identify as the "crisis" confronting the nation at that time?

Shirley Chisholm, Equal Rights for Women (May 21, 1969)

Shirley Chisholm was the first African American woman to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. She represented her New York City district in Congress from 1969 until her retirement in 1982. She gained national fame in 1972 as the first African American to run for president when she campaigned for the Democratic nomination. In the speech reproduced below Chisholm calls for a constitutional amendment to guarantee equal rights for women.

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM of New York

In the House of Representatives, May 21, 1969

Mr. Speaker, when a young woman graduates from college and starts looking for a job, she is likely to have a frustrating and even demeaning experience ahead of her. If she walks into an office for an interview, the first question she will be asked is,

"Do you type?"

There is a calculated system of prejudice that lies unspoken behind that question. Why is it acceptable for women to be secretaries, librarians, and teachers, but totally unacceptable for them to be managers, administrators, doctors,

lawyers, and Members of Congress.

The unspoken assumption is that women are different. They do not have executive ability orderly minds, stability, leadership skills, and they are too emotional.

It has been observed before, that society for a long time, discriminated against another minority, the blacks, on the same basis - that they were different and inferior. The happy little homemaker and the contented "old darkey" on the plantation were both produced by prejudice.

As a black person, I am no stranger to race prejudice. But the truth is that in the political world I have been far oftener discriminated against because I am a woman than because I am black.

Prejudice against blacks is becoming unacceptable although it will take years to eliminate it. But it is doomed because, slowly, white America is beginning to admit that it exists. Prejudice against women is still acceptable. There is very little understanding yet of the immorality involved in double pay scales and the classification of most of the better jobs as "for men only."

More than half of the population of the United States is female. But women occupy only 2 percent of the managerial positions. They have not even reached the level of tokenism yet No women sit on the AFL-CIO council or Supreme Court There have been only two women who have held Cabinet rank, and at present there are none. Only two women now hold ambassadorial rank in the diplomatic corps. In Congress, we are down to one Senator and 10 Representatives.

Considering that there are about 3 1/2 million more women in the United States than men, this situation is outrageous.

It is true that part of the problem has been that women have not been aggressive in demanding their rights. This was also true of the black population for many years. They submitted to oppression and even cooperated with it. Women have done the same thing. But now there is an awareness of this situation particularly among the younger segment of the population.

As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians, and other groups, laws will not change such deep-seated problems overnight But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and to begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to reexamine it's unconscious attitudes.

It is for this reason that I wish to introduce today a proposal that has been before every Congress for the last 40 years and that sooner or later must become part of the basic law of the land -- the equal rights amendment.

Let me note and try to refute two of the commonest arguments that are offered against this amendment. One is that women are already protected under the law and do not need legislation. Existing laws are not adequate to secure equal rights for women. Sufficient proof of this is the concentration of women in lower paying, menial, unrewarding jobs and their incredible scarcity in the upper level jobs. If women are already equal, why is it such an event whenever one happens to be elected to Congress?

It is obvious that discrimination exists. Women do not have the opportunities that men do. And women that do not conform to the system, who try to break with the accepted patterns, are stigmatized as "odd" and "unfeminine." The fact is that a woman who aspires to be chairman of the board, or a Member of the House, does so for exactly the same reasons as any man. Basically, these are that she thinks she can do the job and she wants to try.

A second argument often heard against the equal rights amendment is that it would eliminate legislation that many States and the Federal Government have enacted giving special protection to women and that it would throw the marriage and divorce laws into chaos.

As for the marriage laws, they are due for a sweeping reform, and an excellent beginning would be to wipe the existing ones off the books. Regarding special protection for working women, I cannot understand why it should be needed. Women need no protection that men do not need. What we need are laws to protect working people, to guarantee them fair pay, safe working conditions, protection against sickness and layoffs, and provision for dignified, comfortable retirement. Men and women need these things equally. That one sex needs protection more than the other is a male supremacist myth as ridiculous and unworthy of respect as the white supremacist myths that society is

trying to cure itself of at this time.

Document Analysis

1. What persuasive tools does Rep. Chisholm use to convey her message? Is the message effective to you as a reader? Why or why not?
2. Given the racial and gender situations in America in 1969, can Chisholm be considered a trailblazer for African Americans and women? Why or why not?
3. How does Chisholm compare the situation of women in the United States with that of other minority groups?

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (1971)

Desegregation of public schools moved slowly in spite of the Brown decision. Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education upheld that busing was an acceptable solution to the de facto segregation that resulted from shifting residential patterns. In 1998, Swann was challenged by the parents of a white student who argued that the thirty-year-old ruling discriminated against both races when they tried to get into magnet schools, which accept students by a lottery system. When a U.S. District Court judge ruled that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system had achieved desegregation in September, 1999, a divided school board appealed the decision, which is still pending. SOURCE: Henry Steele Commager, Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, Documents in American History (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965), pp. 756-760.

BURGER, C. J. We granted certiorari in this case to review important issues as to the duties of school authorities and the scope of powers of federal courts under this Court's mandates to eliminate racially separate public schools established and maintained by state action. . . .

This case and those argued with it arose in states having a long history of maintaining two sets of schools in a single school system deliberately operated to carry out a governmental policy to separate pupils in schools solely on the basis of race. That was what *Brown v. Board of Education* was all about. These cases present us with the problem of defining in more precise terms than heretofore the scope of the duty of school authorities and district courts in implementing *Brown I* and the mandate to eliminate dual systems and establish unitary systems at once. Meanwhile district courts and courts of appeals have struggled in hundreds of cases with a multitude and variety of problems under this Court's general directive. Understandably, in an area of evolving remedies, those courts had to improvise and experiment without detailed or specific guidelines. This court, in *Brown I*, appropriately dealt with the large constitutional principles; other federal courts had to grapple with the flinty, intractable realities of day-to-day implementation of those constitutional commands. Their efforts, of necessity, embraced a process of "trial and error," and our effort to formulate guidelines must take into account their experience. . . .

The central issue in this case is that of student assignment, and there are essentially four problem areas:

- (1) to what extent racial balance or racial quotas may be used as an implement in a remedial order to correct a previously segregated system;
- (2) whether every all-Negro and all-white school must be eliminated as an indispensable part of a remedial process of desegregation;
- (3) what are the limits, if any, on the rearrangement of school districts and attendance zones, as a remedial measure; and

(4) what are the limits, if any, on the use of transportation facilities to correct state-enforced racial school segregation.

(1) RACIAL BALANCES OR RACIAL QUOTAS

The constant theme and thrust of every holding from Brown I to date is that state-enforced separation of races in public schools is discrimination that violates the Equal Protection Clause. The remedy commanded was to dismantle dual school systems.

We are concerned in these cases with the elimination of the discrimination inherent in the dual school systems, not with myriad factors of human existence which can cause discrimination in a multitude of ways on racial, religious, or ethnic grounds. The target of the cases from Brown I to the present was the dual school system. The elimination of racial discrimination in public schools is a large task and one that should not be retarded by efforts to achieve broader purposes lying beyond the jurisdiction of school authorities. One vehicle can carry only a limited amount of baggage. It would not serve the important objective of Brown I to seek to use school desegregation cases for purposes beyond their scope, although desegregation of schools ultimately will have impact on other forms of discrimination. We do not reach in this case the question whether a showing that school segregation is a consequence of other types of state action, without any discriminatory action by the school authorities, is a constitutional violation requiring remedial action by a school desegregation decree. This case does not present that question and we therefore do not decide it.

Our objective in dealing with the issues presented by these cases is to see that school authorities exclude no pupil of a racial minority from any school, directly or indirectly, on account of race; it does not and cannot embrace all the problems of racial prejudice, even when those problems contribute to disproportionate racial concentrations in some schools.

In this case it is urged that the District Court has imposed a racial balance requirement of 71%-29% on individual schools. The fact that no such objective was actually achieved - and would appear to be impossible - tends to blunt that claim, yet in the opinion and order of the District Court of December 1, 1969, we find that court directing:

"that efforts should be made to reach a 71-29 ratio in the various schools so that there will be no basis for contending that one school is racially different from the others . . . , that no school [should] be operated with an all-black or predominantly black student body, [and] that pupils of all grades [should] be assigned in such a way that as nearly as practicable the various schools at various grade levels have about the same proportion of black and white students."

The District Judge went on to acknowledge that variation "from that norm may be unavoidable." This contains intimations that the "norm" is a fixed mathematical racial balance reflecting the pupil constituency of the system. If we were to read the holding of the District Court to require, as a matter of substantive constitutional right, any particular degree of racial balance or mixing, that approach would be disapproved and we would be obliged to reverse. The constitutional command to desegregate schools does not mean that every school in every community must always reflect the racial composition of the school system as a whole. . . .

We see therefore that the use made of mathematical ratios was no more than a starting point in the process of shaping a remedy, rather than an inflexible requirement. From that starting point the District Court proceeded to frame a decree that was within its discretionary powers, an equitable remedy for the particular circumstances. As we said in Green, a school authority's remedial plan or a district court's remedial decree is to be judged by its effectiveness. Awareness of the racial composition of the whole school system is likely to be a useful starting point in shaping a remedy to correct past constitutional violations. In sum, the very limited use made of

mathematical ratios was within the equitable remedial discretion of the District Court.

(2) ONE-RACE SCHOOLS

The record in this case reveals the familiar phenomenon that in metropolitan areas minority groups are often found concentrated in one part of the city. In some circumstances certain schools may remain all or largely of one race until new schools can be provided or neighborhood patterns change. Schools all or predominantly of one race in a district of mixed population will require close scrutiny to determine that school assignments are not part of state-enforced segregation.

In light of the above, it should be clear that the existence of some small number of one-race, or virtually one-race, schools within a district is not in and of itself the mark of a system which still practices segregation by law. The district judge or school authorities should make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation and will thus necessarily be concerned with the elimination of one-race schools. No per se rule can adequately embrace all the difficulties of reconciling the competing interests involved; but in a system with a history of segregation the need for remedial criteria of sufficient specificity to assure a school authority's compliance with its constitutional duty warrants a presumption against schools that are substantially disproportionate in their racial composition. Where the school authority's proposed plan for conversion from a dual to a unitary system contemplates the continued existence of some schools that are all or predominantly of one race, they have the burden of showing that such school assignments are genuinely non-discriminatory. The court should scrutinize such schools, and the burden upon the school authorities will be to satisfy the court that their racial composition is not the result of present or past discriminatory action on their part.

An optional majority-to-minority transfer provision has long been recognized as a useful part of every desegregation plan. Provision for optional transfer of those in the majority racial group of a particular school to other schools where they will be in the minority is an indispensable remedy for those students willing to transfer to other schools in order to lessen the impact on them of the state-imposed stigma of segregation. In order to be effective, such a transfer arrangement must grant the transferring student free transportation and space must be made available in the school to which he desires to move. . . .

(3) REMEDIAL ALTERING OF ATTENDANCE ZONES

The maps submitted in these cases graphically demonstrate that one of the principal tools employed by school planners and by courts to break up the dual school system has been a frank - and sometimes drastic - gerrymandering of school districts and attendance zones. An additional step was pairing, "clustering," or "grouping" of schools with attendance assignments made deliberately to accomplish the transfer of Negro students out of formerly segregated Negro schools and transfer of white students to formerly all-Negro schools. More often than not, these zones are neither compact nor contiguous; indeed they may be on opposite ends of the city. As an interim corrective measure, this cannot be said to be beyond the broad remedial powers of a court.

Absent a constitutional violation there would be no basis for judicially ordering assignment of students on a racial basis. All things being equal, with no history of discrimination, it might well be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes. But all things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation. The remedy for such segregation may be administratively awkward, inconvenient and even bizarre in some situations and may impose burdens on some; but all awkwardness and inconvenience cannot be avoided in the interim period when remedial adjustments are being made to eliminate the dual school systems.

No fixed or even substantially fixed guidelines can be established as to how far a court can go, but it must be recognized that there are limits. The objective is to dismantle the dual school system. "Racially neutral"

assignment plans proposed by school authorities to a district court may be inadequate; such plans may fail to counteract the continuing effects of past school segregation resulting from discriminatory location of school sites or distortion of school size in order to achieve or maintain an artificial racial separation. When school authorities present a district court with a "loaded game board," affirmative action in the form of remedial altering of attendance zones is proper to achieve truly nondiscriminatory assignments. In short, an assignment plan is not acceptable simply because it appears to be neutral.

In this area, we must of necessity rely to a large extent, as this Court has for more than sixteen years, on the informed judgment of the district courts in the first instance and on courts of appeals.

We hold that the pairing and grouping of non-contiguous school zones is a permissible tool and such action is to be considered in light of the objectives sought. Judicial steps in shaping such zones going beyond combinations of contiguous areas should be examined in light of what is said [above] concerning the objectives to be sought. Maps do not tell the whole story since non-contiguous school zones may be more accessible to each other in terms of the critical travel time, because of traffic patterns and good highways, than schools geographically closer together. Conditions in different localities will vary so widely that no rigid rules can be laid down to govern all situations.

(4) TRANSPORTATION OF STUDENTS

The scope of permissible transportation of students as an implement of a remedial decree has never been defined by this Court and by the very nature of the problem it cannot be defined with precision. No rigid guidelines as to student transportation can be given for application to the infinite variety of problems presented in thousands of situations. Bus transportation has been an integral part of the public education system for years, and was perhaps the single most important factor in the transition from the one-room schoolhouse to the consolidated school. Eighteen million of the nation's public school children, approximately 39%, were transported to their schools by bus in 1969-1970 in all parts of the country.

The importance of bus transportation as a normal and accepted tool of educational policy is readily discernible in this and the companion case. The Charlotte school authorities did not purport to assign students on the basis of geographically drawn zones until 1965 and then they allowed almost unlimited transfer privileges. The District Court's conclusion that assignment of children to the school nearest their home serving their grade would not produce an effective dismantling of the dual system is supported by the record.

Thus the remedial techniques used in the District Court's order were within that court's power to provide equitable relief; implementation of the decree is well within the capacity of the school authority.

The decree provided that the buses used to implement the plan would operate on direct routes. Students would be picked up at schools near their homes and transported to the schools they were to attend. The trips for elementary school pupils average about seven miles and the District Court found that they would take "not over thirty-five minutes at the most." This system compares favorably with the transportation plan previously operated in Charlotte under which each day 23,600 students on all grade levels were transported an average of fifteen miles one way for an average trip requiring over an hour. In these circumstances, we find no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation. Desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school.

An objection to transportation of students may have validity when the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk either the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process. District courts must weigh the soundness of any transportation plan in light of what is said . . . above. It hardly needs stating that the limits on time of travel will vary with many factors, but probably with none more than the age of the students. The reconciliation of competing values in a desegregation case is, of course, a difficult task with many sensitive

facets but fundamentally no more so than remedial measures courts of equity have traditionally employed.

The Court of Appeals, searching for a term to define the equitable remedial power of the district courts, used the term "reasonableness." In *Green*, supra, this Court used the term "feasible" and by implication, "workable," "effective," and "realistic" in the mandate to develop "a plan that promises realistically to work, and . . . to work now." On the facts of this case, we are unable to conclude that the order of the District Court is not reasonable, feasible and workable. However, in seeking to define the scope of remedial power or the limits on remedial power of courts in an area as sensitive as we deal with here, words are poor instruments to convey the sense of basic fairness inherent in equity. Substance, not semantics, must govern, and we have sought to suggest the nature of limitations without frustrating the appropriate scope of equity.

At some point, these school authorities and others like them should have achieved full compliance with this Court's decision in *Brown I*. The systems will then be "unitary" in the sense required by our decisions in *Green* and *Alexander*.

It does not follow that the communities served by such systems will remain demographically stable, for in a growing, mobile society, few will do so. Neither school authorities nor district courts are constitutionally required to make year-by-year adjustments of the racial composition of student bodies once the affirmative duty to desegregate has been accomplished and racial discrimination through official action is eliminated from the system. This does not mean that federal courts are without power to deal with future problems; but in the absence of a showing that either the school authorities or some other agency of the State has deliberately attempted to fix or alter demographic patterns to affect the racial composition of the schools, further intervention by a district court should not be necessary.

For the reasons herein set forth, the judgment of the Court of Appeals is affirmed as to those parts in which it affirmed the judgment of the District Court. The order of the District Court dated August 7, 1970, is also affirmed. It is so ordered.

Watergate Special Prosecution Force Memorandum (August 9, 1974)

During the night of June 17, 1972, five burglars broke into the offices of the Democratic National Committee at the Watergate office complex in Washington, D.C. A subsequent investigation into the break-in exposed a trail of abuses that led to the highest levels of the Nixon administration and ultimately to the President Nixon himself. Nixon ultimately resigned the presidency under threat of impeachment on August 9, 1974. The following memorandum was issued the same day.

WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTION FORCE

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Leon Jaworski, Special Prosecutor

DATE: August 9, 1974

FROM: Carl B Feldbaum, Peter M. Kreindler

SUBJECT: Factors to be Considered in Deciding Whether to Prosecute Richard M. Nixon for Obstruction of Justice

In our view there is clear evidence that Richard M. Nixon participated in a conspiracy to obstruct justice by concealing the identity of those responsible for the Watergate break-in and other criminal offenses. There is a presumption (which in the past we have operated upon) that Richard M. Nixon, like every citizen, is subject to the rule of law. Accordingly, one begins with the premise that if there is sufficient evidence, Mr. Nixon should be indicted and prosecuted. The question then becomes whether the presumption for proceeding is outweighed by the factors mandating against indictment and prosecution.

The factors which mandate against indictment and prosecution are:

1. His resignation has been sufficient punishment.
2. He has been subject to an impeachment inquiry with resulting articles of impeachment which the House Judiciary Committee unanimously endorsed as to Article I (the Watergate cover-up).
3. Prosecution might aggravate political divisions in the country.
4. As a political matter, the times call for conciliation rather than recrimination.
5. There would be considerable difficulty in achieving a fair trial because of massive pre-trial publicity.

The factors which mandate in favor of indictment and prosecution are:

1. The principle of equal justice under law requires that every person, no matter what his past position or office, answer to the criminal justice system for his past offenses. This is a particularly weighty factor if Mr. Nixon's aides and associates, who acted upon his orders and what they conceived to be his interests, are to be prosecuted for the same offenses.
2. The country will be further divided by Mr. Nixon unless there is a final disposition of charges of criminality outstanding against him so as to forestall the belief that he was driven from his office by erosion of his political base. This final disposition may be necessary to preserve the integrity of the criminal justice system and the legislative process, which together marshalled the substantial evidence of Mr. Nixon's guilt.
3. Article I, Section 3, clause 7 of the Constitution provides that a person removed from office by impeachment and conviction "shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment, and Punishment, according to Law." The Framers contemplated that a person removed from office because of abuse of his public trust still would have to answer to the criminal justice system for criminal offenses.
4. It cannot be sufficient retribution for criminal offenses merely to surrender the public office and trust which has been demonstrably abused. A person should not be permitted to trade in the abused office in return for immunity.
5. The modern nature of the Presidency necessitates massive public exposure of the President's actions through the media. A bar to prosecution on the grounds of such publicity effectively would immunize all future Presidents for their actions, however criminal. Moreover, the courts may be the appropriate forum to resolve questions of pre-trial publicity in the context of an adversary proceeding.

When Historians Disagree

Two Views of Phyllis Schlafly

Phyllis Schlafly and her Eagle Forum remains a voice in debates about women's rights and about education, religion, and foreign policy. Donald T. Critchlow's biography and Judith Warner's critical review of that book frame a debate reflecting different perspectives about her.

Donald T. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade*. Princeton:

Judith Warner's, "She Changed America," Review of *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade*. *New York Times*, January 29,

Princeton University Press, 2005, pp. 3-10.

How had a small movement, consisting of a few conservative intellectuals and grassroots anticommunist activists in the 1950s, become so powerful as to radically change American politics in ways arguably comparable to Jacksonian democracy in the 1830s or the Republican party in the 1860s? What transpired in the last half century to change America as a beacon of liberalism at the end of World War II to a voice of conservatism as the century drew to a close? Why did liberalism come to be seen by so many Americans as a failed experiment by the end of the twentieth century, even though it had fulfilled its promise to create the modern welfare state in the 1930s, had created a new international order after World War II, and had extended new rights and civil liberties to Americans in the 1960s?

This book offers insight into this transformative upheaval in American politics through the political career of Phyllis Schlafly [and] ... finds that the foundation of the Republican Right was laid in grassroots anticommunism that paralleled the development of an intellectual movement that sought to educate the general public, especially young people, about the principles of conservatism...

The final theme in this study is the importance of women in the emergence of the grassroots Right, and the unique sensibility that they brought to the movement. Of course, men played an important role as leaders and grassroots activists, but women were especially important in organizations such as the National Federation of Republican Women and the Daughters of the American Revolution, organizations in which Phyllis Schlafly held high office. The discovery of conservative, antifeminist women has attracted serious attention by scholars ... In understanding the motivation of the grassroots Right and the individuals involved, I came to the conclusion that sociological interpretation based on status anxiety, gender privilege, class interest, or misplaced maternalism was inadequate to explain the grassroots Right, especially the women of the Right.

Instead this study places the women of the Right within a deeply rooted ideological sensibility that combines a libertarian espousal of the virtues of small government and individual responsibility with a faith in traditional values and divine moral authority... By synchronizing religion and politics, this moral sensibility assumed that free government rested upon a moral or religious

2006.

THE equal rights amendment is simple and, it would seem, utterly innocuous: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

When it was approved by the House and Senate and sent to the states for ratification in March 1972, its success seemed assured. Thirty state legislatures ratified the amendment within a year. Presidents Nixon, Ford and Carter all lent their support. Yet in 1982 the E.R.A. died, just a few states short of ratification. By then, it had become linked in the public mind with military conscription for 18-year-old girls, coed bathrooms and homosexual rights. That public relations coup was largely the work of one clever, charming, ambitious, energetic and forever ladylike woman: Phyllis Schlafly. ...

Schlafly founded her (eventually) powerful Eagle Forum in 1975 as "the alternative to women's lib." She opposed the E.R.A. on the grounds that it would take away the "special protection" the "Christian tradition of chivalry" offered women - in other words, the "right" to be "supported and protected" by men. "Those women lawyers, women legislators, and women executives promoting E.R.A. have plenty of education and talent to get whatever they want in the business, political and academic world," is how one anti-E.R.A. letter distributed to Ohio state legislators put it. "We, the wives and working women, need you, dear Senators and Representatives, to protect us." .

There are no answers to be found in "Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism" because, despite having had access to Schlafly's personal papers and having benefited from occasional conversations with Schlafly about those papers, Critchlow has no particular feel for her as a woman. More generally, he lacks critical distance and scholarly skepticism.

He is particularly indulgent of Schlafly and her Christian conservative allies when they engage in quite un-Christian behavior. When, for example, Schlafly and other "moral conservatives" revolted at the 1960 Republican convention after supported a civil rights plank (proposed by Nelson Rockefeller) demanding "aggressive action" against segregation and discrimination, Critchlow is quick to defend them. ... They were against it only because "conservatives were going to oppose

citizenry whose principal civil responsibility was the protection of public virtue...

The mindset of the Right that spoke of the fundamental right to life of the fetus, biblical teachings about the proper family structure and sexual relations, the sin of homosexuality, and the need to restore prayer in the school was so removed from the modern sensibilities that it appeared nearly incognizable to many on the Left. They spoke a different language, understood the world differently, and brought different cultural values and social visions to the political arena.

whatever Rockefeller proposed."...

Because Critchlow essentially speaks the same language as Schlafly and her cohort, unquestioningly using terms like "moral" and "Christian" and "pro-family," it's difficult to grant his book the objective authority to which it aspires. Critchlow can't begin to answer the more profound questions Schlafly's life and work raise because, for him, her answer - that she's living in step with traditional Christian values - is sufficient. Such words appear to be as rich in meaning for him as they are for Schlafly and the grass-roots right she represents. But for secular readers - or for those who define words like "religion" and "morality" or even "values" differently - they amount to an intellectual void.

The Reagan Revolution, 1980-1989

Cecelia Rosa Avila, Third Generation Mexican American, 1988

Immigration from abroad increased enormously during the 1980s, especially from Asia, Latin America, and Central America. Newcomers fleeing extreme poverty and political instability tended to settle within already established immigrant communities. In California, Mexican Americans had long been an important political and cultural presence. Yet the ambiguities of identity remained. Cecelia Rosa Avila, seventeen-year-old daughter of a prominent Mexican American civil rights activist, expressed the sense of multiple identity common within immigrant communities of the 1980s. SOURCE: From Latinos by Earl Shorris. Copyright ©1992 by Earl Shorris. Reprinted by permission of W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Its sad. Its scary. I get scared when I go outside to get the mail. I used to go outside and everything, but it just got too crazy, too many gangs, too many innocent people getting killed. Even if you just like wore a tie or sunglasses, you could get killed for that. Wrong color. Some people say they got killed for just wearing the wrong color sunglasses. Its just terrible. Its not getting any better. I mean, if President Reagan cant do anything, what makes you think Bush is going to do something? This world is terrible.

When I was little there wasnt as much violence. I could go out and play and not worry about nobody bothering me, no kidnappings or anything. I was with people I trusted. I would go over so-and-sos house and nothing would happen, but now things are so crazy, you know sometimes people walk down the street and they never come back. I knew of a girl, she went down to her neighbors house, she never came back. She ended up dead the next day.

The Crips are blue and the Bloods are red. It used to be they just fought with fists, but now they fight with machine guns. And its not like one on one, its like ten on one, ten on ten. Its like group on group. They fight to kill. They don't fight to hurt, they fight to kill. They don't care. Its like they kill somebody tomorrow, they don't care. Its like they're used to it, so they just kill again.

Girls get involved in gangs very much, but I wouldnt. Its too crazy. And sometimes if somebodys going to jump you, they just like leave you there, they don't even jump in and help you, and they're supposed to be like your friends, backing you up in the gang, but they'll just like leave you.

I'm seventeen. Ill be eighteen in April [1989]. I used to know a lot of people and a lot of things, two years ago. Sometimes I hear things now. I know different things. I don't worry about it. I don't put myself in a position where Ill get hurt. I just go about my business. I don't do things in Compton. I go to my cousins house or something. I don't do nothing in Compton.

Ive been to Norwalk once. Thats farther from here. It was pretty nice and pretty quiet. I would like to move; Compton is just too crazy. Well probably move when I get married. Were...they're going to move to Idaho. Thats what they want to do. My dad wants to go really bad, but hes going to wait 'til like later.

I would like to live somewhere far from here, but not out of the state, not in the country. I don't like the country, its too quiet. Its different. You have to work really hard out there. Say youre a farmer, you have your crops and all that; you have to feed all your animals. You have to drink goats milk and thats gross. Its too quiet. You have to walk like twenty miles to get to the nearest gas station or something. But in the city, everybodys like for theirself. Theres so much hate and so much rush—rushing here, rushing there—so much hate, but the country goes really slow. I would like to live in the city, but between, like in a rural/urban in-between, not too country, not too city, but just right, not too packed, but not too far away from each other.

When I was in junior high all my friends were black, and I always felt they were superior and this and that, so I started hanging around with them. I dressed like one. I wasnt proud to be a Mexican, you know, like, *I'm a Mexican, oh no!* I used to think Mexicans weren't nothing, I used to thought blacks were superior, you know. I guess because they walked around in big groups and all this and that, you know. I was in Ralph Bunche Junior High. It was mostly black, 70 percent black. The other kids were Mexican and maybe two or three Samoans. I had some friends who were Mexican, but I didnt hang around with them, because I didnt think they were anything. I didnt think they were important. I thought they were nerds or ugh! Mexican. I was telling myself, “I want to be black. I want to be black.” So I used to hang around with black people when I thought I was black and all this.

I did little ridiculous things. I totally talked, you know, like slang, everything. I used to have a attitude. I used to like put my hair up high, like make it straight. You know, curl it. I used to buy all this like activator. I used to buy clothes for it and everything. I used to dress like it and everything. I wore like cords, tee shirts. Back then Pumas were in style, then Fila, then Booties and white socks and that. Id you know chew my gum and like that and try and pop it all the time. The blacks acted like what I did was normal. They accepted me as being me.

Then I started getting older and my mind was maturing and all that and I said, “Why am I trying to be something I'm not. I should just be myself.” Then by the tenth grade I started to realize different things. I should just be myself, Mexican.

Mexicans speak a different language, first of all, some do; second of all, different home styles, the way they're brought up, the way they cook—different cultures, two totally different cultures. The way they keep up their house, Mexicans have like a bunch of flowers or something in their front yard, sometimes they have dirt floors, like in Mexico. They have a lot of little kids. Black has kids, but not as much as Mexicans. Black, they have different ways, like in Africa they live like in huts or something. The food is different. We eat beans and rice and all that. That's not their everyday dish; they cook something else.

We all talk different. The blacks have like, “Child” and we have like “*O, mihija*” and “*hola*” and all this, you know. It's just different.

I wouldn't say Mexicans are more superior than the blacks. To me everybody's equal. Just because you're Mexican doesn't mean you have to get all into it, like being from a gang just to prove you're proud of your race. You can be proud of your race just to be proud. It feels good to know you're from somewhere.

I'm Mexican American. I'm Mexican, but I wasn't born in Mexico. I'm not Caucasian. All my relatives are Mexican, plus I have a Mexican last name and everything, so I'm Mexican American. Caucasian people are not from Mexico just like African people aren't from Mexico. It's just a difference, a whole difference.

I was bilingual when I was little. I used to speak Spanish and English, but unfortunately, it wasn't kept up. I could speak Spanish a little bit: *No se creas*, that means “I don't believe it.” *Yo tengo una lápiz*.

I've never been to Mexico. I would like to go really soon. All my relatives are there. I haven't seen nobody. I hardly know nobody. They live in Chihuahua, Mexico City, Guadalajara. Tijuana—I've been there. Tijuana was sad. I mean you think you don't have the richest house and you want more, but you should see what the people have. Sometimes they're like really poor. They sleep in boxes. Actually, it's really sad to see people living like that, but then there's a nice part. What really got me was the sad part, little kids coming up to cars begging for stuff and then they're selling little things they made. It's just really sad.

I go out with Mexicans. I used to like blacks. It doesn't matter to me, because I'm not prejudiced at all. I don't think anybody should be, because God created us all to be equal. But if a black comes up, that's fine with me as long as he treats me right and everything's right.

I don't try to be no cholo or anything because I don't have no feathers or big loops. Like Mexican girls wear really big loops so that they're chola, like in the girl gang, the Mexican gang. If I dressed that way, I would be rebelling. That's not the right way you're supposed to go. When you get into a gang, you're just asking for trouble. My hairs just me. I'm myself. My clothes I don't imitate nobody else; I'm myself.

I am sincere. I don't try to rule over people. I don't try to put people down. I care about people and what people think about me.

I work in a store in the Lakewood Mall. Its called Silvermans. I sell mens clothing, from leather to Cataricci pants, Carnegie sweaters, like really expensive stuff, really nice stuff. I like working, even though it is hard, but I enjoy it. I need to be responsible sometime, because I cant always be saying, "Daddy, I want this; Daddy, I want that." I gotta go out there and do for myself.

Respecting the judgment of our fellow citizens as we seek their mandate for reform, we hereby pledge our names to this Contract with America.

Document Analysis

1. How does Avila deal with the gang warfare around her? How does she negotiate the complex issue of racial identity in Los Angeles?
2. What does it mean for Avila to be a Mexican American? In what sense is she simply an American?

Jesse Jackson, Address Before the Democratic National Convention, July 18, 1984

Late in the evening of July 17, 1984, Jesse Jackson spoke to the delegates at Democratic National Convention in San Francisco. In hopes of healing old wounds created from his own presidential candidacy, Jackson threw his support behind Walter Mondale. For the better part of an hour, Rev. Jackson converted the convention hall into a great tent revival. Jackson's emotional oration, reminiscent of an old-time gospel preacher, galvanized his audience in the name of party unity.

Throughout the speech, the television audience kept increasing—reaching 33 million viewers by the end. Many compared the speech to one of the greatest ever delivered at a nominating convention. "If you are a human being and weren't affected by what you just heard, you may be beyond redemption," declared Florida Governor Bob Graham.

SOURCE: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/jesse/speeches/jesse84speech.html>

Tonight we come together bound by our faith in a mighty God, with genuine respect and love for our country, and inheriting the legacy of a great party, the Democratic Party, which is the best hope for redirecting our nation on a more humane, just and peaceful course.

This is not a perfect party. We are not a perfect people. Yet, we are called to a perfect mission: our mission to feed the hungry; to clothe the naked; to house the homeless; to teach the illiterate; to provide jobs for the jobless; and to choose the human race over the nuclear race. (Applause)

We are gathered here this week to nominate a candidate and adopt a platform which will expand, unify, direct and inspire our Party and the Nation to fulfill this mission.

My constituency is the desperate, the damned, the disinherited, the disrespected, and the despised. They are restless and seek relief. They've voted in record numbers. They have invested faith, hope and trust that they have in us. The Democratic Party must send them a signal that we care. I pledge my best to not let them down.

There is the call of conscience, redemption, expansion, healing and unity. Leadership must heed the call of conscience, redemption, expansion, healing and unity, for they are the key to achieving our mission. Time is neutral and does not change things. With courage and initiative, leaders can change things.

No generation can choose the age or circumstance in which it is born, but through leadership it can choose to make the age in which it is born, an age of enlightenment, an age of jobs and peace and justice. (Applause)

Only leadership — that intangible combination of gifts, the discipline, information, circumstance, courage, timing, will and divine inspiration — can lead us out of the crisis in which we find ourselves. The leadership can mitigate the misery of our nation. Leadership can part the waters and lead our nation in the direction of the Promised Land. Leadership can lift the boats stuck at the bottom.

I've had the rare opportunity to watch seven men, and then two, pour out their souls, offer their service and heal — and heed the call of duty to direct the course of our Nation. There is a proper season for everything. There is a time to sow, a time to reap. There is a time to compete, and a time to cooperate.

I ask for your vote on the first ballot as a vote for a new direction for this Party and this Nation. (Applause) A vote of conviction, a vote of conscience. (Applause)

But I will be proud to support the nominee of this convention for the Presidency of the United States of America. (Applause) Thank you.

I have watched the leadership of our party develop and grow. My respect for both Mr. Mondale and Mr. Hart is great. I have watched them struggle with the crosswinds and crossfires of being public servants, and I believe they will both continue to try to serve us faithfully.

I am elated by the knowledge that for the first time in our history a woman, Geraldine Ferraro, will be recommended to share our ticket. (Applause)

Throughout this campaign, I've tried to offer leadership to the Democratic Party and the Nation. If in my high moments, I have done some good, offered some service, shed some light, healed some wounds, rekindled some hope, or stirred someone from apathy and indifference, or in any way along the way helped somebody, then this campaign has not been in vain. (Applause)

For friends who loved and cared for me, and for a God who spared me, and for a family who understood, I am eternally grateful.

If, in my low moments, in word, deed or attitude, through some error of temper, taste or tone, I have caused anyone discomfort, created pain or revived someone's fears, that was not my truest self. If there were occasions when my grape turned into a raisin and my joy bell lost its resonance, please forgive me. Charge it to my head and not to my heart. My head — so limited in its finitude; my heart, which is boundless in its love for the human family. I am not a perfect servant. I am a public servant doing my best against the odds. As I develop and serve, be patient. God is not finished with me yet.

This campaign has taught me much; that leaders must be tough enough to fight, tender enough to cry, human enough to make mistakes, humble enough to admit them, strong enough to absorb the pain and resilient enough to bounce back and keep on moving. (Applause)

For leaders, the pain is often intense. But you must smile through your tears and keep moving with the faith that there is a brighter side somewhere.

I went to see Hubert Humphrey three days before he died. He had just called Richard Nixon from his dying bed, and many people wondered why. I asked him. He said, “Jesse, from this vantage point, with the sun setting in my life, all of the speeches, the political conventions, the crowds and the great fights are behind me now. At a time like this you are forced to deal with your irreducible essence, forced to grapple with that which is really important to you. And what I have concluded about life,” Huber Humphrey said, “When all is said and done, we must forgive each other, and redeem each other, and move on.”

Our party is emerging from one of its most hard fought battles for the Democratic Party’s presidential nomination in our history. But our healthy competition should make us better, not bitter. (Applause)

We must use the insight, wisdom, and experience of the late Hubert Humphrey as a balm for the wounds in our Party, this Nation and the world. We must forgive each other, redeem each other, regroup and move one.

Our flag is red, white and blue, but our nation is a rainbow — red, yellow, brown, black and white — and we’re all precious in God’s sight.

America is not like a blanket — one piece of unbroken cloth, the same color, the same texture, the same size. America is more like a quilt — many patches, many pieces, many colors, many sizes, all woven and held together by a common thread. The white, the Hispanic, the black, the Arab, the Jew, the woman, the native American, the small farmer, the businessperson, the environmentalist, the peace activist, the young, the old, the lesbian, the gay and the disabled make up the American quilt. (Applause)

Even in our fractured state, all of us count and all of us fit somewhere. We have proven that we can survive without each other. But we have not proven that we can win and progress without each other. We must come together. (Applause)

From Fannie Lou Hamer in Atlantic City in 1964 to the Rainbow Coalition in San Francisco today; from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we have experienced pain but progress as we ended American apartheid laws, we got public accommodation, we secured voting rights, we obtained open housing, as young people got the right to vote. We lost Malcolm, Martin, Medgar, Bobby, John and Viola. The team that got us here must be expanded, not abandoned. (Applause)

Twenty years ago, tears welled up in our eyes as the bodies of Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney were dredged from the depths of a river in Mississippi. Twenty years later, our communities, black and Jewish, are in anguish, anger and pain. Feelings have been hurt on both sides.

There is a crisis in communications. Confusion is in the air. But we cannot afford to lose our way. We may agree to agree; or agree to disagree on issues; we must bring back civility to these tensions.

We are co-partners in a long and rich religious history — the Judeo-Christian traditions. Many blacks and Jews have a shared passion for social justice at home and peace abroad. We must seek a revival of the spirit, inspired by a new vision and new possibilities. We must return to higher ground. (Applause)

We are bound by Moses and Jesus, but also connected with Islam and Mohammed. These three great religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, were all born in the revered and holy city of Jerusalem.

We are bound by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Rabbi Abraham Heschel, crying out from their graves for us to reach common ground. We are bound by shared blood and shared sacrifices. We are much too intelligent; much too bound by our Judeo-Christian heritage; much too victimized by racism, sexism, militarism and anti-

Semitism; much too threatened as historical scapegoats to go on divided one from another. We must turn from finger pointing to clasped hands. We must share our burdens and our joys with each other once again. We must turn to each other and not on each other and choose higher ground. (Applause)

Twenty years later, we cannot be satisfied by just restoring the old coalition. Old wine skins must make room for new wine. We must heal and expand. The Rainbow Coalition is making room for Arab Americans. They, too, know the pain and hurt of racial and religious rejection. They must not continue to be made pariahs. The Rainbow Coalition is making room for Hispanic Americans who this very night are living under the threat of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill. (Applause) And farm workers from Ohio who are fighting the Campbell Soup Company with a boycott to achieve legitimate workers' rights. (Applause)

The Rainbow is making room for the Native American, the most exploited people of all, a people with the greatest moral claim amongst us. We support them as they seek the restoration of their ancient land and claim amongst us. We support them as they seek the restoration of land and water rights, as they seek to preserve their ancestral homelands and the beauty of a land that was once all theirs. They can never receive a fair share for all they have given us. They must finally have a fair chance to develop their great resources and to preserve their people and their culture.

The Rainbow Coalition includes Asian Americans, now being killed in our streets, scapegoats for the failures of corporate, industrial and economic policies.

The Rainbow is making room for the young Americans. Twenty years ago, our young people were dying in a war for which they could not even vote. Twenty years later, young America has the power to stop a war in Central America and the responsibility to vote in great numbers. (Applause) Young America must be politically active in 1984. The choice is war or peace. We must make room for young America.

The Rainbow includes disabled veterans. The color scheme fits in the Rainbow. The disabled have their handicap revealed and their genius concealed; while the able-bodied have their genius revealed and their disability concealed. But ultimately, we must judge people by their values and their contribution. Don't leave anybody out. I would rather have Roosevelt in a wheelchair than Reagan on a horse. (Applause)

The Rainbow includes for small farmers. They have suffered tremendously under the Reagan regime. They will either receive 90 percent parity or 100 percent charity. We must address their concerns and make room for them.

The Rainbow includes lesbians and gays. No American citizen ought to be denied equal protection from the law.

We must be unusually committed and caring as we expand our family to include new members. All of us must be tolerant and understanding as the fears and anxieties of the rejected and of the party leadership express themselves in so many different ways. Too often what we call hate — as if it were some deeply rooted in philosophy or strategy — it is simply ignorance, anxiety, paranoia, fear and insecurity. (Applause)

To be strong leaders, we must be long-suffering as we seek to right the wrongs of our Party and our Nation. We must expand our Party, heal our Party and unify our Party. That is our mission in 1984. (Applause)

We are often reminded that we live in a great nation — and we do. But it can be greater still. The Rainbow is mandating a new definition of greatness. We must not measure greatness from the mansion down, but from the manger up.

Jesus said that we should not be judged by the bark we wear but by the fruit that we bear. Jesus said that we must measure greatness by how we treat the least of these.

President Reagan says the nation is in recovery. Those 90,000 corporations that made a profit last year but paid no Federal taxes are recovering. The 37,000 military contractors who have benefited from Reagan's more than doubling of the military budget in peacetime surely they are recovering.

The big corporations and rich individuals who received the bulk of a three-year, multibillion tax cut from Mr. Reagan are recovering. But no such recovery is under way for the least of these. Rising tides don't lift all boats, particularly those stuck at the bottom.

For the boats stuck at the bottom there's a misery index. This Administration has made life more miserable for the poor. Its attitude has been contemptuous. Its policies and programs have been cruel and unfair to working people. They must be held accountable in November for increasing infant mortality among the poor. In Detroit (Applause) — in Detroit, one of the great cities in the western world, babies are dying at the same rate as Honduras, the most underdeveloped Nation in our hemisphere. This Administration must be held accountable for policies that have contributed to the growing poverty in America. There are now 34 million people in poverty, 15 percent of our Nation. Twenty-three million are White, 11 million Black, Hispanic, Asian and others. By the end of this year, there will be 41 million people in poverty. We cannot stand idly by. We must fight for change now. (Applause)

Under this regime, we look at Social Security. The 1981 budget cuts included nine permanent Social Security benefit cuts totaling \$20 billion over five years.

Small businesses have suffered on the Reagan tax cuts. Only 18 percent of total business tax cuts went to them, 82 percent to big businesses.

Health care under Mr. Reagan has already been sharply cut. Education under Mr. Reagan has been cut 25 percent. Under Mr. Reagan there are now 9.7 million female head families. They represent 16 percent of all families. Half of all of them are poor. Seventy percent of all poor children live in a house headed by a woman, where there is no man.

Under Mr. Reagan, the Administration has cleaned up only six of 546 priority toxic waste dumps. Farmers' real net income was only about half its level in 1979. Many say that the race in November will be decided in the South. President Reagan is depending on the conser-

vative South to return him to office. But the South, I tell you, is unnaturally conservative. The South is the poorest region in our nation and, therefore, the least to conserve. In his appeal to the South, Mr. Reagan is trying to substitute flags and prayer cloths for food, and clothing, and education, health care and housing. (Applause)

Mr. Reagan will ask us to pray, and I believe in prayer. I have come to this way by power of prayer. But then, we must watch false prophecy. He cuts energy assistance to the poor, cuts breakfast programs from children, cuts lunch programs from children, cuts job training from children, and then says to an empty table, "Let us pray." (Applause) Apparently he is not familiar with the structure of prayer. You thank the Lord for the food that you are about to receive, not the food that just left. (Laughter and applause) I think that we should pray, but don't pray for the food that left. Pray for the man that took the food — to leave.

We need a change. We need a change in November. (Applause)

Under Mr. Reagan, the misery index has risen for the poor. The danger index has risen for everybody. Under this administration, we have lost the lives of our boys in Central America and Honduras, in Grenada, in Lebanon, in a nuclear standoff in Europe. Under this Administration, one-third of our children believe they will die in a nuclear war. The danger index is increasing in this world.

All the talk about the defense against Russia; the Russian submarines are closer, and their missiles more accurate. We live in a world tonight more miserable and a world more dangerous. While Reaganomics and Reaganism is talked about often, so often we miss the real meaning. Reaganism is a spirit, and Reaganomics represents the real economic facts of life.

In 1980, Mr. George Bush, a man with reasonable access to Mr. Reagan, did an analysis of Mr. Reagan's economic plan. Mr. George Bush concluded that Reagan's plan was "voodoo economics." He was right. (Applause)

Thirdparty candidate John Anderson said "a combination of military spending, tax cuts and a balanced budget by 1984 would be accomplished with blue smoke and mirrors." They were both right.

Mr. Reagan talks about a dynamic recovery. There's some measure of recovery. Three and a half years later, unemployment has inched just below where it was when he took office in 1981. There are still 8.1 million people officially unemployed, 11 million working only part-time. Inflation has come down, but let's analyze for a moment who has paid the price for this superficial economic recovery.

Mr. Reagan curbed inflation by cutting consumer demand. He cut consumer demand with conscious and callous fiscal and monetary policies. He used the Federal budget to deliberately induce unemployment and curb social spending. He then weighed and supported tight monetary policies of the Federal Reserve Board to deliberately drive up interest rates, again to curb consumer demand created through borrowing. Unemployment reached 10.7 percent. We experienced skyrocketing interest rates. Our dollar inflated abroad. There were record bank failures; record farm foreclosures; record business bankruptcies; record budget deficits; record trade deficits.

Mr. Reagan brought inflation down by destabilizing our economy and disrupting family life. He promised — he promised in 1980 a balanced budget. But instead we now have a record toward a billion dollar budget deficit. Under Mr. Reagan, the cumulative budget deficit for his four years is more than the sum total of deficits from George Washington through Jimmy Carter combined.

I tell you, we need a change. (Applause)

How is he paying for these short-term jobs? Reagan's economic recovery is being financed by deficit spending — \$200 billion a year. Military spending, a major cause of this deficit, is projected, over the next five years, to be nearly \$2 trillion, and will cost about \$40,000 for every taxpaying family.

When the Government borrows \$200 billion annually to finance the deficit, this encourages the private sector to make its money off of interest rates as opposed to development and economic growth.

Even money abroad, we don't have enough money domestically to finance the debt, so we are now borrowing money abroad, from foreign banks, governments and financial institutions: \$40 billion in 1983; \$70-80 billion in 1984 (40 percent of our total); and over \$100 billion (50 percent of our total) in 1985. By 1989, it is projected that 50 percent of all individual income taxes will be going just to pay for interest on the debt.

The United States used to be the largest exporter of capital, but under Mr. Reagan we will quite likely become the largest debtor nation.

About two weeks ago, on July 4th, we celebrated our Declaration of Independence, yet every day supply-side economics is making our Nation more economically dependent and less economically free. Five to six percent of our Gross National Product is now being eaten up with President Reagan's budget deficits. To depend on foreign military powers to protect our national security would be foolish, making us dependent and less secure, yet Reaganomics has us increasingly dependent on foreign economic sources.

This consumer-led but deficit-financed recovery is unbalanced and artificial. We have a challenge as Democrats to point a way out. Democracy guarantees opportunity, not success. Democracy guarantees the right to participate, not a license for either a majority to dominate. The victory for the Rainbow Coalition in the Platform debates today was not whether we won or lost, but that we raised the right issues.

We could afford to lose the vote; issues are non-negotiable. We could not afford to avoid raising the right questions. Our self-respect and our moral integrity were at stake. Our heads are perhaps bloody, but not bowed. Our back is straight. We can go home and face our people. Our vision is clear. (Applause)

When we think, on this journey from slavery to championship, that we have gone from the planks of the Boardwalk in Atlantic City in 1964 to fighting to help write the planks in the platform in San Francisco in 1984 there is a deep and abiding sense of joy in our souls in spite of the tears in our eyes. Though there are missing planks, there is a solid foundation upon which to build. Our party can win, but we must provide hope, which will inspire people to struggle and achieve; provide a plan that shows a way out of our dilemma and then lead the way.

In 1984, my heart is made to feel glad because I know there is a way out — justice. The requirement for rebuilding America is justice. The linchpin of progressive politics in our nation will not come from the North, they in fact will come from the South.

That is why I argue over and over again. We look from Virginia around to Texas, there's only one black Congressperson out of 115. Nineteen years later, we're locked out the Congress, the Senate and the Governor's mansion.

What does this large black vote mean? Why do I fight to win second primaries and fight gerrymandering and annexation and at-large elections? Why do we fight over that? Because I tell you, you cannot hold someone in the ditch unless you linger there with them. (Applause) Unless you linger there. (Applause)

If you want a change in this nation, you enforce that voting rights act. We'll get 12 to 20 Black, Hispanics, female and progressive congresspersons from the South. We can save the cotton, but we have got to fight the boll weevils. We have got to make a judgment. We have got to make a judgment.

It is not enough to hope that ERA will pass. How can we pass ERA? If Blacks vote in great numbers, progressive Whites win. It is the only way progressive Whites win. If Blacks vote in great numbers, Hispanics win. When Blacks, Hispanics and progressive Whites vote, women win. When women win, children win. When women and children win, workers win. We must all come together. We must come together. (Spontaneous demonstration) Thank you.

I tell you, in all our joy and excitement, we must not save the world and lose our souls. We should never shortcircuit enforcing the Voting Rights Act at every level. When one of us rises, all of us will rise. Justice is the way out. Peace is the way out. We should not act as if nuclear weaponry is negotiable and debatable.

In this world in which we live, we dropped the bomb on Japan and felt guilty, but in 1984 other folks have also got bombs. This time, if we drop the bomb, six minutes later we, too, will be destroyed. It is not about dropping the bomb on somebody. It is about dropping the bomb on everybody. We must choose to develop minds over guided missiles, and then think it out and not fight it out. It is time for a change. (Applause)

Our foreign policy must be characterized by mutual respect, not by gunboat diplomacy, big stick diplomacy and threats. Our Nation at its best feeds the hungry. Our Nation at its worst, at its worst, will mine the harbors of Nicaragua; at its worst will try to overthrow their government, at its worst will cut aid to American education and increase the aid to El Salvador; at its worst, our Nation will have partnership with South Africa. That is a moral disgrace. It is a moral disgrace. It is a moral disgrace. (Applause)

We look at Africa. We cannot just focus on Apartheid in Southern Africa. We must fight for trade with Africa, and not just aid to Africa. We cannot stand idly by and say we will not relate to Nicaragua unless they have elections there, and then embrace military regimes in Africa overthrowing democratic governments in Nigeria and Liberia and Ghana. We must fight for democracy all around the world, and play the game by one set of rules.

Peace in this world. Our present formula for peace in the Middle East is inadequate. It will not work. There are 22 nations in the Middle East. Our nation must be able to talk and act and influence all of them. We must build upon Camp David, and measure human rights by one yard stick. In that region we have too many interests and too few friends.

There is one way out, jobs. Put America back to work.

When I was a child growing up in Greenville, South Carolina, the Reverend Sample used to preach ever so often a sermon relating to Jesus and he said, "If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." I didn't quite understand what he meant as a child growing up, but I understand a little better now. If you raise up truth, it is magnetic. It has a way of drawing people.

With all this confusion in this Convention, the bright lights and parties and big fun, we must raise up the single proposition: If we lift up a program to feed the hungry, they will come running; if we lift up a program to start a war no more, our youth will come running; if we lift up a program to put America back to work, and an alternative to welfare and despair, they will come running.

If we cut that military budget without cutting our defense, and use that money to rebuild bridges and put steel workers back to work, and use that money and provide jobs for our cities, and use that money to build schools and pay teachers and educate our children, and build hospitals, and train doctors and train nurses, the whole nation will come running to us. (Applause)

As I leave you now, we vote in this convention and get ready to go back across this nation in a couple of days, in this campaign I tried to be faithful to my promise. I lived in old barrios, ghettos and in reservations and housing projects.

I have a message for our youth. I challenge them to put hope in their brains and not dope in their veins. (Applause) I told them that like Jesus, I, too, was born in the slum, and just because you're born in a slum does not mean the slum is born in you and you can rise above it if your mind is made up. (Applause) I told them in every slum there are two sides. When I see a broken window that's the slummy side. Train some youth to become a glazier; that is the sunny side. When I see a missing brick, that is the slummy side. Let that child in a union and become a brick mason and build; that is the sunny side. When I see a missing door, that is the slummy side. Train some youth to become a carpenter, that is the sunny side. When I see the vulgar words and hieroglyphics of destitution on the walls, that is the slummy side. Train some youth to be a painter and artist, that is the sunny side.

We leave this place looking for the sunny side because there's a brighter side somewhere. I am more convinced than ever that we can win. We will vault up the rough side of the mountain. We can win. I just want young America to do me one favor, just one favor.

Exercise the right to dream. You must face reality, that which is. But then dream of a reality that ought to be, that must be. Live beyond the pain of reality with the dream of a bright tomorrow. Use hope and imagination as weapons of survival and progress. Use love to motivate you and obligate you to serve the human family.

Young America, dream. Choose the human race over the nuclear race. Bury the weapons and don't burn the people. Dream — dream of a new value system. Teachers who teach for life and not just for a living; teach

because they can't help it. Dream of lawyers more concerned about justice than a judgeship. Dream of doctors more concerned about public health than personal wealth. (Applause) Dream of preachers and priests who will prophesy and not just profiteer. Preach and dream! Our time has come. Our time has come.

Suffering breeds character. Character breeds faith, and in the end faith will not disappoint. Our time has come. Our faith, hope and dreams have prevailed. Our time has come. Weeping has endured for nights but that joy cometh in the morning.

Our time has come. No grave can hold our body down. Our time has come. No lie can live forever. Our time has come. We must leave the racial battle ground and come to the economic common ground and moral higher ground. America, our time has come.

We come from disgrace to amazing grace. Our time has come. Give me your tired, give me your poor, your huddled masses who yearn to breathe free and come November, there will be a change because our time has come.

Thank you and God bless you.

Document Analysis

1. For whom does Jesse Jackson speak?
2. How important is leadership? And what does Jackson believe it can do?
3. What does he see as the key to success? What does he wish for young Americans to do? And for teachers?
4. **Patricia Morrisroe, "Yuppies - The New Class" (1985).**

Patricia Morrisroe is an author who is best known for her biography of controversial artist Robert Mapplethorpe and her articles for New York Magazine. In this 1985 selection, Morrisroe describes the movement of young urban professionals, or "yuppies," into New York's Upper West Side neighborhoods. Yuppies as a group are typically identified with the consumerist excesses of the 1980s, and they are generally derided as shallow people interested only in money and status symbols.

It's a Saturday night at 96th and Broadway. Inside the new Caramba!!! everybody's drinking frozen margaritas and talking real estate, while outside on the traffic strip, a derelict swigs Wild Turkey and shouts obscenities. By 11 P.M., he's sound asleep on the bench, but the crowd at Caramba!!! is still going strong.

"These are the most lethal margaritas in Manhattan," says a man in a blue pinstriped suit by Polo. He staggers out of the restaurant and into David's Cookies next door. "Get the double-chunk chocolate chip," says his girlfriend, who is window-shopping at Pildes Optical. At the newsstand across the street, a middle-aged woman buys the Sunday *Times* and looks at the dozens of young professionals spilling out of Caramba!!! "Yuppies," she shouts. "Go home!"

But they are home. Ads in the *Times* tout the Upper West Side as "Yuppie Country," and Amsterdam is being called "Cinderella Avenue." According to a study of the years 1970 through 1980 by New York's Department of City Planning, 7,500 people between the ages of 25 and 44 flooded the area between West 70th and 86th Streets. That age-group now makes up 47 percent of the population there. At the same time, the number of singles went up by 31 percent, while the number of families dropped 24 percent. "You want to know who's moving into the West Side?" says a woman who owns an antiques store on Amsterdam Avenue. "It's the young, the rich, and the restless."

Some older West Siders blame the newcomers for the skyrocketing rents and the uprooting of local merchants. They deplore the cuteness of Columbus Avenue and the hordes of tourists who congest the sidewalks. They worry that the neighborhood's solid middle class values will be replaced by the yuppie version of the West Side Dream: a pre-war apartment with a Food Emporium around the corner.

They can't relate to the 30-year-old on Central Park West who takes her husband's shirts to the East Side because she can't find a "quality" laundry in the neighborhood. Or to the tenants at the Sofia on West 61st Street, 50 percent of whom bought their apartments after seeing a model of the bathroom. ("They're big and very Deco," says Richard Zinn, the building's director of sales.)

The Columbia, a condominium on West 96th Street, has been called the "Yuppie Housing Project" by locals who can't believe anyone would pay to live on Broadway. "Didn't anyone tell these people it's a commercial street?" says an elderly man who is buying Rice Krispies at the Red Apple on the corner. "If I had the money for a condo, I'd move to Florida."

One third of the Columbia's units were bought by lawyers; the average income per apartment is \$100,000. "It's a nice first home for couples on their way up," says developer Arthur Zeckendorf, who worked with his father, William, to build the Columbia. Once they've made it, they can move to the Park Belvedere, a condominium on West 79th Street also built by the Zeckendorfs. Sold for an average of \$400 per square foot, it has attracted a better-off buyer. "I looked at the Columbia," says a 27-year-old Wall Street bond trader, "but the neighborhood was just too borderline for me." So he bought an apartment in one of the Belvedere's towers and persuaded a friend to buy one, too. "It's a great deal," he says of his \$400,000 one-bedroom.

Many West Side co-ops are besieged by Wall Street financiers who use their bonuses to make down payments. "The last five apartments in my building went to investment bankers," says a woman who owns a co-op on West End Avenue. "I want to protect my property, so it's good to have people with money move in. But I worry about the population in the next ten years. Are you going to need an MBA to get into Zabar's?" . . .

Yet for all the money being poured into the neighborhood, some of the new West Siders have a decidedly old-fashioned point of view. For every yuppie who dreams about moving from Broadway to Central Park West there are others who chose the West Side because it seemed unpretentious. "I always hated everything the East Side represented," says 33-year-old Joe Powers in between feeding mashed carrots to his five-month-old son, Mark. "The West Side always seemed to have less airs about it. To me, it's Zabar's and Fairway. Not Røelles and Pasta & Cheese." . . .

Ten blocks uptown, 31-year-old Richard Conway is setting up his VCR to tape Jacqueline Bisset in Anna Karenina. A vice-president at a Wall Street investment firm, Conway recently bought a twelfth-floor five-room co-op at 106th Street and Riverside Drive. In the past fifteen years, Conway has moved from Greenwich to Harvard to Third Avenue to Yale to Chelsea, and now to Duke Ellington Boulevard.

"This is not a yuppie neighborhood," says Conway, uncorking a bottle of white wine. "That's what I like about it. In my building, we have a wonderful mix of people. The head of the co-op board is a musical director, and we've got artists and writers and movie producers."

When Conway decided to buy a co-op, he wanted to look only north of West 96th Street. "I think a lot of the glamour is gone from the East Side," he says. "Besides, I considered it boring and staid, too much like Greenwich. I like living in a neighborhood that's ethnically diverse. Broadway has a lot of bodegas and mom-and-pop stores. To me, that's nice."

From his living room, Conway has a spectacular view of the Hudson. From the opposite end of the apartment, in the dining room, he can see a cityscape of charming turn-of-the-century brownstones. "I wonder how long they'll last," he says. "It's ironic, but everything I like about the neighborhood will probably disappear. And unfortunately, the reason is that people like me are moving into it." . . .

[Lawyer Jay] Zamansky, who grew up in Philadelphia, now makes his home in a renovated SRO next door to the Salvation Army senior citizen's home on West 95th Street. "I really wanted a place where I could establish roots," he says. Constructed around the turn of the century, the building has 30 apartments, most of which are inhabited by young professionals. "We're a real unique building," he explains. "In the summer, we have barbecues, and when our first co-op baby was born, everybody was thrilled."

Zamansky bought this apartment, a duplex with a roof garden, for a little over \$100,000. "I'm real proud of it," he says. "It's the consummate bachelor pad." The ceiling is painted black, with lots of track lighting. "I met an interior designer at the Vertical Club," he explains, "and she helped me with the overall concept."

But Zamansky says he doesn't want to be the kind of person who does nothing but "work, eat at restaurants, and go to a health club. I really want to be a part of this neighborhood," he says. "I attend community-board meetings, and I registered voters in front of Zabar's. I even went into the Salvation Army's old people's home and registered senior citizens. They were just so glad to see a young face that I don't think they cared how they voted. By the way, I'm a Republican. I think it's important to put that in the article."

"I'm also very pro-development," he adds. "It makes me angry when people criticize a lot of the changes. The displacement is unfortunate, but where are we supposed to live? We have rights. We pay taxes. Whether people realize it or not, we're real assets to this community."

Twenty-nine-year-old Paula Handler, who lives with her husband in a three-bedroom apartment in the Eldorado on Central Park West between 90th and 91st Streets agrees. "These big pre-war buildings need young blood," she says. "The old people can't maintain their apartments. They resist everything, from redoing the lobby to putting in new windows. The problem is they can't switch their rental mentalities into a co-op mode."

The Handlers moved from the East Side to the Eldorado a year ago. "Frankly, I didn't know anything about Central Park West," says Paula. "I mean, I knew the Dakota, but the Eldorado? What? All I knew was that I wanted space, and I wanted old. Old is chic."

"Originally, I said no to the West Side," says Scott, a quiet man who is involved in commercial real estate. "That's right, he did," Paula says. "He didn't like it because it was dirty and nobody we knew lived there. But I fell in love with this apartment. It was a total wreck, but it was me. We gave them an offer the minute we saw it. We even offered more than they asked because we wanted it so much."

The Handlers put in two new bathrooms and a new kitchen, and redid the plumbing and wiring. Today, the apartment, which faces the park, is completely renovated. "See what I mean about new blood?" Paula says. "It doesn't take money. It just takes creativity."

Six floors above the Handlers, Linda and Mark Reiner also had to redo their apartment completely. "It was considered the worst disaster in the building," Linda says. "The walls, which were painted magenta, royal blue, and orange, were falling down. But we really wanted to live here. We recognized how the West Side was growing, and we wanted to be a part of that."

Two years ago, they moved from a house in Hewlett Harbor, where Mark Reiner had a medical practice. "It was a risk giving up everything," he says, "but Hewlett Harbor was very sterile and uniform." "That's why we didn't want the East Side," adds Linda, who until recently was a practicing psychologist. "Now I sell real estate," she says. "I became addicted to it while we were looking for this apartment." The au pair brings their two-year-old son into the living room to say good night. "You wouldn't believe the children's playground in the park," Linda says. "You can barely get a place for your kid in the sandbox."

"Everybody wants to come here," says Mark. "There's nothing more exciting than living in a neighborhood in transition. It's sad, because a lot of people who live here can't afford to shop in the stores. But they're being pushed out of Manhattan, not just the West Side."

"The West Side makes you feel the difference between the haves and the have-nots," says Linda, who is dressed in a silk Chanel shirt, black pants, and pumps. "Right in our building, there's a real schism between the pre-conversion and post-conversion people. A new breed is taking over, and there's a lot of hostility. People are separated by age and economic class. The senior citizens got insider prices so low that there's a lot of resentment on all sides. At a recent meeting, one elderly person shouted, 'Well, I'm not rich like you.' But what can you do?"

"Basically, we're very optimistic," Mark says. "We feel good about the changes. The neighborhood is going to continue to improve." Linda nods. "Definitely," she says. "For the West Side, there's no turning back."

Paul Craig Roberts, *The Supply-Side Revolution* (1984)

*Economist Paul Craig Roberts was instrumental in developing many of the economic policies of the Reagan administration. From 1981 to 1982, he was assistant secretary of the Treasury for economic policy, and he a major role in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. Journalist, author, and scholar at many of the nation's top think-tanks and universities, Roberts published his book *The Supply-Side Revolution* in 1984. In the selection below, he discusses the debate over Keynesian economic theory and the effects of deficit spending.*

Prior to February 23, 1977, Republican economic policy focused on balancing the budget by raising taxes and cutting spending, an approach that denied the party a credible economic and political program. The Republicans were not always successful themselves at reducing spending, but if the government was going to spend, they at least wanted to pay for it with cash instead of borrowed money. This put them in conflict with Keynesian economics.

Keynesian theory explained the economy's performance in terms of the level of total spending. A budget deficit adds to total spending and helps keep employment high and the economy running at full capacity. Cutting the deficit, as the Republicans wanted to do, would reduce spending and throw people out of work, thereby lowering national income and raising the unemployment rate. The lower income would produce less tax revenue, and the higher unemployment would require larger budget expenditures for unemployment compensation, food stamps, and other support programs. The budget deficit would thus reappear from a shrunken tax base and higher income-support payments. Patient (and impatient) Democrats, economists, columnists, and editorial writers had explained many times to the obdurate Republicans that cutting the deficit would simply reduce spending on goods and services, drive the economy down, and raise the unemployment rate. Keynesians argued that the way to balance the budget was to run a deficit. Deficit spending would lift the economy, and the government's tax revenues would rise, bringing the budget into balance. Since cutting the deficit was believed to be the surest way to throw people out of work, there were not many Republican economists. When Democrat Alice Rivlin was asked why there were no Republican economists on her "nonpartisan" Congressional Budget Committee staff, she was probably telling the truth when she said she could not find any.

The focus on the deficit had left the Republicans without a competitive political program. They were perceived by the recipients of government benefits as the party always threatening to cut back on government programs such as social security, while the taxpaying part of the electorate saw Republicans as the party that was always threatening to raise taxes in order to pay for the benefits that others were receiving. The party that takes away with both hands competes badly with the party that gives away with both hands, and that simple fact explained the decline of the Republican Party, which had come to be known as the tax collector for Democratic spending programs. . . .

Supply-side economics brought a new perspective to fiscal policy. Instead of stressing the effects on spending, supply-siders showed that tax rates directly affect the supply of goods and services. Lower tax rates mean better incentives to work, to save, to take risks, and to invest. As people respond to the higher after-tax rewards, or greater profitability, incomes rise and the tax base grows, thus feeding back some of the lost revenues to the Treasury. The saving rate also grows, providing more financing for government and private borrowing. Since Keynesian analysis left out such effects, once supply-side economics appeared on the scene the Democrats could no longer claim that government spending stimulated the economy more effectively than tax cuts. Tax cuts were now competitive, and the House Republicans began to make the most of it. . . .

Many people also have the mistaken idea that taxes on personal income have no adverse consequences for business other than reducing the demand for products. They believe that higher tax rates on personal income help business by reducing the federal deficit and lowering interest rates. In actual fact, higher personal tax rates reduce private-sector saving and drive up both the cost of credit and the cost of labor to firms. When the Treasury examined the effects of the Kennedy tax cuts, it was found that the personal saving rate rose. This implies that the saving rate would fall if tax rates rise, and indeed the saving rate declined as bracket creep pushed savers into higher tax brackets.

Higher income tax rates raise labor costs to the firm, thereby undermining the competitiveness of its products at home and abroad. The higher the worker's marginal tax rate, the more expensive it is to the firm to protect wages from being eroded by inflation or to give real wage increases. Since additional income is taxed at the worker's highest bracket, the higher the tax rate, the larger the gross wage necessary to correspond to any net wage.

This does not mean that deficits are good for the economy. But it does mean that the argument that higher taxes are preferable to higher borrowing is at best unproved. The way this unproven argument has been used against the President's efforts to reduce tax rates and improve economic incentives is irresponsible. The key to a successful economy is incentives. Any economic policy that forgets this—even one that reduces deficits—will fail. . . .

We now have many decades of empirical evidence of the effects of disincentives on economic performance, ranging

from China and the Soviet Union to the European welfare states. The effects of disincentives clearly thwart the intended results of central planning, government investment programs, and the maintenance of aggregate demand. On the other hand, there is an abundance of evidence of the positive effects of good incentives. Only free people are productive and forward-looking, but they cease to be free when their property rights are sacrificed to interest-group politics. Supply-side economics is the economics of a free society. It will prevail wherever freedom itself prevails.

Document Analysis

1. What issues are at the heart of the debate over Keynesian economic theory?
2. What is a deficit? What is deficit spending?
3. What does the phrase “the key to a successful economy is incentives” mean?

Richard Viguerie, *Why the New Right is Winning*, 1981

Richard Viguerie represents the right-wing, ultra conservative movement. A direct mail campaign wizard, today, Viguerie sponsors his own web page of political righteousness. Below is selection from his book.

SOURCE: *The New Right: We're Ready to Lead*. Falls Church, Virginia, The Viguerie Company, 1981, pp. 1–7.

The election of 1980 came as a great shock to Americans who depended on the establishment media for their forecasts. Not only did Ronald Reagan win the Presidency in an electoral landslide of historic proportions. For the first time in nearly a generation, Republicans took over the Senate. Nationally known liberal Democrats—George McGovern, Frank Church, John Culver, Warren Magnuson, Gaylord Nelson, Birch Bayh—went down to defeat. The nation’s leading liberal Republican senator (one of the few remaining after the 1978 elections) went down too: Jacob Javits lost to Alfonse D’Amato.

Americans learned early on the evening of November 4 that the election the media had called a “cliffhanger” was going to be, instead, a rout.

It was not until the next morning, when they woke to find the Senate in Republican hands, that they began to sense the full dimensions of the conservative revolution.

Suddenly it was the most cautious forecasters who looked most foolish. It was the people who had played it “safe” who had proved wildly wrong.

A few of us were not surprised. We in the New Right had been working for this moment for many years. We saw that our labors were bearing fruit, and we said so.

In the first edition of this book, written in the summer of 1980 and published six weeks *before* the election, I wrote: “I firmly believe that we are on the brink of capturing one of those Houses, the U.S. Senate, perhaps this year and almost surely by 1982.”

At the time it must have sounded as if I hadn't been reading the papers! On the night of November 4, history walked in on the liberals uninvited. • Ronald Reagan, the country's foremost conservative politician since 1966, won the Presidency of the United States.

- His popular vote total topped that of the incumbent President, the highly-publicized third-party candidate John Anderson, and all the splinter-party standard-bearers *combined*.
- His electoral college margin—489 to 49—was among the greatest in history. And among challengers facing incumbents, only Franklin Roosevelt in 1932—with a three-year Depression on his side—did better.

Meanwhile, in the Senate races, the results were just as astonishing.

Backed by the support and organization of the New Right, conservatives like Steve Symms of Idaho, Don Nickles of Oklahoma, Bob Kasten of Wisconsin, Jeremiah Denton of Alabama, John East of North Carolina, Charles Grassley of Iowa, James Abdnor of South Dakota, Dan Quayle of Indiana, and the only woman to win, Paula Hawkins of Florida, stepped forth to offer the nation a new generation of conservative congressional leadership.

While we didn't win all our battles—liberals like Colorado's Gary Hart and California's Alan Cranston managed to retain office by talking like conservatives—the results were even better than we had expected. But we knew it was a definite possibility.

We knew it *might* happen—because we were *making* it happen.

It has been obvious for a long time that conservatism is rising and liberalism is declining. Despite all the talk in the media about “trends,” “cliffhangers,” and “last minute shifts,” the plain truth is that more and more Americans are sick of liberalism—and aren't afraid to say so.

The election of 1980 was the first modern conservative landslide. But it wasn't the first anti-liberal landslide.

In 1968 two anti-liberal candidates, Richard Nixon and George Wallace, won a combined 57 percent of the popular vote against the well-liked—but liberal—incumbent Vice President, Hubert Humphrey.

In 1972 Nixon, never very popular, won more than 60% of the total vote against the flamingly liberal George McGovern, who carried only one state (not even his home state of South Dakota), Jimmy Carter didn't win election as a liberal. In the 1976 primaries he presented himself as the most conservative candidate in the field, and it was not until after he was safely in office that it became clear he intended to be a liberal President.

Even in 1980, when Democrats were sick of Carter, he won primaries—when his opponent was the even further left—Edward Kennedy. Meanwhile, Ronald Reagan piled up victories against conservative, moderate and liberal candidates in his own party.

After the televised debate a week before the election, an ABC phone-in poll gave Reagan a 2 to 1 edge over Carter. Many others in media denounced the poll as “unscientific.”

Maybe it was. But the election on November 4 wasn't conducted in a laboratory either. The ABC poll was just one more sign of the times—for anyone who was interested.

All the signs pointed one way. They've been pointing that way for years, and years, and years. They still do.

America is basically a conservative country. The potential for conservative revolt has always been there, under the most favorable conditions. But those conditions have to be made.

That's where the New Right comes in. For many years, conservatives were frustrated. We had no way to translate our vision into reality. Most importantly, we lacked a vehicle to carry our message to the voters without going through the filter of the liberal-leaning news media. During the 1950s, 1960s, and most of the 1970s liberal politicians were able to make speeches that sounded as if they were written by Barry Goldwater. The liberals could come home on weekends and make speeches calling for a strong America, attacking waste in Washington, and complaining about big government. Then, on Monday, they could go back to Washington and vote to block new weapons systems, to give away the Panama Canal, to increase taxes, to create new government agencies, and to weaken the CIA and FBI.

Occasionally, liberal politicians would visit Communist leaders like Fidel Castro and return to the U.S. with wonderful words of praise for the Cuban dictator, praise that most voters in South Dakota or Idaho never heard.

Why did the voters in South Dakota, Idaho, Iowa, Indiana, and Wisconsin not know about their congressmen's and senators' double lives—conservative-sounding at home, actively liberal in Washington or abroad?

Because most of the national (and some of the local) media didn't report the double life the politicians were leading.

Thanks to the New Right, the “people's right to know”—which the establishment media pay loud lipservice to, when it serves their own purposes—finally became a reality.

“You can't turn back the clock.” How often we hear this line from liberals. What they really mean is that we shouldn't try to correct their mistakes. Well, the New Right has news for them. We aren't in the business of turning back clocks. It's the Left that has tried to stop the clock and even bring back evils civilization has left behind. • It's the Left that has re-introduced guild privileges based on compulsory unionism, government-imposed racial and sexual discrimination, and oppressive taxes.

- It's the Left that favors a society based on state regulation, supervision, and coercion.

- It's the Left that has defended and even promoted pornography and abortion. (The clock has stopped forever for eight million unborn American children.)

- It's the Left that focuses its compassion on the criminal rather than his victims.
- It's the Left that attacks our allies rather than our enemies.
- It's the Left that favors the non-producers over the people who work.
- It's the Left that encourages American women to feel that they are failures if they want to be wives and mothers.
- It's the Left that tears apart families and neighbors by the forced busing of children.
- It's the Left that has failed to protest Communist slavery and religious persecution—evils afflicting 1.8 *billion* human beings.
- It's the Left that's fought to keep prayer out of the schools.
- It's the Left that allowed ruthless Communist takeovers in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Afghanistan.
- It's the Left that allowed the takeover of Iran, one of America's strongest allies, by a group of terrorists and extremists.
- It's the Left who crippled the CIA and FBI.
- It's the Left who sold the Russian computers and other sophisticated equipment used to oppress their people.

Liberalism has pitted itself against the best instincts of the American people. Journalist Tom Bethell says the abortion issue alone has destroyed the liberals' "moral monopoly."

Put simply, most Americans no longer look up to liberals. They look down on them.

Liberals have long sensed this. They have tried to make their mistakes irreversible and election-proof. As far as possible, they have sought to turn the powers of government over to the courts and administrative agencies—that is, to unelected and unaccountable public officials.

They have found other ways to impose their will. One of the most sophisticated has been deficit spending—producing an inflation that reduces blue-collar workers' real pay by pushing them into what used to be executive tax brackets. By such means liberals have increased government's grip on our wealth without openly raising tax rates.

Somebody had to call a halt to this devious elitism. What used to be liberalism has turned into socialism on the installment plan.

With the New Right, America has found a new voice. In 1980, that voice rang out-loud and clear.

The voters of Idaho and South Dakota finally got to know the *real* Frank Church and the *real* George McGovern—the ones Fidel Castro knows.

Because conservatives have mastered the new technology, we've been able to bypass the Left's near-monopoly of the national news media.

The New Right has also had its own ready-made network: the thousands of conservative Christian ministers whose daily broadcasts on local and national radio and TV reach an audience of 27 million. Every week, approximately 20 million people view just three such ministers—Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and James Robison.

Until now this whole culture has been a dark continent to the Northeast, coastal-based national media. But these ministers are attacking issues the national media hardly mention: issues like worldwide Communist aggression, school prayer, sex on TV, the failures of the public schools. The conservative ministers are in touch with the people, and now they are in touch with each other.

The conservatism was always there. It took the New Right to give it leadership, organization, and direction.

The key word is *leadership*. Conservatives have had no lack of brilliant thinkers, brilliant writers, brilliant debaters, brilliant spokesmen. But none of these is the same thing as a leader.

George Gallup has found that 49% of registered voters in the U.S. now place themselves “right of center”—as against only 29% who say they are “left of center” and only 10% who call themselves “middle of the road.”

And yet, with this tremendous potential support, the Republican Party has proved itself incapable of even mounting a consistent and effective opposition, much less rallying that 49% behind an agenda of its own. If it can't find its base with both hands, how is it going to lead the whole nation?

The New Right has proved it can lead. We're doing it. Leadership doesn't just show up on the first Tuesday in November. It has to be out there ahead of time—organizing, mailing, phoning, advertising, informing, getting names on the ballot.

It's fine for the analysts and pundits to talk about “trends.” But “trends” don't win elections. People do.

It sounds plausible to explain the pollsters' failure to predict the 1980 results by referring to a hypothetical “last-minute shift” to Reagan and the Republicans. But it would be an amazing coincidence for so many million people to abruptly shift at the same instant. This explanation overlooks the demonstrated conservatism of the American people and the results of active conservative organization in this campaign.

There are no impersonal “trends.” There was no national last-minute “shift.” The people didn't suddenly fall in love with the Republican Establishment. These are fig-leaf excuses of the establishment media who were so far out of touch with the country that they missed all the signals the voters were sending.

The simple truth is that there is a new majority in America—and it's being led by the New Right.

Document Analysis

1. When does Viguierie claim the conservative shift began? Compare Richard Nixon and George Wallace. Are their views similar? How do they differ?
2. Does Viguierie make blanket, overarching statements without any examples to support his arguments? Explain.
3. What vehicle did the New Right use to carry its message to the voters?
4. Does the author display any bias?
5. Viguierie cites presidential elections from 1968 to 1980, what issues segregation, war, inflation, or unemployment does he give as reasons for the shift to the right?

6. **Ronald Reagan, Iran Contra Address (March 4, 1987)**

On October 5, 1986, a U.S. cargo plane was shot down over southern Nicaragua. Two of the crew members died in the crash, but the third, Eugene Hasenfus, parachuted to safety and was captured by the Sandinista army. The capture of Hasenfus set in motion an incredible chain of cover-ups and lies that would mushroom into one of the biggest scandals in U.S. political history. Loosely known as the Iran-Contra affair, it involved a network of arms sales to Iran that were designed to win release of U.S. hostages being held in Lebanon while raising money to fund the Nicaraguan Contras. In the speech reproduced below, President Ronald Reagan attempts to explain his actions to the American people.

My fellow Americans: I've spoken to you from this historic office on many occasions and about many things. The power of the Presidency is often thought to reside within this Oval Office. Yet it doesn't rest here; it rests in you, the American people, and in your trust. Your trust is what gives a President his powers of leadership and his personal strength, and it's what I want to talk to you about this evening.

For the past 3 months, I've been silent on the revelations about Iran. And you must have been thinking: "Well, why doesn't he tell us what's happening? Why doesn't he just speak to us as he has in the past when we've faced troubles or tragedies?" Others of you, I guess, were thinking: "What's he doing hiding out in the White House?" Well, the reason I haven't spoken to you before now is this: You deserve the truth. And as frustrating as the waiting has been, I felt it was improper to come to you with sketchy reports, or possibly even erroneous statements, which would then have to be corrected, creating even more doubt and confusion. There's been enough of that.

I've paid a price for my silence in terms of your trust and confidence. But I've had to wait, as you have, for the complete story. That's why I appointed Ambassador David Abshire as my special counselor to help get out the thousands of documents to the various investigations. And I appointed a special review board, the Tower board, which took on the chore of pulling the truth together for me and getting to the bottom of things. It has now issued its findings.

I'm often accused of being an optimist, and it's true I had to hunt pretty hard to find any good news in the Board's report. As you know, it's well-stocked with criticisms, which I'll discuss in a moment; but I was very relieved to read this sentence: "... the Board is convinced that the President does indeed want the full story to be told." And that will continue to be my pledge to you as the other investigations go forward.

I want to thank the members of the panel: former Senator John Tower, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and former national security adviser Brent Scowcroft. They have done the Nation, as well as me personally, a great service by submitting a report of such integrity and depth. They have my genuine and enduring gratitude.

I've studied the Board's report. Its findings are honest, convincing, and highly critical; and I accept them. And tonight I want to share with you my thoughts on these findings and report to you on the actions I'm taking to implement the Board's recommendations.

First, let me say I take full responsibility for my own actions and for those of my administration. As angry as I may be about activities undertaken without my knowledge, I am still accountable for those activities. As disappointed as I

may be in some who served me, I'm still the one who must answer to the American people for this behavior. And as personally distasteful as I find secret bank accounts and diverted funds - well, as the Navy would say, this happened on my watch.

Let's start with the part that is the most controversial. A few months ago I told the American people I did not trade arms for hostages. My heart and my best intentions still tell me that's true, but the facts and the evidence tell me it is not. As the Tower board reported, what began as a strategic opening to Iran deteriorated, in its implementation, into trading arms for hostages. This runs counter to my own beliefs, to administration policy, and to the original strategy we had in mind. There are reasons why it happened, but no excuses. It was a mistake.

I undertook the original Iran initiative in order to develop relations with those who might assume leadership in a post-Khomeini government. It's clear from the Board's report, however, that I let my personal concern for the hostages spill over into the geo-political strategy of reaching out to Iran. I asked so many questions about the hostages' welfare that I didn't ask enough about the specifics of the total Iran plan.

Let me say to the hostage families: We have not given up. We never will. And I promise you we'll use every legitimate means to free your loved ones from captivity. But I must also caution that those Americans who freely remain in such dangerous areas must know that they're responsible for their own safety.

Now, another major aspect of the Board's findings regards the transfer of funds to the Nicaraguan contras. The Tower board wasn't able to find out what happened to this money, so the facts here will be left to the continuing investigations of the court-appointed Independent Counsel and the two congressional investigating committees. I'm confident the truth will come out about this matter, as well. As I told the Tower board, I didn't know about any diversion of funds to the contras. But as President, I cannot escape responsibility.

Much has been said about my management style, a style that's worked successfully for me during 8 years as Governor of California and for most of my Presidency. The way I work is to identify the problem, find the right individuals to do the job, and then let them go to it. I've found this invariably brings out the best in people. They seem to rise to their full capability, and in the long run you get more done.

When it came to managing the NSC staff, let's face it, my style didn't match its previous track record. I've already begun correcting this. As a start, yesterday I met with the entire professional staff of the National Security Council. I defined for them the values I want to guide the national security policies of this country. I told them that I wanted a policy that was as justifiable and understandable in public as it was in secret. I wanted a policy that reflected the will of the Congress as well as of the White House. And I told them that there'll be no more freelancing by individuals when it comes to our national security.

You've heard a lot about the staff of the National Security Council in recent months. Well, I can tell you, they are good and dedicated government employees, who put in long hours for the Nation's benefit. They are eager and anxious to serve their country.

One thing still upsetting me, however, is that no one kept proper records of meetings or decisions. This led to my failure to recollect whether I approved an arms shipment before or after the fact. I did approve it; I just can't say specifically when. Well, rest assured, there's plenty of recordkeeping now going on at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

For nearly a week now, I've been studying the Board's report I want the American people to know that this wrenching ordeal of recent months has not been in vain. I endorse every one of the Tower board's recommendations. In fact, I'm going beyond its recommendations so as to put the house in even better order.

I'm taking action in three basic areas: personnel, national security policy, and the process for making sure that the system works. First, personnel - I've brought in an accomplished and highly respected new team here at the White House. They bring new blood, new energy, and new credibility and experience.

Former Senator Howard Baker, my new Chief of Staff, possesses a breadth of legislative and foreign affairs skills that's impossible to match. I'm hopeful that his experience as minority and majority leader of the Senate can help us forge a new partnership with the Congress, especially on foreign and national security policies. I'm genuinely honored that he's given up his own Presidential aspirations to serve the country as my Chief of Staff.

Frank Carlucci, my new national security adviser, is respected for his experience in government and trusted for his judgment and counsel. Under him, the NSC staff is being rebuilt with proper management discipline. Already, almost

half the NSC professional staff is comprised of new people.

Yesterday I nominated William Webster, a man of sterling reputation, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Webster has served as Director of the FBI and as a U.S. District Court judge. He understands the meaning of "rule of law."

So that his knowledge of national security matters can be available to me on a continuing basis, I will also appoint John Tower to serve as a member of my Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. I am considering other changes in personnel, and I'll move more furniture, as I see fit, in the weeks and months ahead.

Second, in the area of national security policy, I have ordered the NSC to begin a comprehensive review of all covert operations. I have also directed that any covert activity be in support of clear policy objectives and in compliance with American values. I expect a covert policy that if Americans saw it on the front page of their newspaper, they'd say, "That makes sense." I have had issued a directive prohibiting the NSC staff itself from undertaking covert operations - no ifs, ands, or buts. I have asked Vice President Bush to reconvene his task force on terrorism to review our terrorist policy in light of the events that have occurred.

Third, in terms of the process of reaching national security decisions, I am adopting in total the Tower report's model of how the NSC process and staff should work. I am directing Mr. Carlucci to take the necessary steps to make that happen. He will report back to me on further reforms that might be needed. I've created the post of NSC legal adviser to assure a greater sensitivity to matters of law.

I am also determined to make the congressional oversight process work. Proper procedures for consultation with the Congress will be followed, not only in letter but in spirit. Before the end of March, I will report to the Congress on all the steps I've taken in line with the Tower board's conclusions.

Now, what should happen when you make a mistake is this: You take your knocks, you learn your lessons, and then you move on. That's the healthiest way to deal with a problem. This in no way diminishes the importance of the other continuing investigations, but the business of our country and our people must proceed. I've gotten this message from Republicans and Democrats in Congress, from allies around the world, and - if we're reading the signals right - even from the Soviets. And of course, I've heard the message from you, the American people. You know, by the time you reach my age, you've made plenty of mistakes. And if you've lived your life properly - so, you learn. You put things in perspective. You pull your energies together. You change. You go forward.

My fellow Americans, I have a great deal that I want to accomplish with you and for you over the next 2 years. And the Lord willing, that's exactly what I intend to do.

Good night, and God bless you.

Ronald Reagan, The Air Traffic Controllers Strike

An early challenge to the Reagan presidency, the strike conducted by the Professional Air Traffic Controller's Union (PATCO) drew a clear distinction between the right of labor to strike in the public sector, but not at the expense of public safety. President Reagan's response was to fire all of strikers and bring in replacements as quickly as possible. Reagan never reversed his decision throughout the remainder of his presidency.

This morning at 7 a.m. the union representing those who man America's air traffic control facilities called a strike. This was the culmination of 7 months of negotiations between the Federal Aviation Administration and the union. At one point in these negotiations agreement was reached and signed by both sides, granting a \$40 million increase in salaries and benefits. This is twice what other government employees can expect. It was granted in recognition of the difficulties inherent in the work these people perform. Now, however, the union demands are 17 times what had been agreed to — \$681 million. This would impose a tax burden on their fellow citizens which is unacceptable.

I would like to thank the supervisors and controllers who are on the job today, helping to get the nation's air system operating safely. In the New York area, for example, four supervisors were scheduled to report for work, and 17

additionally volunteered. At National Airport a traffic controller told a newsperson he had resigned from the union and reported to work because, ``How can I ask my kids to obey the law if I don't?" This is a great tribute to America.

Let me make one thing plain. I respect the right of workers in the private sector to strike. Indeed, as president of my own union, I led the first strike ever called by that union. I guess I'm maybe the first one to ever hold this office who is a lifetime member of an AFL - CIO union. But we cannot compare labor-management relations in the private sector with government. Government cannot close down the assembly line. It has to provide without interruption the protective services which are government's reason for being.

It was in recognition of this that the Congress passed a law forbidding strikes by government employees against the public safety. Let me read the solemn oath taken by each of these employees, a sworn affidavit, when they accepted their jobs: ``I am not participating in any strike against the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, and I will not so participate while an employee of the Government of the United States or any agency thereof."

It is for this reason that I must tell those who fail to report for duty this morning they are in violation of the law, and if they do not report for work within 48 hours, they have forfeited their jobs and will be terminated.

T. Boone Pickens, "My Case for Reagan" (1984)

This document is a general treatment of President Reagan's economic policies as he faced reelection. Addressing a debate that continues today, the author argues that smaller government is better government because it allows free enterprise to flourish. By comparing four years under Reagan with the previous Carter administration, the author attempts to discourage support for Carter's vice-president, Walter Mondale, and his running mate, Geraldine Ferraro, in the impending election.

When businessmen consider why they should support President Reagan's reelection, their analysis should come down to two important questions: What has allowed their companies to grow and prosper? What makes business opportunities in America different from those in any other country?

The answer is free enterprise. Our economic system is what keeps Americans employed, clothed, housed, and nourished. That system makes it possible for every American to attain his or her dream of material or spiritual wealth. It truly makes ours the land of opportunity. This year voters will have a clear choice between a President who believes in retaining the maximum amount possible of the nation's wealth in the private sector and a challenger who supports a greater role for government.

More than any other President in the last 30 years, Ronald Reagan understands the importance of free enterprise. He knows that this country's markets should be allowed to operate freely and competitively. That's the philosophy he brought to the White House in 1981, and we've seen how beneficial the results are. Since President Reagan took office, inflation has dropped from nearly 14% to approximately 4%, and the prime rate has fallen from 20% to 13%.

By reducing government intervention, Reagan has injected a new competitive spirit into the marketplace. There is now an atmosphere that encourages business efficiency. For example, merger and acquisition activity, properly undertaken within the constraints of antitrust laws, has allowed companies and even entire industries to restructure and become more efficient and financially sound. Shareholders have reaped the rewards of their investments, and the government has received additional revenues as taxes are paid on those gains.

In contrast, Walter Mondale does not appear to understand what makes America work. His proposals would more heavily tax individuals and corporations, inhibit capital formation, and use government as the primary means to stimulate employment.

The cheapest, most effective way to create jobs is to encourage business growth, not to devise complicated and costly federal programs. Ronald Reagan has proved that. His policies have invigorated the market and put more Americans to work. Economic recovery is the best jobs program this country has had. A record 107 million people are currently employed, five million more than when the Carter-Mondale Administration left office.

But Reagan has done even more for the average worker than stimulate employment. Through his tax policies, Americans are now taking home more pay. They have more money for their children's education, a new home, retirement, and investments. Some 42 million Americans have invested in shares of publicly owned companies, either

directly or through mutual funds, compared with 30 million in 1980.

We've seen tangible evidence that Ronald Reagan's policies are working for America. That's important for everyone in this country. The health of U.S. business is critical to our nation's survival. We do, indeed, have a responsibility to support candidates who understand that principle—a responsibility not just to ourselves but to all citizens.

I am frequently asked by high school and college students how they can attain success from modest beginnings. My answer is simple. Like many business executives, I owe my success to the free enterprise system. I started with a good education, \$2,500 in capital, and an opportunity to do something—the sky was the limit, and fortunately the same opportunity still exists.

The American free enterprise spirit is something we will be able to maintain only under a Reagan Administration. While Walter Mondale tells us that his plan for this country is better, we've seen what better means: Mondale's recent speeches have promised increased government intervention in the market and our lives and disincentives in the form of higher taxes.

The ill effects of the Carter-Mondale Administration were far-reaching: double-digit inflation—the worst since 1946—unemployment, skyrocketing interest rates, and a crumbling economy. There is no reason to believe that a Mondale-Ferraro Administration would be any different in philosophy or outcome.

All of us realize the importance of strong leadership. It is the greatest attribute any President can have and should be a prime asset of the nation. Lack of leadership ability is one of my greatest concerns about a Mondale-Ferraro Administration. Mondale has given no indication of having such ability either as Carter's Vice President or on his own. How could a nation possibly trust the affairs of state to a person who could not make a decision as to whether Bert Lance or Charles Manatt would chair his party?

America need not take that chance when it is blessed with an incumbent President who has proven leadership qualities. Ronald Reagan has been able to instill a new sense of pride and confidence in our nation. Gone are the days of Carter-Mondale defeatism and national malaise.

In 1980 the American people realized the disastrous economic brink on which this country teetered. They wanted a change for the better, and they chose a President who accomplished that goal. On November 6, Americans will once again ask themselves if a change is in order. I think the resounding answer will be that they wish to stay the course Reagan has charted. We're no longer on the brink of disaster; both feet are planted firmly on solid ground, and the future looks bright.

I'm supporting President Reagan and Vice President Bush for those reasons, and I unabashedly ask others to support them as well. I make no apology for political participation. At stake in this election is the future of the free enterprise system. A commitment from the business community, not just a check, is required to prevent another give-away-now, pay-later disaster. And that commitment will mean for future Americans a vigorous free market, the opportunity to succeed, and an attainable American Dream.

Document Analysis

1. Speculate as to what role Pickens believed the federal government should play in the economy.
2. How did Pickens portray Democratic nominee Walter Mondale? How did he portray the Carter administration?

Thurgood Marshall, Remarks on the Bicentennial of the Constitution, (1987)

By 1987, the bicentennial year of the U.S. Constitution, the Supreme Court makeup had turned conservative, leaving Marshall and eighty-year-old Justice William Brennan the only liberals. Both men despised the Right-Wing shift, Ronald Reagan, and feared regression in civil rights. Marshall refused an invitation from Chief Justice Burger to reenact the signing of the Constitution, and he angered others with caustic comments in his speech before the patent and trademark lawyers association.

SOURCE: Speech given at the Annual Seminar of the San Francisco Patent and Trademark Law Association, Maui, HI, May 8, 1987.

Remarks on the Bicentennial of the Constitution

1987 marks the 200th anniversary of the United States Constitution. A Commission has been established to coordinate the celebration. The official meetings, essay contests, and festivities have begun.

The planned commemoration will span three years, and I am told that 1987 is "dedicated to the memory of the Founders and the document they drafted in Philadelphia." We are to "recall the achievements of our Founders and the knowledge and experience that inspired them, the nature of the government they established, its origins, its character, and its ends, and the rights and privileges of citizenship, as well as its attendant responsibilities."

Like many anniversary celebrations, the plan for 1987 take particular events and holds them up as the source of all the very best that has followed. Patriotic feelings will surely swell, prompting proud proclamations of the wisdom, foresight and sense of justice shared by the Framers and reflected in a written document now yellowed with age. This is unfortunate not in the patriotism itself, but the tendency for the celebration to oversimplify, and overlook the many other events that have been instrumental to our achievements as a nation. The focus of this celebration invites a complacent belief that the vision of those who debated and compromised in Philadelphia yielded the "more perfect Union" it is said we now enjoy.

I cannot accept this invitation, for I do not believe that the meaning of the Constitution was forever "fixed" at the Philadelphia Convention. Nor do I find the wisdom, foresight, and sense of justice exhibited by the Framers particularly profound. To the contrary, the government they devised was defective from the start, requiring several amendments, a civil war, and momentous social transformation to attain the system of constitutional government, and its respect for the individual freedoms and human rights, we hold as fundamental today. When contemporary Americans cite "The Constitution," they invoke a concept that is vastly different from what the Framers barely began to construct two centuries ago.

For a sense of the evolving nature of the Constitution we need look no further than the first three words of the document's preamble: "We the People." When the Founding Fathers used this phrase in 1787, they did not have in mind the majority of America's citizens. "We the People" included, in the words of the Framers, "the whole number of free Persons." On a matter so basic as the right to vote, for example, Negro slaves were excluded, although they were counted for representational purposes at three-fifths each. Women did not gain the right to vote for over a hundred and thirty years.

These omissions were intentional. The record of the Framers' debates on the slave question is especially clear: the Southern States acceded to the demands of the New England States for giving Congress broad power to regulate commerce, in exchange for the right to continue the slave trade. The economic interests of the regions coalesced: New Englanders engaged in the "carrying trade" would profit from transporting slaves from Africa as well as good produced in America by slave labor. The perpetuation of slavery ensured the primary source of wealth in the Southern States.

Despite this clear understanding of the role slavery would play in the new republic, use of the words "slaves" and "slavery" was carefully avoided in the original document. Political representation in the lower House of Congress was to be based on the population of "free Persons" in each State, plus three-fifths of all "other Persons." Moral principles against slavery, for those who had them, were compromised, with no explanation of the conflicting principles for which the American Revolutionary War had ostensibly been fought: the self-evident truths "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

It was not the first such compromise. Even these ringing phrases from the Declaration of Independence are filled with irony, for an early draft of what later became that Declaration assailed the King of England for suppressing legislative attempts to end the slave trade and for encouraging slave rebellions. The final draft adopted in 1776 did not contain this criticism. And so again at the Constitutional Convention eloquent objections to the institution of slavery went unheeded, and its opponents eventually consented to a document which laid a foundation for the tragic events that were to follow.

Pennsylvania's Governor Morris provides an example. He opposed slavery and the counting of slaves in determining the bases for representation in Congress. At the Convention he objected that "the inhabitant of Georgia or South Carolina who goes to the coast of Africa, and in defiance of the most sacred laws of humanity tears away his fellow creatures from their dearest connections and damns them to the most cruel bondage, shall have more votes in a Government instituted for protection of the rights of mankind, than the Citizen of Pennsylvania or New Jersey who

views with a laudable horror, so nefarious a practice." And yet Governor Morris eventually accepted the three-fifths accommodation. In fact, he wrote the final draft of the Constitution, the very document the bicentennial will commemorate.

As a result of compromise, the right of the southern States to continue importing slaves was extended, officially, at least until 1808. We know that it actually lasted a good deal longer, as the Framers possessed no monopoly on the ability to trade moral principles for self-interest. But they nevertheless set an unfortunate example. Slaves could be imported, if the commercial interests of the North were protected. To make the compromise even more palatable, customs duties would be imposed at up to ten dollars per slave as a means of raising public revenues.

No doubt it will be said, when the unpleasant truth of the history of slavery in America is mentioned during this bicentennial year, that the Constitution was a product of its times, and embodied a compromise which, under other circumstances, would not have been made. But the effects of the Framers' compromise have remained for generations. They arose from the contradiction between guaranteeing liberty and justice to all, and denying both to Negroes.

The original intent of the phrase, "We the People," was far too clear for any ameliorating construction. Writing for the Supreme Court in 1857, Chief Justice Taney penned the following passage in the Dred Scott case, on the issue whether, in the eyes of the Framers, slaves were "constituent member of the sovereignty," and were to be included among "We the People":

"We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included. They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the Negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. Accordingly, a Negro of the Africa race was regarded as an article of property, and held, and brought and sold as such. No one seems to have doubted the correctness of the prevailing opinion of the time."

And so, nearly seven decades after the Constitutional Convention, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the prevailing opinion of the Framers regarding the rights of Negroes in America. It took a bloody civil war before the 13th Amendment could be adopted to abolish slavery, though not the consequences slavery would have for future Americans. While the Union survived the civil war, the Constitution did not. In its place arose a new, more promising basis for justice and equality, the 14th Amendment, ensuring protection of the life, liberty, and property of all persons against deprivations without due process, and guaranteeing equal protection of the laws. And yet almost another century would pass before any significant recognition was obtained of the rights of black Americans to share equally even in such basic opportunities as education, housing, and employment, and to have their votes counted, and counted equally. In the meantime, blacks joined America's military to fight its wars and invested untold hours working in its factories and on its farms, contributing to the development of this country's magnificent wealth and waiting to share in its prosperity,

What is striking is the role legal principles have played throughout America's history in determining the condition of Negroes. They were enslaved by law, emancipated by law, disenfranchised and segregated by law; and, finally, they have begun to win equality by law. Along the way, new constitutional principles have emerged to meet the challenges of a changing society. The progress has been dramatic, and it will continue.

The men who gathered in Philadelphia in 1787 could not have envisioned these changes. They could not have imagined, nor would they have accepted, that the document they were drafting would one day be construed by a Supreme Court to which had been appointed a woman and the descendent of an African slave. "We the People" no longer enslaved, but the credit does not belong to the Framers. It belongs to those who refused to acquiesce in outdated notions of "liberty", "justice," and "equality," and who strived to better them.

And so we must be careful, when focusing on the events which took place in Philadelphia two centuries ago, that we not overlook the momentous events which followed, and thereby lose our proper sense of perspective. Otherwise, the odds are that for many Americans the bicentennial celebration will be little more than a blind pilgrimage to the shrine of the original document now stored in a vault in the National Archives. If we seek, instead, a sensitive understanding of the Constitution's inherent defects, and its promising evolution through 200 years of history, the celebration of the "Miracle at Philadelphia" will, in my view, be a far more meaningful and humbling experience. We will see that the true miracle was not the birth of the Constitution, but its life, a life nurtured through two turbulent centuries of our own making, and a life embodying much good fortune that was not.

Thus, in this bicentennial year, we may not all participate in the festivities with flag waving fervor. Some may more quietly commemorate the suffering, struggle, and sacrifice that has triumphed over much of what was wrong with the original document, and observe the anniversary with hopes not realized and promises not fulfilled. I plan to celebrate

the bicentennial of the Constitution as a living document, including the Bill of Rights and the other amendments protecting individual freedoms and human rights.

When Historians Disagree

Did Ronald Reagan End the Cold War?

Historians agree that on entering the White House in 1981, Ronald Reagan took a tougher line on the Cold War than any of his predecessors and that, a little less than eight years later, he and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev were strolling through Red Square together calling each other “old friends.” Less than a year after Reagan left office the Cold War and, indeed, the Soviet Union, were no more. But historians continue to have sharp debates about the particular role that Reagan played in these extraordinary changes. Did he “win” the Cold War? Was he merely a bystander to events unfolding in Russia? How important was the personal chemistry between Reagan and Gorbachev? On these and many related questions, there is no agreement. Peter Schweizer, a fellow at Stanford University’s Hoover Institution and Michael Schaller, a professor of History at the University of Arizona clearly represent two very different views.

Peter Schweizer, *Reagan’s War*. New York: Random House, 2002, pp. 280-284.

Those virtues that Reagan so admired—courage and character—are what the nearly half-century battle against communism required most of him. Beginning in Hollywood and throughout his presidency, Reagan was always willing to speak the truth about communism...

In retrospect, it is clear that Reagan was largely correct about communism and his critics were wrong. Soviet communism was the threat that he claimed it was and was vulnerable in the way he said it would be. He was on the correct side of the great battles of his forty-year struggle against communism. Moscow and its supporters did try to gain a level of control in Hollywood; the peace movement in the 1970s and 1980s was being influenced by the Soviet Union; and Moscow and Havana did have plans to subvert Central America. Archives in the former Soviet bloc settle these debates...

No American throughout the history of the Cold War up until Reagan had been willing to make rolling back and defeating communism a primary goal. Even anti-Communists like Richard Nixon subscribed to the seductive idea that stability was most important and that a healthy Soviet Union was important for long-term peace. But Reagan understood that communism by its nature was a danger to peace because it relied on fear and

Michael Schaller, “Reagan and the Cold War,” in Kyle Longley, Jeremy D. Mayer, Michael Schaller, and John W. Sloan, *Deconstructing Reagan: Conservative Mythology and America’s Fortieth President*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp, 2007, pp. 3, 30, 36-

Popular memories of Ronald Reagan focus on his embrace of free markets at home and strident anticommunism abroad. To many Americans, his unapologetic celebration of patriotism and military fortitude not only made the nation safer, but also in the words of British prime minister Margaret Thatcher, won the Cold war “without firing a shot.”... In contrast to this claim of cause and effect, most historians dispute the assertion that communism was on a victory roll in 1981 and that Reagan’s policies led directly to Soviet collapse a decade later...

During 1987, events pushed both Gorbachev and Reagan toward a more cooperative relationship... Gorbachev hoped to slash Soviet defense spending (an estimated 25 percent of gross national product, as compared to 3 percent in the United States) to free resources for economic restructuring. He hoped that democratic reforms would both mobilize support for his leadership and win concessions from Washington...

[U.S. secretary of state] Schultz and other moderates now advising Reagan saw this new Soviet stance as something of a lifeline for a president floundering in the Iran-contra scandal

external enemies to maintain its legitimacy...

How did Reagan contribute to the demise of the Soviet empire? You can draw up a scorecard and count the economic costs that Reagan's policies placed on a struggling Soviet economy ...

Or you can look at the body blows that the Soviet empire suffered. Military defeat in Afghanistan demoralized the Kremlin and the military as they suffered their first defeat of the Cold war. At the same time, the survival and eventual triumph of Solidarity in Poland burned a hole in the heart of the empire that could never be filled. In both of these cases, Reagan proved decisive in victory.

Since the end of the Cold War, a debate has raged about how it ended. One person who never got wrapped up in this debate was Ronald Reagan. One of the last items to be removed from his Oval Office desk in January 1989 was a small sign that read: "It's surprising what you can accomplish when no one is concerned about who gets the credit."

and watching his public approval ratings falling sharply.

... Yet instead of encouraging Gorbachev's democratic reforms and efforts to build international cooperation, in public and private venues Reagan took to boasting that his hard line had forced a Soviet retreat...

By the time the Soviet Union dissolved in December 1991, new threats had emerged in the post-Cold war world. George Kennan, the architect of containment, spoke to this fact in an opinion piece he published in the New York Times on October 28, 1992. It was "simply childish," Kennan asserted, to say that Reagan's policies achieved victory. The United States had not "won" the long struggle that cost both sides so dearly. Each bore responsibility for its inception and duration. Politicians should pause before patting themselves on the back.