Abroad at Home

ANTHONY LEWIS

An Atomized America

When Alexis de Tocqueville sought to explain democracy in America, 150 years ago, he pointed to the fact that "Americans are forever forming associations." They get together, he said, for commercial, religious, moral and practical objectives — or "to proclaim a truth." Civic groups, he argued, are an essential element of a democratic culture.

The phenomenon that de Tocqueville shrewdly saw — America as a nation of joiners — is now withering away. So we learn from a fascinating article by Prof. Robert D. Putnam of Harvard in the new issue of the quarterly The American Prospect.

Surveys of average Americans over the last 30 years, the article says, show that participation in voluntary associations is down between 25 and 50 percent. That is so of groups as diverse as P.T.A.'s, the Elks, the League of Women Voters and the Red Cross.

"Americans today are significantly less engaged with their communities than was true a generation ago," Professor Putnam concludes. And with that has come a decline in what he calls "social trust": belief in one another.

Professor Putnam's purpose is not just to note the decline but to explain it. A clue is that it is generational. Those born between 1925 and 1930 have been "exceptionally civic: Voting more, joining more, reading newspapers more, trusting more." (De Tocqueville, too, noted a link between civic participation and newspaper-reading.) Those born after World War II participate much less.

Why? Professor Putnam's answer is television.

The average American spends 40 percent of his free time watching television — and those who watch a lot participate little. Television discourages "social trust and group membership," Professor Putnam writes. "Heavy readers [of newspapers] are avid joiners, whereas heavy viewers are more likely to be loners." Surveys show that readers belong to 76 percent more civic groups than watchers.

The time spent in front of the set is one reason why television may discourage joining groups and participating in the community. Another is the negative picture television usually gives of American society.

"Heavy watchers of TV are unusually skeptical about the benevolence of other people," Professor Putnam says — "overestimating crime rates, for example. . . . Heavy TV watching may well increase pessimism about human nature."

A final point goes beyond television. It is that the whole electronic revolution in communications, even while it enlarges our opportunities, has a profoundly fragmenting effect on the society. In other words, we can sit alone at our computers and interact only through electronics. Technology, Professor Putnam concludes, "may indeed be undermining our connections with one another and with our communities."

To that provocative analysis I would add another point. The United States today is in the grip of free-market ideology carried to the extreme: a belief that the society will thrive if nearly all decisions are left for individuals to make on economic grounds. That ideology no doubt thrives on the atomization described by Professor Putnam — and feeds it.

But individual decision-making cannot give a society clean water or safe drugs, much as the right-wing ideologues in Congress today like to pretend it can as they remove governmental safeguards. Nor can pure commercialism give a country a decent television service, as all other civilized societies understand.

The former director of the London School of Economics, Lord Dahrendorf, warned recently against "an economism run amok," an attitude that disdains "non-economic motives — motives that lead people to do things because they are right, or because people have a sense of duty, a commitment."

Making the values of commerce emperors of our souls, Lord Dahrendorf said, leads to "the destruction of public spaces and the decline of the services that go with them, the weakening of health systems and public education, transportation and safety."

When people in a society care only for themselves, when they are taught by demagogues to sneer at government and the communal good, it cannot be surprising that social bonds and social trust decline. In that process, everyone will eventually lose. In a society where fewer people vote or care or join — a society that has lost its sense of community — individualism will not bring contentment. □

Books, Not Bureaucrats

By Betsy McCaughey Ross

ALBANY

The children at P. S. 27 in the Bronx must share their math books — one for every two students. When a class ends, the books are collected and sent down the hall where another class is waiting. Are spending cuts to blame for this shortage?

Hardly. From 1980 to 1993, spending on New York City public schools increased 148 percent, even though the number of students increased only 3 percent. Even after taking inflation into account, New York City spent 37 percent more per pupil in 1993 than in 1980.

Where did the money go? The State Education Department's data provide the answer. (The data are available only through 1993.)

Each year, a decreasing share went into regular classrooms to pay for computers, textbooks, lab equipment and teachers, while an increasing share went to central administration and special education. Spending on central administration increased almost five times as fast as spending for regular classroom teaching.

Too much money went for bureaucrats, not books; administrators, not educators; red tape, not learning aids.

Betsy McCaughey Ross is Lieutenant Governor of New York.

The problem is not merely citywide, it is statewide: From 1980 to 1993, school enrollment in the state declined by 9 percent but spending shot up by 142 percent. School districts spent more and more and taxed local residents to pay for these outlays. Even after adjusting for inflation, spending per pupil increased 48 percent, yet many teachers are so exasperated by the lack of resources that they reach into their own pockets to pay for classroom supplies.

Let parents know where education money goes.

That's why local boards of education should be required to publish report cards on every school. The cards should tell how much is spent on each pupil, how much spending has increased and whether it has resulted in better student performance on standardized tests.

Such tests are not a perfectly fair and complete measure of performance, but still they will help parents evaluate how their child's school stacks up and whether the dollars are making it to the classroom.

School report cards would help create a groundswell of support for education reform, especially in schools like P. S. 27. Students there do so poorly on reading and math exams that it has been on the list of failing schools since 1989. That's six years — half a child's time in public school. Yet even the committed parents who are classroom volunteers at P. S. 27 said they had not heard that it was on the failing list. That's why they need report cards.

State government is doing its part. Our administration reduced mid- and upper-level management costs in the State Education Department by 19 percent last year so that more money would be spent in classrooms, not government offices. We're proposing further management savings in this year's budget.

The Regents recommend that school districts that hold down bureaucratic costs be rewarded with additional state aid. Our administration's new budget does just that.

For more than a decade, school spending in New York State doubled while the number of students declined. School enrollment is on the upswing again. We face a formidable challenge: improving schools for an increasing number of students while controlling costs.

Education is 30 percent of New York State's budget. It is 100 percent of New York State's future.

Parents, taxpayers and teachers need to work together to hold school boards and elected officials accountable for spending so that the scarce education dollars are used wisely to give every child a chance in life. □

THE NEW YORK TIMES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1995

In America

BOB HERBERT

Sorrow on 125th St.

They came wrapped in their heavy winter coats and the dead weight of their grief to the Francisco Funeral Home on First Avenue to pay their respects to Olga Garcia, who died for no good reason at the age of 19.

They sat on folding chairs and prayed and wept softly. A crucifix and a picture of the Blessed Mother rested beside the body, and above the casket was a large photograph of Olga, dressed casually in white and smiling that gorgeous and easy smile that is one of God's great gifts to the young.

Olga died in the racial madness that erupted on 125th Street a week and a half ago when a black man with a gun and a container of flammable liquid invaded a Jewish-owned clothing store called Freddy's. The man shot four people, set the store ablaze and then shot himself.

Eight people died, including the gunman, a 51-year-old handyman and part-time street vendor named Roland Smith.

Olga Garcia was working in the store when Smith burst in. Her body was found in the basement, huddled with three other victims.

Last week, when I saw the looks of sorrow and incomprehensibility on the faces of Olga's relatives at the funeral home, my thoughts went back many years, to 1963 and the agony of the families of the four African-American girls who were killed in the racist bombing of a Baptist Church in Birmingham, Ala.

Racist poison fueled the killings.

Such atrocities do not erupt unbidden from the void. They are nurtured in the poisonous atmosphere of race hatred, unrestrained rhetoric, destructive leadership and the cowardice of those who remain silent in the face of that which they know is wrong.

It was true in Birmingham in 1963 and it is true in New York now. Roland Smith was driven by a sick hatred of whites and Jews and by the criminally irresponsible anti-white and anti-Semitic ravings of protesters who had been picketing Freddy's.

In the parlance of the picket line, Jews were "bastards" and "bloodsuckers," the latter term enjoying renewed popularity thanks to Louis Farrakhan. African-Americans who patronized Freddy's were derided as "cracker-lovers" and traitors to their race. A black security guard who worked in the store, and was killed in the attack, had been told repeatedly that he would get his.

It didn't occur to anyone involved in this ugliness that they had fully adopted the nauseating attitudes and tactics of the white racist terrorists that they professed so strongly to despise. They should have worn George Wallace buttons.

The picketers were led by Morris Powell, leader of the 125th Street Vendors Association. If there are any small remnants of humanity left within Mr. Powell, he keeps them carefully concealed. One day after the hideous tragedy at Freddy's, Mr. Powell went ahead with a planned protest outside Bargain World, another Jewish-owned store on 125th Street. Leaflets at that protest said, "Now we will drive Bargain World out of business."

Last Thursday night, during an appearance at the Slave Theater in Brooklyn, Mr. Powell called again for a shutdown of Bargain World, lacing his angry comments with more racially offensive rhetoric. His appearance was part of a rally at the theater in which some speakers expressed their strong admiration for Roland Smith.

The protesters at Freddy's had the unqualified support of the Rev. Al Sharpton, who made at least one guest appearance at the picket line, and who went on the radio to describe the owner of Freddy's as a "white interloper" and insist that "we are not turning 125th Street back over to outsiders."

Mr. Sharpton usually welcomes any publicity, good or bad. Nothing is more attractive to him than his own face on television. But seven murder victims is too much, even for Mr. Sharpton. He now contends that his remarks were not anti-white, not anti-Jewish, and not inflammatory.

Oh.

On Friday, Kareem Brunner, the security guard who was told that he would get his, was buried. He was 22.

There will be more killings. More Kareem Brunners. More Olga Garcias. Every ethnic epithet is an incitement to violence, and variations on the theme of Birmingham will continue as long as we choose to listen to the poison of bogus leaders rather than to the counsel of our better selves. □

Essay

WILLIAM SAFIRE

Two for the Seesaw

WASHINGTON

Just one year ago, Newt Gingrich's star was on the most rapid rise: his contract was signed, his Speakerhood was at hand, his revolution was gaining momentum.

At the same moment, Bill Clinton's star was more like a plunging meteorite: his grandiose health plan had been rejected and his misjudgment had cost Democrats the House of Representatives for the first time in two generations. He was reduced to making bleats about the Presidency still being relevant.

Today, polls assure us the opposite is true. Gingrich is self-benched lest his high negatives weaken his team; Clinton stands astride the liberal ramparts, gaining strength by posing as defender of the old and poor.

What a difference a year makes.

Ups and downs of Newt and Bill.

What happened to threaten what the Chinese call a reversal of verdicts?

The seesaw swung because neither man handles success well; both do much better as underdogs.

Gingrich stayed cocky past the point of victory. He had always come on strong, which was admired as forthright scrappiness when he was in the minority, but after he really became strong, it scared people when he kept coming on strong.

Newt's biggest mistake was to exploit his new celebrity to write a book to make himself a millionaire. The other ethics charges could be dismissed as tit-for-tat for his having brought down a previous Speaker, but the Gingrich grab for a personal fortune while on the public payroll turned off a lot of people who would have been his followers. When criticized, he piqued too soon.

Bill, on the contrary, got humility. The year before, he saw where an air of cockiness and an inflated sense of destiny led him: into stunning midterm defeat. Having failed to lead the people where they did not want to go in 1994, Clinton decided to follow the people in 1995.

He followed them to the center with a proposed tax cut and a promise of a balanced budget, and then followed them to the left as pollsters reported that people were getting alarmed at the consequences of diminished entitlements.

As a result, we now have this seesaw of political fortunes. The inner-directed Gingrich is being seen now as personally petulant and politically prickly — an unhappy warrior — while the other-directed Clinton is seen as resolutely malleable, determined to align his position to whatever swing voters say they want at the moment.

Will the seesaw of 1995 swing again? Will the low man change places with the high man in the coming year?

A good guess is yes. Br'er Newt's style led to a demonization that has gone too far; he is at ease in the outcast's briar patch, and the recent Democratic attempt to revive the technique of "running against Herbert Hoover" in a local election backfired. At the same time, Bill Clinton — presuming to look military while being interviewed in an Air Force One jacket — revels in his relevance.

The fulcrum on which the teeter may totter is the keeping of one's word.

Clinton made a well-publicized deal to balance the budget in seven years based on the Congressional Budget Office's upwardly revised projections; he broke his word, and now insists on an even rosier scenario to escape anti-deficit discipline. That double-cross will rankle long after the inevitable deal is struck.

In the same way, he had promised to cooperate with Congress and independent counsel on Whitewater documents; the increasingly confident President broke his word again, using some flimsy claim of privilege, doomed in court. That sort of trickiness turns seesaws.

Contrariwise, Gingrich is grimly staying "on message," willing to defer to Bob Dole as his broker to give on degree while adhering to the conservative direction. Before the next year ends, conventional wisdom is likely to be "say what you like about Newt, he did all a politician could do to keep his word."

The rises and falls of Newt and Bill have been a controlled experiment in media impartiality. By amplifying error and magnifying trends, the media in their totality help lower the Ups and boost the Downs, but our echo chamber is set to reverberating by the news and noises made by political figures.

The noise I hear on the eve of '96 is a seesaw creaking. □

THE NEW YORK TIMES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1995

Educ - Bureaucracy

THE NEW YORK TIMES, THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1995

EDUC – Bureaucracy

Giuliani Is Half Right on Schools

By Frank J. Macchiarola

Mayor Rudolph Giuliani certainly has a way with words. On Monday, he managed in a short speech about the public schools to alienate virtually the entire educational establishment. What did he say? That the public school system is near collapse and that a remake should be modeled on the city's Roman Catholic schools.

Mayor Giuliani is wrong about much of this. But he is also right. I share his high regard for parochial schools, having been educated at St. Augustine's in Brooklyn, once the rival to Bishop Loughlin High School, the Mayor's alma mater. Like him, I shared the sense of high expectations, strong community values and strict academic standards of the LaSalle Christian brothers. I wish every child here could have as good an experience.

But the Catholic schools do not have a monopoly on these qualities. There are plenty of public schools — and non-Catholic parochial schools — where talented, committed teachers work with students and parents to provide an excellent education. Many of these students come from the poorest neighborhoods.

We do not have to look far to discover models for public education. These include LaGuardia High School, in Manhattan, where students excel in the performing arts; Midwood High School, in Brooklyn, which features a medical science program that has gotten graduates into top colleges, and A. Philip Randolph High School, in Manhattan, which offers medical science courses at City College.

Frank J. Macchiarola, dean of the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University, was Schools Chancellor from 1978 to 1983.

There are also outstanding non-traditional schools, like the Science Skills Center in Brooklyn and the Renaissance School, in Long Island City, which last year ranked first in the district in reading. The newly established Manhattan School for Children, in East Harlem, tries to involve poor parents in their children's education.

These schools are examples of the reform the Mayor wants. Clearly, more could be done with support from the top. In large part, not that you'd know it from the Mayor's speech, these schools are the result of efforts by Chancellors Joseph Fernandez and Ramon Cortines.

The Catholics have an edge: no Board of Ed.

Mr. Fernandez pushed for and Mr. Cortines has actively supported school-based management — schools run by principals and teachers working closely with parents to develop programs tailored to communities' needs. School-based management unleashed a creative force that the Mayor should embrace. He would do more for school reform by acknowledging these efforts than by giving aid and comfort to those who would pit parochial schools against public schools.

So how is the Mayor right? He's right in being angry and frustrated with the Board of Education. He's hardly alone. Most of the city's innovative educators share his frustration. The only way Deborah Meier and the others who created the city's special schools did so was by doing an end-run around bureaucrats at 110 Livingston Street.

The Mayor is right in considering the board a major impediment to change. The board does not know how to manage school affairs. Instead of creating and nurturing successful schools, it insists on mindless adherence to irrelevant rules. It does not even know how many schools it runs, the number of employees or where they work. After 20 years of watching this system closely, I believe the board really doesn't care.

New Yorkers saw this ineptitude when Mayor Giuliani asked for simple budget data and the board repeatedly gave him misinformation. Whether the issue is an asbestos crisis, a school safety problem or wholesale theft from the bureau of supplies, often the board is the last to know.

But the Mayor is wrong to assume that the solution lies outside the public schools. It lies with the State Legislature, which should abolish the board. The Mayor, who is ultimately held accountable by the public, should have control over the schools, including the power to appoint a chancellor, answerable to him.

If Gov. George Pataki and the Legislature do not act immediately to abolish the board, selfish grown-ups will have failed our children again. And too many others will join the Mayor in mistakenly thinking that the path to school success can only come from models imported into our public schools. If that happens, school reform will be set back years. □

Note to Readers

The Op-Ed page welcomes unsolicited manuscripts. Because of the volume of submissions, however, we regret that we cannot acknowledge an article or return it unless it is accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. If manuscripts are accepted for publication, authors will be notified within two weeks.

Freedom, for Some Indonesians

This is a great day in many respects for Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim country. A flotilla of 119 yachts and 21 tall ships is arriving in Javanese waters, Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands is in Jakarta for a state visit and hundreds of political prisoners are being freed to celebrate the half-century since Indonesia proclaimed itself independent amid the tumult of Japan's World War II surrender.

Celebrants can point to real achievements. Nearly 200 million people spread through 13,500 islands have impressively striven for national unity and have generally prospered. The archipelago boasts one of the strongest economies in Asia.

But little will be said about the darker side of the authoritarian military rule of Indonesia's President Suharto. He came to power following the massacre of ethnic Chinese in 1965 to thwart a purported Communist coup. Under his New Order, despite promises of "openness," dissenters are jailed, torture is routine, Parliament is a rubber stamp and General Suharto, 74 years old and now in his sixth term, is virtually President for Life.

Little of this can be discussed in Jakarta's heavily censored press, and writers who question official platitudes face house arrest, as in the case of Indonesia's most famous novelist, Pramoedya Ananta Toer.

No subject is touchier than East Timor, the former Portuguese colony that Indonesia invaded in 1975, then annexed. Famine claimed tens of thousands, and unrest has persisted ever since. Only the other day, Indonesian troops were quelling riots and killing teen-agers in two Timorese towns.

Indonesia insists that East Timor's predominantly Roman Catholic people welcome annexation, but foreign reporters and human rights monitors are denied unimpeded access to the province. When the Jakarta-appointed governor of East Timor, Abilio Soares, proposed autonomy within the Indonesian state, even this gesture was rejected by President Suharto.

In truth, Indonesia's dominion over East Timor rests on the same imperial doctrine that Indonesia experienced as a Dutch colony: Forcible conquest is the prerogative of the powerful.

Community Treatment for the Retarded

The Clinton Justice Department has joined the effort to move mentally retarded patients out of large institutions and into community facilities. It is a potentially worthy undertaking, putting the Federal Government, once again, behind a policy carried out in many states and supported by experts and advocates for 20 years. But the department should be wary about closing down institutions unless it gets firm assurances that alternative treatment will be available.

The practice of closing down large mental hospitals, known as deinstitutionalization, gained momentum in the late 1960's and 1970's. It was inspired partly by horror stories of overcrowded, inhumane institutions and partly by new forms of treatment that allowed many patients to function in smaller community facilities or even at home. Since 1967, the population of mentally retarded people housed in institutions has dropped from about 200,000 to less than 70,000.

But in many states, including New York, deinstitutionalization became a cruel hoax, funneling the mentally ill into communities where programs and facilities did not exist. Patients were left to fend for themselves on the streets. Meanwhile politicians and labor leaders kept some large hospitals open to retain local jobs, and state officials were reluctant to commit funds for community treatment. The Reagan and Bush Administrations also resisted expanding community placements.

The Justice Department now argues against keeping the mentally retarded in "forced segregation and isolation." It suggests that such actions may amount to discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. It has therefore moved to expand community placements in nine states and the District of Columbia.

But there are pitfalls. It is often difficult to make sweeping judgments about who can function in community facilities. Institutional settings might be better for some severely retarded patients.

Total deinstitutionalization is not realistic. But neither is wholesale incarceration. As long as communities have places for the mentally retarded to go, the Justice Department's new emphasis on community placement is reasonable social policy.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1996

In America

BOB HERBERT

Playing to the Mob

Ferrer embraces the death penalty.

The death penalty brings out the worst in politicians. With just the slightest whiff of an execution in the air, even the most mild-mannered officials can become agitated and recklessly aggressive, like respectable folks who suddenly have gotten all liquored up, and in their frantic howling for a killing we can hear the vestiges of the lynch mob.

Last week a police officer named Kevin Gillespie was slain while on duty in the Bronx. There is no hint of any mitigating circumstances. It was a cold-blooded murder that occurred in the course of a carjacking. A second police officer was wounded and three bystanders were shot. The men arrested have long prison records for violent crimes.

The murder has been a political boon for Gov. George Pataki, who loudly and very publicly demanded that the District Attorney for the Bronx, Robert Johnson, seek the death penalty for the suspects. Yesterday Mr. Pataki pushed his political advantage by shoving Mr. Johnson aside and designating the State Attorney General, who will do exactly as he is told, as a special prosecutor in charge of the case.

The mob is on Mr. Pataki's side. Kevin Gillespie is dead and a blood dance of retribution is pounding on his grave.

Mr. Pataki, at least, has been consistent on this issue. He has long been a proponent of capital punishment.

But now, adding a timorous voice to the atmosphere of hysteria, comes the Borough President of the Bronx, Fernando Ferrer, with the most convenient change of mind and change of heart you are likely to see, even in the craven world of politics.

Like Mr. Pataki, Mr. Ferrer saw the political opportunity in Officer Gillespie's death and he seized it. Unlike Mr. Pataki, Mr. Ferrer had to sell his soul to do it.

Fernando Ferrer is soft-spoken, thoughtful and widely considered to be a good Borough President. He has not been soft on crime, and in fact was one of the earliest supporters of the most recent expansion of the police force.

He has, however, been a lifelong opponent of the death penalty. There has never been a crime in the Bronx heinous enough for Mr. Ferrer to toss aside his personal principles and advocate death as retribution — not even the mass slaughter at the Happy Land Social Club in 1990, where 87 people died in an arson fire.

He has not favored the death penalty for the cold-blooded murder of children, for previous police murders, for rape-murders — not for any crime. He opposed the death penalty law that Governor Pataki signed. It was a matter of principle.

But now Mr. Ferrer is running for Mayor. And so, last Saturday, two days after the murder of Kevin Gillespie, the mayoral candidate underwent a very public conversion. He placed his principles in escrow and demanded the death penalty for the men who killed Mr. Gillespie.

"Why now?" I asked.

Mr. Ferrer said the murder of Officer Gillespie was so hideous, "so cold-blooded, that it just made me nuts. It really did."

At some point, said Mr. Ferrer, "a line had to be drawn."

When I suggested that his move was a cynical one, a morally expensive attempt to shield his liberal flank from attack by a law-and-order Mayor, he said, "You're wrong."

"People in government have choices to make, and have to weigh in from time to time," said Mr. Ferrer, "and all my liberal friends who will huff and puff about this don't live on 183d Street and Grand Concourse."

It was a cheap comment made worse by the fact that it came from a politician who saw the light only after his hat was in the ring. Mr. Ferrer is not usually the type to run with the mob. He has always been more decent than that. And he admits that he still is not comfortable in his spiffy new death penalty suit. The suspicion lingers that he has been listening to political counselors who, at another time, would have been shown the door.

"I am not a proponent of the death penalty," said Mr. Ferrer. "I'm really not. I have never been. But in this case, with this police officer and the way he was gunned down, I felt I had no other moral option."

Which is a high-toned way of saying that if you want the office badly enough you do what you have to do. □

EDUC. — Bureaucracy

What School Reform?

By Diane Ravitch

Three plans would leave New York's bureaucracy intact.

In city after city across America, reformers are trying to change the way public schools are managed. Seattle has hired a former Army general as its superintendent. Milwaukee wants to let poor kids choose among public, private and parochial schools. Reformers in Boston are creating charter schools that are relieved of all but essential regulations.

New York City is also ripe for reform. Its overregulated, inefficient system has no defenders. The city's dropout rate is intolerably high: Fewer than half of its high school students earn a degree within four years. The notorious rigidity of the system makes it difficult for principals to institute changes or even control their own budgets.

A reform plan is needed that will free schools to manage their own budgets and personnel. And yet none of New York's well-meaning reformers is ready to dispense with the tradition of central command and control.

Earlier this month, Schools Chancellor Rudy Crew announced a reorganization plan that shifts administrators around but leaves intact the huge powers of the bureaucracy. In Albany, three competing school reform bills have been introduced in the State Legislature, but they are likely to do little better in freeing up the schools.

The people who write school reform legislation seem to think that education is delivered by boards, not by teachers and principals. Each creates elaborate structures of oversight, as though the professionals who work in the schools are less trustworthy than anyone appointed or elected to serve on a public board.

Mayor Rudolph Giuliani's legislative proposal would convert the schools into a city agency, run by a powerful chancellor (appointed by the Mayor with the City Council's assent), with the aid of five borough boards and the 32 existing local school boards. Senator John Marchi, Republican of Staten Island, has submitted a bill that would abolish the central board and the position of chancellor, then turn the schools over to five borough boards and the community boards. Only Sheldon Silver, the Speaker of the Assembly, had the audacity to recommend the abolition of the scandal-ridden community boards, while urging the expansion of the central board from 7 to 19 members.

Mr. Silver's proposal is the most promising, because it envisions transferring real powers to local school councils composed of teachers, parents and principals. These councils would select principals and help develop school budgets. But the Silver proposal leaves intact the current system of collective bargaining, which means that staff would continue to be assigned by the central machine and the school councils would have little, if any, say in hiring their own teachers, custodians and other staff. In addition, none of these proposals decentralizes departments such as food services, which are now pointlessly run by the Chancellor's office.

If allowed to find their own way to meet high educational and fiscal standards, the public schools might surprise everyone. And eliminating waste would eliminate the common excuse that extra money for the schools — for example, to pay our teachers and principals as much as their suburban counterparts — would only be squandered. The proposals before us are simply unequal to coping with a bureaucracy that resembles a weed that will grow back unless it is pulled out by the roots. □

Diane Ravitch is an adjunct fellow of the Manhattan Institute.

Correction

Because of an editing error, an article yesterday by Muhamed Sacirbey, the Bosnian Ambassador to the United Nations, used the term "Muslim-Croat Federation," which he finds unacceptable. The article should have referred to the "Bosnian Federation."

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1996

On My Mind

A. M. ROSENTHAL

Buchanan and the Fish

So Patrick Buchanan will not be the Republican candidate for President this year. But he has become a steadily increasing political and moral liability to the Republican Party, to Americans who usually vote Republican and to Democrats thinking of doing so this November.

The burden was not created by Mr. Buchanan all by himself. He would have been a long time gone if he had not had the help of the Republican candidates and party leaders.

By selective silence they helped him build national standing and, save our souls, acceptability. They criticized his economics but refused to say why he had no place in political life, when they knew exactly why.

In the primary campaign, he showed himself as he has for years — intelligent enough to exploit real problems troubling many Americans and superciliously ignored by the mainstream politicians, a rousing orator, and a bigot.

He tried on the stump to control revealing the hate in him during the campaign. But these types find that real hard. So he got what kicks were available at least cost — slurs about Jews and Latinos meant to be understood beneath the light code-word covering, the ineradicable insult to blacks of promoting use of the Confederate flag, and the sick pride that gutter brawlers take in refusing to apologize for what they do.

But that's old Pat, the quintessential Washington insider hilariously playing a factory hand in overalls, the sidekick of politicians and journalists, the house anti-Jew whom even Jews among them tolerated and "stood by."

Poor chaps must have felt in an awkward situation. But not more awkward than the one William Buckley finds himself in. Some journalists recently said that Mr. Buckley had denounced Mr. Buchanan as an anti-Semite, in 1992, after I made the charge. In fact there were Jews who had taken their impression that a non-Jew was saying Mr. Buchanan was anti-Semitic as permission to say a few naughty-naughty words about him themselves.

Mr. Buckley has felt compelled to write a new column saying he had done no such thing. He is right.

Mr. Buckley points out that while he had written that it was impossible to defend Mr. Buchanan against charges that what he had done and said "amounted to anti-Semitism," he had also explained that Mr. Buchanan was "most probably" driven by an "iconoclastic temperament." You see? Mr. Buckley, my old friend, is irritated that lesser journalistic minds found the refinement "too complicated, too handle." You can understand his annoyance.

But a few other noted writers are not finding it difficult to make themselves plain. George Will writes contemptuously of Mr. Buchanan's "eagerness" to use material denying the Holocaust. And in Time magazine Lance Morrow had a fine essay with the magnificently descriptive title: "Stinking to High Heaven."

It is the householder's hygienic duty to toss a fish out when it begins to stink. In the Buchanan matter, Republican leaders are the householders. But while many found fault with the fish's trade policy, most dealt with the fundamental, disqualifying issue of bigotry by looking pained and saying: "What fish?"

Republicans' selective silence.

But in an open letter, Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Republican of New York, denounced Mr. Buchanan for denigrating women, bashing homosexuals, criminalizing immigrants, insulting African-Americans. I can hear the snickers of New Yorkers who would not give Mr. D'Amato credit if he pulled them out of a burning building: wasn't it easy for him because he led the Dole campaign in New York?

If it was so easy why don't more Dole backers do it — or Mr. Dole himself? Will he really let Mr. Buchanan light a venom-fire at the San Diego Convention without renouncing him? Will they stand together, arms raised in unity? If so, where will we go to be sick? If not, shouldn't he start the casting-out of Mr. Buchanan before the Convention?

Every day that goes by without the Republican leadership breaking its silence about why American values disqualify Mr. Buchanan allows him to burrow more lastingly into American political life.

Am I shouting into the wind to ask Republicans to risk losing some votes of Buchanan backers by telling the truth about him? Probably, but better a hoarse throat than one more zippered mouth. □

PHOTOCOPY RESERVATION

Goals on the Shoals

How Washington Thwarted School Reform

By Chester E. Finn Jr.

NOT SINCE 1965, when Washington's role in our schools and colleges assumed its present contours, have the views of Democrats and Republicans on the subject of education differed so sharply. Whether those expressed differences actually translate into needed changes in federal policy remains to be seen.

Certainly there is much partisan contention. Disagreement between the White House and Congress over the proper level of federal "investment" in education has emerged as a key sticking point in budget negotiations. And even as GOP presidential aspirants pledge to eliminate the Education Department, scrap dozens of programs and return responsibility to communities and parents, Bill Clinton has signaled that his re-election bid rests in no small part on the claim that U.S. education is "turning the corner" as a result of measures he and the last Congress enacted.

That he's wrong about the corner-turning is clear from recent National Assessment data. Reading scores were lower in 1994 than in 1992; 30 percent of high school seniors were not even "basic" readers, meaning that some 750,000 youngsters graduate every year without a solid grasp of the most basic skill. As for U.S. history, the 1994 results show just 11 percent of 12th graders performing satisfactorily. These failures were underscored by the report issued earlier this month by a bipartisan panel assessing progress in meeting the educational goals set by the nation's governors five years ago.

Party differences about education are a recent development, however. For two decades, education enjoyed a loose bipartisan consensus about what was wrong and what needed to happen: Resources and services should be expanded, and poor (and handicapped and non-English speaking) children given greater access to them. Then in the 1980s, a different consensus began to emerge: that weak achievement and poor quality were our foremost education problems, that reform strategies should focus on student performance rather than extending services, that such reforms may need to overturn long-established practices, and that, while some desirable changes might take more resources, the country was not getting its money's worth from the investment already being made.

This new consensus was also bipartisan, at least outside Washington. Several prominent Democratic governors—notably Clinton and his education secretary, Dick Riley—played important roles in shaping it. Its high-water mark was probably the 1989 Charlottesville "summit" held by President Bush and the governors, the six national education goals set shortly thereafter, and the "America 2000" strategy developed by former education secretary Lamar Alexander to move the country closer to those goals.

The Democratic Congress never really joined in the new consensus, however, and neither, as the months passed, did the Clinton ad-

Clinton now believes he erred by yielding to congressional Democrats on these points.)

Today, party differences look stark. Judging from its rhetoric, the GOP hopes to position itself as the education consumer's ally while Democrats continue to hold hands with the teacher unions and other producer interests.

But wait. A year into the Republican revolution, there's lots more smoke than flame. Neither House nor Senate shows any inclination to tackle "special education," though this is the largest unfunded federal mandate in education and the source of vast amounts of burdensome regulation. Nobody is rushing to amend last year's omnibus measure that set new rules for such hot-button issues as sex education, gender equity and weapons in schools. Bills to scrap the Education Department haven't even had hearings in either chamber. A semi-block grant program will likely replace a handful of vocational education and training programs, but the main federal programs remain much as in LBJ's day.

The 1996 appropriation bill is a window onto how little has yet truly changed. Yes, a bit of cash will be trimmed from last year's $33 billion education appropriation and yes, the House version would wipe out the Goals 2000 program. But for all of Bob Dole's jaw-boning about the dangers of bilingual education, the Senate bill makes only a slight reduction in federal bilingual programs. (The House cut, while deeper, is far from fatal.) The Fund for Improvement of Education—essentially a discretionary fund for the executive branch—will receive $8 million more than the White House even requested.

In more than a dozen areas—library support, the National Writing Project, Law School Clinical Experience, college aid for migrants,—the Senate bill actually keeps alive activities the Clinton White House sought to kill. It would maintain 127 programs, including such pet projects as Sen. Ted Kennedy's Star Schools, at a total spending

teachers' unions. Mayors and governors from Arizona and Wisconsin to Chicago and New York are seeking to wrest control of schools from establishment hands.

These state education policy-makers (and their governors and legislators) are bolder than most Congressional Republicans. They understand that most American parents have a short, straightforward agenda for their children's schools: safety, discipline, high standards and "the basics." They don't mind receiving money from Washington but they have scant use for a federal government that regulates more than it aids and blocks promising reforms.

And they have no use at all for a big federal education bureaucracy dominated by producer interests, which is what they see at the Education Department. Consider last year's reorganization of that agency's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Though it dispenses less than $100 million a year in research funds, nearly all it earmarked by Congress for specific grantees, the 1994 legislation created a cumbersome new superstructure. A wee agency that would benefit from simplicity has instead been split into five new "institutes" whose very names (e.g., the National Institute on Postsecondary Education, Libraries and Lifelong Learning) evoke the "stakeholder" groups whose interests underlie this reorganization.

Astride all that is yet another unwieldy federal panel, this one called the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, which held its first meeting a few months back. Riley put some talented people onto this board, but nearly all are employed by school systems or universities. Though meticulously balanced by race, gender and region, it's a producer-dominated body that will pay scant heed to the priorities and concerns of parents, employers or taxpayers.

The Education Department now employs nearly 5,000 persons and it spends about $500 for every student in America. Even so rugged a defender of an activist federal role as President Clinton is ready—more ready than Senate appropriators—to prune it. Serious critics want to fell the entire tree. They've seen it grow two new limbs for every twig that gets lopped off.

Those who would maintain an active federal role cannot cite much evidence that it helps. Clinton's own Education Department was commendably candid in September 1993, when it explained why the big "Chapter 1" program of compensatory education for disadvantaged children should (again) be reformed because it is "no longer closing the gap between disadvantaged students and others," seemed to have no effect on raising test scores of participants, "frequently does not contribute to high-quality instruction [and] is not generally tied to state and local reform efforts . . . ."

Administration officials meant these gloomy conclusions to justify changes they were asking Congress to make in the program, many of which were enacted last year. Perhaps it will now be more effective. But this was the eighth time since 1965 that Chapter 1 has been fixed. No previous repairs worked.

The sums involved are not trivial. If

ties and parents, Bill Clinton has signaled that his re-election bid rests in no small part on the claim that U.S. education is "turning the corner" as a result of measures he and the last Congress enacted.

That he's wrong about the corner-turning is clear from recent National Assessment data. Reading scores were lower in 1994 than in 1992; 30 percent of high school seniors were not even "basic" readers, meaning that some 750,000 youngsters graduate every year without a solid grasp of the most basic skill. As for U.S. history, the 1994 results show just 11 percent of 12th graders performing satisfactorily. These failures were underscored by the report issued earlier this month by a bipartisan panel assessing progress in meeting the educational goals set by the nation's governors five years ago.

Party differences about education are a recent development, however. For two decades, education enjoyed a loose bipartisan consensus about what was wrong and what needed to happen: Resources and services should be expanded, and poor (and handicapped and non-English speaking) children given greater access to them. Then in the 1980s, a different consensus began to emerge: that weak achievement and poor quality were our foremost education problems, that reform strategies should focus on student performance rather than extending services, that such reforms may need to overturn long-established practices, and that, while some desirable changes might take more resources, the country was not getting its money's worth from the investment already being made.

This new consensus was also bipartisan, at least outside Washington. Several prominent Democratic governors—notably Clinton and his education secretary, Dick Riley—played important roles in shaping it. Its high-water mark was probably the 1989 Charlottesville "summit" held by President Bush and the governors, the six national education goals set shortly thereafter, and the "America 2000" strategy developed by former education secretary Lamar Alexander to move the country closer to those goals.

The Democratic Congress never really joined in the new consensus, however, and neither, as the months passed, did the Clinton administration. Cheered on by the education establishment, they enacted such intrusive measures as the controversial Goals 2000 program. Back in vogue were approaches that stressed increased funding and top-down, regulatory approaches. Tests, accountability and more efficient means of producing results waned. (Ben Wattenberg's recounting of his recent conversation with the president indicates that

Clinton now believes he erred by yielding to congressional Democrats on these points.)

Today, party differences look stark. Judging from its rhetoric, the GOP hopes to position itself as the education consumer's ally while Democrats continue to hold hands with the teacher unions and other producer interests.

But wait. A year into the Republican revolution, there's lots more smoke than flame. Neither House nor Senate shows any inclination to tackle "special education," though this is the largest unfunded federal mandate in education and the source of vast amounts of burdensome regulation. Nobody is rushing to amend last year's omnibus measure that set new rules for such hot-button issues as sex education, gender equity and weapons in schools. Bills to scrap the Education Department haven't even had hearings in either chamber. A semi-block grant program will likely replace a handful of vocational education and training programs, but the main federal programs remain much as in LBJ's day.

The 1996 appropriation bill is a window onto how little has yet truly changed. Yes, a bit of cash will be trimmed from last year's $33 billion education appropriation and yes, the House version would wipe out the Goals 2000 program. But for all of Bob Dole's jaw-boning about the dangers of bilingual education, the Senate bill makes only a slight reduction in federal bilingual programs. (The House cut, while deeper, is far from fatal.) The Fund for Improvement of Education—essentially a discretionary fund for the executive branch—will receive $8 million more than the White House even requested.

In more than a dozen areas—library support, the National Writing Project, Law School Clinical Experience, college aid for migrants,—the Senate bill actually keeps alive activities the Clinton White House sought to kill. It would maintain 127 programs, including such pet projects as Sen. Ted Kennedy's Star Schools, at a total spending level of $29 billion, compared with the administration's request of $29.6 billion for 105 programs. (The House provides $27 billion to 84 programs.)

Did someone say revolution?

Outside Washington, the fires of change are still being stoked. Nineteen states have enacted "charter" school laws and two have passed voucher programs. (More of each are pending.) At least 10 communities are experimenting with private contract-management of public schools. Virtually every state is struggling to develop workable standards and real accountability mechanisms. Several legislatures are nipping at the heels of the once-almighty

ic grantees, the 1994 legislation created a cumbersome new superstructure. A wee agency that would benefit from simplicity has instead been split into five new "institutes" whose very names (e.g., the National Institute on Postsecondary Education, Libraries and Lifelong Learning) evoke the "stakeholder" groups whose interests underlie this reorganization.

Astride all that is yet another unwieldy federal panel, this one called the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, which held its first meeting a few months back. Riley put some talented people onto this board, but nearly all are employed by school systems or universities. Though meticulously balanced by race, gender and region, it's a producer-dominated body that will pay scant heed to the priorities and concerns of parents, employers or taxpayers.

The Education Department now employs nearly 5,000 persons and it spends about $500 for every student in America. Even so rugged a defender of an activist federal role as President Clinton is ready—more ready than Senate appropriators—to prune it. Serious critics want to fell the entire tree. They've seen it grow two new limbs for every twig that gets lopped off.

Those who would maintain an active federal role cannot cite much evidence that it helps. Clinton's own Education Department was commendably candid in September 1993, when it explained why the big "Chapter 1" program of compensatory education for disadvantaged children should (again) be reformed because it is "no longer closing the gap between disadvantaged students and others," seemed to have no effect on raising test scores of participants, "frequently does not contribute to high-quality instruction [and] is not generally tied to state and local reform efforts . . . ."

Administration officials meant these gloomy conclusions to justify changes they were asking Congress to make in the program, many of which were enacted last year. Perhaps it will now be more effective. But this was the eighth time since 1965 that Chapter 1 has been fixed. No previous repairs worked.

The sums involved are not trivial. If the money budgeted for this program in 1996 were targeted to the lowest-achieving 10 percent of students, it would work out to almost $1,500 apiece—enough to pay the tuition at most Catholic schools.

There's no immediate prospect, mind you, of turning such resources over to the consumers. But that's the sort of thing that today's education revolutionaries favor. That's also why education policy may loom large in the 1996 elections, both nationally and in the states. The future direction of U.S. education reform might even hinge on who wins.

Chester Finn is a fellow at the Hudson Institute and professor of education and public policy (on leave) at Vanderbilt University. From 1985 to 1988 he served as assistant secretary of education.

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

Metro Report

The New York Times

Educ - Bureaucracy

FELICIA R. LEE

On Sunday

Blacks' Dollars Seem Scarce In AIDS Fight

THE telephone call, with crisp business tones traded for dulcet endearments, symbolized the delicate juggling act that is Linda Stewart Campbell's professional life.

Ms. Campbell, the executive director of the Minority Task Force on AIDS, was chatting with her 18-year-old daughter, Catherine Lindsay. The young woman was preparing to leave New York City for Hampton University in Virginia, one of the nation's premier historically black colleges.

The mother and daughter talking in the Task Force's worn office in midtown Manhattan represented a black middle class whose numbers have more than doubled since 1967, with all the trappings of the elite.

But in her three-year incarnation at the helm of the task force, celebrating its 10th anniversary this year, the 45-year-old Ms. Campbell has had little luck in capturing those middle-class dollars and passions even as AIDS settles in as yet another scourge of the ghetto.

"I don't have a single black major donor over $1,000," Ms. Campbell said the other day, with mingled shock and resignation. "There are no David Geffens in the black community."

MS. CAMPBELL, a no-nonsense type not given to self-pity, was nonetheless envious of Mr. Geffen's recent gift of $1.5 million to God's Love We Deliver, which prepares meals for homebound people with AIDS, and $2.5 million to the Gay Men's Health Crisis. Mr. Geffen is one of the most influential executives in Hollywood.

His combined donation, believed to be the largest single gift ever made to AIDS support services, has been the talk of the ever-beleaguered advocates of people with AIDS, trapped between a compassion-fatigued public and deep cuts in funds.

The Task Force is the oldest minority AIDS service organization in New York and one of the first in the nation. Its dearth of individual donors forces reliance on dwindling government aid and a handful of institutions like Nynex and the Aaron Diamond Foundation in a

Angel Franco/The New York Times, left; V&P News, above

The exterior of 1740 Grand Avenue in the Bronx, above, where three men were shot in January. At left, Margarita Rosario, whose son was killed.

Police Barrage Still Rebounds

Investigators Feud Over Bronx Killings

By MATTHEW PURDY and GARRY PIERRE-PIERRE

POSTERIOR VIEW

Is More Left To Be Cut In Schools? Many Say No

By ALAN FINDER

Rudolph W. Giuliani makes no secret of his goal to "crush," in his words, the Board of Education's notorious bureaucracy and gain more control over New York City's schools.

News Analysis

The Mayor trained his oratorical howitzers on the school system again last week, saying that it was close to collapse and that its bloated bureaucracy was the biggest obstacle to improving public education.

His words undoubtedly resonate among New Yorkers familiar with years of studies pointing out the school system's failings. But even if the school board were willing to make the changes the Mayor is demanding, it would very likely find that there isn't enough administrative fat left to produce cuts big enough to suit Mr. Giuliani.

If the board were to eliminate its entire central administration — the headquarters, the high school division and the offices of all 32 community school districts — it would save about $165 million in city money, just a fraction of the $750 million the Mayor and the City Council cut from the board's budget in June.

Beyond that, although Mr. Giuliani insists that the cuts can be made without affecting classrooms, many independent education officials disagree. Some even argue that Mr. Giuliani's repeated broadsides against the bureaucracy might be intended less to shake it up and pare it down than to help him avoid political blame for the larger classes and diminished school days that they believe are in the offing.

"The Mayor is a master of rhetoric on this issue," said Robert Berne, dean of the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service at New York University. "There is no question that in any large organization

like the drug use — reminds us of all the evils that have torn us apart. It's not what we imagine ourselves to be in this country.

"I've been told blacks give our money to other things: churches, black colleges, fraternal organizations," she said.

IMAGES aside, more than half of all AIDS cases are among minorities, according to the Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Black women are nearly 15 times as likely as white women to have AIDS, with almost half the cases caused by intravenous drug use. The babies born with the AIDS virus are overwhelmingly black and Hispanic.

Keith Cylar, the co-executive director of Housing Works, a minority group in Manhattan that houses people with AIDS, said was having better luck with blacks than the Task Force, but it was still an uphill climb.

"It's kind of like a lot of black families have a cousin who is a drug addict, but you don't embrace him," Mr. Cylar said. "And if I'm going to write a check to a cause, does it go to something that might kill me in 10 years like AIDS, or to stopping stray bullets?"

Mr. Cylar also mentioned the enduring stigma of the myth that AIDS started among blacks and the scarcity of black fund-raisers.

Yet, he and Ms. Campbell remain optimistic that blacks indeed have the resources to deal with both bullets and AIDS, just two of the more contemporary plagues in the community.

While large swaths of Brooklyn and the Bronx are AIDS-infested, and black and Hispanic people there live in wretched conditions, the median income for black households in Queens has outpaced that of white households, according to the Census Bureau. It's a demographic and social seesaw. Nationally, the percentage of high-income black families more than doubled between 1967 and 1990. At the same time, the proportion of black families at the lowest income level grew by 50 percent.

Ms. Campbell sees the wedge in all the numbers as the notion with which she was raised: the duty to those left behind. As an affirmative-action baby and the daughter of working-class parents in segregated St. Louis, she saw community as defined not by geography or class but common destiny.

The way Ms. Campbell sees it, the seesaw can go either way.

ANTHONY ROSARIO — HILTON VEGA

2 Deaths, 22 Bullets

According to the Medical Examiner's report, two robbery suspects, Anthony Rosario, 18, and Hilton Vega, 21, died of multiple gunshot wounds in their confrontation with New York City police detectives on Jan. 12. Mr. Rosario was hit with 14 bullets, including six bullets in his back. Mr. Vega was shot eight times, including five in the back.

bery would take place, unleashed a fusillade of 28 bullets at three armed men, killing two of them, Anthony Rosario, 18, and Hilton Vega, 21, and wounding the third.

Police officials and leaders of the detectives' union have said the shooting was justified, a result of a confrontation in which the suspects did not obey orders to drop to the ground. "The officers were in imminent danger," said Detective Thomas J. Scotto, president of the Detectives' Endowment Association. In March, a Bronx grand jury cleared the 46th Precinct detectives, Patrick J. Brosnan and James Crowe, of criminal misconduct.

But the shooting has resounded far beyond Apartment 114 of 1740 Grand Avenue, kept alive by new investigations, by a grieving mother's crusade and by the gnawing questions of why so many shots were fired, particularly into the victims' backs.

The case, which touches on elements as disparate as illegal marriage brokering and the politics of who monitors police behavior, has angered some residents of the Bronx, where complaints of police misconduct have risen sharply in the last year.

Detective Patrick J. Brosnan was named Police Officer of the Year by Gov. Mario M. Cuomo in 1991.

A month before the shootings, a man playing football with his brothers in the University Heights section died while being subdued by an officer from the 46th Precinct, who has been indicted in the death. And in May, 15 officers from the neighboring 48th Precinct were indicted in an investigation of brutality against drug suspects.

Although the cases are unrelated, they have fueled suspicion in the largely Hispanic neighborhoods of the central and

Continued on Page 41

is a diversion from the tough issue of how do we improve outcomes for kids in this city."

That is not to say that the vast school system, with more than 1,000 schools, 1 million students and 60,000 teachers, could not be managed more effectively. Even critics of the Mayor's approach agree with him that better management of everything from building mainteoance to purchasing to security would improve the system.

Many critics also agree with Mr. Giuliani that the school system should be decentralized, with more authority given to individual principals and the bureaucratic culture made much more flexible to encourage innovation. But they say that the Mayor has concentrated his public remarks too much on reducing the number of administrative employees at the central and district offices — the oft-cited "bureaucratic bloat" — and has overestimated the potential savings that could be gained there.

"I think the bureaucracy has been the whipping boy, the last evil empire," said Noreen Connell, executive director of the Educational Priorities Panel, a coalition of civic and parent organizations. "It's very easy to attack."

Continued on Page 37

Dial M for Movies: Phone Company Tests New Service

By GEORGE JUDSON

WEST HARTFORD, Conn. — A year after Margrete Olsen gave her cable-television company the boot and switched to a trial video service started by her local phone company, Southern New England Telephone, she is one of SNET's biggest fans.

She gets more television channels, with a sharper picture. She and her daughters, Amanda and Tori, use a remote control to order any of 1,800 movies and videos any time they want. And SNET's employees are as solicitous as waiters in a four-star restaurant.

A marriage of video and a tantalizing new technology.

"It was so good, we told all our neighbors about it," Ms. Olsen said. "We had people over to watch it. We said, call and order it."

Ms. Olsen says she is thrilled to be rid of her cable company. But the phone company's entry into video has not changed her life — yet. "What we're looking forward to is what they've promised for the future," she said. "To do all the things computers can do, to plug into banks, plug into shopping, plug into games."

The nation's regional telephone companies promise all that and more as they rebuild their phone networks with fiber-optic wire that, with the impending arrival of digital television, makes two-way video communication possible.

But as SNET prepares to expand its trial from a few neighborhoods here into several towns and cities, how soon the promise is delivered depends on technology that has not been perfected, regulators settling new rules for competition between the telephone and cable industries, and not least, consumers like Ms. Olsen revealing what they want.

For now, the future being shown in a handful of early trials of what is known as video dialtone service looks like cable television, though with more channels, more

Continued on Page 38

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

SAKS FIFTH AVENUE

Red on the surface. Python print accessories in color, exclusively ours.
Backpack, $225. Zip arounds, $65-$110. Pump, $120.
Street Floor and Four in New York. Also in Short Hills, Bergen, Garden City, Stamford, White Plains and select SFA stores nationwide.

DEFINING STYLE

Little Fat Is Seen In Board

Continued From Page 35

"I always say turn off the sound," Ms. Connell said. "Under the Dinkins administration you had a much kinder message. He pumped a lot of money into youth services, while he took a lot of money out of the Board of Education. You have a more muscular, macho mayoralty under Giuliani, but it's the same thing, taking money out of the Board of Education."

Statistics show the dimensions of the school board's financial situation. A little more than a year ago, there were 6,300 full-time and part-time employees at the central board, which oversees curriculum, school supplies, building maintenance, food services, teacher licensing, transportation and other operations.

Today, many say largely through Mr. Giuliani's prodding, there are 4,200 people at the central board. About 3,000 are full-time workers, and 2,300 of them are paid with city money. (The rest are paid by specific state and Federal programs, and if they were cut, the city could not use that money to help close the schools' budget gap.)

An additional 1,300 people work in the district offices. Of these, 687 are paid with city money. So if the central and district administrations were eliminated, the school system would no longer have to pay these 2,987 salaries, yielding an annual saving of about $164 million. But then each principal would be responsible for writing teachers' paychecks, buying food for lunch, leasing buses, negotiating contracts and myriad other tasks.

And if all the administrators financed by state and Federal money were eliminated, it would add another $70 million in potential savings, still a fraction of what the Mayor is demanding.

The city's Budget Director, Marc V. Shaw, noted that even $164 million was a significant amount, since the

A Parochial Yearbook

In a speech last week about the future of public education in New York City, Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani said the city's school system was on the verge of collapse, and he demanded radical changes to model it after the Catholic schools. Mr. Giuliani, who graduated from Bishop Loughlin High School in Brooklyn, then considered one of the top parochial high schools in the city, said the success of the Catholic system was due to its smaller bureaucracy, as well as its higher standards, parents' ability to choose their children's schools and the system's encouragement of parent's participation. Six prominent New Yorkers were asked by Sarah Kershaw, a reporter for The New York Times, to recall their Catholic school experiences

Anne Meara, comedian and playwright. Graduated from St. Agnes High School in Rockville Centre, L.I., in 1947. Converted to Judaism 40 years ago when she married Jerry Stiller.

"The nuns were masters of humiliation. I just thought it was terribly repressive, but I have to put that in the time frame of my generation, which was the mid-1930's to 1947, when I graduated."

"Maybe Mayor Giuliani had a different experience. There was always a proudness with some people; they would say, 'Boy, the nuns were tough and boy, I needed it.' But as I look back, I see it was a very soul-crushing type of education."

Fernando Ferrer, Bronx Borough President. Graduated from Cardinal Spellman High School in 1968.

"It was a very competitive environment; there were high achievers and good teaching. There was the extensive use of corporal punishment. You think I was born this way? Nobody liked getting slugged by a Brother, but it happened all the time. If you didn't make the grade, you were out of there. Out. No appeal, no nothing. Goodbye."

"To get smacked around was negative. But all the rest of it, the heavy religious education, all of this was a very positive experience. I go to all my reunions, so I obviously appreciated it. Did I love it at all times? No, of course not."

Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and a major AIDS researcher. Graduated in 1958 from Regis High School in Manhattan.

"I can say without any hyperbole, that probably the defining experience in my educational career was my training at Regis High School."

"Selection of the students was very stringent. Once you got there the atmosphere was truly extraordinary. There was a combination of open-mindedness and inquisitiveness with an incredible amount of discipline, intellectual discipline. It wasn't the discipline of behavior, like when you have some priest hitting you over the head with the ruler. It was the training intellectually."

Mario M. Cuomo, former Governor of New York. Graduated in 1949 from St. John's Prep, which has since moved from Brooklyn to Queens. Before high school, he attended public schools in Queens.

"When I went to P.S. 50, if you were bad in class, you were relegated to the

Man Held in Wounding Of Reputed Aide to Gotti

Police Trace Cellular Phone Suspect Used

By ADAM NOSSITER

A 59-year-old ex-convict from the Bronx was charged yesterday in the shooting of the reputed mob figure John P. Giordano outside Lenox Hill Hospital in April.

The suspect, Ernesto Rodriguez, was arrested Friday night at a Bronx apartment where he was hiding, the authorities said yesterday. Two other men, described by the police as accomplices, were arrested in April. The shooting left Mr. Giordano, reportedly a top figure in the Gambino crime family and close associate of John Gotti Sr., paralyzed from the neck down.

Mr. Rodriguez, described by the police as the gunman, was charged with attempted murder and felonious assault.

Mr. Giordano, known as Handsome Jack, was shot in the early evening of April 10 as he was leaving Lenox Hill, where he had been visiting a Gambino associate, Louis DeFazio. He was getting into his car on East 77th Street near Park Avenue in Manhattan when another car pulled up alongside and a gunman fired a 9-millimeter pistol, hitting Mr. Giordano in the neck and damaging his spinal column. He is in a New Jersey hospital and is not cooperating with the authorities, the police said.

Mr. Rodriguez had apparently been hired by a man who was working in a loan-sharking operation Mr. Giordano was running, Chief John Hill, commander of Manhattan Detectives, said at a news conference yesterday in the 19th Precinct station house on the Upper East Side. Money owed in the operation wasn't being paid fast enough, Chief Hill said. Mr. Giordano was pressuring the associate, he added, and that person had had enough. Mr. Rodriguez was to be paid $50,000, the chief said.

"Jack was leaning on somebody," he said. "The guy wanted him off his back." Mr. Rodriguez, hired for the job, was to be paid $50,000.

"This was strictly business," the chief said. He said that another ar-

Thomas Dallal for The New York Times

Ernesto Rodriguez was charged yesterday in the April shooting of a reputed mob figure.

A reputed top aide to a mob boss was left paralyzed.

returned three days ago because he had not been paid, the police said. Helped by his use of a cellular phone, police staked out three locations where they thought he might hide. At one of them, 2155 Virgil Place in the Union Port section, the apartment of a friend, police captured him on Friday.

He has spent half his life in jail on drug charges, Chief Hill said, and is on parole from Federal prison. Walked from the station house yesterday by detectives, Mr. Rodriguez, a stocky man with a neat haircut and brownish sunglasses, smiled at the crush of reporters. Asked how he felt about returning to prison, he smiled again and said: "You got to go, you got to go."

Mr. Giordano, a resident of New Springville, S.I., is considered a loyal lieutenant to John Gotti Sr., who promoted him to captain in the Gam-

CLINTON LIBRARY
PHOTOCOPY

responding to a $72 million cut apportioned by the school board to the districts.

Mr. Shaw also contended, as have previous budget directors, that school budgeting was a murky process, sometimes even impenetrable. He said that an unspecified number of people who work as administrators show up in the budget not as bureaucrats, but as teachers, which they once were.

And he also argued that salaries were not the only potential source for trimming bureaucratic fat. Mr. Shaw said the school system spends $982 million a year in "other support services," a category that includes school security and transportation.

"Where are the real savings?" he said. "They are still buried in the $982 million in other support services."

all the kids. You have to be very bad indeed to be shut out of a public school education."

George Carlin, comedian. Attended Cardinal Hayes High School in the Bronx, but left during his sophomore year in 1952 and never went back to school. Before that he attended a Catholic grammar school, Corpus Christi, which he called "an experimental school."

"I credit that eight years of grammar school with nourishing me in a direction where I could trust myself and trust my instincts. They gave me the tools to reject my faith. They taught me to question and think for myself and to believe in my instincts to such an extent that I just said, 'This is a wonderful fairy tale they have going here, but it's not for me.' "

'You got to go, you got to go.'

rest was expected shortly. The police said that Mr. Rodriguez had been driven to the scene by his brother-in-law Gilberto Rodriguez, who was arrested the day after the shooting and faces the same charges. An alert hospital guard took down the license plate number of his car.

Ernesto Rodriguez was driven to the Bronx in another car waiting around the corner, the police said. That car was driven by Ramon Morales, Chief Hill said. Mr. Morales was arrested April 29 and has also been charged with attempted murder and assault. He and Gilberto Rodriguez are awaiting trial.

Ernesto fled to Puerto Rico, but often seen in court, and the two had coffee together during breaks.

Law-enforcement officials said that Mr. Giordano ran gambling and loan-sharking operations for the senior Mr. Gotti in Manhattan and Nassau County. The operation, reportedly run from the back room of an East Village pastry shop, grossed $300 million a year in illegal loans and bets, according to an indictment in 1991.

That year, Mr. Giordano pleaded guilty in Manhattan State Supreme Court to two misdemeanor charges of promoting gambling, and served eight months of a one-year sentence. He was also convicted on state racketeering and gambling charges in Nassau County and sentenced to a prison term of 4 to 12 years.

When he was shot, Mr. Giordano was free on bail while his Nassau County conviction was being appealed.

Grateful Dead Fans Hold Memorial, Despite a Ban

By DAVID M. HERSZENHORN

Hundreds of Grateful Dead followers, many in tie-dyed shirts and dresses, played cat-and-mouse with the police across Central Park yesterday in defiance of a ban on a gathering in memory of the band's leader, Jerry Garcia.

The fans, denied a permit for the observance, converged on the Great Lawn near the Metropolitan Museum of Art but were confronted by parks enforcement officers who told them they would not be allowed to play the bongos, drums and guitars they carried unless they moved to another part of the park.

That led to an impromptu psychedelic parade past curious sunbathers, bicyclists and Rollerbladers that ended near the band shell, where the faithful pitched camp in the Summerstage open-air theater.

On the ground in front of the stage, they built a shrine of candles, flowers, fruit, incense, empty beer and liquor bottles and a poster-sized painting of Mr. Garcia. Most of the material had collected on the Imagine mosaic at the Strawberry Fields section of the park since his death on Aug. 9, when more than 1,000 people gathered to reminisce, sing Dead tunes and dance. Small notes were included in the altar, like "Thank you, Jerry," and "What a long, strange trip it's been."

"Everybody's taking off the suits and ties to come and be a family, in hopes to say goodbye to Jerry in a proper way," Piper Murphy, a 27-year-old actress and waitress from SoHo, said. "I still consider Jerry more my father than my real dad."

Tim Benson, a 25-year-old carpenter, said he had driven all night from Newport News, Va., to be with fellow Deadheads for the memorial observance. "We're all a family," he said. "We're all going through a tragic loss right now."

A formal memorial gathering in Central Park was scheduled by the Parks Department after Mr. Garcia's death, but was postponed at the request of the Grateful Dead until after his funeral. The observance was rescheduled for yesterday, but on Thursday, the Mayor's office canceled the event, saying organizers had failed to come up with the $100,000 the city estimated would be needed for extra police officers and trash cleanup.

The fans, however, were undeterred. Communicating across the Internet, they organized the "Official Unofficial New York City Central Park Grass-roots Gathering," promising a day of peace, love and music.

"This will be just a gathering to talk, reflect, take comfort in each other and give a sense of closure for East Coast heads," one organizer wrote in an Internet message to Grateful Dead followers.

"We feel that we don't need to spend any money to gather together for support," the organizer wrote. "We've done far more with much less in the past — we don't need money."

He added, "Remember, let's make Jerry proud of this. We have to continue sharing his spirit and his love."

Monica Almeida/The New York Times

Park enforcement officers order Grateful Dead fans off the Great Lawn in Central Park at the start of a memorial for the band's leader, Jerry Garcia.

Another organizer wrote: "This is for us and we need it. Bring water and warm smiles and hugs and anything else to get you through the day. Clean up after yourself, be respectful and friendly to the authorities."

Many of the Dead fans said they were angry at Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani for canceling the official memorial. Gary Dos Santos, one of the organizers, said plans to [illegible] out speakers and other sound equipment were dropped on orders of the police.

"This is a stab in Jerry's back," Mr. Dos Santos said. "We want to be with him up in heaven, but we can't; the only way we can do it is to have a memorial."

But the Mayor said yesterday that he stood by his decision not to make [illegible] the cost of an observance. "If they had gotten into this big electronic event they were talking about, that would have cost the city a lot of money, and then every other group that came along would want to do the same exact thing," Mr. Giuliani said. "I can't let that happen."

Yesterday's memorial may have been the final Grateful Dead event in New York City. The band was scheduled to perform a series of concerts at Madison Square Garden in late September. Last week, a spokesman, Dennis McNally, said the fall tour, which included stops in other Northeast cities, had been canceled. He said no other decisions had been made about the band's future.

CLINTON LIBRARY
PHOTOCOPY