

From the Publisher

Number 25 of *Policy Review* is a special issue for The Heritage Foundation. *Policy Review* begins its seventh year of publication, and it loses its editor—John O’Sullivan. John has succumbed to the blandishments of his former colleagues at the *Daily Telegraph* in London, and he will soon be returning to London to assume a senior position with that venerable print institution. John’s tenure as editor of *Policy Review* has encompassed seventeen issues. His contributions to the magazine have been many: He instituted the “Against the Grain” series, introduced the “Over There” column of foreign reporting and the hilarious “Tales from the Public Sector,” and, most recently, began the regular reports from David Ranson, who comments on the economy from a supply-side viewpoint. In my judgment, this issue represents John’s most significant and lasting contribution to *Policy Review*. That is, he has brought to fruition the new format for *Policy Review*.

I must admit this was accomplished by John with some resistance from members of the Editorial Advisory Board and, indeed, from me, the publisher. It was not only my innate conservatism that made such a change undergo a detailed internal review process, but also the frequent praise from our primary readership—the Washington policy-making community—that led me to press certain reservations about such a change. As a conservative, I don’t believe in change for change’s sake. As a think tank president, I am concerned with influencing the policy makers, and most of them have assured me that *Policy Review* is effective in this regard.

When these arguments were successfully countered by John and his colleagues, I fell back on Lance’s Law: “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it!” But that argument was unpersuasive. Finally, I tried the first law of all publishers, “Cut the editor’s budget,” but even that was unsuccessful as John and his colleagues convinced me that the new format could be adopted with minimal additional expense.

Having surmounted these parochial arguments from the “practical” side, John has launched our new *Policy Review* with a new format and a new medium for expression—graphics.

I commend him, Sylvia Danovitch, and the *Policy Review* staff for having the vision and the persistence to convince me that the change was worth making. Our best wishes go with John as he returns to the *Daily Telegraph*. He has truly left his mark on *Policy Review*, and we are pleased that he will continue to provide us with his counsel as a member of our Editorial Advisory Board.

As for you, faithful reader, I hope you will share my enthusiasm for the new *Policy Review*. As a friend—more conservative than I—commented, “After all, not all change is necessarily bad.”

Policy Review has been accepted by the policy makers not because it is conservative, but because it addresses real policy issues in a realistic (and not necessarily predictable) way. I hope that you, the readers of this, the flagship publication of The Heritage Foundation, will share your thoughts with us.

Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.

From the Editor

When Robert Schuettinger launched *Policy Review* in 1977, the *Library Journal* commented that the editor hoped to produce a journal written with verve and wit. That was a laudable, even ambitious aim. Readers of most journals devoted to public policy would have been content if an article therein had been written in plain English, since some had apparently been roughly translated from the original Albanian, and others had not. But as the *Library Journal* went on to report, Mr. Schuettinger achieved his ambition. When I succeeded him as editor four years ago, *Policy Review* was already remarkable as a journal that was lively as well as authoritative. I have tried to build upon its tradition so that *Policy Review*, we hope, combines the solid research of a journal with the crisp writing of a magazine.

But we have had to face the fact that this liveliness has been interred in the classic journal format. Our Puritan appearance offered no hint that a reader might be diverted by wit, excellent reporting, clear logical analysis, provocative argument, or simply good writing. And there were other considerations. By denying ourselves the use of graphics, we were denying the reader that extra illumination to be gained from a cartoon or photograph that adds historical depth to contemporary argument. Every illustration in *Policy Review*, even those that are apparently lighthearted, will serve a serious purpose. Nothing will be included simply to break up print. And, finally, we had to solve the problem that in a bookstore, *Policy Review* literally disappeared. In a world of 8½- by 11-inch magazines, a 6- by 9-inch journal is born to blush unseen.

We therefore decided to put on these smart new clothes. This has been a major enterprise for a small journal, and I would like to aim expressions of gratitude in various directions. My thanks go first to Ed Feulner, who, as he lightly points out above, performed a publisher’s most necessary duties. He asked tough questions, checked and rechecked our arithmetic, and pretended to be curmudgeon. Secondly, I owe a special debt to Sylvia Danovitch, who has been tireless and imaginative in superintending the magazine’s rebirth, and to my other colleagues at *Policy Review*, Sally Atwater, Nancy Long, and Stephanie L. Smith, who have worked with enthusiasm above and beyond the call of salary. Thirdly, I am still slightly dazed by my good luck in asking Jane D’Alelio and Jane Tully of Ice House Graphics to redesign the magazine and Shirley Green to research the graphics. Now we look as good as we read. Finally, I wish to thank all my Heritage colleagues whose advice and encouragement have been invaluable to me, in particular Robert Blake, formerly associate editor of *Policy Review*, who periodically prodded me into considering this change.

I am naturally sorry to be leaving *Policy Review*, where I have enjoyed the last four years, even for the green pasture of Fleet Street. But at least I am going with a vast blaze of fireworks and illumination.

John O’Sullivan

Controversy

Is Racial Discrimination Special?

Dear Sir:

Michael Levin states what I believe is *the* valid objection to affirmative action programs as they have been implemented on the first page of his essay in the Fall 1982 issue of *Policy Review*. "Reverse discrimination," he says, "is the policy of favoring members of certain groups (usually racial), in situations in which merit has been at least ideally the criterion, on the grounds that *past* members of these groups have suffered discrimination. Giving someone a job because *he* was discriminated against does not come under this heading, since such redress is justified by ordinary canons of justice, in particular that of giving someone what he is owed."

But Professor Levin too easily assumes away the question of whether racial discrimination in employment persists in the *present*. Proof of a statement in the negative is always difficult, but in this case it is made even harder by a lack of reliable empirical evidence. No employer is going to admit that his hiring practices violate federal law on a questionnaire! Professor Levin justifies his unusual approach to the affirmative action debate on the grounds that "frontal assaults on reverse discrimination usually accomplish nothing." I believe that a case should be argued logically, according to its merit, irrespective of the consequences.

Nonetheless, his question is valid: "is *racial* discrimination special?" And in his discussion of "patterned wrongs," he comes close to suggesting why racial discrimination may indeed be special. "The second reason patterned wrongs seem especially malign," he says, "is that they create anxiety through their promise of repetition." Exactly so. It is the *psychological* impact of patterned wrongs on their victims which separates them from isolated incidents of injustice.

What separates racial discrimination from other patterned wrongs is the criterion—race. Since race is, especially for racial minorities, a central and inescapable facet of individual identity, racial discrimination affects its victims' self-image from birth to death. And "anxiety" is too mild a word to describe its effect.

To the extent that those who practice racial discrimination ultimately make its victims cooperate in their own victimization, they succeed where other criminals fail. That's what makes racial discrimination, and affirmative action, special.

Colin Gibson
Enterprise America
Los Angeles, California

Michael Levin replies:

The harm done by discrimination to black pride does not make discrimination special or warrant special treatment for blacks today. There are worse forms of injury that demand recompense more urgently—I would rather have a poor self-image than be hit by a car—and citing psychic wounds as an excuse for special treatment still ignores the innocent white. It is wrong to boost the morale of a present-day black at the expense of a white who did nothing to damage it. Anyway, a black can hardly take pride in being given a job that he and everyone else suspect he cannot do. Perhaps Mr. Gibson would have affirmative action kept secret.

Forbidding discrimination by law is the most a society can do to prevent its evils, psychic or otherwise. That violations may be tricky to detect is no excuse for penalizing the innocent. (We do not jail the usual suspects when ignorant of who committed a crime.) If the enforcement of civil rights laws is all that problematic, perhaps they should be repealed. They certainly sin against enough individual liberties.

Mr. Gibson's implicit endorsement of other forms of "affirmative action" is made more depressing by the presence of Ronald Reagan, William Simon, and Simon Ramo on *Enterprise America* letterhead. The other compensatory schemes favored by bleeding-heart conservatives also discriminate against whites. "Underutilization studies" and "outreach programs" which force employers to look extra hard for blacks are just devious forms of favoritism.

I for one would like some solid evidence, apart from the oral tradition of sociology, that discrimination has affected anybody's self-image. What of other mistreated groups whose contemporary members are not crippled "from birth to death"? Jews do not seem afflicted with weak egos even though they have been persecuted longer and more harshly than any other group.

What a Riot!

Dear Sir:

One more time. *The* final chapter.

Some of our best friends are political scientists, but in the case of Dr. Louis Bolce, he fails the "requirements" because of his robotlike excuses offered for our rebuttal to his article, "Why People Riot," which appeared in the Fall 1982 issue of *Policy Review*.

If our rebuttal (Spring 1983 *Policy Review*) and thesis "speaks for itself," why is this political scientist, who surely must believe that political science is a "science," so galled that he almost foams at the mouth rather than