

---

---

# New Options

---

---

Mark Satin, Editor

May 29, 1987

Issue No. Thirty-nine

---

---

## There Are Visionary Bills—and Supportive Congresspeople

Contrary to popular opinion, Congress *does* have some visionary bills in its hopper. (Over 20, in fact.)

And they're not just buried there. Frequently they're supported by a "visionary cadre" of Congresspeople. (Twenty-five to 63 Congresspeople, depending on how you measure.)

The most supportive Congresspeople during the 99th session of Congress, covering the years 1985 and 1986, were John Kerry (D-Mass.) on the Senate side and John Seiberling (D-Ohio) on the House side. The most supportive Republican was Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon. (Not exactly household names.)

All this is according to a voting index released last week by New Options Inc. The index, which has been produced biannually for five years now, and is about to be included for the first time in the standard reference book *How They Rate* (1120 Connecticut Ave. N.W., #940, Washington DC 20036, \$115), seeks to measure Congressional support for legislation that embodies such values as decentralization of power, ecology, fiscal soundness, *human* growth, and global responsibility.

Those are some of the core values of the Green movements in western Europe, and of many new-style activists in this country.

### Index with a difference

NEW OPTIONS's index is dramatically different from those of groups on the traditional left and right:

• **Getting to yes.** Most voting indexes highlight the negative. For example, last year the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy scored Congresspeople on 18 defense and foreign policy issues, and on 13 of them Congresspeople were awarded a plus if they *opposed* things. The vast majority of the votes and resolutions we looked at were in *favor* of some life-giving new policy or program.

• **Getting to risk.** Most Congressional indexes focus on how Congresspeople *voted*. That excludes most visionary bills automatically,

since most of them never get to a vote, and those that do tend to be heavily watered-down. Our index pays more attention to who *co-sponsored* legislation—who was willing to risk lending their name to it in its "pure" form.

• **Getting to change.** Most voting indexes focus on bills that would do more (or, less) of the same. Left-wing voting indexes typically give points to Congresspeople who'd spend less on defense and more on social services; right-wing indexes, the reverse. Our index pays very little attention to bills that would do more (or, less) of the same. It focuses instead on proposals that would change the way we do things.

### Visionary cadre

Because most indexes focus on negative votes, watered-down bills and positions advocating more (or less) of what we have now, they're able to give 70-100% ratings to 100 Congresspeople or more. For example, last year the left-liberal Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) gave 70-100% ratings to 192 Congresspeople. By contrast, New Options Inc. was able to give 70-100% ratings to only 25 Congresspeople—out of 535!

But since they genuinely *earned* their ratings—giving public support to bills that challenged various aspects of the "American Way of Life" circa 1985-86—those 25 Congresspeople can be said to constitute a kind of "visionary cadre." By their actions they proved themselves willing to help competent, practical idealists get their policy proposals into the Congressional mainstream.

Here is that cadre, along with their scores (to find out how the scores were determined, see page two, column one below):

Rep. John Seiberling (D-Ohio), 90  
Rep. Matthew Martinez (D-Calif.), 85  
Rep. James Weaver (D-Ore.), 85  
Rep. Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.), 85  
Rep. Howard Berman (D-Calif.), 80  
Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), 80  
Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), 80

Rep. Mel Levine (D-Calif.), 80  
Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-N.Y.), 75  
Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio), 75  
Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), 75  
Rep. Peter Kostmayer (D-Penna.), 75  
Rep. Robert Matsui (D-Calif.), 75  
Rep. Robert Mrazek (D-N.Y.), 75  
Rep. Tim Wirth (D-Colo.), 75  
Rep. Anthony Beilenson (D-Calif.), 70  
Rep. George Crockett Jr. (D-Mich.), 70  
Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.), 70  
Rep. Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), 70  
Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.), 70  
Rep. Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.), 70  
Rep. Bruce Morrison (D-Conn.), 70  
Rep. Major Owens (D-N.Y.), 70  
Rep. Robert Torricelli (D-N.J.), 70  
Rep. Bruce Vento (D-Minn.), 70

Mickey Leland (D-Tex.), at 65%, was the highest-ranking Southerner; William Lehman (D-Fla.), at 60%, was the highest-ranking white Southerner. Hamilton Fish (N.Y.) and Claudine Schneider (R.I.), both at 55%, were the highest-ranking Republicans in the House of Representatives.

For proof that the "visionary cadre" is more than a one-time statistical aberration, consider this: 65% of the cadre scored in the top 10% in the 98th Congress (1983-84).

For proof that the cadre is, indeed, a "cadre" (a small and distinct group), consider this: Only 38 other Congresspeople scored over 50%! By contrast, approx. 250 Congresspeople scored over 50% on ADA's index.

For proof that our index measures a dimension that's beyond the traditional left and right, consider this: Only seven Congresspeople scored zeroes (and five of them were Democrats). By contrast, 60 of ADA's Congresspeople scored zeroes.

### Congress' rainbow

Who are those 25 members of the "visionary cadre"? Do they have anything in common besides their frequent support for decentralist/ecological/globally responsible legislation?

## Corridors of Power

By and large, they are not your flaming liberals. Their composite score on the 1986 ADA index would place them exactly 77th.

What they are is Congress' rainbow. The multiracial, multiethnic coalition that Jesse Jackson seeks to weld together on behalf of left-liberalism, has *already* come together . . . albeit unknowingly . . . on behalf of a *post-liberal, post-socialist* politics.

Five of the 25 are people of color (three blacks, one Mexican-American, one Japanese-American). Three are women—out of only 25 women in the *entire* Congress. Six are Jews, five are Catholics. Only eight are WASP males.

Fourteen of the 25 were born *after the beginning of World War II*. Another five were too young to fight in World War II. And one—Judge Crockett of Detroit—was born in 1909. Thus, 80% were *not* shaped primarily by the Depression and World War II.

If this were *People* magazine, we'd add that *five* of the men have beards or moustaches.

### No one for president?

According to the *Washington Post* (May 19, 1987), the 1988 election campaign is heralding the "Dawn of the New Age Democrats" — younger Democrats who profess to speak on behalf of the visionary fragment of the 60s generation.

Much of their rhetoric is, certainly, evocative. "The cynics believe that my generation, having reached the conservative age of mortgage payments, pediatrician bills, and concern about our children's welfare, [is] ripe for Republican picking," says candidate Joe Biden in his standard stump speech. "They have misjudged us. Just because our political heroes were murdered does not mean that the dream does not still live, buried in our broken hearts."

The trouble is, the so-called New Age Democrats who've announced for president are long on rhetoric, short on follow-through. (Just like other New Agers.) *Not one* of the candidates who goes on and on about "my generation" is part of the visionary cadre of 25 Congress-people. Only two of them scored even 50%:

Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), 55  
Sen. Paul Simon (D-Ill.), 50  
Sen. Gary Hart (D-Colo.), 45  
Sen. Joe Biden (D-Del.), 35  
Sen. Robert Dole (D-Kans.), 20  
Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.), 15  
Rep. Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.), 15  
Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.), 15  
Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.), 10  
Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), 5

### Visionary bills

Here are the bills and resolutions we focused on. Scores were obtained by giving Congresspeople one point each time they co-sponsored or voted for *at least one* of the measures

under each heading (#a-t below), two points each time they were the principal sponsor; then multiplying by five (since there are 20 headings in all).

When we give the number of co-sponsors, it means the bill or resolution never got to a vote (unless we say otherwise). The vast majority of the measures below died in committee.

### Deep ecology

**a. Food safety.** Thanks in part to the efforts of the Center for Science in the Public Interest (NEW OPTIONS #31), *three* good food safety bills hit the 99th Congress running.

Senator John Chafee (R-R.I.) and Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.) introduced a bill requiring fast food restaurants to list ingredients on the packaging. *Six Senators and 32 Representatives were co-sponsors.*

Senator Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) and Rep. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) introduced a bill banning the use of sulfites in fresh fruits and vegetables, and requiring the government to test the safety of sulfites in other foods. *Six Senators and 29 Representatives were co-sponsors,* and last summer the FDA banned the use of sulfites in fresh fruits and vegetables other than potatoes.

In the House, Douglas Bosco (D-Calif.) introduced a bill curbing the expansion of food irradiation (i.e., prohibiting pork and produce irradiation) "until such time as conclusive evidence of safety has been clearly established." *Fifty-two Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**b. Renewable energy.** Senator Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.) and Rep. Cecil Heftel (D-Haw.) introduced a bill extending the residential energy income tax credit for renewable energy property, and the energy investment tax credit for renewable energy businesses. *The bill passed but was gutted in committee. Thirty-eight Senators and 209 Representatives co-sponsored the original legislation.*

**c. The global possible.** Senator Gore and Reps. James Scheuer (D-N.Y.) and Gus Yatron (D-Penna.) offered resolutions calling for the establishment of a cooperative international program to study the greenhouse effect. *No Senators and 11 and 35 Representatives, respectively, were co-sponsors.*

In the Senate, Mark Hatfield introduced a bill promoting zero population growth ("national and global population stabilization"). *Three Senators were co-sponsors.*

**d. Animal rights.** "We feel that animals should be treated just like children," says Alex Pacheco, co-founder of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (in NEW OPTIONS #16). "They feel the same things we do, fear, anxiety, joy, pain. . . ."

In the Senate, Bob Dole (R-Kans.) introduced a bill requiring improved care and treatment of laboratory animals. *Thirty-six Senators were co-sponsors.*

In the House, Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) introduced a bill phasing out the use of the notorious LD50 test used in the testing of commercial products (LD50 kills 50% of the test animals). *One hundred five Representatives were co-sponsors.*

Also in the House, Charlie Rose (D-N.C.) introduced a bill giving *people* the right to bring claims in court *on behalf of animals* who are suffering. *Thirty-three Representatives were co-sponsors.*

### Sustainable economy

**e. Fiscal responsibility.** If fiscal responsibility means anything, it means not spending more than you take in.

In the Senate, Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) proposed a Constitutional amendment requiring Congress to adopt a balanced budget each year, except when a three-fifths majority votes to allow a "specific excess." *The amendment was defeated by one vote, 66-34 (67 votes are needed to adopt a Constitutional amendment).*

In the House, Jim Jones (D-Okla.) offered the most intelligent of the balanced budget resolutions. *One hundred twelve Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**f. Regenerative farming.** To solve the farm crisis, we need to do more than increase farmers' profits. We need to achieve regional self-reliance in food. And we need to adopt sustainable agricultural practices (NEW OPTIONS #23).

Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) and Rep. James Weaver (D-Ore.) introduced a bill calling on the Department of Agriculture to assist some organic farmers and research organic farming techniques ("crop rotation, intercropping, biological pest control. . ."). *The bill passed by voice vote. Fourteen Senators and 40 Representatives were co-sponsors.*

Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) and Rep. George Brown Jr. (D-Calif.) introduced a

*Continued on page four, column one . . .*

## NewOptions

NEW OPTIONS (ISSN 0890-1619) is published every month except August by New Options Inc., 2005 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., lower level, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 822-0929.

Please address ALL correspondence to Post Office Box 19324, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Subscriptions: \$25 a year in the U.S., \$32 first-class and Canada, \$39 elsewhere. Back issues \$2 each.

Editor: Mark Satin

Manager, New Options Inc.: Sylvia Tognetti

Typesetting: Baker Johnson Design, (703) 237-0557

Printing: Newsletter Services, (202) 529-5700

**In-House Critics:** Shelley Alpern, Anne Bartley, Robin Cahn, Guy Gran, Arthur Levine, Trip Meima, Richard Perl, Marc Sarkady, Andrew Schmookler, Judith Schmidman, Elaine Zablocki

**Board of Advisors** (partial listing): Lester Brown, Ernest Callenbach, Fritjof Capra, Herman Daly, James Fallows, Marilyn Ferguson, Elizabeth Dodson Gray, Joan Gussow, Vincent Harding, Willis Harman, Hazel Henderson, Jane Jacobs, Petra Kelly, Hunter & Amory Lovins, Joanna Macy, Jane Mansbridge, Patricia Mische, Robin Morgan, Magaly Rodriguez Mossman, John Naisbitt, Jeremy Rifkin, Robert Rodale, Carl Rogers, Theodore Roszak, Mark Rudd, Kirkpatrick Sale, Charlene Spretnak, Robert Theobald, Nancy Jack Todd

## Groups

### Books to build a new society

May, 1987. The prestigious American Booksellers' Association convention is under way in Washington, D.C., and literally thousands of book publishers are displaying their wares in tiny booths. Most of the booths feature displays made of metal and plastic. New Society Publishers' booth stands out because of its wood shelves—and because it's constantly busy. Most of NSP's six worker-managers have come down from Philadelphia to explain to bemused book buyers that, starting from scratch in 1982, their company is now putting out more than 15 books a year, with sales exceeding \$550,000. That makes NSP one of the largest "political" publishing houses in the country, and easily the largest with a consistently nonviolent/decentralist/globally responsible point of view. (You've seen eight of their books reviewed in NEW OPTIONS—twice as many as from any other publisher.)

We couldn't resist. The very next week we took the train to Philadelphia. . . .

### Coming home

NSP's headquarters is about an hour's walk from downtown, in a racially-mixed, multi-ethnic neighborhood called Squirrel Hill. We walk into the old brick house and can't believe our eyes. Is it an office disguised as a home, or a home disguised as an office? (It's both, of course. Two full-timers live on the third floor.) Every inch is occupied—with battered old filing cabinets, homemade light tables, prewar high-backed Royal typewriters, etc., but also intimidating-looking computer hardware, plastic shelves, a xerox machine. . . . David Albert, 37-year-old co-founder of NSP, tells us to take a good look; in mid-July the office is (finally!) moving—to a two-story, 9,000-square-foot converted warehouse down the street.

He makes some instant coffee and gives us a chipped cup. "We are worker self-managed," he says, "and all the workers, from the shipping manager on up or down, depending on how you look at it, are the editors as well—which makes us rather unique! So long as you work full-time, you're part of the collective, and you're also part of the editorial board and a 'trustee' of the publishing house."

"We've divided up publishing into four areas, marketing, finance, production, and [customer services]," says collective member T.L. Hill, 27, who came to NSP by way of Britain and India. "And we've made an individual or pair of individuals responsible for each of these functions, because if everybody is responsible you'll have a whole bunch of details falling through

the cracks."

"We're trying to maximize the benefits of collective organization while making chains of authority as clear as we can," adds Albert. "Our editorial decisions are still made collectively. But once we decide to take on a book, it's assigned to a specific collective member. . . ."

"We each take home \$9,300 a year," says Barbara Hirshkowitz, who came to NSP from California where she edited a newsletter on peace marches. "But we have a health plan, we have maternity-paternity leave, child-care benefits, a pension plan. . . ."

"We look at the corporate structure and say, well, salaries are ridiculously too high [in the context of the global economy]," says Albert. "But we provide a very good benefits package. We want people to stay for a long time."

### Positive vision

NSP's editorial content is even more distinctive than its business practices. "We're looking to do books that explore the ramifications of feminism and nonviolence," says Albert. "We do what we call 'books to build a new society'—group dynamics, nonviolent forms of child-rearing, democratic management. . . ."

"We will do analytic or historical books that give a sense of the roots of problems," says Hill. "But we want them to include suggestions for action. The emphasis should always be toward action."

We asked Albert to compare his operation to Harper & Row's. "Our mean trade book sells more than the mean Harper & Row!" he said proudly. "Much more! Because they depend heavily on reviews [to sell their books, whereas] we don't have any books that won't find an audience. We *won't take books on* unless we know who's supposed to use them. And that gives us a major advantage."

How do you compare to South End Press? we asked (South End, based in Boston, is a left-wing version of NSP). "Our purview is very different," Albert replied. "First of all, we do more books that are inspirational and motivational and skill-oriented. That's conscious; that's what we think activists need most. . . . Second of all, I think all of us at this publishing house are much more decentralist-oriented, and specifically concerned about nonviolence."

### Secrets of success

So what are your trade secrets? we asked. "Unfortunately, we have a [virtual] monopoly on what we do," says Albert. "Small publishers are having a very hard time. And the big pub-

lishers are not interested in [doing the books] we do."

"I think we have a really good mix of personalities and types of thinkers," says Hirshkowitz.

"What we looked for in the people we hired was commitment," says Albert. "You can't buy that. And [we found it]."

"Many of the people who came of age in the 60s do read," says Hirshkowitz, "and they have money now, and they buy books. And although they might not be active, they're still interested [in political ideas and ideals]."

### Down the road

NSP collective members have strong ideas about where they'd like their company to go. "In the long run," says Ellen Sawislak, who's been with NSP since nearly the beginning, "we'd like to be a core organization [with] lots of small collectives. We'd like to start a video collective; we'd like to start a children's book publisher; we'd like to set up some kind of arrangement with a British publisher. . . ."

"I think there's a good chance of expanding into VCRs or audio cassettes," says Hirshkowitz. "I think going into a variety of packaging will be very exciting."

### Tell me why

NSP's six full-timers have more than their share of "respectable" credentials (Williams, Oxford, Cal, Brown, Swarthmore, Penn, Chicago . . .). They could be making a lot more than \$9,300 a year somewhere else. As gently as possible we ask them, What's in this for you?

Albert puts it this way (with a summer breeze blowing in through the back bay window): "You put the right book in the right person's hand at the right time in their life and [it can make an enormous difference]."

Sawislak owns that part of her vision is "to be useful to a lot of different organizations" — and NSP is providing them with what is in effect a "publishing service."

Hirshkowitz sits down on the floor. "The job I was doing [in California] for which I was being rewarded handsomely by the system was a job that I felt any 12-year-old could have done. And there was no way to barter with the system to make that job more pleasing to me and more productive for them. It was totally rigid. And I realized I was using the money [I made] to support a house, a very fancy house, very beautiful, and I was killing myself to do that. And there was no way that trade-off was interesting to me."

Hill smiles impishly and says he wants to "publish books that give people hope." *New Society Publishers, 4527 Springfield Ave., Philadelphia PA 19143. "We're always looking for authors," says Albert. (Ask for NSP's manuscript submission guidelines.)*

Continued from page two:

bill seeking to protect the public from the hazards of pesticides. A much weaker "compromise" bill eventually emerged. *Nine Senators and 22 Representatives co-sponsored the original bill.*

In the House, James Weaver introduced a bill restricting the use of antibiotic drugs in animal feed. The bill was singled out for support by the American Holistic Medical Association (NEW OPTIONS #36). *Thirty-eight Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**g. Beyond the military economy.** In the Senate, Charles Grassley (R-Ia.) proposed an amendment limiting the rate of growth in defense spending for Fiscal Year 1986 to the annual rate of inflation. In the lengthy and fascinating debate that followed (*Congressional Record*, May 2, 1985), several Senators noted that defense spending is an inefficient way to pump-prime the economy. *The amendment passed, 51-48.*

In the House, Reps. John Seiberling (D-Ohio) and Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.) introduced the most intelligent bills promoting conversion of defense industries to industries serving non-military needs (cf. NEW OPTIONS #38). *Fifteen and 54 Representatives, respectively, were co-sponsors.*

### Let the people decide

**h. Parental leave.** Senator Chris Dodd (D-Conn.) and Reps. Bill Clay (D-Mo.) and Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.) introduced bills providing unpaid leave for employees—men and women alike—due to pregnancy, birth or adoption, or the need to care for a seriously ill child or parent. In addition, Schroeder's bill authorizes "a study to determine ways of providing salary replacement for employees who take parental and disability leaves." These bills were recently endorsed by the National Organization for Changing Men (NEW OPTIONS #38). *Four Senators and 45 and 126 Representatives, respectively, were co-sponsors.*

**i. Gay and alternative-lifestyle rights.** "Publicly, there's a retreat to the rhetoric of traditional values," says Deborah Anapol, founder of Intinet (NEW OPTIONS #20). "But privately we're continuing to evolve toward [alternative lifestyles]."

Senator Kerry and Rep. Weiss introduced a bill prohibiting discrimination on the basis of "affectional or sexual orientation." *Five Senators and 72 Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**j. Power to the people.** In the Senate, Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) introduced a bill enabling states and localities to allow voluntary prayer in the public schools if they so chose. (The question of school prayer *should* be taken up at the lowest possible level—by the individual school boards or, better yet, by the individual

schools. Let them reach their own conclusions, and let people learn to listen to each other in the process.) *The bill was tabled (defeated), 36-62.*

In the House, Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.) proposed an amendment to the Housing Act permitting some low-income tenants of public housing to band together and *buy* their dwelling units. *The amendment passed, 238-176.*

### Global responsibility

**k. A better game than war.** "Peace is the absence of a very exciting activity—war," says new-style peace activist Robert Fuller (in NEW OPTIONS #1). "And nobody ever opted for nothing in place of something. We've got to figure out what it is we actively want, and then be for that."

Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.) and Reps. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) offered resolutions urging "a joint U.S.-Soviet effort to achieve worldwide disease immunization by 1990." *Thirty-four Senators and two and 45 Representatives, respectively, were co-sponsors.*

In the Senate, Spark Matsunaga (D-Haw.) offered a resolution urging NASA to take steps toward "U.S.-USSR cooperation in Mars exploration" (cf. NEW OPTIONS #19). *Eleven Senators were co-sponsors.*

Also in the Senate, William Proxmire offered a resolution urging the establishment of a joint U.S.-Soviet commission "to study the environmental effects of nuclear winter and its impact on the security of both nations." *Eleven Senators were co-sponsors.*

**l. Grassroots diplomacy.** "By making [citizens and] communities a basic building block of international diplomacy," says Michael Shuman, founder of the Center for Innovative Diplomacy (NEW OPTIONS #23), "we may be unmasking thousands of new potential transnational alliances that current nation-state cleavages hide."

In the Senate, Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.) proposed an amendment preventing the federal government from penalizing states—that is, U.S. states—that boycott South Africa. *The amendment was tabled (defeated), 35-64.*

In the House, Tom Downey (D-N.Y.) offered a resolution urging expanded cultural exchange between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. *Fifty-one Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**m. World order.** In the Senate, Mark Hatfield offered a resolution "deploring the intention of the U.S. to withdraw from the compulsory jurisdiction of the [World Court]." *Eight Senators were co-sponsors.*

In the House, Jim Leach (R-Ia.) offered a resolution establishing a U.S. "Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the U.N." One of the subjects to be targeted for "special attention" by the Commission: "the feasibility and

advisability of weighted voting [at the U.N.], including the so-called 'binding triad' formula" touted by the Center for War/Peace Studies (NEW OPTIONS #34). *Eighty-eight Representatives were co-sponsors.*

Also in the House, George Brown Jr. offered a resolution calling for gradual disarmament—and the creation and strengthening of global institutions to assure compliance. *Seventy Representatives were co-sponsors.*

### "Alternative development"

**n. Small-scale development.** Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kans.) and Rep. Ben Gilman (R-N.Y.) introduced a bill providing assistance for small-scale, resource-conserving, self-help agricultural projects in Africa. "Special emphasis" would be placed on grants to international and African non-governmental organizations and U.S. private and voluntary organizations. Tom Stoel Jr., international programs director for the Natural Resources Defense Council and prominent advocate of "sustainable development" (NEW OPTIONS #28), played a major role in drafting the bill. *Nine Senators and 50 Representatives were co-sponsors.*

In the House, Claudine Schneider (R-R.I.) introduced a bill providing assistance for training in environmental management techniques in Africa, with special emphasis on "local-level training in techniques using smaller, cost-saving, community-based technologies." The training would "incorporate women's needs in proportion to their traditional participation in the targeted activity" (i.e., this is largely a women's training program). *Sixty-two Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**o. Third World ecology.** Senator William Roth (R-Del.) and Rep. Gus Yatron introduced bills designed to protect (1) tropical forests in developing countries, and (2) biological diversity in developing countries. See page eight, col. two below. *Twenty-two and 21 Senators, respectively, and 55 and 55 Representatives, respectively, were co-sponsors.*

**p. Third World access.** In both Houses of Congress, a bill was introduced seeking to impose quotas on imports of textiles, apparel and shoes from the Third World. It is outrageous that the U.S.—which has long used military force and military threat to preserve access to markets and raw materials—should seek to shut out products from developing countries. Nevertheless, *the bill passed the Senate, 39-60, and the House, 161-255.*

### Real security

**q. Independent initiatives (I).** In NEW OPTIONS #32, Mark Sommer, co-founder of Expro, proposed "independent initiatives" as a post-liberal, post-socialist alternative to peace-through-strength and arms control. He defined

*Continued on page eight, column one . . .*

## Letters . . .

### The surfacing

I awoke this morning and realized very simply what the Green, bioregional, decentralist movement is, and why it grabs us so deeply (NEW OPTIONS #35).

It is the surfacing of a survival instinct in an animal species—us—in danger of extinction.

It is humanity finally beginning to hear the silent prodding of a million other species to join them in balance and harmony.

It is the voice of the entire living Earth, correcting its wayward child, man (and I do mean "man").

We don't know whether Death will triumph on this beautiful world, but we are now responding to the force of Life, trying to fill us with courage and work through us. . . .

—Joel Taunton  
Seattle, Wash.

### Sandbox politics?

Well, I see another big Green politics meeting is coming up (NEW OPTIONS #38), and I'll probably attend. There will be old friends to see and I love a good meeting.

Little is likely to come of it, of course. American Greens seem more than ever determined to ignore the realities of American political life. Your article mentions some interesting speakers and workshops; doubtless, fascinating discussion will occur. But the possibility of action seems more remote than ever ("We are *not* gathering to make decisions for the Green movement. Our purpose is educational").

This is sad. Politics is serious business. The planet is in wretched condition. Millions of humans are undernourished or even starving. War is everywhere. Action is desperately needed. But the American government, which could be a source of positive energy in the world, is bogged down in Old Age politics, media glitz, and money.

Meanwhile, America's Greens continue to play sandbox politics. Visions of alternative governments, international plague, and millenarianism dance in their heads. Or they fiddle with third-party politics, which, because of our electoral system, has always been a graveyard for political idealists.

As for myself, I'm what the German Greens call a "realo." Political parties are the vehicle for political change in the U.S.; for the last 75 years, the Democrat party. At present, the Democrat party, nominally vaguely liberal, has no coherent vision or agenda. Hence, it cannot

accomplish much and cannot enlist the involvement and support of masses of people. Yet the Democrat party has a very open structure with clubs in every precinct. Citizens with a Green vision and agenda could easily join their local clubs and immediately begin to affect local and, soon, national politics.

Consider the educational benefits of this approach. Greens would be preaching to more than the converted; Greens would be interacting with ordinary Americans who need exposure to Green political consciousness. And Greens would learn something, too—how politics works.

—Gerald Goldfarb  
Los Angeles, Calif.

*Goldfarb, co-author of Winning With Your Lawyer (1980), recently ran for a seat on the Los Angeles County Democratic Party Central Committee.*

### Only six stories?

I copied your article on the six "major stories [that are] competing in the new postmodern world" (NEW OPTIONS #33) and gave it to my new membership class. I thought you'd be interested in the following response, from Ms. Andetrie Smith of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

. . . There is also *Rastafarianism* which takes various forms but is mainly among Black people, emphasizing freedom, a connection with the ancient homeland, Africa, and liberation from 'Babylon,' which stands for the oppression of Western racist capitalism. It is rooted in the Bible and in African traditions. It reaches out to all people regardless of color, singing in reggae music a message of peace, love, justice, and harmony with the environment.

"Women, especially lesbian and/or feminist, are emphasizing the original form of Rastafarianism—Nejaling—which is feminist and matriarchal. Its practice was forbidden and outlawed in colonial Africa.

"Many people who respect the primitive and beautiful liberation theology of Hispanic peasants in Latin America seem to have ignored this spiritual movement. I think it is hard for White people to appreciate Black things."

—Rev. Finley Schaefer, Pastor  
Park Slope United Methodist Church  
Brooklyn, N.Y.

### No real conflict

I read with interest the "Teaching Self-Esteem" exchange in NEW OPTIONS #33. One observation: If John Noell, Patrick Farenga and Jack Canfield could see that they're each [appealing to] a different "market segment," they would realize there's no real conflict among their positions.

Some kids *can* base self-esteem on successfully negotiating well-designed curricula, and live productive lives joyfully exploring their chosen fields—as Noell would have them do. Others desperately need the kind of social and emotional training Canfield advocates. Still others have parents with the time and motivation to be part of Farenga's Growing Without Schooling network, and can get all of the above at home.

No problem. Go for it, all three of you.  
—Michael Luke Aitken  
Honolulu, Hawaii

### Too charitable?

Thank you for your review of my new book, *To Govern Evolution* (NEW OPTIONS #37). You did a remarkable job of getting across the book's main ideas, and the critical points are well taken.

However, I can't agree with your charitable notion that Jeremy Rifkin has performed a valuable service to the public debate on biotechnology by turning it into a moralistic media circus. I know he has done a successful job in publicizing himself as having made a great contribution, but I remain unimpressed. I think it will take years for the public dialogue to recover from his contribution to it.

And I don't think it does much good to the debate to define it as a conflict between my "co-evolution" wing and his "re-sacralization" wing. We should all go easy on the jargon. I don't feel the need to style myself as leader of a co-evolution movement—I think that term belongs to Stewart Brand anyway—and I don't find the Rifkin position all that sacred. In fact I find his theology as shaky as his science.

I think it would be nice if we could recognize that there are in fact many theological positions and spiritual values involved here, and that it is quite possible for somebody to have his own religious faith, as I do, and still disagree profoundly both with Rifkin's arguments and with his way of presenting them.

I'm glad you drew out and emphasized the "soft path" idea [Jack Doyle's "biotechnical soft path" would use biotechnology to reduce the scope of agro-industrial technology—ed.]. I hope you will stay with that in the future, because it is tremendously important.

—Walter Truett Anderson  
Albany, Calif.

I think you were [too charitable to] Walter Truett Anderson's book, *To Govern Evolution*.

I have seen pigs on their knees, crippled by a mysterious arthritis that comes from having the gene for human growth hormone spliced into their DNA. This is not only cruel, but ominous. We *don't* know what we're doing.

As for that patented bacterium, "Frostban":





# 1987 Ballot — Political Book Award

Please RETURN TO NEW OPTIONS, INC. (Box 19324, DC 20036) no later than SEPT. 1

Dear Subscriber,

Once again, we'd like you to be a judge in New Options, Inc.'s Political Book Award contest.

Each year, the Award is given to the author of the best political (broadly defined!) book published the previous year in the U.S. This year's Award will cover books published in 1986.

This year's nominees are listed below. To make the ballot, a book had to be nominated by at least two of our nominators. This year's nominators were: Jeff Fishel, co-founder of the American Political Science Association's "Conference Group on Transformational Politics" (NEW OPTIONS #31); Michael Marien, editor of the World Future Society's Future Survey Newsletter; Susan Meeker-Lowry, author of Economics as If the Earth Really Mattered (forthcoming); Bel-den Paulson, co-convenor of the first "post-liberal think tank" (to be announced); Charlene Spretnak, co-author of Green Politics (#3); and Ann Weiser, administrator of the Action Linkage networking organization (#1).

To help select this year's Award winner, please rank the three books that, in your opinion, had the potential to contribute most to the reconceptualization of politics along human growth, decentralist and world order lines. Give your first choice "1," your second choice "2," your third choice "3."

If you want to vote against certain books, you can do that, too. You can put a "-2" beside up to three books.

\_\_\_\_ Murray Bookchin, The Modern Crisis (New Society Publr, \$8 pbk);

\_\_\_\_ Lester R. Brown et al., State of the World 1986: A Worldwatch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society (Norton, \$10 pbk);

\_\_\_\_ Don Carlson and Craig Comstock, eds., Securing Our Planet: How to Succeed When Threats Are Too Risky & There's Really No Defense (Tarcher, \$12);

\_\_\_\_ Annie Cheatham and Mary Clare Powell, This Way Daybreak Comes: Women's Values and the Future (New Society Publr, \$13 pbk);

\_\_\_\_ Paul Ekins, ed., The Living Economy: A New Economics in the Making (Routledge & Kegan Paul, \$18 pbk);

\_\_\_\_ William E. Halal, The New Capitalism (Wiley, \$25);

\_\_\_\_ Jane J. Mansbridge, Why We Lost the ERA (Univ. of Chicago Press, \$10 pbk);

\_\_\_\_ Marc Pilisuk and Susan Hillier Parks, The Healing Web: Social Networks and Human Survival (Univ. Press of New England, \$20);

\_\_\_\_ Robert Theobald, The Rapids of Change (Participation Publr, \$15 loose-leaf; now Knowledge Systems Inc., \$17 pbk).

Your age: \_\_\_\_\_ sex: \_\_\_\_\_ occupation: \_\_\_\_\_ home town: \_\_\_\_\_

Optional, below: Please give your reasons for voting as you did. Be blunt and concise (info. to be used in our article on the Award).

Happy reading!

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	s	t	TOT	
4 COBEY	X																					
5 Neal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6 COBLE	X																					
7 Rose	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8 Hefner	X																					
9 MCMILLAN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
10 BROYHILL	X																					
11 HENDON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
North Dakota																						
- Dorgan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ohio																						
1 Luken	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15
2 GRADISON	X																					
3 Hall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4 OXLEY	X																					
5 LATTA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6 MCEWEN	X																					
7 DEWINE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8 KINDNESS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
9 Kaptur	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15
10 MILLER	X																					
11 Eckart	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12 KASICH	X																					
13 Pease	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
14 Seiberling	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15
15 WYLIE	X																					
16 REGULA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17 Traficant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
18 Applegate	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
19 Feighen	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
20 Oakar	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
21 Stokes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Oklahoma																						
1 Jones	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2 Synar	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3 Watkins	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4 McCurdy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5 EDWARDS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6 English	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Oregon																						
1 AuCoin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2 SMITH, ROBT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3 Wyden	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4 Weaver	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	17
5 SMITH, DENNY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Pennsylvania																						
1 Foglietta	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2 Gray	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3 Borski	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4 Kolter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11
5 SCHULZE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6 Yatron	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12
7 Edgar	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8 Kostmayer	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	15
9 SHUSTER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
10 MCDADE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
11 Kanjorski	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12 Murtha	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
13 COUGHLIN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
14 Coyne	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
15 RITTER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
16 WALKER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17 GEKAS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
18 Walgren	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
19 GOODLING	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
20 Gaydos	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
21 RIDGE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
22 Murphy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
23 CLINGER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Rhode Island																						
1 St Germain	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11
2 SCHNEIDER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
South Carolina																						
1 HARTNETT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2 SPENCE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3 Derrick	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4 CAMPBELL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5 Spratt	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6 Tallon	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
South Dakota																						
- Daschle	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	s	t	TOT	
Tennessee																						
1 QUILLEN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2 DUNCAN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3 Lloyd	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4 Cooper	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5 Boner	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6 Gordon	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
7 SUNDQUIST	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8 Jones	X	X	X</																			

## Reich and Tokar: ships in the night

Robert Reich graduated from Dartmouth and Yale, Brian Tokar from MIT and Harvard. But then their paths diverged. Reich became director of policy planning at the Federal Trade Commission, and is currently professor of politics, business and economics at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. Tokar became an environmental consultant and computer programmer and founding member of the Central Vermont Greens.

One thing they do have in common is that, this year, they've both come out with books that seek to challenge the very way we think about politics and economics in this country. But even here their paths diverge. Reich's book, *Tales of a New America* (\$20), heads the spring list of the prestigious Times Books publishing company. Tokar's book, *The Green Alternative* (\$9 pbk), comes to us from R. & E. Miles, a publishing house run by a longshoreman and a quilter (Box 1916, San Pedro CA 90733).

There's another thing these authors have in common. Both of their books are perilously incomplete. Reading them side by side is like listening to two people who insist on talking at each other without ever listening to what the other has to say.

### Ambitious

Both books are nothing if not ambitious:

- Both seek to go "beyond left and right." Reich rejects the value choices offered by the traditional political spectrum—aggression/appeasement, selfishness/charity, etc. Tokar rejects the economic and political centralization that left and right take for granted.

- Both come across as exciting new syntheses. Reich's book pulls together some of the best "neo-liberal" economic and political thought of the 80s. Tokar's book claims to be a synthesis of Green political thought, but is actually a synthesis of the ideas of the eco-anarchist wing of the Green movement—no small achievement in itself. (Jonathon Porritt's book *Seeing Green*, NEW OPTIONS #16, synthesizes the ideas of what you could call the New Age wing; and Carl Boggs's *Social Movements and Political Power*, to be reviewed, highlights the ideas of the socialist wing.)

- Both books claim to have devised a new way of approaching our problems and possibilities. Instead of having us angrily demand our rights, Reich would have us rise to the challenge of seeking joint gains and avoiding joint losses (his oft-used phrase: "mutual responsibilities, reciprocal benefits"). Tokar wants us to adopt a new ethical and spiritual

orientation based on ecology. We are all part of nature, we are each of us parts of one whole.

Both books come alive when the authors start ripping into America's guiding self-images—which Reich calls our guiding "stories" or "parables" or "myths."

### Four tall tales

**The Mob at the Gates.** According to Reich, one of our enduring stories is that we are besieged by hostile and alien forces "out there." Surely, he says, it's time to radically revise that story.

Reich wants us to understand, clearly, that we can no longer be militarily invulnerable—that our only defense is learning to accept our "mutual vulnerability." Tokar is much less sanguine about learning to live with nuclear weapons. He'd have us work for a denuclearized, even demilitarized world, and have us adopt "nonviolent defense strategies."

Reich believes that economic independence is "too expensive" in the modern world, and wants us to seek out "opportunities for mutual gain" — with Japan, with Europe, with the Third World. Tokar strongly urges a system of "local production for local needs."

**The Triumphant Individual.** In American mythology, the achiever—the hero—is essentially a loner. That's another myth that has to catch up to reality, say Reich and Tokar.

In place of the "triumphant individual," Reich would put the "collective entrepreneur" — the (competent) team player. Tokar would put worker-owners and worker-managers . . . as well as people choosing to live simpler lives.

To better compete against other nations, Reich wants us to move from stable mass production to a system where we'd be continuously refining and elaborating new products (e.g., refining the boom-box into the Walkman, as the Japanese did). Tokar calls for an entirely different sort of international economic system, one in which nations would not "compete," and communities would do most of the trading.

**The Benevolent Community.** A third American story celebrates our generosity to each other, especially in time of need. It's a beautiful story. The trouble is, it's less than accurate in the modern world.

Social democrats like Robert Bellah (*Habits of the Heart*, NEW OPTIONS #23) try to guilt us into bringing the old benevolent community back again. Reich calls instead for a new kind of "social solidarity" — one less rooted in generosity (and guilt) and more rooted in the knowledge that, by investing in others, we're

investing in our collective future. Tokar would move the "benevolent community" away from the nation-state and back to the local level. He calls for a network of decentralized self-help programs—community land trusts, "sweat equity" housing arrangements and the like.

**Rot at the Top.** Americans have always gone after their powerful elites, and Reich says it's time we cooled it a bit. Because our problems can hardly be solved by government-bashing or corporation-bashing. They are more likely to be solved if we take a third path—designing the market in accordance with our values.

Tokar isn't frustrated that we go after our elites. He wishes we'd stop alternating between big business-bashing and big government-bashing, and finally go after both at once.

### Imagine

It is hard to imagine a dialogue between Reich and Tokar. And yet, it is possible that progress won't be made in either author's direction until they learn to meet each other halfway.

Reich continually tells the reader that he's not calling on us to change our "stories," merely to revise and update them. But just think: If we became as responsible and accountable to each other as Reich wants us to become, wouldn't it mean a radical break with our traditional political culture? Tokar's book is disingenuous in a different way. It is so utopian in tone, so visionary in content, that it occasionally reads as more a bible for a sub-culture than a program for a serious political movement.

Reich's prose is a model of clarity and grace. Tokar's is rather less than that. But Reich occasionally becomes too facile, as when he speaks too often of Americans as "us" and "we." Tokar knows in his utopian-socialist bones how many class/sexual/racial/ethnic barriers must be bridged before we can become "we."

Reich says nothing about how his ideas might be translated into public policy . . . until his last paragraph, when we get this: "It is just possible Americans are already telling one another [new] stories, and are only waiting for a new set of leaders to give them clear voice." If Reich's ideas are half so path-breaking as he assumes, it's going to take more than a passive populace and A Few Good Men to put them into effect. It is going to take a political movement. The whole last section of Tokar's book is about how an effective political movement can be brought into being—one that would forge an "active relationship" between elected officials and grassroots efforts. But Tokar perhaps too quickly assumes it will have to be a marginal movement, far away from center stage. If Tokar serves to remind Reich that he'll have to struggle to achieve his goals, Reich serves to remind Tokar that the struggle is not, in itself, the goal.

Continued from page four:

independent initiatives as "policy initiatives to be taken by a government independently of its adversary in order to generate reciprocal action on the part of its adversary." By Sommer's definition, several proposals from the 99th Congress would qualify as independent initiatives.

In the Senate, John Kerry proposed an amendment barring anti-satellite weapons (ASATs) tests—unless the Soviets tested ASATs. *The amendment was tabled (defeated), 43-55.*

In the House, George Brown Jr. proposed an amendment barring testing ASATs against targets in space—unless the Soviets tested. *The amendment was adopted, 222-197.*

**r. Independent initiatives (II).** In the Senate, John Kerry proposed an amendment prohibiting any nuclear weapons tests in Star Wars research—so long as the Soviets refrained. *The amendment was tabled (defeated), 33-61.*

In the House, Norman Dicks (D-Wash.) proposed an amendment prohibiting deployment of weapons exceeding SALT II limits—so long as the Soviets refrained. *The amendment was adopted, 225-186.*

**s. Contadora.** The Contadora countries may have a better understanding of the U.S.'s long-term security needs than either the traditional left or traditional right. In the Senate, Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), and in the House, Mel Levine (D-Calif.), offered resolutions expressing support for the Contadora peace process. *Three Senators and 20 Representatives were co-sponsors.*

In the House, Leon Panetta (D-Calif.) introduced a resolution providing for "direct consultations" between the U.S. and the Contadora countries, and urging the U.S. to engage in various acts of commission and omission "in order to provide a favorable climate for the Contadora process." *Fifty-seven Representatives were co-sponsors.*

**t. Peace tax fund.** Senator Mark Hatfield and Rep. James Oberstar (D-Minn.) introduced a bill providing that a taxpayer "conscientiously opposed" to participation in war could have his or her income tax payments spent for non-military purposes only. A U.S. Peace Tax Fund would be set up to receive those payments—and to finance such peace-enhancing projects as international citizen exchanges, peace research, and small-scale local development in the Third World.

"During the Vietnam war, 1.6% of draftees were recognized as COs," says Marian Franz, director of the National Peace Tax Fund Campaign and chief lobbyist for the bill (NEW OPTIONS #17). "If that same percentage of taxpayers diverted their tax payments, the peace tax fund would receive about \$1.7 billion each year!" *Three Senators and 54 Representatives*

*were co-sponsors.*

### Why they don't pass

Most of the measures above did not lack for co-sponsors. So why did the vast majority of them die in committee?

According to many grizzled visionaries from the 60s, the answer is clear: The system is rigged in some way. But talk with some of the lobbyists who've been trying to push the measures above, and you'll get a different story.

According to the lobbyists, the shoe is on our foot. If most of our bills are biting the dust, it's because most of us are unorganized and ambivalent about working the system.

"Most Congresspeople will listen to lobbyists and use their information," David McGrath, former associate director of the Global Tomorrow Coalition, told NEW OPTIONS (McGrath helped steer the tropical forests bill—#0. above—through Congress). "But good information is not enough, good arguments are not enough. Congresspeople will not push for the legislation we're looking for *unless they hear from their constituents.*

"And it doesn't have to be shoals of messages. Individual letters written by thoughtful people in the [Congresspeople's home] districts will do it.

"On the tropical forests legislation, we needed [Washington state Senator Dan] Evans's support to get the bill through the Foreign Relations Committee and onto the floor. But one of his aides told us that the bill was going nowhere, and things [looked pretty grim].

"So we went to our little network in Washington state—30 citizens who'd attended our Globescope conference (NEW OPTIONS #14)—and they all sent letters and made phone calls to Evans. And guess what? Evans became a conservationist. We got the bill through the Foreign Relations Committee and got it at-

tached to the Child Survival Bill, and the President signed it.

"The moral of the story is that the system often works as our founding fathers wanted it to. And it works a lot better than the parliamentary system [many U.S. Greens wish they had in place in this country], where citizens can't put pressure on their representatives to get things done—only the senior ministers have any real power and if you're not in the right political party, forget it.

"Most of us think we're too insignificant to make our Congressperson listen to us. And that may be true for any one of us. But it doesn't take many, acting together, to get action.

"The PACs can give money and all of that. But votes are the bottom line for a Congressperson."

### Get your scorecard

A copy of New Options Inc.'s scorecard showing the positions taken by each of the 535 Congresspeople in each of the areas mentioned above is available for \$2 from NEW OPTIONS. (The scorecard is designed so you can superimpose your own grid and create your own scorecard.)

Copies of our scorecards from the 97th and 98th Congresses are also available for \$2 each.

---

*Robin Cahn and Trip Meima did some of the research for this report, and all of us benefited from discussions with people at the following organizations: American Holistic Medical Association, Business Executives for National Security, Campaign for U.N. Reform, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Center for War/Peace Studies, Fund for Renewable Energy and the Environment, Global Tomorrow Coalition, National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides, National Institute for Science, Law and Public Policy, National Peace Tax Fund Campaign, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, RESULTS, Rocky Mountain Institute, and Rodale Press.*

---

## NewOptions

New Options, Inc.  
Post Office Box 19324  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Issue No. Thirty-nine

Address Correction Requested

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Washington, D.C.  
Permit No. 4999