STATE OF TEXAS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE
POST OFFICE BOX 12697, CAPITOL STATION
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711

David A. Dean
SECRETARY OF STATE

June 28, 1982

Mr. Jim Ciconni
Special Assistant to
the President
The White House
1st Floor, West Wing
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Jim:

It is my pleasure to provide you with an Executive Summary of the May 1982 primary election analysis conducted by my Office.

The findings of the analysis are extremely illuminating as to the Texas voter and nonvoter's attitudes on changes necessary in Texas' election system.

The complete detailed analysis is available upon your request.

Sincerely,

David A. Dean
Secretary of State

DAD:dsm

Enclosure

Durkee, Robert K.

Princeton University VICE PRESIDENT FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS
223 NASSAU HALL, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08544

March 5, 1982

James W. Cicconi
Special Assistant to the President
The White House
1st Floor, West Wing
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Jim:

Thank you for your note of February 25 concerning Bill Bowen's paper on the federal role in higher education. That paper served as a point of departure for his testimony on March 3 before the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, a copy of which is enclosed. I hope you will find it to be of interest.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Robert K. Durkee

RKD/esd
Enclosure

William G. Bowen

Testimony before the

House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

March 3, 1982

My name is William G. Bowen and I am the President of Princeton University. I appreciate this opportunity to discuss some of the Administration's Fiscal 1983 budget recommendations in the area of higher education. As requested, I will speak directly to the potential impact on my own institution, but with reference to a range of broader concerns. As important as it is to appreciate the implications of these proposals for particular individuals and particular institutions, it is even more essential that they be understood in their cumulative and collective impact.

I have tried to suggest a set of basic principles for thinking about the federal role in higher education in a paper recently distributed to members of this Subcommittee and appended to this testimony. That role, as I envision it, is a limited but extremely significant one, with special emphasis on four broad areas: (1) support of basic research; (2) support of graduate education; (3) encouragement of individual opportunity and diversity within the educational system; and (4) maintaining an environment that encourages private support of education and the decentralized exercise of responsibility for educational decisions.

Given the jurisdiction of this Subcommittee, I propose to confine my remarks this afternoon to federal support at the graduate and undergraduate levels. At the same time I am sure you appreciate the importance to this country of sustaining -- indeed expanding -- our commitment to basic research.

Excellence in graduate education is essential to teaching, to research, and to scholarship of the highest quality. Unless we find ways to encourage -- and ways to make it possible for -- our very best candidates to pursue advanced training, we jeopardize the quality of our research effort and we fail to educate those who have the talent to become the leaders of the next generation in the sciences, in engineering, in international studies, and in all other fields. The preparation of a scholar or a teacher, or a highly trained practitioner in industry, the professions, or public affairs, is a time-consuming and expensive process, with benefits that never accrue solely to the person being educated.

The United States today has an enviable reputation for the quality of its graduate education and research (as illustrated by the large number of foreign students who elect to come here for advanced training and by this country's remarkable success in winning Nobel prizes). But this reputation is both more recent and more fragile than many realize, having been built largely over the past forty years. A substantial federal investment has been critical in this process, and it is imperative that it be continued -- not for the purpose of educating large numbers of

graduate students in those fields where job prospects are bleak, but to assure that the country will continue to educate its most outstanding individuals.

It is also important to the nation that we make full use of the talents of all of our citizens, including women and members of minority groups. This is an essential objective at the graduate level because it is advanced training that qualifies individuals for academic positions and many other leadership roles.

Federal support for graduate students takes the form of research project grants which make provision for graduate student assistance; fellowship and traineeship programs addressed to special needs; and access to the College Work Study, Guaranteed Student Loan, and Auxiliary Loan programs.

The Administration's proposals would continue to support graduate work under research grants, particularly in the sciences. They also would preserve such critically important programs as NSF fellowships and NIH training grants, although without adjustment for inflation in the NSF program and with reductions at NIH. But in the area of international education, they would reduce funding by some 60 percent from Fiscal 1981 levels. They also would eliminate the Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program, which this year is supporting 17 percent of our black graduate students, and the public service

fellowship program which supports students at our Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Providing programs of high quality in regional studies is extremely expensive, and the number of students pursuing advanced work in such programs will never be large. Nonetheless, it is essential to the country that those students with the necessary aptitudes and interests be able to enroll, and that first rate programs exist. This year, eight of Princeton's twelve U. S. Ph.D. students in Near Eastern Studies and four of our fourteen U. S. Ph.D. students in East Asian Studies hold National Resource Fellowships under Title VI. Without these fellowships, there is no question that opportunities would be foreclosed and the overall scope and quality of our programs would be reduced.

The Administration's proposal of greatest consequence at the graduate level calls for the removal of graduate students from the Guaranteed Student Loan program. This year, approximately 43 percent of all U.S. graduate students at Princeton are borrowing a total of $1.5 million under GSL. In the humanities, social sciences, and architecture, the figure is closer to 55 percent. The needs test imposed last fall is likely to reduce graduate student borrowing by about one-third -- in most cases not because the student is not in need, but because the needs assessment presumes a parental contribution that it is unrealistic to expect at the graduate level.

In a recent survey, 56 percent of the graduate students with loans at Princeton said that they would not have been able to attend Princeton had they not been able to borrow. This figure was 77 percent for students in the humanities. While the ALAS program can be helpful to parents in states where it exists, ALAS can increase the cost of borrowing by as much as 67 percent over GSL, thereby making it too expensive for most potential graduate student borrowers. This is particularly serious for students already carrying substantial undergraduate debts or for those anticipating academic careers in the arts and sciences. Without GSL, many students will be unable to borrow at any interest rate, and thus will have no choice but to abandon their pursuit of a graduate degree.

Recognizing the nation's overall budgetary constraints, many of us a year ago supported measures at the undergraduate level to restrict subsidized loans to students who could demonstrate need. We also accepted the phasing out of educational benefits under Social Security as long as needy students would have access to other programs. Unfortunately, the full range of student assistance programs has been cut substantially for this fiscal year (despite rapidly rising educational costs). And the effects of measures already enacted pale in comparison with the Administration's proposals for Fiscal 1983, which would dismantle major elements of a student aid structure carefully crafted on a bipartisan basis over several decades to enhance individual opportu-

nity in this country and to undergird diversity within our educational system.

One of our most significant characteristics as a nation is our commitment to the proposition that individuals from all walks of life should be able to move up the ladder of accomplishment as far as their energies and abilities will take them. A key element of this commitment is educational opportunity. By pursuing and expanding this commitment, we are able to take advantage of productive talents that otherwise would be lost to the nation. We also provide incentives for achievement, we encourage individuals to invest in themselves, and we give meaning to what is often referred to as "the American Dream."

Beyond assuring access, the federal investment in educational opportunity has enabled millions of lower and middle income citizens to exercise some choice in selecting those institutions best suited to their particular talents and aspirations. One of the special strengths of our American system of higher education is the diversity of institutions available to students. Just as important is diversity of students within individual institutions. The federal programs now in place help to make it possible for individuals from different backgrounds, with different perspectives, to learn together and from each other. This would be important in any society, but it is especially important in a country like the United States which prides itself on its pluralism. There is surely a strong national interest in

avoiding the re-segregation of many educational institutions on the basis of economic status, race, or geography. The social fabric would be harmed greatly if this were to occur, and the quality of education would be diminished for all.

The best estimates currently available to us at Princeton suggest that, if the Administration's proposals for Fiscal 1983 were adopted, federal support for student assistance under Pell, SEOG, NDSL, and College Work Study would decline on our campus from $2.8 million in Fiscal 1981 (i.e. the current academic year), to $1.2 million in Fiscal 1983 (academic year 1983-84) -- a reduction of 60 percent at a time when the need for such aid is expected to rise by about one-third. With 40 percent of our current undergraduate student body qualifying for aid, the loss per scholarship recipient would be $898 over a two-year period when tuition is projected to increase by some $2400 (from the current level of $7250). Looked at another way, this year federal grants under Pell and SEOG account for 17 percent of our total scholarship budget (roughly $1.5 million out of $8.9 million). Under the Administration's proposals, in two years federal support would meet just 3 percent of our total estimated scholarship needs.

The proposed reductions in the Pell program would eliminate awards to between 300 and 400 of the 685 undergraduates who currently qualify for the program. For the most part, these are students from families with incomes between $15,000 and $25,000. Even those who remain eligible would receive roughly the same

award two years from now that they would have received last year, when tuitions were 65 percent of what they are expected to be in 1983-84. About half of our undergraduates on financial aid (or approximately 950 students) currently receive average awards of almost $1,000 under SEOG, which is proposed for elimination. The average income of their families is $18,000.

In addition, our students stand to lose some $350,000 in educational benefits under Social Security. They also face reductions in state scholarship programs if the State Student Incentive Grant program is eliminated. And they will incur increased indebtedness under GSL if, as proposed, the origination fee is doubled and interest rates are increased to market levels two years after graduation.

I want to conclude by noting that whatever the actions taken at the federal level, colleges and universities are going to be hard pressed to sustain their traditional commitments to quality and opportunity. Traditional sources of income have failed to keep pace with rising costs, and even without cutbacks in Washington we would face increasing gaps between the resources available for student assistance and the level of student need.

In developing our own budget at Princeton, which we have worked hard to balance, we have increased substantially the general funds that we allocate to student aid. We also require each student to contribute to his or her own education before

scholarship dollars are awarded. Next year we will expect each freshman on aid to contribute $3,760 through summer job, term job, and student loans; sophomores, juniors, and seniors will be expected to contribute progressively more.

We also are seeking to raise additional private support. Just two weeks ago we launched a Campaign to raise $275 million over five years, including $35 million for student aid. But even if we succeed in meeting as ambitious a goal as this, our resources for financial aid will still fall far short of expected needs. Institutions and students can and should be expected to do their share and to make sacrifices. But without a substantial federal effort as well, the goals that we have set for higher education in this country will not be achieved -- and it is our society that will be the loser, for many years to come.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 25, 1982

Dear Bob:

I just wanted to let you know that the latest version of Bill Bowen's paper has been received, and is being read with interest.

I am certain we will get back to you on this at some future point. In the meantime, please convey our thanks for the work and thought that went into the paper's preparation.

Sincerely,

Jim Cicconi

James W. Cicconi
Special Assistant to the President

Mr. Robert K. Durkee
Vice President for Public Affairs
223 Nassau Hall
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

Princeton University VICE PRESIDENT FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS
223 NASSAU HALL, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08544

February 11, 1982

Mr. James W. Cicconi
Special Assistant to the President
The White House
1st Floor, West Wing
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Jim:

I thought you might be interested in the enclosed letter to Murray Weidenbaum. The paper attached to it is a later version of the one that we sent last month to you and Jim Baker. We remain interested in any comments or reactions that you may have.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Bob Durkee

Robert K. Durkee

RKD/esd
Enclosure

call Bell; VAB asks for look at this = what is fed role?
How does this differ from what was explained in meeting —

Princeton University VICE PRESIDENT FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS
223 NASSAU HALL, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08544

February 11, 1982

Professor Murray L. Weidenbaum
Chairman
Council of Economic Advisers
Old Executive Office Building
17th & Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dear Professor Weidenbaum:

When you appeared last week before the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, one of your questioners expressed a concern that some substantial number of private colleges and universities will not survive if adequate funding is not available to help students meet the higher charges at those institutions.

Since one of the special strengths of our American system of higher education is the diversity of institutions available to students, the concern for survival -- at least up to a point -- is one that I share. Independent initiative is as important in education as in other areas of the economy, and it would be most unfortunate if the range of independent alternatives were to diminish significantly.

But in my view it would be even more unfortunate if the opportunities available in the independent sector were to be foreclosed for some solely on grounds of financial circumstance or family income. That is the concern that I hoped to express last week, and about which I now write.

For an institution like Princeton, or your home institution of Washington University, the issue is not one of survival. It is one of access and opportunity, of whether deserving students from all backgrounds will be able to attend. It is also, and importantly, an issue of educational quality, measured in terms of an institution's ability to admit its very best applicants, and in terms of the composition of its student body and its educational milieu.

Justice Powell observed in the Bakke decision that the quality of the educational process is enhanced when individuals from different backgrounds, with different perspectives, learn together -- and from each other. As Princeton's President Bowen

points out in the enclosed paper, "this would be important in any society, but it is especially important in this country where we pride ourselves on our pluralism. There is surely a strong national interest in avoiding the re-segregation of many educational institutions on the basis of economic status, race, or geography. The social fabric would be harmed greatly if this were to occur, and the quality of education would be diminished for all."

If the Administration continues to move in its current directions, there is a real danger that private colleges and universities will become increasingly the province of those who can meet their higher charges. I have no doubt that the institutions would do what they can, as they have with great determination over recent years, to allocate as many of their own resources as possible to help those unable, even at great personal sacrifice, to pay their own way. Out of Princeton's $8.5 million scholarship budget this year, almost $6 million comes from University funds and another $800,000 comes from other private sources. But as the recent reports from Wesleyan University dramatize, without some considerable degree of federal participation even the most economically secure private institutions will be unable to withstand the inexorable stratification of higher education along economic lines.

With respect to racial stratification, one of the questions raised in the discussion last week had to do with opportunities for black Americans. In your response you noted the commitment of the Administration to the traditionally black colleges and universities. While applauding that commitment, it is important to express a word of caution about assuming that the educational needs and aspirations of black Americans can or should be addressed only through the traditionally black institutions. Black Americans have the same interest as other Americans in being able to choose the educational opportunities most responsive to their particular talents.

If this nation's primary objective is, as you defined it, a stronger economy, it is hard to see how that goal can be achieved without as much concern for the development of human capital as for the revitalization of other contributing factors. If our national objectives are broadened to encompass national security and the quality of life, then the importance of education only becomes more pronounced. Within higher education, there are central roles to be played by individual students, families, institutions, and states. But there is also a critical federal role. The broad dimensions of that role, seen in the context of current economic realities, are described in the enclosed paper.

If there are elements of that paper, or other questions, that you would like to explore further, we would be happy to assist in any way possible.

I want to conclude with a word of thanks for meeting with the NAICU group last week, at a time when I suspect your calendar was already oversubscribed.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Robert K. Durkee

RKD/esd
Enclosure

RC — READING FILE

Princeton University PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08544

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

January 6, 1982

JAB, ISN'T CICCONI HANDLING THIS FOR YOU ——?

MDT
1/12

Mr. James A. Baker III
Chief of Staff and Assistant
to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

Yes - ask J.C. to discuss with me. (Want T. Bell to read in light of his discussion that I arranged.)

Dear Jim:

The attached paper, written more or less in memorandum style, is a response to your request for my thoughts on the proper role of the federal government in higher education. It seems to me, as to you, extremely important that decisions on particular programs be grounded in general principles. Accordingly, I have tried to outline a framework for thinking systematically about these questions.

I would welcome an opportunity to elaborate on any of the points in this paper, to provide documentation or illustrations, or to respond to any questions that you or members of your staff may have. As you will see, I have tried to be reasonably concise, while attempting to spell out a rather complete set of principles and their implications for policy and programs.

You were good to encourage me to make this effort. I have enjoyed working on the paper, and I hope that it is of some help to you and your colleagues. While it has been written in direct response to your request, and with your concerns primarily in mind, we may seek some broader distribution. Obviously, we want to do what we can to inform the general discussion of these issues. If we make any further distribution of the paper, I shall be careful to avoid any reference to my conversations with you or to your role in encouraging me to write it.

With best personal regards, as always,

Sincerely,

Bill

William G. Bowen

WGB:lc

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

William G. Bowen

January 6, 1982

The appropriate role of the federal government in higher education, as I envision it, is a limited but extremely significant one. My starting point is a general belief that the federal government should act in a particular area if, and only if, all three of the following conditions are met:

1. There is a clear national interest to be served;
2. There is a need for federal involvement, since state and private efforts, however welcome, will not meet the national need adequately without complementary federal actions;
3. There is a workable mechanism that can be used effectively by the federal government to accomplish its purposes.

There are four broad areas in which I believe the federal government has a proper -- indeed indispensable -- role. They are:

A. Support of basic research;

B. Support of graduate education and advanced training;

C. Encouragement of individual opportunity and diversity within the educational system; and

D. Maintenance of an environment that encourages private support of education and the decentralized exercise of responsibility for educational decisions.

Let me now discuss the reasons why each of these areas satisfies the three-pronged test stated above.

A. SUPPORT OF BASIC RESEARCH

1. National Interest.-- There is a strong and long-standing consensus on the national stake in promoting basic research of the highest quality, much of which is conducted in universities.* On what is this consensus based?

- Such research is critically important for the nation's economy, and especially for the rate of economic growth over the long run. This nation's "comparative advantage" is in new ideas, technology, and our capacity to innovate. Thus, basic research in a wide variety of fields is essential to our ability to compete with countries such as Japan that are themselves investing heavily in research. Some observers believe that the momentum of research accomplishment, especially in high technology areas, has already started to swing away from the United States. Failure to make substantial investments in the discovery of new knowledge is a sure route to economic stagnation. And there are grounds for serious concern that current efforts to increase investments in capital goods and in industrial research and development will not be matched by equivalent efforts to strengthen the basic research which must provide their foundation.

- Basic research is also essential to further progress in medicine, in the health sciences generally, and in a great many other areas, such as transportation, where new ideas can generate far greater national benefits and may be far more productive in the long run than simple additions to expenditures in support of current technologies and practices.

---

* While important research is of course also carried out in government and industrial laboratories, a recent NSF study found, for example, that 70% of the "major advances" in four selected fields (Mathematics, Chemistry, Astrophysics, and Earth Sciences) were the result of research done in universities.

•Basic research is vital to the defense capability of the nation. Any number of examples can be cited to show how weapons systems, new modes of communication, and other devices central to the defense effort have stemmed from fundamental advances in mathematics, astrophysics, and many other subjects -- advances often achieved without any thought of specific applications.

•Basic research -- including scholarship of the highest order in the humanities and social sciences as well as in science and engineering -- is important if the United States is to continue to enjoy a position of international leadership in the world of ideas, and is to be regarded as a country concerned about human values as well as technical proficiency. At a practical level, the wise governing of the nation depends on an understanding of our own society, and our effective interactions with other countries depend importantly on the depth of our understanding of other cultures and societies. The deterioration in the nation's language capabilities and in research related to international affairs (as documented in the Perkins Commission Report of 1979) surely weakens our country's ability to play an effective role in world affairs.

2. Need For Federal Involvement.-- But why must the federal government act, as distinct from the states and private enterprises, if the compelling national interest in basic research is to be served? The answer lies in the nature of basic research and in the concept known to economists as "spill-over benefits." Basic research is an inherently less predictable enterprise than many others; there can never be a guarantee that valuable results will be obtained from any one undertaking; the benefits from successful efforts are likely to be realized fully only over long periods of time; and these benefits often turn out to be surprisingly different -- and to have a far greater variety of applications -- than could have been anticipated. Accordingly, those responsible for the discoveries cannot expect to capture for

themselves all of the benefits that flow from basic research. In short, the benefits of a powerful new idea in, say, mathematics inevitably "spill over," as they should, to many individuals, companies, activities, and uses. Consequently, the nation at large has a far stronger economic incentive to invest heavily in basic research than does any individual enterprise.

It should also be recognized that traditional attitudes toward competition in the United States, as reflected in our stringent anti-trust laws, make it less likely here than in some other countries (Japan is again a useful example) that groups of companies will band together to fund basic research. Of course, as one moves along the scale from basic research toward more applied work, the economic incentive for business to do the investing increases, since results are more predictable, potential applications are clearer, and processes and products can be patented. For this reason, the economic case for governmental involvement is not nearly as strong at the "applied" end of the research spectrum as at the "basic" end.

3. Mechanisms.-- In considering the availability of mechanisms to serve the federal interest in the promotion of basic research, we can point to proven experience with two complementary modes of support:

(a) Sponsored research linking particular agencies of government with particular projects (through contracts and grants) has worked well since it was introduced on a large scale after World War II. This mode of support is flexible, in that it allows the government to reflect its greater interest in some fields than in others through the amounts of money provided. The "project" mode of support also allows sponsoring agencies to provide funding to those individuals and groups that it believes will do the best work, while simultaneously taking advantage of existing research facilities.

(b) Programs designed to provide "core" support for laboratories, libraries and other shared research facilties in leading universities can complement the beneficial effects of project support. The recent deterioration of scientific laboratories and facilities, in particular, is widely seen as a major handicap to the basic research effort in the United States, and it is clear that institutional resources alone will be inadequate to remedy the situation. Nor can support awarded on an individual "project" basis be expected to meet this broader need to preserve the underlying foundations for both outstanding research and advanced training.

B. GRADUATE EDUCATION AND ADVANCED TRAINING

1. National Interest.-- Excellence in graduate education is related directly to research and scholarship of the highest quality. Research benefits immeasurably from the active involvement of the brightest young minds; strong graduate programs, in turn, are essential if we are to educate the leaders of the next generation in the sciences, in engineering, in international studies, and in all other fields. Thus, the long-term national interest in a vigorous research enterprise requires that we insure a steady flow of the most capable young people into advanced training.

The United States today has an enviable reputation all over the world for the quality of both its graduate education and its research (as illustrated, for example, by the large number of foreign students who come here for advanced training and by this country's remarkable success in winning Nobel prizes). But this reputation is both more recent and more fragile than many realize, having been built largely over the past forty years. A substantial federal investment has been critical in this process, and it must be continued -- not for the purpose of educating large numbers of graduate students in fields in which job pros-

pects are bleak, but to assure that the country will continue to educate its most outstanding potential candidates.

It is important to the nation that we make full use of the talents of all of our citizens, including women and members of minority groups. This is an essential objective at the graduate level because it is advanced training that qualifies individuals for academic positions and many other leadership roles.

2. Need For Federal Involvement.-- The case for the assumption of some measure of federal responsibility for graduate education (especially in certain fields) is derived in large part from the case for support of basic research. The two activities are mutually reinforcing and together provide major spill-over benefits for the country as a whole that extend beyond the rewards that will accrue to the individuals being educated.

Financial assistance to graduate students, in the form of fellowships, research assistantships, and some relief from market rates of interest on loans, is essential if we are to attract strong candidates -- especially in fields where the lure of alternative career paths is all too clear. In engineering, for example, where there are currently 2000 vacant faculty positions, we are enrolling such a limited number of well-qualified candidates in graduate programs that we face a serious risk of failing to replenish our educational "seed corn." In other fields as well, the ablest candidates have many other attractive options. But it is essential to the future of basic research and the advancement of learning that graduate education be attractive to those who have the ability to work at the forefront of the search for knowledge in the years ahead -- and who must also be counted on to educate their own successors in the following generation.

There is a special case to be made for federal guarantees of student loans. It is difficult for individual graduate students without substantial resources to obtain funds from

private capital markets for the simple reason that they have no collateral to offer. Students seeking to invest in their own "human capital" face obstacles fundamentally different from those faced by borrowers seeking to finance acquisition of an asset that can be used to secure the loan (the house in the typical case of the home mortgage). Thus, there is a compelling reason for government loan guarantees here that does not apply in many other instances.

In a limited number of specialized fields, there is also a strong need for federal assistance that extends beyond support for outstanding graduate students. Universities alone simply do not have the resources needed to offer excellent graduate programs (or to do the necessary research) in fields that are as inordinately expensive as, for example, Plasma Physics and Chinese Studies. Yet outstanding work in such fields is vital to the national interest.

3. Mechanisms.-- Here again effective mechanisms for federal participation already exist. Perhaps the most successful has been the portable, merit-based fellowship program of the National Science Foundation. This highly regarded program has concentrated support on the most promising candidates, has given them recognition as well as financial support, and thus has played a major role in sustaining the flow of outstanding future scientists into mathematics, physics, and many other fields. The ability of students to use these fellowships at whichever university seems to them best (hence the designation "portable") is an extremely important feature, in that it provides a market test of graduate programs, as their quality is perceived by the strongest candidates. Also, fellowship programs of this kind can be kept deliberately small, thereby encouraging the ablest students without simultaneously stimulating overly large graduate populations in fields where the national interest may not require large numbers.

Sponsored research has also provided valuable support for graduate students, who are trained as they contribute to the research projects. Here again quality (this time as determined by panels of leading scholars) has dictated the allocation of funds. The "training grants" of the NIH, which combine some of the features of fellowship programs with some of the features of sponsored research grants, have been especially useful in enabling excellent students to pursue advanced training in the health sciences.

As noted above, the guaranteed loan program has also proved to be an effective means for enabling graduate students to invest in themselves, under terms that they can afford and with assured access to capital. At the same time, I believe that the definition and administration of this program can be improved.*

Finally, there are also existing mechanisms that provide the more general support for graduate education required in special fields that are both extremely costly and essential to the national interest. Project support (defined broadly) and training grants can continue to serve this purpose in the sciences. A certain amount of general support has been critically important to the development of international and regional studies in universities and should be maintained on a competitive basis through the Language and Area Centers Program.

---

* One problem with the program in its current form is that it does not control directly the numbers of graduate students who may be supported through it. My own view is that so long as there is a degree of interest subsidy involved (as I think there should be in most cases), it is desirable to find a way of limiting access to the program -- preferably on the basis of the quality of individual candidates. This would save resources, and it can be done in ways that do not undermine the program's essential function as a residual source of support for highly talented students who are also highly motivated.

C. INDIVIDUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY

1. National Interest.-- One of our most significant national characteristics is our commitment to the philosophy of advancement by merit and to the proposition that in this country individuals should be able to move up the ladder of accomplishment as far as their energies and abilities will take them. Educational opportunity is a key to this philosophy. By pursuing this commitment, we have taken advantage of talent that otherwise would have been lost to the nation and have given substance to this aspect of what is often referred to as "the American Dream." It cannot be claimed that we have served this high purpose perfectly. Plainly, barriers of many kinds continue to limit the upward mobility of many deserving young people. But we have done better in this respect than most countries, and now is no time to abandon an objective that seems so right in principle as well as so very important in its practical effects.

"Diversity" within our educational institutions is a related but different concept that has become something of a catchword. But we should not lose sight of what it means and why we should care about it. As Justice Powell observed in the Bakke decision, the quality of the educational process is enhanced when individuals from different backgrounds, with different perspectives, learn together -- and from each other. This would be important in any society, but it is especially important in the United States, where we pride ourselves on our pluralism. There is surely a strong national interest in avoiding the re-segregation of many educational institutions on the basis of economic status, race, or geography. The social fabric would be harmed greatly if this were to occur, and the quality of education would be diminished for all.

2. Need For Federal Involvement.-- Educational opportunities should be available nationally, not just within the students' home states, and that is an important reason for

federal involvement in this broad area. The educational purposes of the country as a whole will be served most effectively if students are able to attend the colleges and universities best suited to their individual needs, and if there is a considerable degree of mobility across state lines.

In my judgment, students (and their families) should be expected to invest heavily in the pursuit of their own educational goals. That is why many of us insist so strongly on "self-help" contributions and on scholarship aid provided only on the basis of remaining need. In addition, both state and private sources should be expected to provide scholarship assistance, as they have historically. But with tuition and other charges now over $10,000 per year at a number of private colleges and universities and over $7,000 for out-of-state students at some state universities, these sources alone will not promote adequately the twin national goals of individual opportunity based on merit and diversity within the educational system. Accordingly, there is an important supplementary role -- not a dominant one but more a supporting role -- for the federal government in this area.

3. Mechanisms.-- While these large purposes are relevant to both graduate and undergraduate education (albeit in different degrees), the comments that follow apply mainly to undergraduate financial aid. (Comments on graduate student support were made earlier.) It is fortunate, in my view, that a basic structure of federal support for undergraduate students already exists. It is composed of a carefully crafted mix of programs involving: (a) direct grants to students based on family circumstances (but not on the costs of the college they attend); (b) campus-based programs including work-study that allow additional support to go to needy students in relation to their educational costs; and (c) guaranteed loan programs. For reasons mentioned already, and for reasons related to the desirability of maintaining strong private as well as public institutions (discussed below), it is important

to preserve this basic structure. It has been built up carefully over time to offer students from all economic backgrounds some real choice -- including the option of attending more expensive, and often more selective, institutions if they can meet the academic standards and are willing to make the personal financial sacrifices required.

This is not the place for detailed comments on specific elements of present federal financial aid programs. Let me add only these observations. First, I agree that the administration -- and even the construction -- of parts of these programs had become too lax and, consequently, too expensive. It was understandable that reductions in support and redefinitions of programs should occur, especially at a time of such overall budgetary stringency. Even now, it may be possible to achieve some additional economies -- in particular by basing student aid even more fully on demonstrated need and by requiring larger self-help contributions. But it would be a serious error, in my judgment, if in the pursuit of economies, we were to lose sight of our broad national purposes. I would hate to see us reach a point where we would say, in effect, to those of ability but limited means: "yes, you can go on to college, but be sure it is not too expensive a place; the more costly educational opportunities are reserved largely for those whose families are affluent enough to pay the bills." That message would be clear -- and clearly read -- as a significant retreat from major national goals. The long-term effects on education in America, and on our society, would be damaging in the extreme.

D. MAINTENANCE OF AN ENVIRONMENT THAT ENCOURAGES PRIVATE SUPPORT OF EDUCATION AND THE DECENTRALIZED EXERCISE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS

1. National Interest.-- Beyond the provision of direct governmental support for the purposes listed above, the national

interest also requires the maintenance of a setting, a set of incentives, and a philosophical orientation conducive to private initiative and decentralized processes of decision-making. This entails:

- Encouraging private contributions (from individuals, corporations, and foundations) for the educational purposes served by all colleges and universities, public and private;

- Sustaining a healthy variety of educational institutions by promoting the continuing vitality of strong privately administered colleges and universities as well as those responsible to state authorities; and

- Insuring that those regulatory actions deemed necessary are carried out as non-intrusively as possible.

2. Need For Federal Involvement.-- Each of these objectives is affected by actions taken -- and not taken -- by the federal government. It is the federal government's taxing power that can create (and diminish) the most powerful economic incentives for charitable contributions by the private sector; federal programs inevitably affect the sometimes delicate balance between public and private institutions; and federal regulations affect directly the degree of autonomy enjoyed by individual colleges and universities in both the public and private sectors. More generally, it is only the federal government that has a sufficiently broad perspective to give force to a national philosophy that encourages a variety of educational approaches, that respects individual choice, and that therefore seeks to avoid imposing any one model of education on our society.

3. Mechanisms.-- Tax incentives for private philanthropy have served the national interest in higher education well for many decades, and it is all the more important that they be preserved -- indeed strengthened -- at a time when more of the

burden of support for higher education is being shifted to the private sector. Of immediate concern are the likely side effects on private giving caused by the reductions in income tax rates and other provisions of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.*

To achieve the second objective -- sustaining strong private as well as public institutions -- the government must not only preserve tax incentives for charitable giving, but must also look carefully at the implications for the various sectors of higher education of modifications in key programs. An important case in point is the array of student aid programs now being reviewed once more. The Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG), for example, was designed specifically to allow talented students some real choice among colleges by making up part of the differential in costs entailed in attending a more expensive institution. Recent proposals for ending it entirely would have particularly severe effects on private institutions. Proposed reductions in other student aid programs would also have disproportionately severe consequences for the private sector of higher education. It would be ironic -- and tragic, in my view -- if an administration committed so strongly to the philosophy of private initiative were to adopt measures that had the de facto effect of eroding the capacity of private institutions to serve essential public purposes.

Finally, with regard to regulation, most of us would agree that the federal government has both a right and an obligation to insist on accountability for public monies, to safeguard the health of citizens, to guard against discrimination, and to

---

* Let me add that, as much as I favor the judicious use of the mechanism of tax incentives, I do not believe that this approach works well in all situations. In particular, proposals to substitute tuition tax credits for student aid programs continue to seem to me unwise because of both adverse effects on the federal budget and likely consequences for higher education.

encourage affirmative action. But my hope is that regulations will not be insensitive to the variety of circumstances within the educational sector or so detailed that they distract institutions from their main purposes. Experience has shown that there are real limits to the capacity of the government to achieve through regulation what many would agree are praise-worthy objectives.

* * * * *

The preceding discussion has sought to define the role of the federal government in terms of those responsibiities that I believe represent an irreducible minimum. While there are, of course, other programs and services that the government might usefully provide -- some existing now and some new initiatives that might be considered -- it is equally clear that in the present economic climate we must be prepared to make hard choices. It is in that spirit that this paper has been written. And it has been written, too, with the conviction that, even in the present budgetary environment, the federal government must not neglect objectives that are absolutely essential to the long-term well-being of our society.

AA
Do you feel this needs response? I'm inclined not to since it's a form letter. JC
Agree / Aidan

Efthimiou, Miltiades B.

EK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

HNIKH ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟC ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙCΚΟΠΗ ΒΟΡΕΙΟΥ Κ' ΝΟΤΙΟΥ ΑΜΕΡΙΚΗC

10 EAST 79th STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021 • TEL (212) 570-3500 • CABLE: ARCHGREEK, NEW YORK

November 5, 1982

Mr. James W. Cicconi
Special Assistant to the President
and Special Assistant to Chief of Staff
White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cicconi:

There is, Ecclesiastes reminds us, a time to keep silent and a time to speak. On NBC recently a television program debased the Orthodox Church and in particular, the role of the Greek Orthodox Priest when he was projected in a most vulgar and objectionable manner. The plot depicts a couple who come to the Priest for counseling. The husband has committed adultery, but both are willing to reconcile and continue their life as husband and wife. What is repulsive and unacceptable is the fact that the role of the alleged Greek Orthodox Priest suggests that before reconciliation takes place, the wife "gets even" by herself committing adultery with a co-worker as did her husband.

The Orthodox Church and the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America and Canada has written to NBC in New York in order to protest this abuse inflicted upon a minority Christian body whose rich spiritual heritage spans 2,000 years. We take issue with those who would say to the general public that the Orthodox Church takes lightly such vulgarity.

I am appealing to you as a person who I know is interested in stopping such indecencies. Programs like these do nothing to enhance the dignity, reverence and venerability of religion in America. It accomplishes the opposite; the mocking, the scorning, the deriding and the ridiculing of the faith of millions of Americans whatever their denominational affiliation.

I am sending you a copy of the telegram that millions of Orthodox sent to the chairman and the chief executive officer of NBC. You might want to use this sample for a similar telegram. In any event, thank you for taking the time to read this letter in consideration of sending a telegram to NBC which must assume full responsibility for such recklessness and lack of proper programming decor.

Sincerely, in His Name,

Fr. M.B. Efthimiou

MBE:ac

Rev. Dr. Miltiades B. Efthimiou
Director
Department Church & Society

Grant Tinker
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
National Broadcasting Company, Inc.
3000 West Alameda Avenue
Burbank, California 91523

Dear Mr. Tinker:

The episode of Taxi that aired Thursday, October 21, depicted an actor portraying an Orthodox Christian Priest in a derogatory, sacrilegious, false and misleading manner. The suggestion that any Priest, especially an Orthodox Priest, would desecrate the Sacrament of Confession by counseling a parishioner to commit adultery is blasphemous. This abomination was reinforced on the episode broadcast Thursday, October 28, with flashbacks of the previous week's epitome of bad taste. Reckless character assassination of Orthodox Priests has no place on network television, even on a situation comedy with its admittedly wide latitude in satirizing society. As one of the five million Orthodox Christians in the United States, I vigorously protest such religious bigotry. Repeated incidents of this reprehensible nature can only provoke more drastic measures, including the picketing of NBC Network- owned and operated stations as well as affiliates.

f cc

ACTION

4 Nov. 1982

Jim -

I wanted you to have copies of my resumes, especially since you ~~have~~ and Mr. Baker have consented to serve as references.

Richard

RICHARD D. ENGLISH
ATTORNEY

501 Slaters Lane #322
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Office: 202/254-8501
Residence: 702/549-3390

RECENT EMPLOYMENT:

March 1981 - Present:
ACTION
The National Volunteer Agency
806 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20525

Title: Deputy Assistant Director
Responsibilities: Manages Evaluation and Planning Divisions, directs refugee activities, directs information and regulatory management efforts, advises on policy matters, etc.

August 1980 - February 1981:
Governor of Texas
State Capitol
Austin, Texas 78711

Title: Administrative Assistant
Responsibilities: Managing problems of policy and government administration, policy analysis, writing, legal counseling.

October 1976 - August 1980:
Governmental Affairs
Tenneco Oil Company
P.O. Box 2511
Houston, Texas 77001

Title: Attorney
Responsibilities: Interpreting and analyzing pending and recently enacted legislation, advising management, writing.

May 1975 - September 1976:
The Honorable Robert O'Conor, Jr.
United States District Judge
515 Rusk Street
Houston, Texas 77002

Title: Law Clerk
Responsibilities: Legal counseling, research and writing for judge, general assistance.

(Earlier employment includes service as Research Director of the Republican Party of Texas, 1973-1974, and Administrative Assistant to two highly regarded Republican State Representatives, 1973 and 1975.)

EDUCATION:

School of Law, University of Texas — J.D. Degree, January 1974

The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

B.A. Degree, May 1970
Major: Plan II (Honors Humanities Program).
Concentrations: Economics 24 Hours
Government 18 Hours
Senior Essay: Pluralism, Public Policies, and Political Science (an analysis of certain federal programs).

HONORS AND ACTIVITIES:

School of Law
The University of Texas — Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity

The University of Texas — Parliamentarian of Student Assembly, freshman year; Member, House of Delegates, sophomore year.

South Park High School
Beaumont, Texas — President of the Student Body and Student Council, 1965-1966

Professional: — Member, State Bar of Texas, American Bar Association. Admitted to practice, United States Courts, Southern District of Texas.

Civic Activities — Life Member, Ex-Students Association of the University of Texas; member, American Mensa, Sons of the Republic of Texas, Sons of the American Revolution.

DATE PREPARED: 26 October 1982

SUPPLEMENT TO PROFESSIONAL RESUME
RICHARD D. ENGLISH

Activities and Accomplishments as Deputy Assistant Director, ACTION

In managing evaluation division:

- Provided clear policy review of evaluation activities.
- Instituted procedures to tighten control over evaluations of ACTION programs.

In managing planning division:

- Created process linking long term planning to policy making.

In providing leadership for refugee programs:

- Formulated successful Refugee Employment Support Program utilizing volunteers.
- Created and supervised writing of Volunteer Refugee Assistance Package, material emphasizing sophisticated techniques of utilizing volunteers.
- Provided leadership for refugee activities through ACTION Council on Refugees activities and in agency publications.
- Coordinated agency activities with U.S. Coordinator of Refugee Affairs and Department of Health and Human Services.

In providing leadership for information and regulatory management affairs:

- Provided leadership for Task Force on Information Resources Management.
- Formulated plan for reviews of agency's information systems.
- Directed review and approved individual information collection requests.
- Counseled agency officials on procedures for information management and regulations.

In contributing to ACTION policy development:

- Created and instituted procedure for providing information support for agency initiatives.
- Helped shape agency ideas about voluntarism.

Served as member, Working Group of the Vice President's Task Force on South Florida.

Formulated the concept of the Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program (inaugurated by the President on November 10, 1981).

Examples of other Activities:

- Advised the Republican National Committee on the role of voluntarism in the public sector.
- Served as Staff Director for the Committee on Private Sector Roles, Structures, and Opportunities at the White House Conference on Aging.
- Delivered many speeches on refugees and on voluntarism to many groups
- Counseled Department of Housing and Urban Development on political, philosophical, and policy aspects of its proposed Urban Policy for the Administration. Cited by Assistant Secretary as the best from another agency. (Implementation of recommendations would have eliminated most comments used by critics of leaked draft of policy.)
- Wrote extensively on voluntarism and policy concepts.

Evaluation:

Received an outstanding rating for performance to October 1, 1982.

DATE PREPARED: 26 October 1982.

POLITICAL RESUME
OF
RICHARD D. ENGLISH

PARTICIPATED IN THE FOLLOWING CAMPAIGNS:

1980 -	Reagan and Bush (volunteer).
1979 - 80	Director of Political Research, George Bush for President, Houston National Headquarters (volunteer).
	National Founder of Young Professionals for Bush (volunteer).
1978 -	Member, Harris County (Houston, Texas) Finance Committee for Senator John Tower (volunteer).
	Organizer, Committee of One Thousand for Ray Hutchison, Harris County (volunteer).
	Jim Baker for Attorney General (volunteer).
	Clements for Governor (volunteer).
1976 -	Confined by strictures of Hatch Act as Law Clerk, March, 1975, through August, 1976.
	Ford for President, Chase Untermeyer for State Representative (volunteer).
1973 - 74	Research Director, Republican Party of Texas (paid).
	Assisted all Republican candidates in Texas.
1971 - 72	Research Assistant, Texans for Tower (paid).
1970 -	Bush for U.S. Senator (volunteer).
1968 -	Nixon for President (paid and volunteer).
	Eggers for Governor (paid and volunteer).
1966 -	Tower for Senator (volunteer).
1964 -	Goldwater for President (volunteer).
	Bush for U.S. Senator (volunteer).
	Greco for Congress (volunteer).

CONVENTION PARTICIPATION:

Delegate to the Republican National Convention, 1980.
Delegate to Republican State Convention, 1970, 1974, 1980.

CLUB MEMBERSHIPS:

Member, Greater Houston Young Adult Republican Club, 1976 -1980.
Member, The University of Texas Young Republican Club, 1966 - 1973.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

Sustaining Member of Republican National Committee since 1972.
Contributor to the campaigns of many Republican candidates.

POLITICAL REFERENCES:

Honorable George Bush, Vice President of the United States (known 15 years).

Honorable James A. Baker III, Chief of Staff, Office of the President (known 11 years).

Honorable Chase Untermeyer, Executive Assistant to the Vice President (known 8 years).

Mr. James W. Cicconi, Deputy to the Chief of Staff, Office of the President (known 2 years).

DATE PREPARED: 26 October 1982

f GC (English, R.)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

23 Dec 1982

TO: JAB III

RE: Call to George Shultz for Richard English

This is the call you offered to make for Richard English.

He has applied for the job of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the Bureau of Refugee Programs (for Refugee Admissions). This is one of three deputy slots in that bureau.

He has interviewed with James Purcell, director of the Bureau. WH Personnel has written Undersecretary Richard Kennedy on Richard's behalf, and he has the support of Amb. Eugene Douglas, State's Coordinator of Refugee Affairs.

The VP has also sent a note endorsing Richard.

(Attached is a sheet listing Richard's qualifications for the job.)

Call made 12/23/82 jmc

Jim Cicconi

13 December 1982

Dear Mr. Baker,

Thank you for offering to call Secretary Schultz in support of my interest in the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the Bureau of Refugee Programs.

Would you please do so?

This position is of deep interest to me--and it is one to which I would bring a good combination of experience, knowledge, and skills, as well as dedication and commitment to hard work.

I very deeply appreciate your interest in helping me.

Sincerely,

Richard

Richard D. English

SUMMARY
RICHARD D. ENGLISH

Position: Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, in the Bureau of Refugee Programs, (for Refugee Admissions).

Description: Essentially, this position supervises the domestic aspects of the bureau's refugee programs, including the reception and placement grants awarded to resettlement agencies, regulations, correspondence, and training.

My Qualifications: Important assets for this position from my background include the following:

* Managerial experience (especially that as Deputy Assistant Director of ACTION, where I directly supervise two large divisions, participate in managing the Office of Policy & Planning, and direct the activities of other task forces and projects, and play a major role in managing the entire agency).

* Experience in the problems of domestic refugee resettlement at the State (in the office of the Governor of Texas) and federal (as leader of ACTION's refugee programs and activities) levels.

* Current knowledge of domestic and international aspects of refugee problems from reading of specialized periodicals and monographs as well as frequent discussions with US officials dealing with refugee problems.

* Good relations with leading federal refugee officials.

* Knowledge of voluntarism--the primary force in US refugee resettlement.

* Knowledge of state and local government, their operations, and their politics.

* Knowledge of the operations and methods of the federal government.

RDE
12-12-82

Monday Morning
13 Dec. 1982

Dear Jim:

The V.P. invited me to go to Leon Jaworski's funeral last Saturday, and at the end of the flight back Saturday night Mr. Baker offered to call George Schultz supporting my candidacy for the position described in the attached sheet.

I have interviewed already with James N. Purcell, Director of the Bureau of Refugee Programs, who supervises the ~~incumbent~~ person who holds this position. Ron Mann of White House Personnel has sent a note to Richard Kennedy, Undersecretary of State, stating that I should be given serious consideration for this position. Ambassador Eugene Douglas, Coordinator of Refugee Affairs, has been very supportive of my interest in this position.

I prepared the enclosed sheet in case it might be of some use in such a call.

Please call me at 254-8501 when you have read this.

Thanks
Richard

(over)

P.S. I have talked to the V.P. and chase about this position, and I think the V.P. may be sending a note over to state this week.

SUMMARY
RICHARD D. ENGLISH

Position: Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, in the Bureau of Refugee Programs, (for Refugee Admissions).

Description: Essentially, this position supervises the domestic aspects of the bureau's refugee programs, including the reception and placement grants awarded to resettlement agencies, regulations, correspondence, and training.

My Qualifications: Important assets for this position from my background include the following:

* Managerial experience (especially that as Deputy Assistant Director of ACTION, where I directly supervise two large divisions, participate in managing the Office of Policy & Planning, and direct the activities of other task forces and projects, and play a major role in managing the entire agency.

* Experience in the problems of domestic refugee resettlement at the State (in the office of the Governor of Texas) and federal (as leader of ACTION's refugee programs and activities) levels.

* Current knowledge of domestic and international aspects of refugee problems from reading of specialized periodicals and monographs as well as frequent discussinns with US officials dealing with refugee problems.

* Good relations with leading federal refugee officials.

* Knowledge of voluntarism--the primary force in US refugee resettlement.

* Knowledge of state and local government, their operations, and their politics.

* Knowledge of the operations and methods of the federal government.

RDE
12-12-82

English, Richard

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 1, 1982

Dear Richard:

I wanted to let you know that Jim appreciated your comments and your support of Tom Pauken for the Administrator's position at the VA. He saw your letter before any decision was made, and I know he shares your high opinion of Tom (as I do).

Best regards,

Sincerely,

James W. Cicconi
Special Assistant to the President

Mr. Richard English
501 Slaters Lane, #322
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

19 October 1982

ACTION

To Jim Cicconi

Jim:

May I place this in your hands to make sure JAB III sees it and also to use it in the ways it can be used most effectively.

Richard

AA draft short note to PI ~~Mark~~ Richard asap. Assure him I made JAB aware of his thoughts before any decision was made on this. Thank him, etc. (FYI, decision went against Panken) JC

501 Slaters Lane #322
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

October 19, 1982

The Honorable James A. Baker, III
Chief of Staff and Assistant
to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Mr. Baker:

Because Tom Pauken has expressed interest in the position of Administrator of the Veterans Administration, I wanted to share with you my observations about his performance.

As Director of ACTION, Tom has:

- represented the Administration and the agency with great skill with highly articulate presentations of ACTION's mission and goals and Administration policy;
- skillfully handled difficult Congressional hearings where he won the respect of Members of Congress;
- very effectively took firm control of the operation of the ACTION agency so that political appointees, not career civil servants, determine policy and control agency operations; and
- provided strong leadership to his management team so that all managers perform effectively and make substantial achievements.

Tom's substantial Washington experience has prevented his making errors that others without his experience often make in dealing with the Congress and the press.

Under Tom's leadership, ACTION has initiated the Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program, and this program -- and expression of his concern and commitment to Vietnam veterans -- has been well received in the veterans community and reflected well on ACTION, Tom Pauken, and the Administration.

In summary, I think Tom's abilities, experience, and performance make him an excellent choice for Administrator of VA.

Thank you for this opportunity to share these observations.

Sincerely yours,

Richard

Richard English