

Q 1/23/67

## Two Communications

Henry Fairlie is the author of an article which appeared in the *Post* on Jan. 15. He replies here to a communication from Don K. Price, Dean of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

DEAN PRICE'S letter is a classic of its kind. In any source-book of primary documents about the working of "establishments," American or English, it would have its deserved pride of place.

First, it is interesting that he should have been chosen (would he dispute that verb?) to reply to my article, and not one of those in the Institute of Politics, especially its director, to whom I talked. He says that I did not bother to talk to him. The simple explanation is that no one within the Institute suggested that it would be worth my while to do so.

His letter persuades me that they were right. As I pointed out in my article, the really revealing fact about the whole operation is the discrepancy between the \$3.5 million endowment of the former Graduate School of Administration (now the John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government) and the \$10 million endowment of the Institute of Politics. I would have expected the dean of the school to be disturbed by this curious sense of priorities. I would have expected him also to know that some of the professors within the school are as suspicious as I of the whole operation.

Dean Price tries to make something of the fact that the letter in which the Kennedy Library Corporation laid down its terms to the Harvard Corporation is on public record at the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. Dean Price may not know that I was shown the letter by Professor Richard Neustadt, the director of the Institute, and that, when I asked if I might have a copy, his reply left me in no doubt that it was not the document on record at the Supreme Court, and was not publicly available.

These are minor points.

Far more interesting is Dean Price's statement that it was by Harvard's initiative that the Graduate School of Administration was renamed after President Kennedy, and the Institute of Politics attached to it. Was it? Am I really to believe that what happened was as Dean Price is reported (in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 18 January 1967) to have said it happened: "Dr. Pusey approached Robert F. Kennedy and the Library Corporation with the idea. The Kennedys agreed". Was \$13 million

disposed of in this lackadaisical way?

DEAN PRICE must let me, along with some professors within his school, remain sceptical. Was the first formal approach from President Pusey preceded by no other informal approaches (in both directions)? At this crucial stage, was no role played by those members of the Kennedy Library Corporation whom Professor Neustadt so neatly described to me as "Arthur Schlesinger Jr. and the family"?

One point in Dean Price's statement should be noticed. Why the separate approaches to Senator Robert F. Kennedy and the Kennedy Library Corporation? What special status did, and does, Senator Robert F. Kennedy hold? Except as "head of the family."

Dean Price then legitimately points out the one clear inaccuracy in my article: Namely, that Mr. McGeorge Bundy was not president of the Ford Foundation when it made its grant. This was a careless mistake on my part, but it does not alter my main point that the way in which the great foundations operate in the United States is near to a public scandal. They are bodies wielding irresponsible power, subject to no public control, whose power is large, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.

So we come to the key

issue: the status and composition of the Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics. Dean Price claims that it is no different from the visiting committees of any of Harvard's faculties and departments. In that case, he is saying precisely the opposite to what Professor Neustadt said to me. During my second lengthy interview with Professor Neustadt, I specifically asked him whether the Advisory Committee was the same as these visiting committees. He categorically denied that it was, in a number of lively phrases.

Professor Neustadt gave me four reasons—I wrote them down in my notebook as he spoke—for the existence and composition of the Advisory Committee. I now give those reasons because Dean Price seems unaware of what Professor Neustadt said to me, and I do not see why I should carry Professor Neustadt's can for him.

1. The Advisory Committee should be composed of people who would help in raising funds at a future date. Professor Neustadt was extremely lively in identifying the usefulness of specific individuals for this purpose.

2. The Advisory Committee should be composed of people who would help to overcome the impression that the Institute of Politics was simply a Kennedy family venture. Again, Professor Neustadt was quite specific in his references to individuals.

3. The Advisory Committee should be composed of people—and Professor Neustadt used the phrase—who would give the Institute an "establishment" appearance. Indeed, he used the phrase, the "Eastern establishment".

4. The Advisory Committee should be composed of people who would make it pleasant for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, as one of its members, to spend a day with them. This outlandish rea-

son was given quite seriously.

MY TIRELESSLY repeated question remains. If the Institute of Politics is as independent (within Harvard) as Dean Price suggests, why the existence and composition of the Advisory Committee. The simplest way of overcoming the impression that it is a Kennedy family venture would have been to endow it in the straightforward manner in which other endowments have been made in the past.

For the rest, Dean Price is merely able to show that there are others at the Institute of Politics besides "Kennedy hopefuls and Kennedy hoped-fors" — another phrase used to me by a professor within the School of Government. It is not an unsophisticated venture, and one would expect to find good Republicans associated with it, lending it an air of respectability. There are.

While I was conducting my interviews at Harvard, I expressed to everyone my suspicion of the whole operation. Each of them, in fact, had the strongest incentive, during my questioning, to offer me the most articulate defense of the institute in reply. I have no alternative, in view of Dean Price's letter, but to refer to some of their answers specifically.

1. Professor Neustadt told me that, although Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy is the only member of the family who has any formal connection with the Institute, it is Senator Robert Kennedy, as "the head of the family", who maintains an active interest in its operation.

2. Professor Daniel P. Moynihan told me that "some of the more difficult problems are taken to Senator Robert Kennedy" although, again, he has no formal connection with the Institute.

3. Professor Neustadt told me that Senator Robert Kennedy frequently "drops in"; and the secretariat of the Institute told me that Senator Edward Kennedy had twice been its guest at dinner. The interest of the family in the operations of the school is, as I said in my article, active and con-

tinuing.

4. Professor Adam Yar-molinsky coined the phrase, "in-and-outers," to describe those who move in and out of successive administrations in Washington. In explaining the function of the Institute to me, he said that there are no "safe seats" in America for these "in-and-outers," as there are in Britain. One of the purposes of the Institute, therefore, is to provide for them when they become restless in Washington. If this is not a euphemistic way of saying that the Institute has the opportunity to attract those who have become restless with one administration, and provide for them until they are prepared to return to another, then I am losing my sensitivity to the nuances of "establishments."

5. In discussing the future of Mr. Francis Bator, who is leaving the White House for the Institute, Professor Neustadt said that he would no doubt return to Washington again, in another capacity. When? About six years. It does not take the New Math to enable one to calculate that six years hence may see the inauguration of President Robert Kennedy.

SO I COULD go on—there are more quotations which I am loath to repeat—but, if there is no smoke without a fire, all I can say is that the smoke at the Institute is thick.

Of course, as Dean Price suggests, there is a basic difference between him and me about the role of the academic, and his connection with politics. It is, perhaps, only necessary to paraphrase some famous lines.

*You cannot hope to bribe  
or twist,*

*The American political  
scientist.*

*But seeing what, un-bribed,  
he'll do,*

*There really is no reason  
to . . .*

HENRY FAIRLIE.

### **Prof. Neustadt Replies:**

There is not a single accurate quotation in Mr. Fairlie's account of his conversation with me. Perhaps he fell victim to the difficulties of translating American into English and should have been accompanied by an interpreter. The other possibility is that he is deliberately distorting the substance of our conversation. I prefer to believe the more charitable explanation.

RICHARD NEUSTADT.

Director of the Institute of Politics,  
John F. Kennedy School of  
Government.