

FOR HRC

2

617 432-1000
- 617 432 1038

This is why I'm going to read his biographical statement.

Bear with me, please. Jay Winston received his Ph.D. in molecular biology from John Hopkins University. Concurrent with post-doctoral cancer research at Harvard Medical School, he devoted considerable time to free-lance writing for the lay press. His articles on science and health policy and on scientific research were carried by the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times Syndicate, the Christian Science Monitor, and the Associated Press.

He left the research laboratory in 1974 to pursue his long-standing interests in journalism and public policy and accepted a position at the Harvard School of Public Health. He directed the school's Office Of Health Policy Information, a resource center for policymakers and journalists. Conducted research, examining quality-assurance programs in medical care; assessed legislative proposals for medical cost containment; served as co-editor along with Nobel Laureate James Watson and Dr. Howard Hyatt of a three-volume "Origins of Human Cancer"; and conducted a three-year study of how news coverage of science and health is shaped by economic, organizational, and professional incentives in journalism.

Currently, he is associate dean in community affairs, for public and community affairs and director of the Center for Health Communication at the Harvard School of Public Health. The center works with journalists, advertising agencies, and the television industry to provide the public with reliable health information and to encourage the adoption of healthy behaviors.

Among his activities, among its activities, the Center sponsors the Harvard Alcohol Project, a national, research-based campaign to change Americans' social norms relating to driving after drinking. Participants in the Harvard Alcohol Project include leading advertising agencies, television networks, and Hollywood studios. Jay.

~~JAY WINSTON:~~ Thank you, Alan. I knew when you were done, cause I wrote it. Thank you all for having me here today. Going to talk about one specific project, the Harvard Alcohol Project as a case study, as a real-world case study, in an effort to give you of what it's possible to do with mass media, both within individual media markets, within each of your own communities and also at, at the national level and lastly, at the local, grassroots community level, not using television, et cetera, but local, public awareness efforts.

Just to begin, a key challenge facing health and social service professionals today is to mobilize the immense power of mass communications, to motivate individuals to adopt healthy behavior, to adopt policymakers' attention to important, but neglected, issues, and to frame those issues for public debate

and resolution.

* To address this challenge, five years ago, the Harvard School of Public Health established a center for health communication. The Center's mission is to develop, legitimize and institutionalize a new field of endeavor in academic public health, namely mass communication and health, and to do so in three ways:

Number one, by conducting and publishing research and analysis, documenting the contributions of mass communication to behavior change and policy.

Number two, developing a graduate curriculum at Harvard, to prepared future leaders in health in how to effectively utilize mass-communications strategies.

And third, to develop programs to work more closely with journalists who specialize in covering health issues.

On the one hand, we're collaborating with leading scholars in the behavioral sciences, especially within the school's Department of Health and Social Behavior, chaired by Professor Diana Walsh and simultaneously, we're working closely with leading practitioners on Madison Avenue, experts in advertising, marketing and public relations.

We're in the process of creating a small think tank, kind of nestled within Harvard University, a think tank in mass communication and health, which consists of seasoned practitioners, rather than scholars in the field. And we're working hand in hand with the scholars in our academic department.

* *good* Currently, for example, within the Center, three journalists are spending a full academic year in residence with us. Three do, every year, with support from the Sloan Foundation. Currently, from the Boston Globe, a senior editor from U.S. News and World Report, and a writer from Essence Magazine.

who? The Center's managing director is a former reporter for the Washington Post and a former health and medical editor at the San Diego Union. The Center's director of corporate and media planning was in her previous position a senior vice president of the New York City Agency, D.D.B. Needham.

Currently in residence with us this year as well, on sabbatical, is the president of Ogilvy & Mather's Washington, D.C. public relations subsidiary, Powell, Adams & Rinehart.

As, in addition to the people we're working with within in the Center on a daily basis, we've established an advisory board to help us gain access to different sectors of the communications

industry. The advisory board includes John Chancellor NBC; former CBS president, Frank Stanton; Jack Valenti, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America; Grant Tinker, former NBC chairman; Milton Gossett, co-chairman/CEO of Saatchi & Saatchi Advertising Worldwide; and Marvin Traube, chairman of Bloomingdale's, cause marketing is key to what we're all about.

In today's talk, I'm going to, by, by example, by case study, address the question of how you can use mass media to help overcome public complacency, to transform a tired, old issue, in to one that is fresh and newsworthy, to move an issue to a position of prominence on a public agenda, and to sustain attention to that issue over time.

4~ The case study that I'll utilize for this purpose is the Harvard Alcohol Project. And despite its broad name, it's not dealing with all aspects of alcohol use and abuse in American society. We chose one specific focus within that area, a specific focus, where we thought that the timing was right to accomplish something meaningful now, and we're using that particular narrow focus as a wedge, using, pushing with that wedge, hopefully, movement on the broad array of issues that relate to alcohol.

But we have only one, specific, narrow objective, and, indeed, you'll hear, we have only one specific, narrow message.

The project's goal is to demonstrate how a new social concept, not new by now, but it was when we started, the Designated Driver, can be rapidly introduced through mass communication, catalyzing a fundamental shift in social norm.

I'm gonna talk about the Harvard Alcohol Project in three different phases. The first phase has to do with our efforts within an individual media market, a local media market--in our case, Boston. It's an approach that can be replicated for a variety of health and social issues, through organizations in your own community.

Secondly, I'll talk about what we've attempted to do at the national level.

And, thirdly, I'll talk about a grass-roots community-based approach to promoting the same concept.

Amn! And, lastly, I'll close with an emphasis on the importance, the critical importance of long-term, strategic planning, in pursuing this kind of work, including the importance of intermediate objectives, which might seem too narrow and too limited to you, when you first think about them, given what you, what you hope to accomplish with regard to children's issues.

But you need to think about what is the action we can ask

people take, to take, that will bring them into our orbit, that will help to co-opt them as allies of ours. And that particular short-term objective is a means to a longer-term end, where you hope that, having made that commitment, they will be supportive of a variety of other initiatives that relate to children's issues.

To begin with the Boston media market; to begin with the Harvard Alcohol Project. Back in October, 1985, we were first establishing the Center for Health Communication. We had about nine different health issues on our agenda. We hadn't yet established priorities.

Drunk driving was one of the issues of the agenda, and it was there because driving after drinking is THE number-one cause of death among young adults in the United States. If current trends persist, in the lifetime of today's high school senior, more than one million Americans of all ages will die in alcohol-related crashes.

That's at a rate of about twenty-two thousand per year, which is equivalent to having a fully loaded jumbo jet go down every day of every--every week, excuse me, of every month of every year.

In October, 1985, a very popular TV newsman in Boston, at the NBC affiliate, WBZT/TV, Dennis Kowf, was killed, the victim of a drunk-driving crash.

The press corps was enraged. There were five hundred people at the funeral, including the Governor and the Mayor of Boston. One of the anchor reporters at WBZT, John Henning, gave a eulogy in which he said: There's so much anger in this room, it could blow the ceiling off this place.

And I read that in the Boston Globe the next morning, and I said to myself: This is a target of opportunity. The press corps has lost one of their own. They are enraged, engaged in the issue. And this is the time to exploit this in the public interest.

And I called John Henning, who I didn't previously know, and I asked him whether the time might be right to convene a luncheon meeting, a media luncheon, for broadcast and print journalists within the Boston area, to consider how within the context of good journalistic practices, they could work to deepen public understanding of the issue and to focus attention on possible solutions.

He thought the timing was, was perfect, and he most importantly agreed to co-host the luncheon and to co-sign the letters of invitation to his peers. He was really the dean of the broadcast press corps in our city. So, it wasn't Jay Winston

of Harvard writing to journalists. It was one of their own, and it was linked to an event that affected them emotionally, personally. 9d

And that will be one of my key points throughout this talk, the importance of involving an influential, an influential who has the access and the stature and the clout and the interest, the commitment to help make something happen.

You may have to do all the work for that influential, as we did in this project. We did all of the staff work. If we relied on John Henning, it couldn't possibly have happened. But it also couldn't have happened without him. 9 und

The first luncheon meeting occurred four weeks later. Forty-five journalists were in attendance at a small meeting room. On-air, the editorial directors for the TV and radio stations and from the Boston Globe and from the Boston Herald. News directors, on-air reporters. On-air reporters, who actually took vacation days, to guarantee they wouldn't be hauled away on assignment, to make sure they could come. Remember, this, a special case. They had lost a close friend.

At the end of that session, John Henning asked out loud--I wouldn't have had the guts to ask it, but he read the group correctly--whether they wanted a second session, and every hand went up affirmatively. And then someone in the audience from Channel 5 spoke up and said: Is Harvard committed to sticking with this?

There was only one answer to give, and, so, we had a second luncheon.

A second event intervened. A very popular lobbyist at the State House, Mike Ventreska, was killed, the victim of a drunk-driving crash. And now, the entire legislature was enraged and engaged in the issue, and the Governor moved quickly to retake the initiative, by introducing legislation, the Safe Roads Act, to strengthen laws relating to drunk driving in Massachusetts.

Now, once that law was introduced, we had a rationale over time for structuring a series of media luncheons, in which we were tracking the progress of that particular, proposed law.

For example, we invited our state Senate president, William Bolger, to speak before the group, and he broke with the Governor at that luncheon. The headline in the Herald the next day was: Bolger Breaks With Duke Over Safe Roads Act.

He had several, he had civil libertarian concerns about two of the provisions. Those provisions were already on the books in a number of other states, including Minnesota. So, for the subsequent session, we brought in two state officials from

Minnesota, to address our Senate president's concerns on the basis of their experience.

Senate president came back to hear their report, and we watched the man change his position over a period of two hours, and he went outside the room at the end of the luncheon before a Channel 5 camera crew and said: Maybe we can try, at least on an experimental basis, what they've done in Minnesota.

Now, he never in the end backed the bill. But he also didn't try to block it, and he could have single-handedly blocked it.

But, interestingly, he kept coming back to the subsequent luncheons. We invited at one session four district attorneys. The chief justice of the district courts. The state secretary of public safety. The Governor's chief general counsel. The co-chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee. And people who came as speakers ended up returning as regular participants, and, so, the group evolved in such a way that it became a very powerful force, with regard to this specific issue.

There reached a point when Sal DeMacy, the co-chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee on the House side, who, parenthetically, on the side, practices law, and he represents defendants in drunk-driving cases, and he's writing the law on, that affects his ability to win these cases, and that's not considered a conflict of interest in the great commonwealth of Massachusetts.

But he was sitting on the bill. So, we invited him to come before us and explain himself. Well, he reported--he came, all right. But he reported the bill out two days earlier, two days before his talk.

The Governor's chief general counsel came and used that opportunity with Sal DeMacy present, to applaud him, to posture Sal DeMacy as a statesman, in an effort to further influence him with regard to the course of the legislation.

And, so, there were a lot of different agendas that got played out. We were the honest brokers. We brought people together, and the truth is, it was not possible to predict precisely what that would lead to. I didn't know the Senate president was gonna break with Dukakis, et cetera.

But we had over a period of over two years seventeen such sessions, which led, in part, to enactment of the Safe Roads Act, and the Governor, in writing, stated that this media luncheon series was one important factor leading to enactment of that law.

Now, out of there, several different lessons out of the story so far. One is that we exploited a target of opportunity

that arose. On the drunk-driving issue, across the country, from time to time, when a prominent person is a victim of a drunk-driving crash, that community in that moment is transformed into a target of opportunity.

But you don't have to wait for a target of opportunity to occur with regard to a random crash. Take the case in Boston of the Boston Globe's recent series within the last year on infant mortality in the city of Boston, with an emphasis on the minority poor.

That front-page series so shamed the Harvard and other teaching hospitals in Boston, that for the first time the Mayor was able to get to the table all the key players, and major changes are being made currently involving multi-million-dollar commitments on the part of the teaching hospitals to--for example, physicians in neighborhood health centers are now being given admitting privileges at the hospitals.

So, there are linkages being created that never existed before, and that Boston Globe series was the target of opportunity. And you can achieve something extremely meaningful by lobbying the senior--a senior editor at the Metropolitan newspaper in your locale.

And I don't mean a one-shot meeting. As you'll see later, when I describe in detail, how we lobbied the Hollywood producers. I'm talking about, I'm talking about when William Paley, the former chairman of CBS, according to one of the books, decided that he wanted to marry a particular woman.

She was currently married to somebody else, and she was off in Europe with the somebody else. He got on the plane, and he went to Europe, and he pursued her, and he wooed her, and he won her, and that's what I'm talking about, with regard to lobbying a senior editor, not a one-shot meeting, and then you wait to see what happens.

Secondly, we, we, we worked through an influential, who had stature and influence with the particular group that we were trying to get to in order to convince them to do what we wanted them to do.

And thirdly, the project required someone--in this case, me-- who has a nose for news, who's interested in news, because every time--we had seventeen such sessions--and at the end of every luncheon, I went through an anxiety crisis: How am I gonna get them back in the tent the next time. How are we gonna move the issue forward and keep the momentum and keep their interest.

We're, parenthetically, we're about to try this particular approach again within Boston, beginning next week, and the topic is: Prevention of Domestic Violence and Child Abuse. And,

again, there's a brand-new law that was en--this case, already enacted in Massachusetts in December, that--relating to domestic violence, in particular, that establishes new authorities for local police departments and the like.

There are important implementation steps, including training programs for local police that will be key to the success of that law. We're putting together a working luncheon group to monitor and oversee the implementation of the law. We have the editorial directors from the NBC, CBS, and ABC affiliates in Boston coming. We have the Globe and the Herald.

The influential, this time, who's helping us convene, is our new State Attorney-General, Scott Harshbarger, who had been one of the four DAs who was involved in our previous series. So, he knows the series and he knows what it can accomplish.

Now, interestingly, since the letters went out under his signature and mine, including to top officials in the new Weld administration, they thought it was their issue, and they apparently see this as a move on the part of the Attorney-General to co-opt some of their turf. So, the Governor's top policy advisor has called to say she's coming. The Governor's Secretary of Human Services is coming. The Commissioner of Public Health is coming. They're bringing out the troops, because they've got to keep control of their issue.

Now, this might well have been a back-burner issue, and we've got the entire hierarchy from the Weld administration coming to this single lunch, and we'll see what happens.

Now, there was another outcome within Massachusetts of the series of working luncheons, and that relates to the origins of the Designated Driver Campaign, because it originated in the Boston media market.

I discovered the Designated Driver idea elsewhere; it originated in Scandinavia; and I was attracted to the concept for several reasons. First, the message, Designated Driver, gets past the negative dictum: Don't drink and drive. It offers a positive step that people can take.

Second, it's a message that's addressed to a group and not simply to an individual, and it's designed to promote interpersonal communication within a group.

Third, it's a message that's not anti-alcohol. We're not asking people not to drink. You know, there's only one amendment to the U.S. Constitution that's ever been repealed. I don't--despite the industry's concern about a neo-temperance, neo-Prohibitionist movement, I don't think that's gonna happen, and I think that a, that a frontal assault on alcohol use will backfire.

But at a more subtle level, the Designated Driver idea is a concept that tends to lend social legitimacy to the non-drinking role. In fact, it defines a new purpose of the non-drinking role, to be the designated driver. And the absence of the social legitimacy of the non-drinking role has been a major barrier to people not driving after drinking.

It's a simple message, a simple, clear message, and when you work with mass media, you need a simple message, you need a slogan. There needs to be complexity beneath the surface. The simple message needs to be the tip of the iceberg. There needs to be an iceberg under the tip.

And I've described some of the more subtle advantages that we saw of the Designated Driver concept.

Now, there have been criticisms of the Designated Driver concept. Some people would argue that it, that it tends to give license to everyone else to drink to excess, that it's enabling, and my response to that is that's the same argument that's made with regard to distribution of, of clean needles to prevent AIDS transmission through IV drug abuse. It's the same argument that's made with regard to distributions of condoms in schools, and it seems to condone the behavior.

Designated Driver is a short-term, expedient measure that's gonna save lives. And the people who criticize the concept, if we succeeded, beyond their wildest possibilities and prevented twenty-two thousand deaths per year and over half--over five hundred thousand serious internal injuries, those critics would still be angry at the Designated Driver idea. So, we simply persist.

But the point is, there's hardly any position you can take that won't be controversial, as viewed by some people. And that's critical, as you consider taking on an activist role, vis a vis your foundations or organizations that you may fund.

Well, I, through the relationships established in the working luncheons series, I went back to WBZT/TV and talked to an executive there. Remember, that's the station that lost Dennis Kowf. And I proposed to them that they export to Massachusetts the Designated Driver idea. And they responded positively. And, in fact, they signed up the State Restaurant Association as co-sponsor. And at its peak, over two hundred restaurants and taverns in the state were offering free, non-alcoholic beverages to the Designated Driver in each group.

This was promoted on every table top with signs like this that talked about free drinks for the Designated Driver. It was also promoted on air, by WBZ, three and four times a day for an entire year, public service announcements that they produced at

their own expense, using one of their anchor reporters, Liz Walker, broadcast in very attractive time slots.

✓
* Now, out of that experience, we learned the merits of the so-called station-sponsored intensive drive, which is in striking contrast to traditional public service advertising, in which one hundred and fifty groups are madly competing for unsold advertising time offered at 2AM in the morning, which is, I think, a waste of resources.

If somebody comes to you, and wants x-thousand dollars to produce the PSA, ask them what their media plan is, where it's gonna be broadcast, how often it's gonna be broadcast, and all of that has to be worked out before it's worthwhile investing in the production, because most of the PSAs produced by most public interest groups literally don't see the light of day--and I mean, literally, because it's 2AM in the morning--but even when they do, the National Council on Alcoholism had a superb spot on teenage alcohol abuse that was targeted at teens.

✓
* But I only saw that particular ad, and I saw it repeatedly on FACE THE NATION on Sunday morning. But there are no teens watching FACE THE NATION. So, if you don't have a media plan that gets to the targeting of the message so the message is going to be received by the people you are trying to reach and influence, it's a shameful waste of resources.

Give one example of a public relations strategy that we employed in support of the designated driver campaign in Massachusetts, and what you can do in a cost-effective way. We conducted--Harvard, for the first time--journalists like to say--conducted aerial advertising over Fenway Park during Red Sox baseball, an airplane carrying a banner about Designated Driver.

Good!
low cost
very effective
see Nichols
Fenway
new price

We worked out a lot in advance. As the plane flew over, the electronic scoreboard flashed the same message. Likewise, New England Sports Network broadcasting the game live turned its camera skyward to capture it for the TV audience.

Channel 5, the ABC affiliate, had sent a camera crew, and they covered it on the 6 o'clock news. The Boston Globe sent a photographer, and the next day in the Sunday paper, it was a six-column photograph of this airplane flying over Fenway Park. The Associated Press put out a wire story that was picked up a lot of local papers in the Massachusetts area.

The amount of secondary exposure of that message was immense at a total cost to us of one hundred and twenty-five dollars for the rental and use of that airplane for an hour. Thank God it didn't crash in Fenway Park.

Now, having discovered the merits--there's something funny about that--the merits of the so-called station-sponsored

intensive drive, we decided to spread our wings and see what we could accomplish at the national level.

Initially, we went to the three networks in New York, and we asked them to consider producing PSAs at their own expense, promoting the Designated Driver concept and to broadcast them frequently in prime time. That's a lot to ask.

But there are a lot of business-related reasons why it was in their interests to say yes. You always have to think about why, why will, is someone likely to say yes to what you want them to do. It helps to position the networks as responsible in their attitude towards alcohol use, and they're under attack in Washington with regard to beer advertising, for example.

So, this, in a voluntary way, they're taking the position that they can regulate themselves and be responsible about the depiction of alcohol, and they do not need federal intervention.

All three networks said yes, and for the past three years have been broadcasting frequently in prime time public service announcements promoting the Designated Driver Idea. This is the very first time that all three networks have ever agreed to simultaneous, prime-time public service campaigns with the same message.

In collaboration with Saatchi & Saatchi Advertising, we conducted advertising research against specific target groups that we were trying to influence with our messages, and we shared the results of that research with representatives of the three networks at a seminar we held in New York City at the Commonwealth Club, at the Commonwealth Fund, and the three networks went off and then produced their own PSAs, with their own, with their own script.

We went about seeking news coverage of the Designated Driver Idea. A lot of networking is involved here. Bill Wheatley had been a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, and he was the executive producer of NBC NIGHTLY NEWS, and I had stayed in touch with him. And Wheatley sent a camera crew from London to Stockholm to look at the Designated Driver concept in practice in the country where the concept originated, and this was broadcast just before New Year's Eve in 1986.

So, we're doing a lot with advertising, a lot with news coverage, a lot with public relations, such as the flyover in Fenway Park, and I would meet periodically in New York City at the Harvard Club with Dr. Frank Stanton and he would--for breakfast--and he would say: Jay, you're doing good work. But you're missing the boat. There's something else that you need to do.

And he made the case that nothing can begin to rival the

potential impact prime-time entertainment programming, where different demographic groups closely, closely follow particular shows, strongly identify with particular characters, are engaged in the subject matter, are connected to the story line, that there's enormous potential for modelling behavior in that situation.

Well, it took him, as you, as Alan indicated, my background is in molecular biology, not in Hollywood. It took Dr. Stanton two years to convince me to give that a try. I've come to like it. But it took two years to convince me.

And when I told him we were ready, he picked up the phone, and we called Grant Tinker, who had recently left NBC and was back out in Hollywood, heading up a new production company. And Tinker became the godfather of the project. He agreed to help.

Not only did he write--again, an example of the importance of having an influential--someone who is influential with the particular people that you're trying to reach and make and convince to do what you want to have them do.

Initially, Tinker wrote letters of introduction for me to the CEOs of the TV divisions of the thirteen largest studios in Hollywood. But he had them--asking them to see me--but he had them RSVP to him, not to me, as to whether or not they would see, and if he didn't hear from them, he picked up the phone and he called them.

And one April week, I met with thirteen CEOs, and they all said yes, they'd help.

Slowly, but surely, I discovered that I hadn't yet begun to talk to the right people, that the real decision makers, and those are the executive producers and the senior producers of the individual shows. And I was able to get access to them through the CEOs.

And I held individual meetings with producers in their offices. I only asked for ten to fifteen minutes for each meeting. Some of them lasted considerably longer at their initiative. In some cases, there'd be four or five producers, or the whole writing team would come to the meeting.

And what I asked them to consider doing on an occasional basis, and only if from their point of view, it worked for their show, was to incorporate a line or two of dialogue to reflect the evolution of a new social norm about driving after drinking, that I argued, on the basis of data, was already beginning to occur in the United States.

So, we weren't asking them to portray a social norm the opposite of reality, but, rather, to reflect changes already

~~underway, thereby adding momentum to those changes.~~ And we really felt that, as I indicated earlier, that the timing was right for a campaign on drunk driving at that particular time, because the groundwork had already been laid, thanks to groups such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

And we weren't gonna be pushing uphill. We were gonna be ~~adding momentum to changes already underway,~~ in exploiting an opportunity. So that when you see a broad, complex issue, you want to think about what is the particular, small piece where it is possible to make progress now and use that as a wedge to move the entire issue area forward.

The producers responded very enthusiastically. In many cases, they thought I was coming to ask them to do a thirty-minute episode on the subject, and when they heard they were being asked for a line or two, they were much relieved.

And one of the principles that I learned out of this is, ~~the less you ask, the more you get,~~ because once they started thinking about it, many of them did entire scenes, and about a dozen or more of the shows did entire thirty or sixty-minute episodes on this subject.

You'll see in a few minutes an excerpt from one of the shows, GROWING PAINS, starring Kurt Cameron--I had never heard of it either. But Kurt Cameron is a major teen-age heartthrob, and that show reaches about forty million people each week. And the producers of that show decided they were gonna go so far as to introduce a new character, a new boyfriend for teenage Carol, with the explicit intent of sacrificing him in an alcohol-related crash, so that their young audience would, would have a--experience the loss of someone they had come to know, in an effort to break through their young audiences' sense of denial and feeling of immortality that 'it can't happen to me'.

Now, I think that the producers said yes for several different reasons. Number one, we obtained the access that we needed. Mothers Against Drunk Driving had tried for years to do the same, and the L.A. MADD Chapter, for example, and they had failed. They failed, because they didn't have the access. But, more importantly, they--or, equally important--they were viewed as advocates--which they are. But advocates are viewed as people who you can never fully satisfy. So, since you're not gonna be able to satisfy them, you better establish an office within your studio to keep them at arms length. Let people talk to them--but not the producers. Let the producers go about their work.

Secondly, Grant Tinker's stature and standing in that community was immense. There'd be meetings in which people would refer to Tinker and point to me. They saw me as his agent, as his extension. So, again, we weren't simply outsiders. We were outsiders-slash-insiders, because I was Grant Tinker's agent.

Third, they were intrigued by the Harvard connection, and we took advantage of that.

Fourth, many of the producers are of an age where they have teenage kids, and when you tell them that drunk driving is the number-one cause of death among young adults, you have their attention.

Also, we're asking them to do very little: a line or two of dialogue. It's relatively easy for them to do, because, for better or worse, they're already depicting alcohol use in many cases.

In addition, the issue that we brought to them, despite some of the debates within academe and alcoholism treatment about Designated Driver, the broader issue of drunk-driving prevention is not a controversial issue. There's no other side out there, arguing in favor of drunk driving.

And, indeed, many of the script lines that have been written in are not references to Designated Driver. The bartender taking car keys away. It's a variety of approaches to drunk driving prevention.

If we had come to them, one side or another, with the issue of abortion, it would have been a very different kettle of fish. The lines never would've gotten on the air, because the Standards and Practices departments of the networks would have made sure that there was balance within the depiction of that issue.

There was no economic opposition to what we're all about. Drunk driving gives the alcoholic beverage industry a black eye. So, they're not opposed. Indeed, they support what we're all about.

In addition, as I indicated earlier, we, the producers and the public was primed and ready for a campaign now on this issue, and timing is key. These issues have a life of their own. Think about the smoking issue. Began in 1964, with the first Surgeon-General's report. You can see a sea-change in public opinion in that first twelve months in 1964. Some people may have quit smoking.

But this issue grew over time, and then it eventually--it went into an exponential growth phase, and that kind of crystallized and hung there in the public consciousness as a major issue, and that happened years later, I think, with, stimulated by the data on the health effects of passive smoking, which gave people license to speak up, which provoked work-site smoking policies, and non-smoking sections in restaurants, and no-smoking at all on airplanes.

But if you had attempted back in 1964 to define explicit, short-term objectives, as funders you were looking for accomplishments after one to two years, you'd be in trouble, because that issue was gonna take--the whole issue of violence against women, for example, right now. Movies like THE ACCUSED are making contributions to that. But you can't measure that, and it's gonna build over time. And, perhaps, ten years from now, there'll be a reason why it surfaces and crystallizes, leading to a sea change in the way we view things--as happened with tobacco, with what used to be perceived as a sexy, attractive habit, tobacco smoking, today has a stigma connected to it in many social circles. Q m

There was a quote a couple of years ago on the front page of the Wall Street Journal to the effect that to be a smoker in the business community today is to give evidence of lack of self-discipline.

Well, that is a radical sea change in the way we view the same behavior. And our goal with regard to the Harvard Alcohol Project is to achieve an equivalent change in the public perception of the acceptability of driving after drinking.

Well, the producers said yes, and the producers, in the end, acted. But I didn't assume, take for granted, that they were going to act. I talked about a--William Paley--and a William Paley approach. Let me give you a sense of how we went about courting the two hundred or so, two hundred and fifty executive producers and senior producers who were the gatekeepers, who influenced--every time they said 'yes', we were reaching forty to fifty million.

And the whole hypothesis of our project was that the cumulative impact of a line or two at a time over the long term would be very, very significant.

This is what we did to encourage the producers, after I held the one-on-one meeting, because not much would have happened, if all we did was hold that round of meetings, per se, even though we had gotten the access, even though they wanted to help, even though they were eager to help, because they're very busy, and they're torn in different directions, and they have to remember to help, after you've left the office.

First, we went to Daily Variety, the trade newspaper, and, lo and behold, we found a reporter, Maurie Gelman, who was interested in this project, and who has covered it on a regular basis. Every time there were another twenty shows that had done something, we were able to get coverage about the recent progress of the Harvard Alcohol Project.

We would take those news clips and we would send them to the producers. We'd do periodic mailings. Likewise, we lobbied the

New York Times for an editorial that would applaud the TV industry for their commitment to this project. We got that editorial and we circulated it all over Hollywood.

The, the news clips helped to create a sense of momentum and continuity about the project. We developed these plexiglass paperweights: Who's Driving Tonight? The Designated Driver. On the other side: The Harvard Alcohol Project, Harvard School of Public Health.

Wholesale close-out. Five dollars and fifty cents each. These today sit on coffee tables and offices of executive producers throughout Hollywood, as a reminder. It's sitting in front of them as a reminder.

We organized a reception at the restaurant, Spago, in West Hollywood, that the owners--(TAPE ENDS AT THIS POINT)

Karen Smith
4/16/92
Little Company

TRAINING MANUAL

FOR

FIRST LADY MAIL

Updated
(4/9/92)

FYI
Alice
Thought you'd be
interested in this
Maggie

YOUR INITIALS

**DATE OF EVENT
(If Applicable)**

AGENCY, STAFF OR ROBO

encl. # __, __

insert: _____

cc:

ANY UNUSUAL SALUTATION

SHOULD BE NOTED HERE ALSO

(Dear Students, Dear third party, etc.)

Dear Analyst,

Welcome to the world of mail coding. This booklet will be a guideline you will want to keep with you while analyzing the mail. There will be updates and changes to these dispositions and you will wish to keep your own notes as well.

When you analyze a letter, please check to see that the letter is addressed **ONLY** to the First Lady (FL) and to no one else. If the letter is addressed to any other party **OR** the FL and any other person (ie President and Mrs. Bush), circle the addressee(s) and put in STAFF bin. Also check for a name and complete address of the writer. If these are incomplete or missing check the letter for threats (see enclosed for disposition on threats), if the letter is not threatening F/ANON or F/IA.

Most of Mrs. Bush's mail will be coded using one of the codes listed in the following pages. Except for letters you must send to Secret Service, you should underline the pertinent parts of the letter or place a bracket outside the important paragraph (PLEASE BE NEAT). You will **FIRST** put your initials in the upper left corner of the incoming letter, then carefully decide which of the many codes to put under your initials. Sometimes you will be using more than one code, and these should be neatly written, exactly as shown above (PLEASE DO NOT BE CREATIVE), under your initials. **ALWAYS AND FOREVER WRITE ONLY IN PENCIL --- NO PENS ALLOWED.**

Thank you,

Mrs. Bush's Staff

P.S. Always read the **ENTIRE LETTER** -- all the way through the P.S. Often a writer will change his theme or reason for writing several times before reaching the end of the letter. You never know when the very last word will completely change your mind about the code you plan to use (I have seen beautifully written letters where the last line of the letter is so very insulting the letter had to be filed -- F/CRUDE!)

CODE

HOW AND WHEN TO USE:

(PLEASE WRITE THESE CODES EXACTLY AS SHOWN)

SS

****SECRET SERVICE -- DO NOT write on these letters**
 Write "SS" on a buckslip and give to Anne or Karen
 -Threats
 -Very crude letters
 -Odd letters mentioning SS, FBI, CIA, etc.

\$

MONEY MAIL (Robert Houser handles this mail)
 -ANY MONEY sent to the White House (even a penny)
 -Any letter mentioning that writer is sending money
 (if the money is not enclosed brief the letter
 "No \$ Encl")

MI

MORE IMPORTANT -- These should be given immediately to Anne or Karen
 -Foreign or domestic: Celebrities, CEO's, Elected Officials -- Federal and State, Agency officials, etc.
 -Personal friends
 -Time sensitive (Must be answered very soon)
 -Letters from the following are likely to be MI:
 Ashley Hall (School)
 Houston, TX
 Kennebunkport, ME
 Midland, TX
 Military friends
 Phillips Andover Academy
 Rye Country Day (School)
 Rye, NY
 Smith College
 Yale

*BB response
 - can request
 BB signature
 vice paper*

A. PEREZ

ANNA PEREZ

-All media related mail
 -All mail concerning anything published, now or in the future, in Mrs. Bush's name
 -Requests concerning items to be published about BB
 -Do not send Yearbook and School Newspaper publication requests

- prisoners, foreigners, mental patients -
Should not get response from WH
*? Sally Kelley will handle

3

HARDSHIPS:
(S. KELLEY) 1) Write your initials
(JCD-10B) 2) JCD-10B
3) cc insert: agency code, if known

(We will look at this,
but another agency
will handle)

-Hardships
-Agency complaints
-Sensitive subjects in the news

-Certain items may be coded simply -- S. KELLEY/FYI

***RED TAG & BRIEF DIRECTLY FOR S. KELLEY-- suicide,
cancer, and time sensitive items

SCHED SCHEDULING -- Requests for the FL's time to: meet,
attend, speak, shake hands, make a tape
*DO NOT send school reading requests (See BB-41
series). If the school is in ME, TX, the
greater DC area, or the FL will be near the
location of that school soon, add: cc A. Brock
*RED TAG -- events scheduled for less than ten days
from the current date

L. FIRESTONE LAURIE FIRESTONE -- handles requests to perform or
attend White House Functions

J. COOKE JULIE COOKE -- handles projects in which the FL is
particularly interested. These letters should
be on letterhead or should be from writers who
have made great efforts in one of these areas.
-Literacy
-Learning Disabled (Including Hardships & Messages)
-Honoraries (Even with mention of a sched request)
-AIDS
-Head Start
-Education
-Homeless

J. COOKE JULIE COOKE (FYI)
(FYI) -Prisoners writing about the letter from BB
published in the Inside Journal
-Published material, newsletters, magazines, fliers,
etc., related to the categories under J. Cooke

C CHILDREN'S MAIL -- should be put in this bin

J. LEACH**JEAN (WALLACE) LEACH**

- Requests for actual BB autographs when writer sends the item to be signed (Otherwise see JCD-20 series) and all MI requests
- Requests for signed Millie Book or signed Bookplate

SP D**SPECIAL DRAFTS --**

- Not a note
- need to proof
- whole letter*
- Message Requests -- to **DEBBIE** in SP D (never send these to an agency)
 - Letters that can be answered by combining ROBOs
 - Letters that require some research before answering
 - Letters that can not be answered in any way mentioned in this booklet
 - Complaints about previous responses
 - Bills/invoices

G PETERSMEYER**GREG PETERSMEYER -- "Points of Light" (Legitimate suggestions or comments)****GIFTS****GIFT UNIT**

- Gifts of Tax Value
- Questions re these gifts

K.B.**K. B. -- Mail re Presidential Appointments****C. B. GRAY****C. B. GRAY**

- Federal Judges
- Legal action against the WH or the First Family or Federal Government

**WH USHERS
OFFICE****GARY WALTERS -- Chief Usher**

- WH Food Purchase/Menu
- WH Housecleaning/Flower Arrangements
- Christmas Decorations/Tree

**WH CURATOR'S
OFFICE**

- WH Furnishings
- Presidential Portrait
- WH History
- Gifts donated to the WH (not personally to the First Family)

MILLIE

- any mail addressed directly to Millie
- will not handle*

R/F

READ AND FILE --

- Thank yous for events hosted or attended by BB
- All Magazines and Newspapers
- Leaflets about gardening, needlepoint, any items of personal interest to BB or items you would enjoy if you were Mrs. Bush
- Thank yous or comments concerning BB or the Bush family personal activities (past or present)

FILES:Must be marked as follows:

F/PROP

PROPAGANDA

- (duplications of HHS)
- Preprinted letters/cards
 - Handwritten letters/telegrams all using exact same wording

F/CRIT

CRITICAL

- Overly critical of the President (critical of the man rather than his policies)
- Overly critical of anyone else

F/Q

QUESTIONABLE

- Crazy or incoherent letters

F/PROLIF

PROLIFIC

- (same person writing over & over)
- Writer admits to writing over and over
 - Writer is on the Prolific List

F/NO REPLY

WRITER REQUESTS THAT WE NOT REPLY.

F/ANON

ANONYMOUS

- Letter is anonymous (but not threatening)

F/IA

INCOMPLETE ADDRESS on incoming letter

F/ILLEG

ILLEGIBLE WRITING

F/CRUDE

CRUDE LETTER (no answer)

F/COPY

COPY LETTER (If hardship -- S. Kelley/FYI)

F/MISC

- Unaccompanied newsclips with no comments on them
- Chain letters, Celebrity Trash requests
- Subject, issue or policy mail -- when given the disposition to file from your supervisor
- Prisoners or mental patients that cannot be answered by an agency or staff

*YUS Bush actually
looks at these*

*Should not
make it to me*

MISCELLANEOUS CODES

Greetings

Requests: ****FOR ALL OF THESE REQUESTS -- CLEARLY MARK THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY TO RECEIVE THE GREETING, AND WRITE THE DATE OF THE EVENT AT CENTER TOP OF INCOMING LETTER**

-Christmas Card Requests -- **GREETINGS**

-MI Requests code for -- **appropriate BB ROBO**
If none are appropriate code -- **SP D**

-General card requests from BB and/or GB code for one of the following if possible:

B-1	Birthday 80-99 years
B-2	Birthday 100+
B-3	Anniversary 50+
B-4	Eagle Scout Award
B-4B	Gold Award -- Girl Scout
B-5	Wedding Congratulations
B-6	Baby Congratulations
B-7	Religious (First Communion, etc.)
B-8	Illness
B-9	Condolence
B-10	Retirement
B-11	Graduation
B-12	General Joyous Occasion

-Multiple requests, unusual requests or requests with incomplete information code -- **GREETINGS**

Foreign Mail: -Foreign MI mail -- **SP D**

-Hardships -- **S. KELLEY** (No JCD-10B)

-General support from "friendly countries" code --
encl #_____

-Comments, questions, requests other than photo requests -- **HHS, ED, or DOS/POST** (DOS/POST for foreign mail not fitting any other disposition)

Prisoners: -Mention "Inside Journal" article -- **J. COOKE/(FYI)**

-True Hardship -- **appropriate agency**

-All other answerable letters -- **DOJ**

-Unanswerable -- **FILE**

Mental

Patients: -Hardships -- **S. KELLEY (FYI)** -- No JCD-10B

-All others -- **F/MISC**

Requests:

*Request for photo
No other request*

-MANY ITEM REQUESTS CAN BE ANSWERED MERELY BY CODING FOR THE APPROPRIATE ENCLOSURE, FOR EXAMPLE: Official Photos, Recipes, Biographies, White House Booklet, etc. These do not usually need to be accompanied by ROBOS. Please do not code for a ROBO unless it is necessary or the writer truly deserves it.

-Check ROBO INDEX for letters suitable for other requests and turndowns

-Auction Item Requests (NON POLITICAL ONLY) - JCD-7

**** See Enclosure List** for Available items

Philippines**Mail:**

-This mail may be coded one of three ways:
VA/PHIL -- for veteran questions/comments
DOD/PHIL -- for military questions/comments
DOS/PHIL -- for most other questions/comments

FREQUENTLY USED CARDS

Please consider coding for the following cards before considering the ROBOS. These cards do not have to go through typing and save much time in proofing, etc.

BBC-1	Support for BB & GB (BBs Signature)
BBC-3	Photo and signature of BB & Millie
BBC-4	Short BB thank you card
BBC-5	Support for GB in Persian Gulf (BB Sig)
BBC-7	Persian Gulf comments (BB Sig)
BBC-8	Photo and signature of BB
GO-1	GB General TKU
GO-2	
GO-3	GB/BB General TKU
GO-4	BB General TKU
GO-5	BB Remembrance/Small gift
GO-6	GB/BB TKU for prayers
GO-7	GB/BB TKU for prayers for USA

ISSUE MAIL

ISSUE MAIL: Includes topics such as: abortion, gun control, wearing fur, world event comments and suggestions, ecology (when legislation is involved), etc. For issue mail you should use one of the following responses:

JCD-6 Strictly comments or fair criticism
JCD-18 "Tell the President" letters
JCD-22 "Change the President's mind" or
 "influence legislation or policy" letters
JCD-35's Current event comments

- * Sometimes a ROBO is created to answer a particular issue when the volume of incoming mail on that subject is great enough to warrant it (During Desert Storm, for example, several ROBOS were issued to help answer this mail).
- * When you notice several letters on the same subject in your mail, please let Anne or Karen know so these can be collected and a disposition on this mail can be given. Usually this mail will be on a subject currently in the news.

DOTS: When applicable these are placed in the upper right corner of the incoming:

Red -Time sensitive mail
Yellow -Letter is VERY WELL WRITTEN

Pink BB SIG Card: Paperclip to front of letters you wish BB to sign

urgent terms

*** IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER ***

- * PLEASE BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE ROBOS (BB'S AND JCD'S) AND MAKE USE OF THE SUBJECT INDEX. ROBOS SHOULD BE USED, WHEN A SUITABLE ROBO EXISTS, FOR MAIL THAT DOES NOT FALL UNDER ANY ONE OF THE MANY DISPOSITIONS LISTED ABOVE.
- * BB LETTERS SHOULD BE USED SPARINGLY. THESE ARE BARBARA BUSH LETTERS AND SHOULD BE SPECIAL (JCD LETTERS SHOULD BE USED MORE FREQUENTLY).
- * REMEMBER SOME WRITERS MAY BE HOPING FOR A BB RESPONSE THAT CAN BE USED FOR POLITICAL GAIN. WE ARE THE ONES THAT MUST BE SURE THIS DOES NOT HAPPEN. ANY RESPONSE FROM THIS OFFICE IS A REFLECTION ON THE PRESIDENT AND JUST MAY BE PUBLISHED IN THE NEWS!
- * YOU WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CODING FOR INSERTS. THESE MUST BE NEATLY WRITTEN WITH NO ABBREVIATIONS OR MISSPELLINGS. PLEASE DO NOT EXPECT THE TYPIST TO CORRECT YOUR WORK OR WRITE OUT YOUR ABBREVIATIONS. THE TYPIST WILL TYPE EXACTLY WHAT IS WRITTEN.
- * YOU WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CODING FOR ALL NECESSARY ENCLOSURES. PLEASE DO NOT OVERLOOK THE WRITER'S REQUESTS AND PLEASE SEND EXACTLY WHAT HE REQUESTS IF THE ITEM IS AVAILABLE AND THE REQUEST IS REASONABLE. WITH CHILDREN, ESPECIALLY, YOU MAY BE GENEROUS IN CODING FOR ENCLOSURES. PLEASE MAKE THE ENCLOSURES MATCH THE CONTEXT OF THE WRITER'S LETTER. (IF HE WRITES ABOUT HIS PET SEND A PHOTO INCLUDING MILLIE, IF HE WRITES ABOUT THE WHITE HOUSE SEND ENCL #36, ETC.)
- * YOU SHOULD ALSO ATTACH THE PROPER ENCLOSURE TO THE LETTER TO ASSURE THAT THE WRITER WILL RECEIVE IT. (SOMETIMES WE RECEIVE COMPLAINTS THAT THE WRITER HAS NOT RECEIVED AN ENCLOSURE WITH HIS LETTER.)
- * AFTER YEARS AND YEARS OF CODING I STILL LOOK UP EVERY ROBO I AM THINKING OF USING, BEFORE WRITING ANYTHING ON THE INCOMING LETTER. LIKEWISE, YOU MUST LOOK AT THE ROBO YOU ARE PLANNING TO USE. IT TAKES TIME, BUT IT SAVES EVEN MORE TIME.
- * IF YOU ARE UNSURE OF A CODE -- PLEASE DO NOT WRITE ALL OVER THE TOP OF THE LETTER. USE A BUCKSLIP TO GIVE YOUR SUGGESTION FOR THE PROPER CODE. PUT IN THE BIN MARKED "FOR ANNE". THIS WAY I WILL NOT HAVE TO ERASE SO MANY INCORRECT CODES. I HAVE COME TO LOATHE ERASER DUST!

FYI
HRC

What Hillary Clinton Really Believes About Child Policy

Duncan Lindsey
University of Toronto

draft (Fri Aug 28 1992)

Duncan Lindsey is the Editor-in-Chief of Children and Youth Services Review and an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Social Work at the University of Toronto. He was recently a visiting scholar at the Child Welfare Research Center at the University of California, Berkeley.

What Hillary Clinton Really Believes About Child Policy

First lady Nancy Reagan was a purposeful advocate for a drug-free America and targeted her message to children. Doubtless there were critics of her approach, but she had an impact. Her sponsorship of the "Just Say No" message allowed it to sweep across the nation. Likewise, Barbara Bush has been a leading spokesperson for the cause of literacy education. Her advocacy has allowed many to overcome the historic barriers of stigmatization and guilt previously associated with adults learning to read. Although critics can be found of any advocacy effort, by and large, the efforts of these first ladies have been broadly approved.

With the recent precedents set by these two first ladies, it is surprising to observe the criticisms of the advocacy work of Hillary Clinton on behalf of children. The difference is that Hillary Clinton has advocated for these issues before entering the public eye as the wife of a presidential candidate and she has made contributions to the professional literature on children's policy in two of the most distinguished journals in the field; the Harvard Educational Review and the Yale Law Journal. These are considered among the most important professional forums in their field and have long traditions of upholding the highest standards of scholarship and research. Hillary Clinton did not gain access to or make her contributions to these forums as a result of her marriage to presidential aspirant Bill Clinton. Hillary Clinton published these contributions before marrying Bill Clinton and well before he was a presidential candidate.

Since Hillary Clinton established her views with published articles in distinguished scholarly professional journals, her views have become the material for review before, and not after, the presidential campaign, and thus have become the objects of often polemic and less objective political scrutiny. This is reasonable. After all, Hillary Clinton will have a voice on these issues if her husband is elected.

12

In the heat of a close political campaign the analysis of Hillary Clinton's views regarding children's issues have not been subjected to careful and balanced analysis and appraisal, but rather have become the source of both unfair and distorted ~~portrayals~~ as well as over statement and exaggeration. In this discussion I would like to examine the views of Hillary Clinton and place them within the context of current debate within the child policy field.

Hillary Clinton has made many contributions to the professional and scholarly literature. In this discussion I will focus on her two most important contributions both because they are representative of her overall contribution and because they identify two of her most important themes-- the legal rights of children and policy and programs which emerge from an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of children.

In 1973, Hillary Clinton published the lead article in an issue of the *Harvard Education Review* that included several papers that have now become landmark contributions. Stanford University Law Professor Robert Mnookin published his famous and frequently cited paper on legal issues surrounding foster care in this issue. In addition, Harvard University Professor Robert Light published his important paper on the incidence of child abuse and neglect.

In her article entitled, "Children Under the Law" Hillary Clinton (then known as Hillary Rodham) examined the changing status of children under the law. This paper has been widely used and frequently cited. Essentially this paper provides an examination of children's rights from a legal perspective. In fact, when it was reprinted in a collection of papers on children's rights published by Columbia University it was retitled, "Children's Rights: A Legal Perspective." The paper falls into the category of traditional legal scholarship with frequent reference to previous court cases and the emergence of case law in the area. The paper does not advocate certain positions, but rather reviews the positions of others and sets them within a broader theoretical framework.

Within this framework of legal scholarship, the concerns developed by Hillary Clinton can be described as representative of one of several lines of inquiry in the area of children's rights. As Dr.

William Garrison (1984, p. 362) has indicated, "Legal scholars have, in recent years, increasingly concerned themselves with the rights of children and adolescents" and from this work three major viewpoints on children's rights can be identified:

- 1) a "strong child advocacy movement (Takanashi, 1978),"
- 2) "the search for a definition of the child's status under the law (Brillham, 1973)" and
- 3) the provision for the child's "competence to participate in personal decision making (Gaylin, 1982)." (Garrison, p. 362)

The first position is representative of the recent approach taken by the United Nations in its Convention on the Rights of the Child. (The United States is alone among the modern industrial nations to not sign this convention.) Hillary Clinton's work, which represents the second approach, has examined the search for a definition of the child's status under the law. Her focus has been to review developments in case law and child development research with respect to defining the child's status under the law. Although this topic lacks glamour and sizzle, it is fundamental to developing a foundation for child policies and programs.

Finally, the third major approach to the legal rights of children identified by Garrison concerns efforts to assess the competence of minors and their ability to participate in decision-making. Although some overlap is inevitable among all three approaches, they represent consistent themes which have emerged. Since our concern is with the views of Hillary Clinton, we will focus on the second approach as it is developed in her paper.

The Child's Status Under the Law

Historically the child has been viewed as having limited status under the law. The interests of the child have been identified as being the same as those of his parent. Consequently, the child's rights were defined by the parents. When the child turned eighteen years of age then he or she attained independent legal status. Over time case law has provided children with additional rights independent

of their parents and often requiring approval of the parents. In custody disputes the courts have now permitted testimony by children as young as 12 years of age. Children are permitted the "right" to drive at age 16.

Children's Rights and Coercive State Intervention

After reviewing the changing legal status of children, Hillary Clinton examines the rights of children subjected to child abuse and neglect (either physical, sexual or emotional). Hillary Clinton contrasts the two principal legal standards used to determine when the state should intervene in situations of child abuse and neglect.

- 1) "the best interest of the child" standard and
- 2) "the least detrimental alternative for the child" standard.

Examination of these standards represents the heart of her work. In her closing paragraphs Hillary Clinton writes, "Even though state interference with family privacy should be minimized because of the state's unwillingness, or inability, to care for children as well as most families do, the state, representing the community of adults, has the responsibility to intervene in cases of severe emotional deprivation or psychological damage if it is likely that a child's development will be substantially harmed by his continued presence in the family." (p. 514)

The major concern regarding state intervention in cases of child abuse and neglect is with developing adequate legal standards. Hillary Clinton observes, "This will involve specifying acceptable reasons for intervention and providing workable review mechanisms for the initial decision and the child's placement. Intervention should be allowed only after the state has attempted to provide services for the child and his parents aimed at ameliorating the conditions of neglect. Only medically justifiable reasons for intervention should be acceptable. *Parental behavior that does not result in medically diagnoseable harm to a child should not be allowed to trigger intervention, however offensive that behavior may be to the community.*" (p. 514)

This represents a conservative legal position which strictly limits state intervention. It should be noted that there is no mention of children disobeying adults or suing their parents. These are issues outside the scope of legal standards considered by Hillary Clinton. In fact, given her emphasis on strict legal standards and limited state intervention in the family, it is unlikely that she would support an increased involvement of the courts in family life. Rather, as seen above, she has argued for the opposite.

Children's Policies

Concern at the federal level with children's policies has suffered from benign neglect. As Hillary Clinton (1977, p. 1523) writes in *The Yale Law Journal*, "In a recent address to a conference on children's needs, a United States senator admitted he knew nothing about the subject and would have felt more comfortable discussing energy. Policymakers are simply not accustomed to thinking about children's needs in the same ways they think about missile development, dam construction, or even old-age assistance." Yet this is an area of major concern for Hillary Clinton. In the *Yale Law Journal* she reviewed Gilbert Steiner's, The Children's Cause, a study of children's policies and programs at the federal level in the United States. She complements the study for "treating the subject with the professional respect due serious political issues" and for "stripping away much of the sentimentality, political naivete, and excuse-making that have served as camouflage for ineffectiveness, waste, and fuzzy thinking."

There are two major viewpoints (or paradigms) which have guided, and continue to guide the development of children's policies and programs. The predominant view has been termed "compensatory" or the "residual model" and it is the view advocated by Steiner. The focus of this approach, according to Hillary Clinton, is to "attempt to remedy deficiencies in a particular child population" (p. 1526). [Steiner] "urges children's advocates to temper their demands, sharpen their practical political skills, and work to improve and expand existing programs for 'demonstrably unlucky children whose bodies or minds are sick or whose families are unstable or in poverty' (citing Steiner, 1976, p. 255)."

12

The other major approach to children's policies has been termed "comprehensive" and promotes programs that "provide services for the entire child population" (p. 1526).

The limitation of the compensatory approach is that it requires children have problems before services are provided. It thus has the paradoxical effect of rewarding those who fail or fall behind.

In contrast to the compensatory approach, the comprehensive approach views children's policies and programs as part of the broader public infrastructure designed to nurture and develop the potential of all children. Like the public school system, public health programs, and recreational programs, children's policies and programs should provide opportunities to all children that will allow those children to develop their full potential.

Hillary Clinton disagrees with Steiner's argument for the compensatory model. She writes, "There is nothing wrong with pressing for better programs for the needy, but Steiner sets his sights too low." In addition, Hillary Clinton argues for thoughtful accountability in programs. She observed in 1977, "Refinement of established programs such as Head Start, may provide another avenue for experimentation in child development policy. Recent evidence indicates that Head Start is achieving not only its original purpose, namely cognitive gains, but also improvements in children's social behavior, parental attitudes, community involvement, and children's health. This successful evolution suggests that the program should be strengthened and expanded within its present structure with an eye to testing the comprehensive approach." (p. 1531)

After examining and discussing the compensatory and comprehensive approaches, Hillary Clinton concludes by embracing a centrist position which recognizes the role of each position. In her concluding paragraph she writes, "Steiner's failure to endorse a comprehensive approach to children's policies is disappointing. In advocating more of the same compensatory programs, Steiner fails to recognize that the compensatory and comprehensive approaches are complementary and should be pursued simultaneously." (p. 1531)

The 1970s, when Hillary Clinton published the papers discussed above, were a decade of great accomplishment in the child welfare field. Major research and demonstration programs that were based on finding from research conducted in the previous decade were conducted. These federally supported research programs demonstrated the effectiveness of the "permanency planning" approach. Permanency planning was an approach that was critical of government programs that allowed children to be removed from their parents and placed in foster care with no prospects of a permanent setting being planned. The emphasis of permanency planning was to return the children home or to free them for adoption-- to find the children a permanent home.

Research conducted in Oregon, California, Tennessee and elsewhere, as well as the multiple state research of the Children's Defense Fund laid the foundation for comprehensive child welfare reform (Knitzer, Allen, & McGowan, 1978). In 1980, Congress passed the most comprehensive legislation in decades, the Adoptions Assistance and Child Welfare Act (1980), implementing on a federal level the finding from the permanency planning research. The number of children in foster care had been reduced from almost 500,000 to about half that number. The 1980s began with hope and expectation of being a great period of progress for children (Lindsey, 1982).

Recent Efforts

Hillary Clinton made her important contributions to the professional literature more than a decade ago. What has happened since the publication of these papers? Like many women in modern America Hillary Clinton has had to balance her personal and professional life. What began with a remarkable contribution to legal scholarship at a young age has shifted to a balance between raising a family and continuing her work on behalf of children, along with trying to hold down a legal career and obtaining a partnership in a major law firm. During the last several years Hillary Clinton has served on the Board of Directors of the Children's Defense Fund, and serving as chair for several years. Under her leadership the Children's Defense Fund has become what many regard as the most important and successful nonpartisan research and advocacy organization for children in the United States.

In spite of her work with the Children's Defense Fund, the last dozen years have been quiet and uneventful in terms of progress for children. The great hope and expectation of the 1980s did not materialize. On the federal level, the last ten years have been a decade of inaction. Programs for children operated at the federal level have been slowly dismantled. Yet, as the research published by the Children's Defense Fund and other children's advocacy groups have pointed out, it has been a decade of decline for children. As mentioned earlier, in 1977 it was estimated that almost 500,000 children were in foster care but that, as a result of the achievements of the permanency planning movement, the numbers had been reduced to about 250,000. The most recent figures indicate that the number of children in foster care has almost doubled and is now approaching 500,000. This compares to Japan, with a population about half the size of the United States, which has less than 3,000 children in foster care. During the last dozen years the number of reports of child abuse and neglect have increased by more than 150 percent (from 1,154,000 in 1980 to more than 2,500,000 in 1991). The rate of child abuse and neglect reports in the United States is many times higher than any other industrialized nation in the world. The rate is more than ten times higher than Canada, just across the border and magnitudes higher than Germany, Italy, France, Japan and other industrialized countries.

The number of children living in poverty in the United States stopped going down and has begun increasing (Johnson, Miranda, Sherman, & Weill, 1991). Children now represent the single highest category of people in poverty. In the United States almost one fifth of all children live in poverty. Perhaps most staggering of all is the situation of young black children in the United States. Almost two out of every three black children born in the United States will be born to single unwed mothers, most of whom live in severe poverty.

Although there is widespread public concern about the declining economy and the recession, the situation for children in the United States is more like a depression. If there were a children's misery index composed of the number of children growing up in poverty, ^{in foster care} or reported for child abuse and neglect, the indicator would have more than doubled in the last decade. As the President's own commission on child abuse reported (U.S. Advisory Board of Child Abuse and Neglect, 1991, p. 47), "Child maltreatment is a serious, complex, and widespread problem that often has lasting

consequences. It demands a comprehensive, high-priority response. The failure to provide such a response has led tragically to a system that is overwhelmed and on the verge of collapse--a collapse so grave that children will be even more seriously at risk than they are now, thus causing countless additional American children to suffer irreparable harm."

But the last decade has also been a calamity for all children, not just those living in poverty or reported because of abuse and neglect. During the last decade the United States has gone from the nation owed the most money to the nation owing the most money. The national debt was approximately one trillion dollars ten years ago. Now it has grown to about four trillion dollars with no foreseeable trend in the other direction. This is a debt which this generation will leave to the next. If the debt were divided and assigned to each child equally it would amount to more than \$60,000 per child. As Ross Perot, ^{U.S. Senator} Phil Gramm and others have pointed out, the issue of the national debt is fundamentally an issue of child policy.

Hillary Clinton has opinions on these child policy issues. She has developed the theoretical base for these views in her published works. Although a centrist on children's rights, her underlying passion is found in her concern for the welfare of all children through her work on behalf of children at the Children's Defense Fund. Make no mistake about it, in the area of theoretical analysis and scholarship concerning child policy Hillary Clinton stands shoulder to shoulder with the most articulate theorists. Her writings place her in the center of legal thought. In fact, she has little patience with dogmatism from either the left or right. Her overwhelming commitment seems to be to make a difference for children. If Bill Clinton becomes President then Hillary Clinton will likely be a voice for the children's cause-- a voice of reason, compassion and action.

References

- Garrison, W.T. (1984). Inpatient psychiatric treatment of the difficult child: Common practices and their ethical implications. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 6, 353-365.
- Gaylin, W. (1982). The competence of children: No longer all or none. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 23, 448-452.
- Johnson, C.M., Miranda, L., Sherman, A., & Weill, J.D. (1991). *Child poverty in America*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.
- Knitzer, J., Allen, M.A., & McGowan, B. (1978). *Children without homes*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.
- Lindsey, D. (1982). Achievements for children in foster care. *Social Work*, 27, 491-496.
- Mnookin, R.H. (1973). Foster care: In whose best interest. *Harvard Educational Review*, 43, 599-638.
- Rodham, H. (1973). Children under the law. *Harvard Educational Review*, 43, 487-514.
- Rodham, H. (1977). Children's policies: Abandonment and neglect. *The Yale Law Journal*, 86, 1522-1531.
- Rodham, H. (1979). Children's rights: A legal perspective. In P.A. Vardin & I.N. Brody (Eds.), *Children's rights: Contemporary perspectives* (pp. 21-36). New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Steiner, G. (1976). *The children's cause*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Takanashi, R. (1978). Childhood as a social issue: Historical roots of contemporary child advocacy movements. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34, 8-28.
- United States Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect (1990). *Child abuse and neglect: Critical first steps in response to a national emergency*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Reports of Child Abuse, 1980-1990.

Source: American Humane Association and National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse.

