


E I G H T H   E D I T I O N

# POINTS OF



# VIEW

READINGS IN AMERICAN  
GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

ROBERT E. DICLERICO  
ALLAN S. HAMMOCK

# *Points of View*

## *Readings in American Government and Politics*

---

*EIGHTH EDITION*

*Edited by*

*Robert E. DiClerico*

*West Virginia University*

*Allan S. Hammock*

*West Virginia University*



Boston Burr Ridge, IL Dubuque, IA Madison, WI  
New York San Francisco St. Louis  
Bangkok Bogotá Caracas Lisbon London Madrid Mexico City  
Milan New Delhi Seoul Singapore Sydney Taipei Toronto

# McGraw-Hill Higher Education

A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies

## POINTS OF VIEW: READINGS IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS EIGHTH EDITION

Published by McGraw-Hill, an imprint of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020. Copyright © 2001, 1998, 1995, 1992, 1989, 1986, 1983, 1980 by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written consent of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., including, but not limited to, in any network or other electronic storage or transmission, or broadcast for distance learning.

Some ancillaries, including electronic and print components, may not be available to customers outside the United States.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 DOC/DOC 0 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

ISBN 0-07-232268-3

Vice president and editor-in-chief: *Thalia Dorwick*

Editorial director: *Jane E. Vaicunas*

Sponsoring editor: *Monica Eckman*

Editorial coordinator: *Hannah Glover*

Marketing manager: *Janise A. Fry*

Project manager: *Rose Koos*

Senior media producer: *Sean Crowley*

Production supervisor: *Enboge Chong*

Coordinator of freelance design: *Michelle D. Whitaker*

Cover designer: *Nathan Buhls*

Cover image: ©Paul Anderson/The Stock Illustration Source, Inc.

Supplement coordinator: *Stacy A. Patch*

Compositor: *ElectraGraphics, Inc.*

Typeface: *10/12 Times Roman*

Printer: *R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company/Crawfordsville, IN*

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Points of view : readings in American government and politics / [edited by] Robert E. DiClerico, Allan S. Hammock. — 8th ed.  
p. cm.

ISBN 0-07-232268-3

1. United States—Politics and government. I. DiClerico, Robert E. II. Hammock, Allan S., 1938–

JK21 .P59 2001

320.973—dc21


00-041835

CIP

## *About the Editors*

ROBERT E. DiCLERICO is Eberly Professor of Political Science at West Virginia University. An Indiana University (Bloomington) Ph.D. and a Danforth fellow, he is author of *The American President*, 5th edition (2000); co-author of *Choosing Our Choices* (2000) and *Few Are Chosen* (1984); and editor of *Political Parties, Campaigns, and Elections* (2000) and *Analyzing the Presidency* (1985).

ALLAN S. HAMMOCK is an Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Political Science at West Virginia University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Virginia and is co-author of *West Virginia Politics and Government* (1996). He currently serves as chairman of the West Virginia Election Commission.



# Preface

Reflecting the press of events and editorial judgments, the changes made for the eighth edition of *Points of View* have been substantial. We have added three new topics. In chapter 1, "Democracy," we have added a new section, "Making Democracy Work"; in chapter 10, "Congress," we have included a new section on the filibuster; and in chapter 15, "Civil Liberties," we have added a topic dealing with the issue of student fees and freedom of speech. In addition to these changes, we have included some new selections: one on public opinion (in chapter 4), one on voting (in chapter 5), two on campaign finance (in chapter 7), and two on bureaucracy (in chapter 13). Finally, of the articles retained from the previous edition, two have been significantly updated: James L. Sundquist's article on the relationship between the president and Congress (in chapter 12) and John Kilwein's selection on crime and the courts (in chapter 14).

The basic goals of the book remain the same: namely, to provide students with a manageable number of selections that present readable, succinct, thoughtful, and diverse perspectives across a broad range of issues related to American government.

We would like to extend our thanks to a number of individuals who made valuable contributions to this project. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Wendy Nelson, who had primary editorial responsibility for this latest edition and whose keen eye for detail was instrumental in improving the style and content of the final manuscript.

We would also like to express our appreciation to the sponsoring editor, Monica Eckman, who had overall responsibility for coordinating this latest revision and did a superb job of expediting the publishing process.

In the course of revising and updating this manuscript, we repeatedly called upon the typing skills of administrative associate Lee Ann Greathouse, who cheerfully reproduced manuscripts with unfailing accuracy and in less time than we had any reason to expect.

Finally, we would like to express our deep appreciation to the following academicians who carefully read the previous edition of *Points of View* and offered the most detailed and constructive suggestions we have ever received on a revision:

Sheryl Breen—University of Minnesota  
Erich G. Frankland—Casper College, Wyoming  
James M. Hoefler—Dickinson College, Pennsylvania  
Theodore Kamena—Western Washington University  
William V. Moore—College of Charleston  
C. Jonathan Moses—Flathead Valley Community College  
Russell Renka—Southeast Missouri State University  
Stephanie Sapiie—Brooklyn College CUNY

Robert E. DiClerico

Allan S. Hammock  
*Morgantown, West Virginia*  
*March 2000*

# *A Note to the Instructor*

For some years now, both of us have jointly taught the introductory course to American government. Each year we perused the crop of existing readers, and while we adopted several different readers over this period, we were not wholly satisfied with any of them. It is our feeling that many of the readers currently on the market suffer from one or more of the following deficiencies: (1) Some contain selections which are difficult for students to comprehend because of the sophistication of the argument, the manner of expression, or both. (2) In many instances, readers do not cover all of the topics typically treated in an introductory American government course. (3) In choosing selections for a given topic, editors do not always show sufficient concern for how—or whether—one article under a topic relates to other articles under the same topic. (4) Most readers contain too many selections for each topic—indeed, in several cases the number of selections for some topics exceeds ten. Readers are nearly always used in conjunction with a textbook. Thus, to ask a student to read a lengthy chapter—jammed with facts—from a textbook and then to read anywhere from five to ten selections on the same topic from a reader is to demand that students read more than they can reasonably absorb in a meaningful way. Of course, an instructor need not assign all the selections under a given topic. At the same time, however, this approach justifiably disgruntles students who, after purchasing a reader, discover that they may only be asked to read one-half or two-thirds of it.

Instead of continuing to complain about what we considered to be the limitations of existing American government readers, we decided to try our own hand at putting one together. In doing so, we were guided by the following considerations.

## **Readability**

Quite obviously, students will not read dull, difficult articles. As well as having something important to say, we feel that each of the articles in *Points of View* is clearly written, well organized, and free of needless jargon.

## **Comprehensiveness**

The sixteen chapters of *Points of View* cover all the major topics of concern that are typically treated in the standard introductory course on American government.

## Economy of Selections

We decided, generally, to limit the number of selections to two per topic, although we did include three selections on representation in chapter 10. The limitation on selections will maximize the possibility that students will read them. It has been our experience that when students are assigned four, five, or more selections under a given topic, they simply do not read them all. In addition, by limiting the selections for each topic, there is a greater likelihood that students will be able to associate an argument with the author who made it.

## Juxtaposition

The two selections for each topic will take *opposing* or *different* points of view on some aspect of a given topic. This approach was chosen for three reasons. First, we believe that student interest will be enhanced by playing one article off against the other. Thus, the “interest” quality of a given article will derive not only from its own content, but also from its juxtaposition with the other article. Second, we think it is important to sensitize students to the fact that one’s perspective on an issue will depend upon the values that he or she brings to it. Third, by having both selections focus on a particular issue related to a given topic, the student will have a greater depth of understanding about that issue. We think this is preferable to having five or six selections under a topic, with each selection focusing on a different aspect, and with the result that the student ultimately is exposed to “a little of this and a little of that”—that is, if the student even bothers to read all five or six selections.

While the readers currently available take into account one or, in some instances, several of the considerations identified above, we believe that the uniqueness of *Points of View* lies in the fact that it has sought to incorporate *all* of them.

Robert E. DiClerico

Allan S. Hammock



# Contents

PREFACE xi

A NOTE TO THE INSTRUCTOR xiii

## Chapter 1 Democracy 1

Defining Democracy 1

Howard Zinn: *How Democratic Is America?* 2

Sidney Hook: *How Democratic Is America?: A Response to Howard Zinn* 14

Making Democracy Work: Civic Involvement 26

Robert D. Putnam: *Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America* 27

Michael Schudson: *What If Civic Life Didn't Die?* 37

## Chapter 2 The Constitution 43

Charles A. Beard: *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* 44

Robert E. Brown: *Charles Beard and the Constitution: A Critical Analysis* 49

## Chapter 3 Federalism 55

Spencer Abraham: *Unfunded Mandates: The Negative Effects* 56

George Miller: *Unfunded Mandates: Laws That Bind Us Together* 59

<i>Chapter 4</i>	<i>Public Opinion</i>	63
	Dick Morris: <i>Vox Populi in Cyberspace</i>	64
	Norman Ornstein and Amy Schenkenberg: <i>The Promise and Perils of Cyberdemocracy</i>	68
<i>Chapter 5</i>	<i>Voting</i>	73
	Arend Lijphart: <i>Compulsory Voting Is the Best Way to Keep Democracy Strong</i>	74
	Austin Ranney: <i>Nonvoting Is Not a Social Disease</i>	78
<i>Chapter 6</i>	<i>Campaigns and the Media</i>	85
	Darrell M. West: <i>Advertising and Democratic Elections: What Can Be Done?</i>	86
	Stephen Bates and Edwin Diamond: <i>Damned Spots: A Defense of Thirty-Second Campaign Ads</i>	93
<i>Chapter 7</i>	<i>Elections</i>	97
	<i>Campaign Finance</i>	97
	Robert J. Samuelson: <i>Campaign Finance Hysteria</i>	98
	Jack Hitt: <i>Real Campaign Finance Reform</i>	100
	<i>The Electoral College</i>	104
	Lawrence D. Longley: <i>The Electoral College Should Be Abolished</i>	105
	Robert Weissberg: <i>In Defense of the Electoral College</i>	112
<i>Chapter 8</i>	<i>Political Parties</i>	117
	Theodore J. Lowi: <i>The Party Crasher: The Need for a Third Party</i>	118
	Paul S. Herrnson: <i>The Reform Party: Fizzle or Crash and Burn?</i>	122
<i>Chapter 9</i>	<i>Interest Groups</i>	129
	Philip M. Stern: <i>Still the Best Congress Money Can Buy: A PAC Primer</i>	130
	Larry J. Sabato: <i>The Misplaced Obsession with PACs</i>	138

<b>Chapter 10 Congress</b>	<b>145</b>
<i>Representation</i>	145
General Assembly of Virginia: <i>The Legislator as Delegate</i>	146
John F. Kennedy: <i>The Legislator as Trustee</i>	150
George B. Galloway: <i>The Legislator as Politico</i>	153
<i>Legislative Process: The Filibuster</i>	157
Tom Harkin: <i>It's Time to Change the Filibuster</i>	158
Bill Frenzel: <i>Defending the Dinosaur: The Case for Not Fixing the Filibuster</i>	164
 <b>Chapter 11 The Presidency</b>	 <b>169</b>
Michael Lind: <i>The Out-of-Control Presidency</i>	170
R. Gordon Hoxie: <i>The Not-So-Imperial Presidency</i>	178
 <b>Chapter 12 The President and Congress</b>	 <b>185</b>
David R. Mayhew: <i>Divided Party Control: Does It Make a Difference?</i>	186
James L. Sundquist: <i>A Government Divided Against Itself</i>	191
 <b>Chapter 13 Bureaucracy</b>	 <b>195</b>
Al Gore: <i>The Best Kept Secrets in Government</i>	196
Robert Worth: <i>Reinvention Lite: Why Al Gore Still Has a Long Way to Go</i>	207
 <b>Chapter 14 Courts</b>	 <b>215</b>
<i>The Supreme Court and Judicial Review</i>	215
Edwin Meese III: <i>A Jurisprudence of Original Intention</i>	216
Irving R. Kaufman: <i>What Did the Founding Fathers Intend?</i>	222
<i>Crime and the Courts</i>	228
Bernard Gavzer: <i>"We're in the Fight of Our Lives"</i>	229
John C. Kilwein: <i>"Just Make It a Fair Fight"</i>	233

Chapter 15 Civil Liberties 245

Free Speech 245

American Council on Education: *Mandatory Student Fees Do Not Abridge Freedom of Speech* 246

Pacific Legal Foundation: *Mandatory Student Fees Violate Students' Right to Free Speech* 252

Pornography 255

Ernest van den Haag: *Pornography and Censorship* 256

Geoffrey R. Stone: *Repeating Past Mistakes: The Commission on Obscenity and Pornography* 262

Chapter 16 Civil Rights 267

Affirmative Action 267

Terry Eastland: *Ending Affirmative Action: The Case for Colorblind Justice* 268

Barbara R. Bergmann: *In Defense of Affirmative Action* 276

Abortion 286

Susan R. Estrich and Kathleen M. Sullivan: *Abortion Politics: The Case for the Right to Privacy* 287

James Bopp, Jr., and Richard E. Coleson: *Abortion on Demand Has No Constitutional or Moral Justification* 298

# 1

## DEMOCRACY

### *Defining Democracy*

*Any assessment of a society's democratic character will be fundamentally determined by what the observer chooses to use as a definition of democracy. Though the concept of democracy has commanded the attention of political thinkers for centuries, the following selections by Howard Zinn and Sidney Hook serve to demonstrate that there continues to be considerable disagreement over its meaning. Each of them has scanned the American scene and reached different conclusions regarding the democratic character of our society. This difference of opinion is explained primarily by the fact that each approaches his evaluation with a different conception of what democracy is.*

*For Zinn, the definition of democracy includes criteria that bear not only upon how decisions get made but also upon what results from such decisions. Specifically, he argues that such results must lead to a certain level of human welfare within a society. In applying these criteria of human welfare to the United States, he concludes that we fall short of the mark in several areas.*

*Although Sidney Hook is willing to acknowledge that democracy might indeed function more smoothly in societies where the conditions of human welfare are high, he insists that these conditions do not themselves constitute the definition of democracy. Rather, he maintains that democracy is a process—a way of making decisions. Whether such decisions lead to the conditions of human welfare that Zinn prescribes is irrelevant. The crucial test, according to Hook, is whether or not the people have the right, by majority rule, to make choices about the quality of their lives—whatever those choices might be.*

## *How Democratic Is America?*

Howard Zinn

To give a sensible answer to the question “How democratic is America?” I find it necessary to make three clarifying preliminary statements. First, I want to define “democracy,” not conclusively, but operationally, so we can know what we are arguing about or at least what I am talking about. Second, I want to state what my criteria are for measuring the “how” in the question. And third, I think it necessary to issue a warning about how a certain source of bias (although not the only source) is likely to distort our judgments.

Our definition is crucial. This becomes clear if we note how relatively easy is the answer to our question when we define democracy as a set of formal institutions and let it go at that. If we describe as “democratic” a country that has a representative system of government, with universal suffrage, a bill of rights, and party competition for office, it becomes easy to answer the question “how” with the enthusiastic reply, “Very!” . . .

I propose a set of criteria for the description “democratic” which goes beyond formal political institutions, to the quality of life in the society (economic, social, psychological), beyond majority rule to a concern for minorities, and beyond national boundaries to a global view of what is meant by “the people,” in that rough, but essentially correct view of democracy as “government of, by, and for the people.”

Let me list these criteria quickly, because I will go on to discuss them in some detail later:

1. To what extent can various people in the society participate in those decisions which affect their lives: decisions in the political process and decisions in the economic structure?
2. As a corollary of the above: do people have equal access to the information which they need to make important decisions?
3. Are the members of the society equally protected on matters of life and death—in the most literal sense of that phrase?
4. Is there equality before the law: police, courts, the judicial process—as well as equality *with* the law-enforcing institutions, so as to safeguard equally everyone’s person, and his freedom from interference by others, and by the government?
5. Is there equality in the distribution of available resources: those economic goods necessary for health, life, recreation, leisure, growth?
6. Is there equal access to education, to knowledge and training, so as to enable persons in the society to live their lives as fully as possible, to enlarge their range of possibilities?

*Howard Zinn is professor emeritus of political science at Boston University. This essay was originally published in Robert A. Goldwin, ed., How Democratic Is America? pp. 39–60 (Chicago, Rand McNally, 1971). The author revised and updated the original for Points of View in 1985 and again in 1997.*

7. Is there freedom of expression on all matters, and equally for all, to communicate with other members of the society?
8. Is there freedom for individuality in private life, in sexual relations, family relations, the right of privacy?
9. To minimize regulation: do education and the culture in general foster a spirit of cooperation and amity to sustain the above conditions?
10. As a final safety feature: is there opportunity to protest, to disobey the laws, when the foregoing objectives are being lost—as a way of restoring them? . . .

Two historical facts support my enlarged definition of democracy. One is that the industrialized Western societies have outgrown the original notions which accompanied their early development: that constitutional and procedural tests sufficed for the “democracy” that overthrew the old order; that democracy was quite adequately fulfilled by the Bill of Rights in England at the time of the Glorious Revolution, the Constitution of the United States, and the declaration of the Rights of Man in France. It came to be acknowledged that the rhetoric of these revolutions was not matched by their real achievements. In other words, the limitations of that “democracy” led to the reformist and radical movements that grew up in the West in the middle and late nineteenth century. The other historical note is that the new revolutions in our century, in Africa, Asia, Latin America, while rejecting either in whole or in part the earlier revolutions, profess a similar democratic aim, but with an even broader rhetoric. . . .

My second preliminary point is on standards. By this I mean that we can judge in several ways the fulfillment of these ten criteria I have listed. We can measure the present against the past, so that if we find that in 2000 we are doing better in these matters than we were doing in 1860 or 1910, the society will get a good grade for its “democracy.” I would adjure such an approach because it supports complacency. With such a standard, Russians in 1910 could point with pride to how much progress they had made toward parliamentary democracy; as Russians in 1985 could point to their post-Stalin progress away from the gulag; as Americans could point in 1939 to how far they had come toward solving the problem of economic equality; as Americans in the South could point in 1950 to the progress of the southern African-American. Indeed, the American government has given military aid to brutal regimes in Latin America on the ground that a decrease in the murders by semiofficial death squads is a sign of progress.

Or, we could measure our democracy against other places in the world. Given the high incidence of tyranny in the world, polarization of wealth, and lack of freedom of expression, the United States, even with very serious defects, could declare itself successful. Again, the result is to let us all off easily; some of our most enthusiastic self-congratulation is based on such a standard.

On the other hand, we could measure our democracy against an ideal (even if admittedly unachievable) standard. I would argue for such an approach, because, in what may seem to some a paradox, the ideal standard is the pragmatic one; it affects what we *do*. To grade a student on the basis of an improvement over past performance is justifiable if the intention is to encourage someone discouraged about his ability. But if he is rather pompous about his superiority in relation to other students (and I suggest this is frequently true of Americans evaluating American “democracy”), and if in addition he

is a medical student about to graduate into a world ridden with disease, it would be best to judge him by an ideal standard. That might spur him to an improvement fast enough to save lives. . . .

My third preliminary point is a caution based on the obvious fact that we make our appraisals through the prism of our own status in society. This is particularly important in assessing democracy, because if "democracy" refers to the condition of masses of people, and if we as the assessors belong to a number of elites, we will tend (and I am not declaring an inevitability, just warning of a tendency) to see the present situation in America more benignly than it deserves. To be more specific, if democracy requires a keen awareness of the condition of black people, of poor people, of young people, of that majority of the world who are not American—and we are white, prosperous, beyond draft age, and American—then we have a number of pressures tending to dull our sense of inequity. We are, if not doomed to err, likely to err on the side of complacency—and we should try to take this into account in making our judgments.

## 1. PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS

We need to recognize first, that whatever decisions are made politically are made by representatives of one sort or another: state legislators, congressmen, senators, and other elected officials, governors and presidents; also by those appointed by elected officials, like Supreme Court justices. These are important decisions, affecting our lives, liberties, and ability to pursue happiness. Congress and the president decide on the tax structure, which affects the distribution of resources. They decide how to spend the monies received; whether or not we go to war; who serves in the armed forces; what behavior is considered a crime; which crimes are prosecuted and which are not. They decide what limitations there should be on our travel, or on our right to speak freely. They decide on the availability of education and health services.

If representation by its very nature is undemocratic, as I would argue, this is an important fact for our evaluation. Representative government is *closer* to democracy than monarchy, and for this reason it has been hailed as one of the great political advances of modern times; yet, it is only a step in the direction of democracy, at its best. It has certain inherent flaws—pointed out by Rousseau in the eighteenth century, Victor Considerant in the nineteenth century, Robert Michels in the beginning of the twentieth century, Hannah Arendt in our own time. No representative can adequately represent another's needs; the representative tends to become a member of a special elite; he has privileges which weaken his sense of concern at others' grievances; the passions of the troubled lose force (as Madison noted in *The Federalist 10*) as they are filtered through the representative system; the elected official develops an expertise which tends toward its own perpetuation. Leaders develop what Michels called "a mutual insurance contract" against the rest of society. . . .

If only radicals pointed to the inadequacy of the political processes in the United States, we might be suspicious. But established political scientists of a moderate bent talk quite bluntly of the limitations of the voting system in the United States. Robert Dahl, in *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, drawing on the voting studies of American



political scientists, concludes that “political activity, at least in the United States, is positively associated to a significant extent with such variables as income, socio-economic status, and education.” He says:

By their propensity for political passivity the poor and uneducated disfranchise themselves. . . . Since they also have less access than the wealthy to the organizational, financial, and propaganda resources that weigh so heavily in campaigns, elections, legislative, and executive decisions, anything like equal control over government policy is triply barred to the members of Madison’s unpropertied masses. They are barred by their relatively greater inactivity, by their relatively limited access to resources, and by Madison’s nicely contrived system of constitutional checks.<sup>1</sup>

Dahl thinks that our society is essentially democratic, but this is because he expects very little. (His book was written in the 1950s, when lack of commotion in the society might well have persuaded him that no one else expected much more than he did.) Even if democracy were to be superficially defined as “majority rule,” the United States would not fulfill that, according to Dahl, who says that “on matters of specific policy, the majority rarely rules.”<sup>2</sup> After noting that “the election is the critical technique for insuring that governmental leaders will be relatively responsive to nonleaders,” he goes on to say that “it is important to notice how little a national election tells us about the preferences of majorities. Strictly speaking, all an election reveals is the first preferences of some citizens among the candidates standing for office.”<sup>3</sup> About 45 percent of the potential voters in national elections, and about 60 percent of the voters in local elections do not vote, and this cannot be attributed, Dahl says, simply to indifference. And if, as Dahl points out, “in no large nation state can elections tell us much about the preferences of majorities and minorities,” this is “even more true of the interelection period.” . . .

Dahl goes on to assert that the election process and interelection activity “are crucial processes for insuring that political leaders will be *somewhat* responsive to the preferences of *some* ordinary citizens.”<sup>4</sup> I submit (the emphasized words are mine) that if an admirer of democracy in America can say no more than this, democracy is not doing very well.

Dahl tells us the election process is one of “two fundamental methods of social control which, operating together, make governmental leaders so responsive to nonleaders that the distinction between democracy and dictatorship still makes sense.” Since his description of the election process leaves that dubious, let’s look at his second requirement for distinguishing democracy: “The other method of social control is continuous political competition among individuals, parties, or both.” What it comes down to is “not minority rule but minorities rule.”<sup>5</sup>

If it turns out that this—like the election process—also has little democratic content, we will not be left with very much difference—by Dahl’s own admission—between “dictatorship” and the “democracy” practiced in the United States. Indeed, there is much evidence on this: the lack of democracy within the major political parties, the vastly disproportionate influence of wealthy groups over poorer ones. What anti-smoking consumer group in the election year of 1996 could match the five million dollars donated to the Republican Party by the tobacco interests? What ordinary citizen