

and has become a model for universities around the country. In 1990, Central became the first school in Connecticut to offer an accredited Computer Science degree, helping to prepare Connecticut students for the Information Age. Its Robert C. Vance Distinguished Lecturer Program has drawn United States Presidents and renowned leaders from around the globe to speak in New Britain. It is clear, that through these special programs, as well as others, Central Connecticut State University provides its students with a valuable educational opportunity and has established itself as one of the Nation's finest regional universities.

So I say again, Mr. President, that I am proud to stand on the floor of the United States Senate to recognize the enduring dedication of Central Connecticut State University to its students, to its state, and to excellence in education. Today, under the adept guidance of President Richard L. Judd and with the effort of so many talented and committed faculty and staff, the university continues to grow and prosper. I believe that Central's unceasing pursuit of excellence will ensure it remains a vital academic institution for many years to come.●

ON THE LIFE OF EDWARD C. BANFIELD

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Edward C. Banfield has died. This had to come. He was 83. Yet little were those who loved him prepared. Or ready, you might say.

He held, of course, Henry Lee Shattuck Chair in Government at Harvard and, as Richard Bernstein notes in his fine obituary in *The Times*, was most active in the Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard in the 1960s and 1970s. For part of that time I was chairman of the Joint Center and so came to know him at the peak of his long, comparably brilliant and yet understated career. In 1970, he published *The Unheavenly City*, which stands to this day as the most salient and, well, heart-wrenching exposition of the intractable nature of so many urban problems. He had been there before. As early as 1955 he wrote, with Martin Meyerson, *Politics, Planning and the Public Interest* which argued that the near religious zeal for high-rise public housing then current in Chicago, and across the land, would be a disaster. One notes it has taken Chicago the better part of thirty-five years to realize this, and start dynamiting the projects, as they came to be known. Just so was the seminal, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, a study of a small village in Southern Italy, which he wrote with Laura Fasano-Banfield, his radiantly intelligent wife and companion of sixty-odd years.

Now of course, none of this work was welcome, especially in academe. Not least because it made too much sense

to be rejected. James Q. Wilson, once his student, now his heir, got this just right in a memorial that appeared in last week's *Weekly Standard* entitled "The Man Who Knew Too Much, Edward C. Banfield, 1916-1999." He was onto *The Mob*, inside *The Agency*, privy to *The Plan*. And yet they never got him. He was, as he would say, a "swamp Yankee," a tough breed.

He was also a great teacher, something Robert J. Samuelson writes about so wonderfully well in *The Washington Post*. Above all he taught his students to pursue the truth, "no matter how inconvenient, unpopular, unfashionable or discomfiting." The greatest gift a great teacher can give.

He could be indulgent if the case seemed hopeless. I went to see him at the time I was thinking of running for the Senate. What would he advise? "Well," he said, "you could do that. Who knows, you might make a good Senator." Those words are with me to this moment.

I ask that the obituary from *The Times*, the article from *The Weekly Standard*, and the column from *The Washington Post* be included in the RECORD.

The articles follow.

[From the *New York Times*, Oct. 8, 1999]

E.C. BANFIELD, 83, MAVERICK ON URBAN POLICY ISSUES, DIES
(By Richard Bernstein)

Edward C. Banfield, a professor emeritus of government at Harvard University whose work on urban policy and the causes of poverty gave him a reputation as a brilliant maverick, died Sept. 30 at his summer home in Vermont. He was 83 and lived in Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. Banfield, born on a farm in Bloomfield, Conn., held Harvard's Henry Lee Shattuck Chair in Government for many years. He was one of the intellectual leaders of the Harvard-Massachusetts Institute of Technology Joint Center for Urban Studies in the 1960's and 70's, when the problems of cities were prominent on the national political agenda.

His books and articles had a sharp contrarian edge. He was a critic of almost every mainstream liberal idea in domestic policy, especially the use of Federal aid to help relieve urban poverty. Mr. Banfield argued that at best Government programs would fail because they aimed at the wrong problems; at worst they would make the problems worse. He fostered generations of graduate students, some of whom became leading figures in American intellectual life. They included James Q. Wilson, who succeeded him in his chair at Harvard, and Christopher DeMuth, president of the American Enterprise Institute in Washington.

Mr. Banfield received his B.A. in English for the University of Connecticut in 1938 and went to work for the United States Forest Service. After jobs with the New Hampshire Farm Bureau and the United States Farm Security Administration in Washington and California, he went to the University of Chicago to work on his doctorate in political science. Chicago at that time, under the influence of figures like Milton Friedman and Leo Strauss, was a bastion of *Laissez-faire* politics, a cause that Mr. Banfield later promoted in his own work.

He served briefly on the faculty in Chicago, moving to Harvard in 1959. He taught at the University of Pennsylvania before returning to Harvard at the end of his career.

In 1955 Mr. Banfield and Mr. Meyerson collaborated on "Politics, Planning and the Public Interest," which examined Chicago's public housing projects. That book was one of several in which Mr. Banfield found Government programs to be foiled by a law of unintended consequences. In the Chicago case he predicted that creating tall institutional buildings full of small apartments would have the unintended effect of racially isolating the urban poor. A major theme of Mr. Banfield's work on poverty, which was often angrily criticized in liberal circles, is that culture plays a more important role than factors like discrimination or lack of education in impeding a person's economic progress.

Among his most influential books was "The Moral Basis of a Backward Society," a study of a small village in southern Italy, researched in collaboration with his wife, the former Laura Fasano. Mr. Banfield's thesis, summed up in a term he coined, "amoral familism," was that the narrow focus on family relations prevented people from cooperating with those outside the family or village.

He is survived by his wife; a daughter, Laura Banfield Hoguet, a lawyer; a son, Elliott A. Banfield, an illustrator, and four grandchildren.

Mr. Banfield's emphasis on culture as the basic element in poverty drew accusations that he was promoting a "blame the victim" attitude. In his 1970 book "The Unheavenly City," and in various papers that he published in the late 60's, he recognized the existence and harm of racism but propounded the view that economic class and not race was the essential ingredient in poverty.

In that book Mr. Banfield constructed a sociological portrait of what he called "the lower-class individual" as someone who was very different from the middle-class professionals who sought ways to solve his problems. "The lower-class individual lives moment to moment," he wrote. "Impulse governs his behavior either because he cannot discipline himself to sacrifice a present for a future satisfaction or because he has no sense of the future. He is therefore radically improvident."

Mr. Banfield's role as an adviser to President Richard M. Nixon and chairman of his Model Cities Task force gave his published views an extra measure of controversy. During the Reagan Administration he served on a task force seeking ways to increase public support for the arts. But his subsequent book, "the Democratic Muse: Visual Arts and the Public Interest," argued that Federal support of the arts was neither justified by the Constitution nor useful in practice.

"Affording enjoyment to people is not a proper function of organizations serving the common good," he wrote in that book.

[From the *Weekly Standard*, Oct. 18, 1999]

THE MAN WHO KNEW TOO MUCH—EDWARD C. BANFIELD, 1916-1999

(By James Q. Wilson)

In the increasingly dull, narrow, methodologically obscure world of the social sciences, it is hard to find a mind that speaks not only to its students but to its nation. Most scholars can't write, many can't think. Ed Banfield could write and think.

When he died a few days ago, his life gave new meaning to the old saw about being a prophet without honor in your own country. Almost everything he wrote was criticized at the time it appeared for being wrongheaded. In 1955 he and Martin Meyerson published an account of how Chicago built public housing projects in which they explained how mischievous these projects were likely to be: tall, institutional buildings filled with tiny

apartments built in areas that guaranteed racial segregation. All this was to be done on the basis of the federal Housing Act of 1949, which said little about what goals housing was to achieve or why other ways of financing it—housing vouchers, for example—should not be available. This was heresy to the authors of the law and to most right-thinking planners.

Within two decades, high-rise public housing was widely viewed as a huge mistake and efforts were made to create vouchers so that poor families could afford to rent housing in the existing market. Local authorities in St. Louis had dynamited a big housing project there after describing it as a hopeless failure. It is not likely that Ed and Martin's book received much credit for having pointed the way.

In 1958, Ed, with the assistance of his wife, Laura, explained why a backward area in southern Italy was poor. The reason was not government neglect or poor education but culture. In this area of Italy, the Banfields said in *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, people would not cooperate outside the boundaries of their immediate families. These "amoral familists" were the product of a high death rate, a defective system for owning land, and the absence of any extended families. By contrast, in a town of about the same size located in an equally forbidding part of southern Utah, the residents published a local newspaper and had a remarkable variety of associates, each busily involved in improving the life of the community. In southern Italy, people would not cooperate; in southern Utah, they scarcely did anything else.

Foreign aid programs ignored this finding and went about persuading other nations to accept large grants to build new projects. Few of these projects created sustained economic growth. Where growth did occur, as in Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea, there was little foreign aid and what existed made little difference.

Today, David S. Landes, in his magisterial book that explains why some nations become wealthy while others remain poor, offers a one-word explanation: culture. He is right, but the Banfield book written forty years earlier is not mentioned.

In 1970, Ed published his best-known and most controversial work, *The Unheavenly City*. In it he argued that the "urban crisis" was misunderstood. Many aspects of the so-called crisis, such as congestion or the business flight to the suburbs, are not really problems at all; some that are modest problems, such as transportation, could be managed rather well by putting high peak-hour tolls on key roads and staggering working hours; and many of the greatest problems, such as crime, poverty, and racial injustice, are things that we shall find it exceptionally difficult to manage.

Consider racial injustice. Racism is quite real, though much diminished in recent years, and it has a powerful effect. But the central problem for black Americans is not racism but poverty. And poverty is in part the result of where blacks live and what opportunities confront them. When they live in areas with many unskilled workers and few jobs for unskilled people, they will suffer. When they grow up in families that do not own small businesses, they will find it harder to move into jobs available to them or to meet people who can tell them about jobs elsewhere. That whites treat blacks differently than they treat other whites is obviously true, but "much of what appears . . . as race prejudice is really class prejudice."

In 1987 William Julius Wilson, a black scholar, published his widely acclaimed book, *The Truly Disadvantaged*. In it he says that, while racism remains a powerful force,

it cannot explain the plight of inner-city blacks. The problem is poverty—social class—and that poverty flows from the material conditions of black neighborhoods. Banfield's book is mentioned in Wilson's bibliography, but his argument is mentioned only in passing.

Both Wilson and Banfield explain the core urban problems as ones that flow from social class. To Wilson, an "underclass" has emerged, made up of people who lack skills, experience long-term unemployment, engage in street crime, and are part of families with prolonged welfare dependency. Banfield would have agreed. But to Wilson, the underclass suffers from a shortage of jobs and available fathers, while for Banfield it suffers from a defective culture.

Wilson argued that changing the economic condition of underclass blacks would change their underclass culture; Banfield argued that unless the underclass culture was first changed (and he doubted much could be done in that regard), the economic condition of poor blacks would not improve. The central urban problem of modern America is to discover which theory is correct.

Banfield had some ideas to help address the culture (though he thought no government would adopt them): Keep the unemployment rate low, repeal minimum-wage laws, lower the school-leaving age, provide a negative income tax (that is, a cash benefit) to the "competent poor," supply intensive birth-control guidance to the "incompetent poor," and pay problem families to send their children to decent day-care programs.

The Unheavenly City sold well but was bitterly attacked by academics and book reviewers; Wilson's book was widely praised by the same critics. But on the central facts, both books say the same thing, and on the unknown facts—What will work?—neither book can (of necessity) offer much evidence.

Ed Banfield's work would probably have benefited from a quality he was incapable of supplying. If it had been written in the dreary style of modern sociology or, worse, if he had produced articles filled with game-theoretic models and endless regression equations, he might have been taken more seriously. But Ed was a journalist before he was a scholar, and his commitment to clear, forceful writing was unshakable.

He was more than a clear writer with a Ph.D.; everything he wrote was embedded in a powerful theoretical overview of the subject. "Theory," to him, meant clarifying how people can think about a difficulty, and the theories he produced—on social planning, political influence, economic backwardness, and urban problems—are short masterpieces of incisive prose.

His remarkable mind was deeply rooted in Western philosophy as well as social science. To read his books is to be carried along by extraordinary prose in which you learn about David Hume and John Stuart Mill as well as about pressing human issues. To him, the central human problem was cooperation: How can society induce people to work together in informal groups—Edmund Burke's "little platoon"—to manage their common problems? No one has ever thought through this issue more lucidly, and hence no one I can think of has done more to illuminate the human condition of the modern world.

A few months ago, a group of Ed's former students and colleagues met for two days to discuss his work. Our fondness for this amusing and gregarious man was manifest, as were our memories of the tortures through which he put us as he taught us to think and write. Rereading his work as a whole reminded us that we had been privileged to know one of the best minds we had ever encountered, a person whose rigorous intellect and extraordinary knowledge created a

standard to which all of us aspired but which none of us attained.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1999]

THE GIFT OF A GREAT TEACHER

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

If you are lucky in life, you will have at least one great teacher. More than three decades ago, I had Ed Banfield, a political scientist who taught mainly at the University of Chicago and Harvard University. Ed's recent death at 83 saddened me (which was expected) and left me with a real sense of loss (which wasn't). Although we had stayed in touch, we were never intimate friends or intellectual soul-mates. The gap between us in intellectual candlepower was too great. But he had loomed large in my life, and I have been puzzling why his death has so affected me.

I think the answer—and the reason for writing about something so personal—goes to the heart of what it means to be a great teacher. By teacher, I am not referring primarily to classroom instructors, because learning in life occurs mainly outside of schools. I first encountered Ed in a lecture hall, but his greatness did not lie in giving good lectures (which he did). It lay instead in somehow transmitting life-changing lessons. If I had not known him, I would be a different person. He helped me become who I am and, more important, who I want to be.

When you lose someone like that, there is a hole. It is a smaller hole than losing a parent, a child or close friend. But it is still a hole, because great teachers are so rare. I have, for example, worked for some very talented editors. A few have earned my lasting gratitude for improving my reporting or writing. But none has been a great teacher; none has changed my life.

What gave Ed this power was, first, his ideas. He made me see new things or old things in new ways. The political scientist James Q. Wilson—first Ed's student, then his collaborator—has called Banfield "the most profound student of American politics in this century." Although arguable, this is surely plausible.

Americans take democracy, freedom and political stability for granted. Ed was more wary. These great things do not exist in isolation. They must somehow fuse into a political system that fulfills certain essential social functions: to protect the nation; to provide some continuity in government and policy; to maintain order and modulate society's most passionate conflicts. The trouble, Ed believed, is that democracies have self-destructive tendencies and that, in modern America, these had intensified.

On the whole, he regretted the disappearance after World War II of a political system based on big-city machines (whose supporters were rewarded with patronage jobs and contracts) and on party "bosses" (who dictated political candidates from city council to Congress and, often, the White House). It was not that he favored patronage, corruption or bosses for their own sake. But in cities, they created popular support for government and gave it the power to accomplish things. And they emphasized material gain over ideological fervor.

Postwar suburbanization and party "reforms"—weakening bosses and machines—destroyed this system. Its replacement, Ed feared, was inferior. "Whereas the old system had promised personal rewards," he wrote, "the new one promises social reform." Politicians would now merchandise themselves by selling false solutions to exaggerated problems. "The politician, like the TV news commentator, must always have something to say even when nothing urgently needs to be said," he wrote in 1970. By some

years, this anticipated the term "talking head." People would lose respect for government because many "solutions" would fail. Here, too, he anticipated. Later, polls showed dropping public confidence in national leaders. Ed was not surprised.

He taught that you had to understand the world as it is, not as you wished it to be. This was sound advice for an aspiring reporter. And Ed practiced it. In 1954 and 1955, he and his wife, Laura (they would ultimately be married 61 years), spent time in a poor Italian village to explain its poverty. The resulting book—"The Moral Basis of a Backward Society"—remains a classic. Families in the village, it argued, so distrusted each other that they could not cooperate to promote common prosperity. The larger point (still missed by many economists) is that local culture, not just "markets," determines economic growth.

What brought Ed fleeting prominence—notoriety, really—was "The Unheavenly City." Published in 1970. Prosperity, government programs and less racial discrimination might lift some from poverty, he said. But the worst problems of poverty and the cities would remain. They resulted from a "lower class" whose members were so impulsive and "present oriented" that they attached "no value to work, sacrifice, self-improvement, or service to family, friends or community." They dropped out of school, had illegitimate children and were unemployed. Government couldn't easily alter their behavior.

For this message, Ed was reviled as a reactionary. He repeatedly said that most black Americans didn't belong to the "lower class" and that it contained many whites. Still, many dismissed him as a racist. Over time his theories gained some respectability from the weight of experience. Poverty defied government assaults; his "lower class" was re-labeled "the underclass." But when he wrote, Ed was assailing prevailing opinion. He knew he would be harshly, even viciously, attacked. He wrote anyway and endured the consequences.

This was the deeper and more important lesson. Perhaps all great teachers—whether parents, bosses, professors or whoever—ultimately convey some moral code. Ed surely did. What he was saying in the 1960s was not what everyone else was saying. I felt uneasy with the reigning orthodoxy. But I didn't know why. Ed helped me understand my doubts and made me feel that it was important to give them expression. The truth had to be pursued, no matter how inconvenient, unpopular, unfashionable or discomfiting. Ed did not teach that; he lived it. This was his code, and it was—for anyone willing to receive it—an immeasurable gift.●

NOTICE

REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1999 third quarter mass mailings is October 25, 1999. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records office will be open from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For

further information, please contact the Public Records office at (202) 224-0322.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 1:15 p.m. on Tuesday, October 19. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences to meet. I further ask consent that the mandatory quorums required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 1:15 p.m., and at 2:15 p.m. two cloture votes will occur with respect to amendments to the campaign finance bill. Following the vote or votes, the Senate may resume consideration of the campaign finance bill. However, debate on this legislation is coming to a close, and Senators should anticipate the consideration of the partial-birth abortion bill, the continuing resolution, and available appropriations conference reports during the remainder of this week's session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask the Senator from Washington why the Senate is not convening until 1:15?

Mr. GORTON. The Senate is not convening until 1:15 at the direction of the majority leader.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am wondering why. It would be a good idea to take up this bill that we have before us and work on it, take up amendments in the morning, instead of losing a half a day. Is there some substantive reason why we are not working on a Tuesday morning, after we started the voting process already on Monday night?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. I find it hard

to understand, as we have just had a vote, which was supposed to be an up-or-down vote on the question of whether or not we are going to ban soft money. The opponents of reform obviously did not want to face that vote.

Quite a number of them had come out to the floor this afternoon to say they were against banning soft money. So they had a chance to vote not to ban soft money. Why didn't they do that? They threw the vote. They all came out here and unanimously voted not to table the McCain-Feingold bill, which simply bans soft money. Now they do not want to have us meet tomorrow morning.

We are not going to do our job tomorrow morning. We are not even going to debate, not going to take up amendments. We are just going to take the morning off.

Mr. GORTON. Regular order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. We see here the unbelievable desire to avoid the issue.

Mr. GORTON. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for. The Senator must either object or permit the unanimous consent to go forward.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will not object, having had the chance to express my dismay at this schedule, which is nothing but a way to avoid the issue.

Mr. GORTON. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1999

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:05 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 19, 1999, at 1:15 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18, 1999:

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD

HERSCHELLE S. CHALLENGER, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM F. SMITH III, 0000.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

GEORGE R. ARNOLD, 0000	RICHARD S. HAGER, 0000
BUFORD D. BARKER, 0000	MARTIN H. HARDY, 0000
HAROLD T. BRADY, 0000	GREGORY R. KERCHER, 0000
DARIN J. BROWN, 0000	ROBERT C. MILLER, 0000
ANTHONY C. CARULLO, 0000	JON RODGERS, 0000
CHRIS J. CLEMMENSEN, 0000	RICHARD E. SEIF, 0000
BRUCE W. GRISSOM, 0000	STEVEN F. SMITH, 0000
	TODD S. WEEKS, 0000