

2016

Iannone, Carol: National Council on the Humanities Nomination (1991): News Article 03

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_34

Recommended Citation

"Iannone, Carol: National Council on the Humanities Nomination (1991): News Article 03" (2016). *Iannone, Carol: National Council on the Humanities Nomination (1991)*. Paper 22.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_34/22

This News Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Iannone, Carol: National Council on the Humanities Nomination (1991) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

4/7/1 (Item 1 from file: 146)

160696

Hill Slashes Funding for Rights Panel.

The Washington Post, October 19, 1986,

By: Howard Kurtz, Washington Post Staff Writer

Section: A SECTION, p. a12

Story Type: News National

Line Count: 41 Word Count: 455

Congress has sliced the budget of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by more than a third and restricted use of the remaining money in response to charges of mismanagement at the troubled agency.

As part of the fiscal 1987 omnibus spending bill, the House agreed to a Senate plan to cut the commission's budget from \$12 million to \$7.5 million and to halve the number of working days that Chairman Clarence M. Pendleton Jr. can charge to the government.

Details were released Friday after the House, which had voted to eliminate the commission's funding, agreed to the compromise.

The eight-member panel has been in a state of perpetual conflict since 1983, when President Reagan and Congress revamped it with a conservative majority that has repeatedly been accused by its liberal faction of being a mouthpiece for the administration. A move to abolish the commission gathered force last spring when the General Accounting Office accused it of widespread mismanagement, including the hiring of a large number of political appointees, consultants and temporary employees instead of career federal workers.

The GAO also found that Pendleton, an outspoken black conservative who lives in San Diego, has turned his part-time chairman's post into a nearly full-time job, charging the commission \$67,344 for 240 days of work last year. Pendleton has dismissed the GAO probe as politically motivated.

The budget bill limits Pendleton's compensation to 125 days a year and the other commissioners to 75 days a year. It sets ceilings of \$20,000 for consultants, \$185,000 for temporary employees and \$40,000 for contracts. And it allows the panel no more than four political appointees beyond the commissioners' assistants, whose billings were also limited.

In addition, Congress directed the commission to spend \$2 million on its regional offices and \$700,000 on monitoring civil rights compliance.

"We are disappointed as much about the earmarks and other restrictions as about the funding level itself, because it is an attempt to micromanage the agency from the outside," said commission staff director J. Al Latham Jr. "That really should be left in the hands of the people who are properly appointed here."

Latham, who contends the commission is more independent than its predecessors, said Friday that it may have to lay off some of its 130 employees. "We are in the process of assessing what this means to our

operation," he said.

Ralph G. Neas, executive director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, called the congressional action "a bipartisan repudiation of the reconstituted Civil-Rights Commission, which has become a sham and a national disgrace. Not one member, Democrat or Republican, stood up in committee or on the floor of the House or Senate to defend the commission."

♦♦

4/7/2 (Item 2 from file: 146)

149624

Do We Need a Civil Rights Commission?

The Washington Post, August 14, 1986,

By: By John H. Bunzel

Section: A, p. 23

Line Count: 84 Word Count: 925

Reversing a decision it made three years ago to keep the reconstituted U.S. Commission on Civil Rights until 1989, the House of Representatives voted last month to cut off all funding for the agency. What is remarkable (and to me disturbing) is that no hearings on the proposal were held, no public witnesses were called, no discussion took place on the floor of the House.

For its part, The Post concurs with the House. But I submit it is a poor way to make public policy about a federal agency whose history spans three decades.

Perhaps the commission should go. I am of several minds on the subject. But if Congress were seriously to consider abolishing it, it should provide a public forum where commission members, civil rights leaders (who, incidentally, do not speak with one voice on this issue) and others with varying points of view could debate whether or not it still has important work to do.

I might be comforted if the House or The Post had suggested that after 30 years the commission's work is done because discrimination is no longer the national problem it once was, or that spending millions on a nonenforcement monitoring agency cannot be justified when budget cuts are required.

But those are not the grounds on which the House's action was based. And this is where candor is needed.

For some time many of those who have wanted to abolish the present commission have had their own agenda--to de-fund it until one can be put in place that will be (in their view) "pro-civil rights." They claim the commission has betrayed the cause of minorities and the civil rights movement because of the positions it has taken--opposition to mandatory busing, racial hiring quotas, job layoffs based on race rather than seniority, comparable worth (unless agreed to in labor-management negotiations), etc. They have wanted a commission, but one that will vote "right" on the issues.

The charge that the bipartisan commission, half of whose members were

selected by Congress, has regularly echoed the Reagan administration's line on civil rights is foolish. All eight members are vigorously independent and speak their own minds. Nearly every point of view on the major issues is represented. Two, sometimes three or four members have voiced strong opposition to Justice Department policies. Several Reagan appointees have criticized White House statements or positions, most recently on minority business set-asides. I myself have publicly differed with those in the administration who want to change Executive Order 11246, the bulwark of federal affirmative action, and last spring called for the resignation of Chairman Clarence Pendleton Jr. These (and others) are hardly actions of a commission doing the bidding of the White House.

It is claimed that the General Accounting Office found widespread mismanagement at the commission. But as the managing editor of the Copley New Service's Washington Bureau has reported, "The GAO was unable to document one instance of malfeasance or misfeasance. The claim that the GAO found improper personnel and management practices is hogwash. A GAO official admitted privately that the technical problems uncovered can be found at any independent federal agency of similar size."

The Post suggests that a new commission should be formed, and some members of the House have already proposed an "independent" Civil Rights Assessment Board that would be made an arm of Congress. But it strikes me that the new Civil Rights Board, made up exclusively of members of Congress who would set program policy, appoint the deputy director, and decide on and control the necessary funds, might have a problem establishing its own independence--of Congress.

One further note about this commission's independence. It has also never echoed the line of civil rights advocacy groups--or any other groups. This is as it should be. In 1980, however, the commission contracted with the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund to "prepare a report on the implementation of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment," an issue for which NOW has lobbied extensively. There is nothing wrong with favoring ERA. I support it too. What is wrong is handing a government project over to a partisan group that has a vested interest in its outcome. That is not my idea of independence.

It has always seemed to me a good bet that the Senate Appropriations Committee (and the full Senate) would vote to cut roughly in half the budget of the commission for the next year rather than to de-fund it entirely. Even half a loaf, however, could create serious staffing problems that were never intended. It could also endanger some of the long-range studies now in progress.

Within the next year or two the commission is scheduled to publish the results of some important research--on minority voting rights, school desegregation, the isolation of Hispanic students, the effects of affirmative action on the labor market status of minorities and women, and what may well be the most comprehensive examination of trends in the earnings of different minority groups and women. This significant series will also include separate studies on women, blacks, Americans of Asian and Hispanic descent and one on minority youth.

Looking ahead, how long will we need a federal agency to monitor

discrimination in this country? Or should there be a different kind of commission with a new mandate to help deal with the special problems afflicting the poor and disadvantaged in today's society? • These and other fundamental questions have yet to be addressed by Congress. The writer is a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

4/7/3 (Item 3 from file: 146)

144690

Rights Panel's Critics Try To Put It Out of Business.

The Washington Post, July 11, 1986,

By: By Howard Kurtz, Washington Post Staff Writer

Section: A, p. 15

Line Count: 83 Word Count: 913

Since President Reagan put his philosophical stamp on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 2 1/2 years ago, House Democrats and civil rights activists have regularly ridiculed the panel as a meaningless sideshow.

Now these critics have stopped making fun of the commission and are trying to put it out of business. They took the first step late last month when the House Appropriations Committee voted 27 to 16 to cut off the commission's funding.

Commissioner Mary Frances Berry, leader of a liberal faction that is engaged in perpetual warfare with the conservative majority, said the panel's wounds are self-inflicted.

"I certainly can understand why Congress might think defunding is the thing to do," Berry said. "If the commission doesn't change what it's doing and tighten up its financial management, defunding might seem like an appropriate response on the part of Congress . . . Here are guys spending \$12 million a year and all we do is fight all the time."

But staff director J. Al Latham Jr. called the defunding move "a preemptive strike" by critics who don't like the commission's ideological direction under Chairman Clarence M. Pendleton Jr.

"This commission is in reality the most independent one there has been," Latham said. "I think it would be a loss to the country if the only kind of Civil Rights Commission that could exist is one that is beholden to Congress and special interest groups."

The commission, created as a factfinding agency under President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1957, won wide respect for its studies and reports on discrimination during two decades of civil rights strife. But in 1983 it became the focus of acrimony when Reagan fired Berry and two other liberal commissioners and tried to replace them with his own conservative choices.

The Senate balked at confirming Reagan's nominees, saying he was destroying the commission's independence. In a last-minute compromise with the White House, Senate leaders agreed to expand the commission from six to eight members, with four to be named by the president and four by congressional leaders.

Reagan installed Pendleton, then president of the San Diego Urban League, as chairman, and also appointed New York lawyer Morris B. Abram, Hoover Institution researcher John Bunzel and Texas teacher Esther Gonzalez-Arroyo Buckley. Berry and Blandina Cardenas Ramirez, who had been fired, were reappointed. But the White House backed off on the appointment of one candidate and persuaded House Republicans to kill the appointment of another candidate who had been part of the deal. This sparked charges of bad faith that launched the turbulent era.

Since then, commission meetings have been raucous affairs, with members attacking each other in highly personal terms.

Pendleton's combative style has fueled the controversy. He has dismissed comparable-worth plans as a "Looney Tunes" idea and described civil rights leaders as "new racists" who are leading blacks into a "political Jonestown." He has also drawn criticism for turning his part-time post into a virtual full-time job.

From the right, the conservative Bunzel has urged Pendleton to resign because of his "inflammatory rhetoric." From the left, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, a coalition of 165 groups, recently called the commission "a sham and a national disgrace."

Conference executive director Ralph G. Neas and NAACP executive director Benjamin L. Hooks said in a letter to Congress that "there is no longer an independent civil rights commission. It died three years ago The commission is now considered part of the Reagan administration. Indeed, it has become nothing more than the propaganda arm of the Department of Justice."

Berry said it is no secret that Pendleton frequently consults with the White House and no coincidence that the commission's criticism of affirmative action coincides with the Justice Department's position.

But Latham said the commission demonstrated its independence with a recent report that called for an end to federal programs that set aside contracts for minorities. The panel voted to have its staff revise the report after it appeared to embarrass the White House.

The flap over minority set-asides came on the heels of a General Accounting Office report in April that accused the commission of widespread mismanagement. The report, requested by four House Democratic subcommittee chairmen, questioned the commission's financial practices and said the panel had used irregular procedures to hire a large number of political appointees and consultants instead of career employees.

Pendleton and Latham denounced the GAO probe as politically motivated. Latham said this week that "the GAO was doing the bidding of liberal Democratic members of Congress. They were tailoring the report to what was expected of them."

But the allegations attracted the attention of the Appropriations Committee, which approved the defunding amendment in a vote along party lines, with Democrats in support. Its sponsor, Rep. Julian C. Dixon

(D-Calif.), emphasized the panel's meager record.

Latham said the commission's critics were attempting to silence forthcoming studies on school busing, housing bias, relative income among Americans, and discrimination toward Asians and ethnic Europeans. He said such "good scholarly work" takes a long time to complete and would be of higher quality than many commission studies before 1983.

4/7/4 (Item 4 from file: 146)
137831

The Washington Post, November 06, 1986,
Section: a, p. 17
Line Count: 63 Word Count: 694

Although Congress has slashed his agency's budget, cut his personal compensation and given him strict marching orders, Clarence M. Pendleton Jr., chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, says he isn't giving up.

"I'm an ex-coach," he says. "You take what the defense gives you Putting the muzzle on us doesn't extend the debate. We're going to do what Congress wants, but we feel hampered."

Pendleton noted in an interview that although he charged the commission \$67,000 in salary last year, his post has until recently been part time only by tradition, not by law. He said he spends much of his official time commuting between Washington and his home in San Diego, and that his travel expenses often exceed his reimbursement. "It costs me money to work for the commission," Pendleton said.

Why, then, did Congress act last month to limit his compensation to 125 days a year--a move that will cut his pay by almost half? "I've been too effective in adding to the debate," the outspoken conservative said. "If you can't kill the messenger, you kill the message center."

Pendleton said it would be hard to replace staff director J. Al Latham Jr., who resigned last week, because Congress, responding to charges of mismanagement, has placed numerous restrictions on the agency's operations. "Who'd want the job after this?" he said. Post Script . . . Postmaster General Preston R. Tisch attended his first board of governors meeting Tuesday, and announced a flurry of new appointments:

Thomas J. Berry, 61, an AT&T corporate vice president, has been recruited to serve as Tisch's executive assistant. Joel S. Trosch, an 18-year Postal Service employe who is presently regional director of Human Resources for the Northeast region, was appointed assistant postmaster general for employe relations. He replaces David H. Charters, who was named assistant postmaster general for the human resources groups. And Gordon R. Morison, presently assistant postmaster general for marketing, was named assistant postmaster general for philatelic affairs.

Morison's position is one of two new assistant postmaster slots created by Tisch and announced at this week's San Francisco meeting. The other, as yet unfilled, is assistant postmaster general for training and development.

These newly minted jobs bring to 18 the number of assistant postmasters general. Gone to Market . . . On Monday, Agriculture Secretary Richard E. Lyng appointed J. Patrick Boyle, an aide to Sen. Pete Wilson (R-Calif.), to oversee the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Boyle, 32, has been Wilson's legislative assistant for agricultural issues since February 1985. Previously, he served as counsel to the National Grocers Association and the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.

He replaces James Handley, who was appointed special assistant to Lyng.
--Marjorie WilliamsjBased on staff reports and news services

4/7/5 (Item 5 from file: 146)

136958

The Washington Post, November 01, 1986,

Section: a, p. 01

Line Count: 85 Word Count: 940

The staff director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights resigned yesterday, the latest loss for a troubled agency whose budget and staff are shrinking as quickly as its reputation in Congress.

J. Al Latham Jr. said he is leaving because Congress, shortly before adjourning, cut the commission's budget by more than a third and sharply restricted the ways in which the panel can spend the remaining money.

"I don't believe that I can accomplish what I personally would want to with the kinds of slashed funding and restrictions that Congress placed on the commission," Latham said in an interview. "I think this seriously jeopardizes a lot of the fine research this agency was doing."

The commission is quickly becoming a shadow of its former self. In recent months, its staff has shrunk from 190 to less than 100, as employees have taken early retirement or scrambled for new jobs following congressional moves to abolish the agency. The commission plans layoffs to reduce the staff to 45.

"Everyone here is a little nervous," spokeswoman Barbara Brooks said.

Latham, who succeeded Linda Chavez, now the Republican Senate nominee in Maryland, blamed civil rights groups for having "hogtied" the commission. "They wanted to silence this commission," he said.

But Ralph G. Neas, executive director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, called Latham's comments "patently absurd. Huge bipartisan majorities in both the Senate and House repudiated the reconstituted Civil Rights Commission because it had abandoned its independence, defied its statutory mandate to oversee the federal government and had become a morass of mismanagement."

Commissioner Mary Frances Berry, a liberal, said Latham was on "a mad pursuit of ideology Latham left because Congress refused to finance his efforts to extend the havoc at the commission and the administration's perversion of civil rights."

The departure of Latham, an outspoken advocate for the policies of Chairman Clarence M. Pendleton Jr., follows the resignation of Vice Chairman Morris B. Abram, a respected conservative.

The 29-year-old commission, which began under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, won wide acclaim for its reports on decades of civil rights strife. But it has been beset by internal warfare since 1983, when President Reagan tried to fire some liberal commissioners, leading to a compromise in which half the members of an expanded panel were named by the president and half by Congress.

The commission's conservative majority is led by the flamboyant Pendleton, a black conservative from San Diego who has attacked civil rights leaders as "new racists" and dismissed comparable-worth plans as a "Looney Tunes" idea. Commission meetings have often degenerated into shouting matches as Berry and other liberal members have accused Pendleton and Latham of being mouthpieces for the administration.

The biggest setback came last spring when the General Accounting Office accused the commission of widespread mismanagement, including the hiring of a large number of political appointees, consultants and temporary employes instead of career federal workers. The GAO also said Pendleton had turned his part-time post into a full-time job, charging the commission \$67,344 for 240 days of work last year.

That got Congress' attention. As part of the fiscal 1987 omnibus spending bill, it reduced the commission's budget from \$12 million to \$7.5 million, limited Pendleton's compensation to 125 days a year and said no more than \$250,000 could be spent on consultants, temporary employes and contracts. Congress also ordered the commission to spend \$2.7 million on its regional offices and on monitoring civil rights compliance by government agencies.

Latham said this would jeopardize commission studies, such as its recent reports on comparable worth and the economic progress of black men, that depart from traditional civil rights approaches.

Latham said "the current civil rights leadership" has abandoned ideals espoused by Martin Luther King Jr. and Roy Wilkins "in favor of an unseemly scramble for spoils based on irrelevant, invidious factors."

Neas replied: "Rather than pursuing the ideals of Roy Wilkins and Martin Luther King, the commission has become a propaganda platform" for the Reagan administration.

Latham's assistant, Susan Prado, will be acting staff director until Reagan names a successor.

4/7/77 (Item 7 from file: 146)
136104

Talking Points Abram to Depart Civil Rights Post.
The Washington Post, June 10, 1986,

Section: A, p. 17

Line Count: 29 Word Count: 329

Morris B. Abram, who has been an increasingly outspoken defender of the Reagan administration's civil rights policies, has resigned as vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Abram, 67, told President Reagan he was stepping down because he wants to devote full attention to his new post as chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, a coalition including the American Jewish Congress and B'nai B'rith.

The New York lawyer had been playing a more combative role on the divided civil rights commission as its chairman, Clarence M. Pendleton Jr., sought a lower profile because of controversy.

Abram, who agrees with the Justice Department that the use of racial goals and quotas is discriminatory, accused critics of trying to discredit the commission "because our ideas are unacceptable."

But Abram also came under fire for recommending two of his son's friends for commission jobs. The two men were given unusually rapid promotions, with one moving in rank from GS-7 to GS-12 in 13 months. Abram said he had nothing to do with the promotions.

As a former chairman of the United Negro College Fund and with roots in the 1960s civil rights movement, Abram was the most prestigious of Reagan's members of the commission, which spends much of its time in internal squabbles. History Lesson . . . There was no shortage of praise in the Senate yesterday for the Finance Committee's tax-overhaul bill, which was the main order of business. Virtually every speaker commended it as "historic," citing its proposal to reduce tax rates to the lowest levels in more than a generation. But Sen. Max Baucus (D-Mont.) placed the bill's historic nature most clearly in context by observing that Congress has not written a new tax code since 1954, when "Marilyn Monroe and Joe DiMaggio were still married." --Marjorie WilliamsjBased on staff reports and news services Graphics/one: Morris B. Abram...heads coalition of Jewish groups

4/7/8 (Item 8 from file: 146)

129651

OP/ED On Merit, of Cours.

The Washington Post, May 01, 1986,

By: By Richard Cohen

Section: A, p. 23

Line Count: 63 Word Count: 699

Thanks to Morris Abram we at last know what the meritocracy is. Abram is the vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, a longtime foe of both affirmative action and quotas and therefore a champion of earning your way by merit. He got two of his son's friends jobs on the civil rights commission.

This is the way you and I always knew the meritocracy works. It explains why the sons of alumni become, after four short years, alumni themselves, or, if you prefer, how a bunch of rich men in California, with a tip here

and some advice there, made Ronald Reagan into yet another rich man in California. In the meritocracy as in the garment business, one hand washes the other.

In Abram's case, he recommended two of his son's friends for jobs with the civil rights commission. In nine months, one of the son's friends zoomed four salary grades, and in 13 months the other went five grades. Abram denied having anything at all to do with the promotions, and indeed, there is no evidence that he did. In fact, no one has even suggested that the two employees, friends of the boss's son though they might be, are not also qualified for their jobs.

And that, of course, is the nub of the argument both for and against affirmative action. At the same time its critics are blasting it as un-American, discriminatory or--the words Abram himself used to describe set-asides-- "blatant tokenism," most of the world realized long ago that its proclaimed alternative, the meritocracy, is a mere ideal. You almost never see the real thing.

Take the case of the two civil rights commission staff aides. Probably, they are qualified for their jobs. Probably, they are bright and industrious and, you would think, examples of the meritocracy at its best. But they also know the boss's son. And it was the boss's recommendation that secured them the jobs. There is the chance--just the chance--that if Abram were at the Commerce Department, the two men would now be working there.

Blacks and other minority groups usually don't have such connections. Having been for years excluded from both government and commerce, they are in fact excluded from both government and commerce. They do not know an Abram. They do not know his son. They do not, by and large, go to Columbia--and some of those who do do so because of affirmative action programs of one sort or another. When they say that meritocracy is yet another name for racial barriers, you can see what they are talking about. They're talking about Abram, his son and his friends.

Years ago I wrote a column about Alan Bakke, the medical student whose suit struck down an affirmative action program based on quotas at the University of California at Davis. It was one of the hardest columns I ever had to write. I was, as the jargon goes, conflicted--torn between a desire to recognize the special needs of minorities and the plight of Bakke himself. After all, there was no getting around the fact that he would have been the innocent victim of racial discrimination --excluded from medical school because he was white.

Since then the issue has become no easier. Always, preferential treatment of any kind--goals, quotas, call it what you want--means that someone gets excluded. Bakke was originally rejected from medical school because he is white, but people are rejected or selected all the time because they are northerners or southerners, athletes or actors, foreign or American and-- often very important--the child of an alumnus or big giver. If all things being (more or less) equal, the child of an alumnus gets the nod, then why is it so wrong also to take race into account? After all, there is merit in attempting to overcome the effects of racial

discrimination

Life is a vast game of musical chairs in which winning and losing should be decided only by merit. Often, though, it is not. Sometimes you win because you're fast on your feet. Sometimes you win because someone holds a chair for you. Abram himself, the son of an immigrant Russian Jew who settled in Fitzgerald, Ga., is an example of both. He made it on his own. But having made it, he most certainly helped his son and, now, his son's friends. That meritocracy is like anything else. If you want to make it work, you need connections.

4/7/10 (Item 10 from file: 146)

128323

Rights Official Hits Back At Critics in Congress Abram Says GAO Is Harassing Commission.

The Washington Post, April 23, 1986,

By: By Howard Kurtz, Washington Post Staff Writer

Section: A, p. 04

Line Count: 60 Word Count: 668

Morris B. Abram, vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, castigated a House subcommittee chairman and the General Accounting Office yesterday for a critical audit that he called "part of a larger effort to discredit the commission because our ideas are unacceptable."

Democratic members of the subcommittee fired back by questioning Abram about unusually rapid promotions for two of his son's friends, who had been recommended by Abram for commission jobs.

The exchanges typified a contentious hearing at which four of the eight members of the commission, itself split between conservative and liberal factions, tried to respond to the GAO's charges of mismanagement and improper political hiring.

Abram criticized Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), who requested the audit as chairman of the House Judiciary subcommittee on civil and "The GAO has never before been attacked as a partisan organization. . . ." --Rep. Don Edwardsj constitutional rights. And Abram said the GAO had relied on "innuendo" in its "continuing harassment" of the commission.

He was supported by commission Chairman Clarence M. Pendleton Jr., who testified that the audit was "unfair, inaccurate and incomplete."

Edwards declared that "there is no politics involved" in his criticism of the commission, adding: "The GAO has never before been attacked as a partisan organization I'm very surprised that the General Accounting Office would be the whipping boy."

The GAO reported finding widespread mismanagement, missing records and questionable spending at the commission under former staff director Linda Chavez, now a Republican candidate for the Senate from Maryland. It criticized the agency for hiring a large number of political appointees, temporary employes and consultants instead of career workers.

Pendleton said little at the hearing, maintaining that he is "not the

day-to-day manager of the agency" and repeatedly insisting that staff director J. Al Latham Jr. be allowed to testify.

Edwards' insistence that the panel hear only from commissioners sparked heated criticism from Rep. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-Wis.), who accused the panel of "a partisan witch hunt."

"I find it puzzling for people to spend all their time attacking the GAO," said Commissioner Mary Frances Berry, Pendleton's chief critic on the panel. Calling such criticism "irrelevant," she said the commission has failed to rebut the allegation that "we had an engorgement of political appointees."

Reps. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.) and John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) questioned Abram about two commission employees hired for GS-7 positions, one of whom was promoted to a GS-11 job in nine months and the other to a GS-12 slot in 13 months.

Abram said that one was a former roommate of his son at Columbia University and the other a friend of his son and that he had recommended both for the jobs.

But, Abram said, "I had nothing to do with anyone's promotion or anyone's grade level." He said the two men are "extraordinary people" with "splendid academic records."

Abram said the real issue is commission opposition to racial quotas. Citing widespread publicity about various remarks by Pendleton, Abram said the news media never give similar coverage to controversial remarks by Berry and others who have "the correct social-engineering ideas."

"Where are these sanctimonious guardians of public discourse when Congressman Parren Mitchell (D-Md.) or others call Chairman Pendleton 'a low-level kind of houseboy' or 'Uncle Tom'?" Abram asked.

Pendleton, who the GAO said has turned his part-time post into a \$67,000-a-year job, did not respond when Schroeder asked whether commissioners' billings should be limited.

4/7/15 (Item 15 from file: 146)

126761

Civil Rights Chairman, Aide Boost Salaries.

The Washington Post, March 25, 1986,

By: By Howard Kurtz, Washington Post Staff Writer

Section: A, p. 01

Line Count: 65 Word Count: 719

Clarence M. Pendleton Jr. has turned his part-time post as chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights into a nearly full-time job that paid him \$67,344 last year, although that amounts to less than half his income from outside ventures.

That is among the findings in an unreleased General Accounting Office report that found widespread mismanagement at the commission. The report, to be made public at a House hearing today, also said that political groups, oil companies, television networks and other sources improperly paid for some of Pendleton's travel.

The GAO findings come amid a Small Business Administration investigation of Pendleton and his special assistant, Sydney I. Novell, who earned \$41,328 at the commission last year. While serving as chairman of a federally funded San Diego firm that packages SBA loan applications, Pendleton arranged a noncompetitive contract for Novell that pays her \$60,000 a year plus commissions, according to Media General News Service, which disclosed the SBA probe.

Pendleton, who is also a partner with Novell in a consulting firm, said he resigned as chairman of the San Diego County Local Development Corp. in January.

An outspoken black conservative who lives in San Diego, Pendleton dismissed the GAO probe as "politically motivated." He said his salary and expenses were higher than his colleagues' because "the chairman has a lot of responsibility The taxpayers are more than getting their money's worth."

Pendleton referred questions about the SBA probe to his San Diego lawyer, who could not be reached yesterday.

The GAO report said Pendleton received \$188,000 in salary from the commission for 233, 233 and 240 days of work over the last three years, more than twice the number of days charged by any other commissioner. Novell charged for 239 days last year. A full-time work year is 260 days.

Pendleton also outpaced the other commissioners by charging the government \$29,300 for 36 trips last year. In the last four years, the GAO said, outside groups have paid for Pendleton's travel or lodging on 45 of 117 trips.

The auditors said Pendleton did not identify most of these groups on his vouchers and that it is a violation of federal rules for him to accept gifts from for-profit companies.

Pendleton, former head of the San Diego Urban League, remains involved in numerous private ventures. Among his other ventures in 1983, according to his financial disclosure statement, he received \$23,500 in director's fees from Great American First Savings Bank in San Diego; \$700 in director's fees from San Diego Transit Corp. and \$4,200 in fees from two other groups.

In the last nine months of 1982, while serving as commission chairman, Pendleton also was paid \$42,500 as president of the New Coalition for Economic and Social Change.

Commission staff director J. Al Latham Jr. said agency lawyers had decided that it was "perfectly lawful and proper" for officials to accept

travel expenses from outside groups because they have no regulatory powers. He said the GAO denied his agency "due process" by not including its comments in the final report.

The GAO review, requested by Reps. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.), Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.) and Matthew G. Martinez (D-Calif.), found that:

The commission has hired a large number of political appointees, consultants and temporary employes, instead of career federal workers. In one 27-month period, the commission made 212 such appointments while hiring 60 career employes.

There were irregularities in the hiring of all 31 consultants and 23 temporary employes examined by the GAO. Consultants were improperly allowed to manage commission projects and supervise career staff, while some temporary employes were hired after the application period had closed.

Three political appointees were directly promoted from GS-7 jobs to GS-11 and GS-12 positions, and a fourth received a \$30,000 salary increase in 17 months.

Latham said the commission has hired "a very distinguished group of consultants" and that there is no evidence that rules were broken or career employes shortchanged. "All these areas are narrow, technical questions that do not involve any claim of malfeasance or misappropriation of funds," he said.

4/7/22 (Item 22 from file: 146)
092066

Congress Urged Not to Reverse Rights Ruling United Press International.
The Washington Post, April 03, 1985,
Section: A, p. 04
Line Count: 25 Word Count: 280

Clarence M. Pendleton Jr., chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, told Congress yesterday that civil rights legislation to reverse a Supreme Court ruling would unnecessarily expand the reach of federal law.

Pendleton, joined by other opponents, told a joint hearing that the legislation supported by liberal members of Congress is an "overreaching proposal."

"The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985 . . . may more aptly be called the Civil Rights Expansion Act of 1985," said Pendleton, who has come under fire for his conservative approach to civil rights.

The joint hearing by the House Judiciary Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee was called to hear opposing views on the proposal to counter the effects of a Supreme Court decision last year restricting the impact of civil rights laws.

In that ruling, involving Grove City College in Pennsylvania, the high court said that only programs receiving direct federal aid were required to comply with civil rights laws.

Liberal members of Congress are backing a proposal to counter the decision and require that any program receiving federal money not discriminate.

Opponents say the proposal would broaden the scope of civil rights enforcement far beyond congressional intentions.

The Reagan administration is on record supporting a more restrictive bill that would limit the law to educational institutions. It argues that the more liberal bill would require "mom and pop" grocery stores, for instance, to provide facilities for the handicapped if they accept food stamps.

4/7/68 (Item 17 from file: 631)
03137462
CIVIL RIGHTS WRONGS
BOSTON GLOBE (BG) - SUNDAY April 14, 1985
Edition: THIRD Section: EDITORIAL PAGE Page: A6
Word Count: 413

TEXT:

There they go again. The US Commission on Civil Rights has weighed in on the wrong side of another civil rights issue and formally declared that policies aimed at ending sex-based wage discrimination are without merit. On Thursday, the commission voted 5-2 to urge Congress and government agencies to reject comparable-worth policies that would require equal salaries for men and women in jobs of equal value to employers.

Last year, Clarence Pendleton, the commission's chairman, called comparable worth "the looniest idea since Looney Tunes." Four years ago, the Supreme Court ruled that under federal civil rights laws, sex-discrimination suits can be brought by women paid less than men for doing jobs requiring similar skills, education, training and responsibility. Since that decision, a federal court has found the state of Washington guilty of sex discrimination for paying female employees less than male employees in jobs of comparable value. Similar suits are pending in 10 states, including Massachusetts.

After the vote, commission member Morris Abrams told reporters that "the repetitious charge that women earn only 60 percent of what men earn in this country obscures the significant fact that women work less hours, have less seniority and work more intermittently than men." Abrams and his colleagues do not see facts that suggest wage-based sex discrimination has nothing to do with seniority or employment history.

In Massachusetts, for example, the starting salary for state cleaning-service matrons is \$1000 less than for male janitors; the starting salary for licensed practical nurses, who are mostly women, is \$1500 less than for groundskeepers, who are mostly men. Under an initiative proposed last year, Massachusetts will gradually remedy sex-based wage discrimination among its employees. State jobs will be reclassified and pay scales will be adjusted to reflect the skills, training, education and responsibilities required.

The Supreme Court ruling has prompted similar action in many states.

Pay-equity funds have been appropriated in six states; policies favoring comparable worth have been adopted by seven states; and pay-equity panels have been established in at least 20 states.

Congressional hearings were held this month on a bill that would require the federal government to review its own job-classification system and determine how its employees are affected by sex-based wage discrimination. A similar bill was approved by the House, 413-6, last year.

Congress should pass the bill and force the Civil Rights Commission and opponents of comparable worth in the Reagan Administration to recognize equal pay for jobs of equal value. MCMANU;04/12,09:29 NKELLY;04/15,16:25 EWORTH

Copyright Globe Newspaper Company 1985

4/7/69 (Item 18 from file: 631)

03133610

END OF US CIVIL RIGHTS PANEL URGED BY MEMBER WHO SUED REAGAN TO STAY
BOSTON GLOBE (BG) - TUESDAY March 26, 1985

By: Joanne Ball, Globe Staff

Edition: THIRD Section: NATIONAL/FOREIGN Page: 20

Word Count: 415

TEXT:

A controversial member of the US Commission on Civil Rights, who sued President Ronald Reagan in 1983 in an effort to retain her post, yesterday called for the dismantling of the agency because it has been transformed from civil rights watchdog into a "propaganda tool" of the Reagan Administration.

Mary Frances Berry, 47, said in an interview in Boston that because the eight-member commission has denounced affirmative action and other civil rights initiatives, it would be better if it ceased to function. She urged ". . . people to simply ignore the commission" if it doesn't lose its funding.

An activist during the earlier civil rights movement, Berry called for progressive-minded people to organize a new multiracial movement in order to dramatize the plight of those hurt by Reagan's policies.

In 1983, Reagan fired Berry and two other commissioners and sought to replace them with nominees who reflected his own conservative attitudes. However, Berry and Blandina Cardenas Ramirez sued Reagan and won. Congress, in the interim, drafted a compromise measure, which Reagan signed, allowing four members to be appointed by the President and four by Congress.

A history and law professor at Howard University in Washington, Berry said during a speech to Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD), there were many good programs that resulted from the civil rights movement of the 1950s and '60s, including the Head Start program for preschool children. Berry described the creation of such programs and the move to provide opportunities to blacks and other minorities as "marching toward Jericho."

"But then we started to move backward."

She said policy-makers had a change of heart and the prevailing belief has become: "Everything that needed to be done has already been done and anybody who hasn't gotten ahead (with these programs) it's their own fault."

Berry said the power of dramatic action has been borne out in the Free South Africa Movement. The day before last Thanksgiving, Berry, Walter Fautroy, a District of Columbia delegate to Congress, and Randall Robinson, head of the black lobbying group TransAfrica, were arrested at the South African Embassy in Washington, launching a wave of national protests against that country's policies of racial separation.

Since then, more than 2000 others have been arrested in protests in 20 cities including Boston. Earlier this month, two bills were introduced in Congress calling for a halt to the sale of the South African Krugerrand coin and a ban on new loans and investment and computer exports. JBALL ;03/25,16:09 BEVER1;03/27,10:58 BERRY26